A History of The Jewish People in the Time of Jesus Christ

EMIL SCHÜRER

A History of The Jewish People in the Time of Jesus Christ

EMIL SCHÜRER

http://www.servantofmessiah.org

Table of Contents

SECOND DIVISION

http://servantofmessiah.org/

VOLUME I: FIRST DIVISION POLITICAL HISTORY OF PALESTINE, FROM B.C. 175 TO A.D. 135

FIRST PERIOD: FROM ANTIOCHUS EPIPHANES DOWN TO THE CONQUEST OF JERUSALEM BY POMPEY

THE RISE OF THE MACCABEES AND THE PERIOD OF FREEDOM, B.C. 175-63

INASMUCH as the history of Israel during this period is very much mixed up with the history of Syria, we propose to give first of all –

A SKETCH OF THE HISTORY OF SYRIA DURING THE LAST CENTURY OF THE SELEUCID DYNASTY, B.C. 175-63

SOURCES

Eusebii Chronicorum libri duo, ed. Schoene, vol. ii. Berol. 1866, vol. i. 1875; especially an extract given there from Porphyry. – Also the Chronicle of Sulpicius Severus, ed. Halm, 1866, contains some statements of importance. See Bernays, Ueber die Chronik des Sulp. Severus, 1861, pp. 61-63. – Scattered notices will also be found in Polybius, Diodorus, Livy, and Justin. Appian gives a good summary sketch. – The Book of Daniel, chap. 11, and the commentary on it by Jerome (Opp. Vallarsi, v. 701-724), come into consideration only for Antiochus Epiphanes. – The two books of Maccabees, especially the first. Josephus, in books xii. and xiii. of his Antiquities, enlarges upon the story, and adds, especially for the history of the Seleucidae, many important historical statements derived from other writers. – And, finally, of the utmost importance are the numerous dated coins. For the literature of this subject, see above, § 2. D. Special attention should be called to Eckhel, Mionnet, de Saulcy, and the Catalogue of the British Museum by Gardner.

LITERATURE

CLINTON, Fasti Hellenici. The Civil and Literary Chronology of Greece and Rome, vol. iii., from the CXXIV Olympiad to the death of Augustus. Oxford 1830. 2nd edition, 1851, pp. 310-350.

EWALD, History of Israel, vol. v. Supremacy of the Seleucidae; the Maccabees; the sons of John Hyrcanus, pp. 286-394.

STANLEY, Lectures on the History of the Jewish Church. Third series. 2nd edition. London

1877. Lect. xlviii.-xlix. pp. 285-396.

NIEBUHR, Vorträge über alte Geschichte, iii. (1851). Also: Historischer Gewinn aus der armenischen Uebersetzung der Chronik des Eusebiut in Klein, Schr. i. 179-304.

FOY-VAILLANT, Seleucidarum imperium sive Historia regum Syriae ad fidem numismatum accommodata. Paris 1681.

FLATHE, Geschichte Macedoniens und der Reiche, welche von macedonischen Königen beherrscht wurden. Bd. ii. (1834). The most complete modern history of the Hellenistic Kingdoms.

FROELICH, Annales compendiarii regum et rerum Syriae numis veteribus illustrati. Viennae 1744, editio altera 1750.

STARK, Gaza und die philistäische Küste. 1852.

A good summary of the sources is given by Clinton. — For the determining of the general chronological framework the chief sources are: 1. The Extract from Porphyry in the Chronicle of Eusebius; 2. Separate statements in the First Book of Maccabees. The Seleucid era, according to which the dates in this book are reckoned, begins probably, not in autumn, but rather in spring of B.C. 312 (see above, § 3. A.). 3. The coins, whose dates have been lucidly collected and arranged by de Saulcy, Mémoire sur les monnaies datées des Séleucides, Paris 1871.

Porphyry, the well-known Neo-Platonic philosopher of the third century after Christ, wrote a chronological world in which he made careful use of the best sources. From, it Eusebius in his Chronicle makes extracts with reference to the history of the Ptolemies (Eusebii Chron., ed. Schoene, i. 159 sq.), and with reference to the Macedonian kings (Eusebii Chron., ed. Schoene, i. 229 sq.). But undoubtedly from, this same source, although Porphyry is not there named, is derived the whole similar paragraph on the history of the Seleucidae (Eusebii Chron., ed. Schoene, i. 247-264). The text of the Chronicle of Eusebius with this passage complete is now extant only in an Armenian translation, first edited by Aucher, Eusebii Chron. vol. i. (1818), translated anew for Schoene's edition into Latin by Petermann. Fragments of the Greek text are met with in a Parisian manuscript, from which they were published even by Scaliger in the Appendix to his Thesaurus temporum, 1606, and more recently by Cramer, Anccdota Graeca e codd. manuscriptis Bibliothecae regiae Parisiensis, vol. ii. (1839) p. 115 sqq. Müller in his Fragmenta historicorum Graecorum, iii. 706-717, gives among the fragments of Porphyry, the Armenian and Greek text, together with a historical commentary.

In this passage Porphyry fixes the chronology of the Seleucidae according to the Olympiad era, and indeed in such a way that he takes into account only whole years; hence the year in which a change of kings occurs is reckoned to the one who preceded a full year, while the reign of his successor is made to begin with the following year. Thus, for example, although he makes the reign of Antiochus Epiphanes begin with Olympiad 151. 3, it actually began in Olympiad 151. 2. It is further to be remarked that, in dealing with the frequent appearances of pretenders to the throne, he dates the reign of the successful pretender from the year in which his opponent was overthrown.

From what sources Porphyry has derived his information may be learned from the following statement of Jerome, although its immediate reference is not to Porphyry's Chronicle, but to his

book on Daniel: Ad intelligendas autem extremas partes Danielis multiplex Graecorum historia necessaria est: Sutorii videlicet Callinici, Diodori, Hieronymi, Polybii, Posidonii, Claudii Theonis et Andronici cognomento Alipii, quos et Porphyrius esse sequutum se dicit; Josephi quoque et eorum quos ponit Josephus, praecipueque nostri Livii et Pompeii Trogi atque Justini, qui omnem extraemae visionis narrant historiam (Hieronymus, Praefatio in Danielem, Opp. ed. Vallarsi, v. 621 sq.).

But valuable as the work of Porphyry is, so carefully culled from the best original documents, we ought also to guard against any over-estimation of its worth. His statements about Olympiads are evidently "deductions from calculations of the years of the several reigns" (Gutschmid, Geschichte Iran's und seiner Nachbarländer, 1888, p. 77, Anm.), and thus do not possess the weight of immediate traditional testimony.

ANTIOCHUS IV. EPIPHANES, B.C. 175–164

He was the son of Antiochus III. the Great, and brother of Seleucus IV. Philopator, who reigned B.C. 187–175. During the reign of his brother Seleucus he lived as a hostage at Rome. Seleucus procured for him liberty to return to his native land by sending as hostage to Rome his own son Demetrius; but before Antiochus reached home Seleucus had been murdered by Heliodorus. Antiochus then usurped the throne to which by right his nephew Demetrius ought to have succeeded (Appian. Syr. 45). — Antiochus died after a reign of eleven years, in B.C. 164, while engaged in a campaign against the Parthians.

That his reign lasted for eleven years is stated by Porphyry (Euseb. Chron., ed. Schoene, i. 253, 263 sq.), Jerome (ad Danielem, 11. 21 sq.), and Sulpicius Severus (Chron. ii. 22). The date of the beginning of his reign is set down by Porphyry as Olympiad 151. 3, and so actually Olym. 151. 2, which is equivalent to B.C. 175–174. This statement is borne out by the fact that the coins also begin with the year 138 of the Seleucid era, which corresponds to 175–174 before Christ. The First Book of Maccabees, on the other hand (chap. 1:10), places the beginning of the reign in the Seleucid year 137, that is, in B.C. 176–175, which can be reconciled with the statement of Porphyry only by supposing that the Seleucid year was reckoned from autumn to autumn, so that Olympiad 151. 2 would begin in the summer of B.C. 175. But if we assume that the First Book of Maccabees counts the year from spring to spring, we shall have to admit the existence of a slight discrepancy. — The death of Antiochus occurred, according to Porphyry, in Olympiad 154. 1, that is, in B.C. 164–163; according to the First Book of Maccabees (6:16), in the Seleucid year 149, which also answers to B.C. 164–163.

The chronology of the Egyptian campaigns of Antiochus, which is of importance also in Jewish history, is still matter of controversy. But according to non-Jewish sources, it is highly probable that they belonged to the period between B.C. 170 and B.C. 168. This is further supported by the fact that the First Book of Maccabees (1:20) makes mention for the first time of an Egyptian campaign in the Seleucid year 143, corresponding to B.C. 170–169, and indeed states precisely that autumn of B.C. 170 was the date of the return from it. Only the Second Book of Maccabees (5:1) disagrees with this by reckoning that campaign the second. But the unreliableness of this document would make the assumption of an earlier campaign in B.C. 171 unjustifiable apart from other evidence. Compare generally on this question: Droysen, De Lagidarum regno, 1831, pp. 56–69, which I have not been able to consult; Jo. Christ. Conr. Hofmann, De bellis ab Antiocho Epiphane adversus Ptolemaeos gestis, Erlangae 1835; Hitzig, Das Buch Daniel, pp. 202–208; Stark, Gaza und die philistäische Küste, pp. 430–434; Grimm. Das erste Buch der Maccabäer, p. 15 f.; Joh. Friedr. Hoffmann, Antiochus IV. Epiphanes, 1873, pp. 36–58; Grätz,

Geschichte der Juden, ii. 2 (1876), pp. 436–443.

On Antiochus generally, besides the works mentioned above, compare: Ewald, History of Israel, v. 293–306; Stanley, History of the Jewish Church, third series, 1877, pp. 288–302. See also the article in Pauly's Real-Encyclop. der class. Alterthumswissenschaft, and the articles by Wieseler in Herzog, vol. i. pp. 458–463, and by Reuss in Schenkel, Bibellexikon. For further notice, see § 4.

ANTIOCHUS V. EUPATOR, B.C. 164–162

This monarch was the son of Epiphanes. According to Porphyry he began to reign in his twelfth year, but according to Appian. Syr. 46 and 66, when he was only nine years old. From the statement of Porphyry it would seem as if he had been for a year and a half co-regent with his father; but the text is probably corrupt (Euseb. Chron., ed. Schoene, i. 253). During his short reign of only one and a half or two years he was simply a tool in the hand of his field-marshal and guardian Lysias, and was along with him, by the order of his cousin Demetrius, assassinated in B.C. 162.

The statements as to the length of this reign vacillate between a year and a half and two years; the former period is given by Porphyry in the Summarium (Euseb. Chron., ed. Schoene, i. 263 sq.), and the latter by Josephus in the Antiquities, xii. 10. 1 (Euseb. Chron. ii. 126 sq., ad ann. Abrah. 1852). The beginning and end are determined by the chronology of his predecessor and his successor. — Compare generally: Reuss in Schenkel and Wieseler in Herzog. Also Smith's Dictionary of Greek and Roman Biography.

DEMETRIUS I. SOTER, B.C. 162–150

Demetrius was the son of Seleucus Philopator. He had been sent by him as hostage to Rome, but fled from thence, and assumed the reins of government in B.C. 162, after having had his cousin Antiochus Eupator assassinated.

In B.C. 153, Alexander Balas took up arms against him as a pretender to the throne. He claimed to be a son of Antiochus Epiphanes, and therefore the legitimate heir of the Syrian throne. Demetrius fell in battle against him in B.C. 150.

The flight of Demetrius from Rome and the consequences resulting from it are very vividly sketched by Polybius, who, as a friend of Demetrius, was personally engaged in the incidents which he narrates (Polybius, xxxi. 12, 19–22). Both Polybius (iii. 5) and Porphyry (Euseb. Chron., ed. Schoene, i. 255, 263 sq.) ascribe to Demetrius a reign of twelve years, while Josephus (Antiq. xiii. 2. 4) allows him only eleven years. Porphyry sets down the commencement of the reign at Olympiad 154. 4, that is really Olym. 154. 3, corresponding to B.C. 162–161; and the First Book of Maccabees (7:1) makes it 151 of the Seleucid era, which also answers to B.C. 162–161. The dated coins extend from 150 to 162 of the Seleucid era, or from B.C. 163–162 to B.C. 151–150. If the number of the year be rightly read as 150, the beginning of the reign must be set down before autumn of B.C. 162, which is reconcilable with the statement in First Maccabees on the supposition that its years are to be understood as spring years. — On the date of the insurrection of Alexander Balas, see below. The common text of Porphyry gives Olympiad 157. 4 as the date of the death of Demetrius. Since this would give him a reign of thirteen years, it is most probably to be read Olympiad 157. 3, corresponding to B.C. 150–149. According to 1 Macc. 10:50 and 57, the death of Demetrius occurred not later

than 162 of the Seleucid era, or B.C. 151-150. — Compare on Demetrius generally, the articles in Herzog and Schenkel.

ALEXANDER BALAS, B.C. 150-145

When Alexander had wrenched the government from Demetrius, the son of Demetrius, who also himself bore the name of Demetrius, rose up against him. With this Demetrius II., Ptolemy Philometor of Egypt entered into alliance. Alexander was besieged in Antioch by the Egyptian king, fled to Arabia, and was there treacherously murdered in B.C. 145. On the fifth day after that bloody deed, the head of Alexander was brought to Ptolemy (Josephus, Antiq. xiii. 4. 8).

The coins of Alexander bear dates from 160 to 168 of the Seleucid era, that is, from B.C. 153-152 to B.C. 145-144. The First Book of Maccabees (10:1) describes his revolt against Demetrius as having taken place in the Seleucid year 160, or B.C. 153-152; and indeed B.C. 153 must be fixed upon, since it occurred before the Feast of Tabernacles of the year referred to (1 Macc. 10:21). — His reign proper is reckoned by Porphyry and Josephus (Antiq. xiii. 4. 8) at five years. The common text of Porphyry puts down the beginning of it in Olympiad 157. 3, and the end in Olympiad 158. 4. Since this, according to Porphyry's style of reckoning, would give six years, probably we should read instead of 157. 3, 157. 4, that is really 157. 3, corresponding to B.C. 150-149. — The death of Alexander is placed by the First Book of Maccabees (11:19) in the Seleucid year 167, or B.C. 146-145. Porphyry's date is Olympiad 158. 4, which corresponds to B.C. 145-144. — Compare on Alexander, the articles in Pauly, Winer, Herzog, and Schenkel.

DEMETRIUS II. NICATOR, B.C. 145-138

ANTIOCHUS VI., B.C. 145-(?). TRYPHO, (?)-138

One of the generals of Alexander, Diodotus, named Trypho, disputed the succession with Demetrius in favour of the youthful son of Alexander, Antiochus VI.

Meanwhile Trypho himself aspired to the throne, had his ward Antiochus murdered, and made himself king. Soon after this, according to other accounts even previously, Demetrius undertook a campaign against the Parthians, in the course of which he was taken prisoner by the Parthians in B.C. 138. But Trypho was defeated by Antiochus VII. Sidetes, the brother of Demetrius, at Dora, then shut up in Apamea, and compelled to end his life by his own hand (Strabo, p. 668; Josephus, Antiq. xiii. 7. 2; Appian. Syr. 68).

The revolt of Demetrius against Alexander Balas took place, according to 1 Macc. 10:67, in the Seleucid year 165, or B.C. 148-147, while his reign began in 167 of the Seleucid era, B.C. 146-145 (1 Macc. 11:19). The dates of the coins extend from 167 to 174 Seleucid era, or from B.C. 146-145 to B.C. 139-138. — There are coins of Antiochus VI. from 167 to 170 of the Seleucid era, or from B.C. 146-145 to B.C. 143-142. Coins of Trypho bear the number of the years III. (de Saulcy, p. 42, Mélanges de Numismatique, t. ii. 1877, p. 82 sq.) and IV. (Gardner, Catalogue of Greek Coins, p. 69). Josephus assigns to the reign of Antiochus VI. a period of four years, and to Trypho a period of three years (Antiq. xiii. 7. 1-2). According to this estimate, the reign of Antiochus would date B.C. 145-141; that of Trypho, B.C. 141-138. This is in agreement with the statement of Porphyry, who gives to Demetrius, before his imprisonment, only a three years' reign (Euseb. Chron., ed. Schoene, i. 257, 263 sq.), from Olympiad 160. 1, which is really Olym. 159. 4, or B.C. 141-140, to Olympiad 160. 3, or B.C. 138-137. Porphyry evidently reckons the reign of Demetrius as beginning with the displacement by conquest or murder of Antiochus VI.

In thorough accord with this, too, is the chronology of the First Book of Maccabees, 13:31, 41, which unhesitatingly assigns the murder of Antiochus by Trypho to the Seleucid year 170, or B.C. 143–142. Finally, it is no serious discrepancy when, in 1 Macc. 14:1, the Parthian campaign of Demetrius is dated from the Seleucid year 172, or B.C. 141–140; while Porphyry, on the other hand, assigns it to Olympiad 160. 2, or B.C. 139–138. In direct contradiction, however, to the foregoing, stands the statement made by many writers (Josephus, Antiq. xiii. 5. 11, 7. 1; Appian. Syr. 67, 68; Justin. xxxvi. 1), that Antiochus was not murdered by Trypho before the time of the Parthian campaign of Demetrius, and indeed not till after Demetrius had been taken prisoner. This, however, is in opposition not only to the chronology of the First Book of Maccabees, but also to the circumstance that then there is not left a three or four years' reign for Trypho, which yet, according to Josephus and the coins, must be admitted. Then Trypho's death occurs almost contemporaneously with the seizure of Demetrius by the Parthians in B.C. 138. See in next paragraph under Antiochus Sidetes. It therefore seems to me hazardous to assume, with many modern critics, that the last-named authorities should have the precedence over 1 Macc. — Compare on this question, and on Antiochus VI. and Trypho generally: Sanclemente, De vulgaris aerae emendatione, 1793, pp. 269–274. Clinton, Fasti Hellenici, iii. 331. Müller, Fragmenta hist. Graec. t. ii. p. xx. Mendelssohn in Ritschl's Acta societatis philol. Lipsiensis, t. v. 1875, pp. 43–49. Gutschmid, Geschichte Iran's, 1888, pp. 51–53. Also the articles in Pauly, Winer, Herzog, and Schenkel.

ANTIOCHUS VII. SIDETES, B.C. 138–128

So long as Demetrius was the prisoner of the Parthians, Antiochus VII. held undisturbed sway in Syria. — In B.C. 129 he undertook a campaign against the Parthians, and in it he met his death in B.C. 128. During the war the Parthian king released Demetrius from his imprisonment, in order that he might seize for himself the government of Syria, and so compel Antiochus to return home.

On the surname Sidetes, compare Porphyry (Euseb. Chron., ed. Schoene, i. 255): in Sida urbe educatus, quapropter Sidetes utique vocabatur. The city Side lies in Pamphylia. — The revolt of Antiochus VII. against Trypho occurred, according to 1 Macc. 15:10, in the year 174 Seleucid, or B.C. 139–138. Porphyry reckons his reign from Olympiad 160. 4, that is really Olympiad 160. 3, or B.C. 138–137. The coins begin with the Seleucid year 174, or B.C. 139–138, and reach down to Seleucid year 184, or B.C. 129–128 (de Saulcy, pp. 44–46). — The beginning of the Parthian campaign cannot, according to Livy, Epit. 59, be placed earlier than B.C. 129, immediately after the consul M. Peperna, whose consulship was in B.C. 130, and immediately before the consul C. Sempronius, whose consulship was in B.C. 129. Porphyry assigns the death of Antiochus, after a nine years' reign, to Olympiad 162. 4, or B.C. 129–128. According to Justin, xxxviii. 10, it occurred in the winter; according to Diodorus, xxxiv. 15 sq., in spring, therefore in the beginning of B.C. 128. In fact, the coins of Alexander Zabinas (see next paragraph) begin with the Seleucid year 184, or B.C. 129–128. — With these matters of fact in view, some coins of Antiochus, purporting to belong to the Seleucid year 185 and 186, the latter corresponding to B.C. 127–126, have occasioned great difficulties to the historians. Some have disputed the authenticity of their date (so Tôchon d'Annecy, Dissertation sur l'époque de la mort d'Antiochus VII. Evergètes Sidétès, roi de Syrie, sur deux médailles antiques de ce prince, et sur un passage du II livre des Macchabées, Paris 1815, pp. 61–65); others have assumed that even after the death of Antiochus, coins were issued with his name (so Niebuhr, Kleine Schriften, i. 251 f.). The most probable explanation is that the date has only been falsely read (see Nussbaum, Observationes, p. 51). — Compare generally: Mendelssohn in Ritschl's Acta

societatis philol. Lipsiensis, t. v. 1875, pp. 265-280. Nussbaum, Observationes in Flavii Josephi Antiquitates, 1875, pp. 49-54. Gutschmid, Geschichte Iran's, Tüb. 1888, pp. 75-77, who places the death of Antiochus in B.C. 129. Also the articles in Pauly, Winer, Herzog, and Schenkel.

DEMETRIUS II. NICATOR, a Second Time, B.C. 128-125 OR 124 (?)

ALEXANDER ZABINAS, B.C. 128-122 (?)

After a ten years' imprisonment among the Parthians, as Porphyry relates in Eusebius, Demetrius II. once again became king of Syria. There was soon raised up against him, through the intrigues of Ptolemy Physkon, an anti-king in the person of Alexander Zabinas, who claimed to be a son of Alexander Balas. Demetrius was besieged by him in Damascus, obliged to fly, and murdered as he attempted to land at Tyre.

Coins of Demetrius are in existence which pretend to belong to the period from 180 to 187 of the Seleucid era, or from B.C. 133-132 to B.C. 126-125 (de Saulcy, pp. 51, 52). If the reading is in every case correct, it might be supposed that even during the Parthian imprisonment of Demetrius, coins were issued with his name printed on them (so de Saulcy, p. 55). But the reading is not by any means certain in every instance (Nussbaum, Observationes, p. 52 sq.). There are some which certainly are marked 183-187 of the Seleucid era (Gardner, Catalogue of Greek Coins, p. 76 sq.; Bunbury, Num. Chronicle, 1883, p. 100 sq.). — Porphyry assigns to Demetrius after his imprisonment a reign of four years. The common text gives as its beginning Olympiad 162. 2, for which we ought certainly to read Olympiad 163. 2, that is really Olympiad 163. 1, or B.C. 128-127; and as the year of his death, Olympiad 164. 1, corresponding to B.C. 124-123. With this it is impossible to reconcile the fact that there exists coins of Antiochus VIII. Grypos, and of Cleopatra, professing to belong to the Seleucid year 187, or B.C. 126-125. Yet here again it may be questioned whether this is the correct reading. — Compare on Demetrius also the articles in Pauly, Winer, Herzog, and Schenkel. — For Alexander Zabinas, Porphyry gives no direct dates. His coins range over the period from 184 to 190 of the Seleucid era, or from B.C. 129-128 to B.C. 123-122 (de Saulcy, p. 57; Gardner, Catalogue of Greek Coins, pp. 81-84; Bunbury, Num. Chronicle, 1883, p. 103 sq.).

SELEUCUS V., B.C. 125 OR 124 (?)

Seleucus V. succeeded his father Demetrius on the throne; but soon after beginning his reign he was murdered at the instigation of his own mother.

ANTIOCHUS VIII. GRYPOS, B.C. 125 OR 124-113

Antiochus VIII. was the brother of Seleucus. He had still to do battle with the anti-king Alexander Zabinas, but conquered him in the third year of his reign; according to Porphyry, in B.C. 122-121. He then caused Alexander to be executed, as Justin reports, xxxix. 2 (compare also Diodorus, xxxiv. 28). According to Porphyry, Alexander put an end to his own life by poison.

After a reign of eleven years, in B.C. 113, Antiochus VIII. Grypos was driven from the throne by Antiochus IX. Kyrikenos, who was his cousin on the father's side, his brother on the mother's side. Antiochus Grypos then withdrew to Aspendos.

The relationship between the two is as follows: — Cleopatra, the daughter of Ptolemy Philometor of Egypt, who had been already the wife of Alexander Balas (1 Macc. 10:58), had separated

herself from him and married Demetrius II. Nicator (1 Macc. 11:12). From this marriage sprang Seleucus V. and Antiochus VIII. Grypos. But while Demetrius was detained among the Parthians, Cleopatra married his brother, Antiochus VII. Sidetes (Josephus, Antiq. xiii. 7. 1). From this marriage sprang Antiochus IX. Kyrikenos (Josephus, Antiq. xiii. 10. 1; Appian. Syr. 68). Porphyry in Euseb. Chron. ed. Schoene, i. 260, says: τῷ ὁμομητρίῳ ἀδελφῷ Ἀντιόχῳ καὶ ἀνεψιῷ τὰ ἐκ πατρός. — Compare generally on the genealogy of the Seleucidae the table at the end of vol. ii. of this work.

The period of the reign of Antiochus VIII., down to his expulsion by Antiochus IX., is reckoned by Porphyry at eleven years, from Olympiad 164. 2, that is really Olympiad 164. 1, down to Olympiad 166. 4, or from B.C. 124–123 down to B.C. 113–112. — On the coins Antiochus VIII. appears sometimes as co-regent with his mother Cleopatra, sometimes alone. The coins of the former kind profess to belong to the period between 187 and 192 of the Seleucid era, or between B.C. 126–125 and B.C. 121–120 (de Saulcy, p. 61 sq.). For an account of the discrepancy between this date and that of Porphyry, see above under Demetrius II. and Alexander Zabinas. The proper coins of Antiochus VIII. begin with the Seleucid year 190, corresponding to B.C. 123–122 (de Saulcy, p. 65 sq.).

ANTIOCHUS IX. CYZICENOS, B.C. 113–95

ANTIOCHUS VIII. GRYPOS, B.C. 111–96

For two years Cyzicenos now ruled as sole monarch. But in B.C. 111, Grypos returned and wrested the greater part of Syria from his cousin. Only Coele-Syria remained in the possession of Cyzicenos. Porphyry in Eusebius, Chron., ed. Schoene, i. 260, says: κρατεῖ μὲν αὐτὸς τῆς Συρίας, ὁ δὲ Κυζικηνὸς τῆς Κοίλης. Thus was the kingdom broken up; and the two cousins and brothers engaged in a conflict with one another.

Antiochus Grypos died fifteen years after his return, in B.C. 96, according to Josephus, Antiq. xiii. 13. 4, by the hand of an assassin. His rights and claims were heired by his son Seleucus VI. He took up arms forthwith against Antiochus Cyzicenos, and laid siege to him in Antioch. In order to avoid imprisonment during the battle in B.C. 95, Antiochus put an end to his own life (Porphyry in Eusebius, Chron. i. 260).

To Antiochus IX. Cyzicenos, Porphyry assigns a reign of eighteen years, extending from Olympiad 167. 1, that is really Olympiad 166. 4, down to Olympiad 171. 1, or from B.C. 113–112 down to B.C. 96–95. The coins, indeed, begin as early as 196 of the Seleucid era, or B.C. 117–116 (de Saulcy, p. 72 sq.). If both are correct, it must be assumed that Porphyry, with his date B.C. 113, does not mean the time of the revolt of Cyzicenos, but the time of his decided victory over Grypos. The return of Antiochus VIII. Grypos is set down by Porphyry in Olympiad 167. 2, or B.C. 111–110, and a reign of fifteen years is given him, extending down to Olympiad 170. 4, or B.C. 97–96. Josephus ascribes to Antiochus Grypos altogether a reign of twenty-five years, from B.C. 125–124 down to B.C. 96 (Josephus, Antiq. xiii. 13. 4).

During the next twelve years, from B.C. 95 to B.C. 83, there now followed an almost unbroken series of conflicts between the five sons of Antiochus Grypos, namely, Seleucus VI., Antiochus XI., Philip, Demetrius III. Eucärus, and Antiochus XII. on the one hand, and the son of Antiochus Cyzicenos, Antiochus X. Eusebes, on the other (Josephus, Antiq. xiii. 13. 4, 14. 3, 15. 1; Porphyry in Eusebius, Chron., ed. Schoene, i. 259–262; Appian. Syr. 69; and Clinton, pp. 340–342).

The result of these contendings was that Tigranes, king of Armenia, took possession for himself of the kingdom of Syria. His reign over Syria lasted for fourteen years, from B.C. 83 to B.C. 69.

The details, according to Josephus, who is here the most complete in his descriptions, are as follows: — Antiochus X. Eusebes, in order to revenge his father, made war against Seleucus VI., conquered him, and drove him into Cilicia, where he was put to death by the citizens of Mopsuestia on account of his oppressions. Then his brother, Antiochus XI., next took up the conflict against Antiochus Eusebes, but was defeated, and lost his life in the battle. The third brother, Philip, now appeared upon the scene, and entered the lists against Antiochus Eusebes, according to Porphyry, in Olympiad 171. 3, or B.C. 94–93, and succeeded in making himself master of at least a part of Syria, while the fourth brother, Demetrius Eucärus, had seized upon another portion, with Damascus as its capital. Then Antiochus Eusebes, according to Josephus, lost his life in a battle with the Parthians. The two brothers, Philip and Demetrius, now reigned for a long time, each over his own part of Syria. But by and by Demetrius declared war against Philip, besieged him in Beröa, east of Antioch, but was himself taken prisoner, and died in confinement. There were now left only Philip and the youngest brother, Antiochus XII., who continued to fight with one another. But Antiochus fell in a battle against the Arab chief Aretas, who thereupon took possession of Coele-Syria. At last the whole of Syria fell into the hands of Tigranes. According to Appian. Syr. 48, 69, Antiochus X. Eusebes was still alive and reigning when Tigranes seized upon Syria; and indeed, according to Justin, xl. 2, and Porphyry in Eusebius, Chron. i. 262, he was still living when Pompey made an end of the Syrian empire. The latter statement, however, has evidently resulted from a confusion between Antiochus X. Eusebes and Antiochus XIII. Asiaticus, who are both clearly enough distinguished by Appian. But the former is in every respect more probable, since Appian seems here to have used reliable sources. It may then be assumed that Antiochus Eusebes had possession of the greater, Philip and Aretas of the smaller part of Syria, when Tigranes made himself master of the kingdom.

For the chronology of the years B.C. 95–83, the coins afford some important clues (Gardner, Catalogue of Greek Coins, p. 95 sqq.). Yet we have not materials for determining all the details. There are dated coins of Philip from the Seleucid year 221 down to 229, or from B.C. 92–91 down to B.C. 84–83 (de Saulcy, p. 78); of Demetrius there are some from the Seleucid year 217 down to 224, or from B.C. 96–95 down to B.C. 89–88 (Gardner, Catalogue, p. 101; Eckhel, iii. 245); of Antiochus XII. there is one belonging to the Seleucid year 227, or B.C. 86–85 (Imhoof-Blumer, Monnaies grecques, 1883, p. 437). Very puzzling are the coins of Philip which were printed in Antioch, and bear the figures 19, 20, 21, 22, 24, 30, purporting to indicate the numbers of the years (de Saulcy, p. 79). If the dates are correctly read, and refer to the years of Philip's reign, it must be assumed that Philip had been able to maintain his position in Antioch even during the domination of Tigranes. In fact, Porphyry also assumes that Philip lived down to the time of Pompey (Euseb. Chron. i. 262). But according to Diodorus, Fragm. 34 (in Müller, Fragm. hist. graec. t. ii. p. 24 sq.), this Philip, who made his appearance at the time of Pompey as a claimant, was a son of our Philip, and so grandson of Antiochus Grypos (see also Müller). We seem therefore to have no alternative but to assume that those numbers signify, not the years of Philip's reign, but the years of an era that began somewhere about B.C. 113.

This much is known regarding the period of Tigranes: that according to Appian. Syr. 48, 70, and Justin. xl. 1–2 (according to the correct reading), he reigned over Syria fourteen years. The end of his reign, however, — that is, his defeat by Lucullus, — occurred, as is well known from the Roman history, in B.C. 69.

After the defeat of Tigranes by Lucullus, Syria did not all at once fall into the possession of the Romans. Lucullus assigned it to a son of Antiochus Eusebes, who reigned from B.C. 69 to B.C. 65 under the title of Antiochus XIII. Asiaticus. It was Pompey who, on his victorious march through Asia, first made a complete end of the Seleucid dynasty, in B.C. 65 (Appian. Syr. 49, 70; Justin, xl. 2; Clinton, pp. 344–348). Syria now became a Roman province (Plutarch, Pompeius, 39).

Pompey first of all, in B.C. 65, sent his legates from Armenia to Syria, and in B.C. 64 he went himself; but the definite arrangements of Syrian affairs were first settled in B.C. 63–62 (Clinton, Fasti Hellenici, iii. 345 sq.; Fischer, Römische Zeittafeln, p. 215 ff.). In B.C. 65 or 64, probably the disturbances broke out of which Diodorus, Fragm. 34 (in Müller, Fragm. hist. graec. t. ii. p. 24 sq.), gives an account. Antiochus XIII. Asiaticus sought to maintain his possession of the throne by the aid of Sampsigeram of Emesa. At the same time a struggle was made for a like purpose by Philip, son of King Philip, and grandson of Antiochus Grypos, who sought to support his claims by the assistance of the Arab prince Azizus. But Antiochus was taken prisoner by Sampsigeram, and afterwards put to death, and Philip was able to escape the snares of Azizus only by flight.

By means of this report of Diodorus of the end of Antiochus Asiaticus, we see how utterly groundless was the statement of older scholars, that Antiochus Asiaticus obtained possession of the small kingdom of Commagene, and became the founder of the dynasty of Commagene (see in opposition, Clinton, pp. 346–348). But it is quite true that the dynasty of Commagene had a connection by affinity with the Seleucidae. Consult upon this matter the inscriptions, Corp. Inscr. Graec. n. 362; Corp. Inscr. Lat. t. iii. n. 552; Corp. Inscr. Atticarum, t. iii. 1, n. 557; and especially Le Bas and Waddington, Inscriptions, t. iii. 2, n. 136d, from Ephesus. The latter tells of a βασιλέα Ἀντίοχον Θεὸν Δίκαιον Ἐπιφανῆ Φιλορωμαῖον καὶ Φιλέλληνα, τὸν ἐγ βασιλέως Μιθραδάτου Καλλινίκου καὶ βασιλίσσης Λαοδίκης Θεᾶς Φιλαδέλφου τῆς ἐγ βασιλέως Ἀντιόχου Ἐπιφανοῦς Φιλομήτορος Καλλινίκου. This same Antiochus, with the same genealogy, appears also in an inscription communicated by Puchstein (Puchstein, Bericht über eine Reise in Kurdistan, Sitzungsberichte der Berliner Akademie, 1883, p. 49 ff.). The Antiochus to whom both inscriptions refer was undoubtedly a king of Commagene; the other Antiochus, the father of Laodice, was evidently a Seleucid, according to Waddington, Antiochus XIII. Asiaticus; according to Mommsen, Antiochus VIII. Grypos. The latter conjecture is certainly correct, for Antiochus VIII. Grypos is designated on coins Ἐπιφανής, is called by Porphyry and Josephus, Antiq. xiii. 12. 2, Φιλομήτωρ, and the cognomen Καλλίνικος, which Mommsen was not then able to authenticate, has also been since confirmed by an inscription from Delos (Bulletin de correspondance hellénique, t. viii. 1884, p. 105 sq.). His daughter Laodice is clearly identical with the Laodice mentioned by Josephus, Antiq. xiii. 13. 4 (Gutschmid, Geschichte Iran's, 1888, p. 80, Anm.). Compare generally: Mommsen, Die Dynastie von Commagene (Mittheilungen des deutschen archäologischen Institutes in Athen, Bd. i. 1876, pp. 27–39). Marquardt, Römische Staatsverwaltung, Bd. i., 2 Aufl. 1881, p. 398 ff.

RELIGIOUS DESTITUTION AND REVIVAL, B.C. 175–165

SOURCES

1 Macc. 1-4 2 Macc. 4-11.

Josephus, Antiq. xii. 5-7. Epitome of it in Zonaras, Annal. iv. 19-20.

The Book of Daniel, chap. 11:21-45, and Jerome's Commentary (Opp., ed. Vallarsi, v. 711-724).

Some facts collected from Megillath Taanith in Derenbourg, Histoire de la Palestine, pp. 59-63.

LITERATURE

The works already mentioned in p. 170 on Syrian history by Foy-Vaillant, Frölich, Clinton, Flathe, Stark, etc.

Treatises and Commentaries on the Books of the Maccabees, by Wace, Birrell (Apocrypha, with introd. notes, etc., New York 1880), Wernsdorff, Michaelis, Grimm, Keil, etc.

Ewald, History of Israel, vol. v. 286-306.

Herzfeld, Geschichte des Volkes Israel (3 Aufl.), iv. 219-261.

Hitzig, Geschichte des Volkes Israel, ii. 367-395.

Grätz, Geschichte der Juden, Bd. ii. 2, pp. 268-352.

Reuss, Geschichte der heil. Schriften Alten Testaments, § 451-460.

Pauly's Real-Encyclop. der class. Alterthumswissensch. i. 1 (2 Aufl.), art "Antiochus IV."

Rossmann, Die makkabäische Erhebung. Vortag. Jena 1860.

Hoffmann (John Fried.), Antiochus IV. Epiphanes, König von Syrien. Leipzig 1873.

Wiederholt, Antiochus IV. Epiphanes nach der Weissagung, Dan. xi. 21, xii. 3, und der Geschichte (Tüb. Theol. Quartalschr. 1874, pp. 567-631).

Menke's Bibelatlas, Bl. IV. Specialkarten über "Judäa und Phönicien zur Zeit des Antiochus Epiphanes."

Since the conquests of the Assyrians and Chaldeans, the Jewish people had lost their political independence. The northern kingdom of the ten tribes had been overthrown by the Assyrians, the southern kingdom of Judah by the Chaldeans. The sovereignty had passed from the Chaldeans to the Persians, and from the Persians, after a supremacy of two centuries, to

Alexander the Great. In the wild commotions of the Diadochean period, Palestine formed a main object of strife between Ptolemy Lagus and his opponents, and was therefore sometimes under one, sometimes under another master. With short intervals it continued throughout the third century under the sway of the Ptolemies. But in the beginning of the second century, Antiochus the Great succeeded in permanently securing possession of Phoenicia and Palestine. In place of the Ptolemies, the Seleucidae now became the suzerains of the Jewish people.

Even in the beginning of the Persian domination the Jews had resolved to organize themselves anew as a religious and political community. But the form in which the Jewish commonwealth was restored after the exile was essentially different from that which prevailed before. It was from this time forward a government of priests. As they were preeminently religious interests that had given the impulse to the reconstruction, so also the form of the new commonwealth was more that of a religious than of a political association. The priests had in it a predominating influence, at least from the time of Ezra. Indeed, a priest stood at the head of the political organization. For the so-called high priest was not by any means simply the supreme director of worship, but was at the same time also the supreme head of the State, in so far as civil authority was not exercised by the great king and his officers. The rank of high priest was held for life, and was hereditary. Alongside of him, probably even during the Persian period, and in any case from the beginning of the Greek domination, stood a council of elders, the γερουσία, with the high priest at its head as its executive organ. How far administration and legislation lay in the hands of this native board, and how far these were exercised by the Persian and Greek suzerains, cannot now be determined with any certainty. Under the Greek suzerains the political independence of the Jewish people could not be less, but probably greater, than it had been before (compare generally, § 23. 3).

The extent of the Jewish commonwealth, which still possessed a relatively considerable measure of independence, was probably limited to Judea proper, that is, the province lying south of Samaria, which in its range corresponded nearly with the kingdom of Judah of earlier days. All the coast cities were excluded from it, for these were mainly occupied by a heathen population, and formed independent communities by themselves (see § 23. 1). How far those Gentile districts extended inland may be seen from this, that even Ekron and Gazara did not belong to Judea. Ekron was first united with the Jewish domain and Judaized in the time of Jonathan (1 Macc. 10:88, 89), Gazara first in the time of Simon (1 Macc. 13:43–48). On the situation of these towns, see below under § 6 and 7. Also the whole of the land east of the Jordan was excluded from the Jewish territory. We find there partly Hellenistic communities (see § 23. 1), partly independent tribes, under native rulers. In the country west of the Jordan, towards the end of the third and the beginning of the second century, “Judea” and “Samaria” formed each a separately administered province alongside of “Coele-Syria” and “Phoenicia.” Galilee was not reckoned as a distinct province, and so it belonged to one of the four above named, but scarcely to Judea, toward which it did not conveniently lie. Now the Pseudo-Hecataeus, indeed, expressly affirms that Alexander the Great gave to the Jews Samaria as a district free from tribute. But even if this statement were more credible than it is, it could not by any means apply to the period of the Seleucid rule, since even under the Maccabean high priest Jonathan it is related as a proof of the special favour of King Demetrius II., that he took three νομοί from Samaria and united them with Judea, and made over this whole district to the Jews free of tribute. Ordinarily, therefore, the territory of the Jewish high priest embraced only Judea. And that, too, Judea in the narrower sense, without Galilee, for this is evidently the meaning of the passages quoted from the First Book of Maccabees.

The spread of the Jewish population was by no means limited to the bounds of Judea in the political sense. Even the circumstance that during the Maccabean age stress was laid upon the union with Judea of the three southern districts of Samaria (1 Macc. 11:34; Ephraim, Lydda, and Ramathaim), leads to the conjecture that the population within those districts was mainly Jewish, – in other words, that they had not with the schismatical Samaritans offered sacrifices on Mount Gerizim, but in Jerusalem, and that they had maintained religious fellowship with the Jews there. But also in the province of Galilee, and even in Gilead, in the country east of the Jordan, at the beginning of the second century, a considerable number of Jews must have resided, who maintained religious intercourse with Jerusalem; for it was one of the first acts of the Maccabee brothers, after the restoration of the Jewish worship, to bring help to their brethren in the faith in Galilee and Gilead who had been oppressed by the heathen: Simon went to Galilee, Judas to Gilead (1 Macc. 5:9-54). The manner in which they afforded this help shows us, however, on the other hand, that then the general mass of the population of those districts was no longer Jewish. For neither Simon nor Judas took the provinces as such under Jewish protection. But after Simon had defeated the heathen in Galilee, he led all the Jews away out of Galilee and Arbatta (properly עֲרָבוֹת, the lower districts of the Jordan), together with their wives and children and all their possessions, into Judea, in order that there he might keep them in safety (1 Macc. 5:23). In precisely the same way Judas dealt with those Jews that lived in Gilead, after he had overthrown the heathen there (1 Macc. 5:45-54). It therefore seems quite evident that the Jews in Galilee and Gilead formed then a "dispersion" among the heathen; and the first Maccabees made no sort of attempt to Judaize those provinces, but, on the contrary, withdrew from them their Jewish population. It was John Hyrcanus, or one of his successors (probably not before Aristobulus I.), who first introduced that policy.

The internal development of Judaism from the time of Ezra to that of the Maccabees, or even down to the compilation of the Talmud, can be sketched only in very general outlines. The starting-point, indeed, is known to us in fuller detail – the priestly law introduced by Ezra in the fifth century before Christ; and then, again, the culmination: the codification of the Jewish law in the Mishna in the second century after Christ. Between these two points lies a period of six centuries. What stage of development had Judaism reached at the outbreak of the Maccabean revolution ? We can only say, it was already on the way to those results which are set before us in the Mishna; and the Maccabean age was simply the period of the greatest crisis through which it was called to pass during that whole era. The attempt was made to overthrow the foundations of its earlier development, to convert the Jewish people to heathenism. The result was that the foundations laid before by Ezra were now strengthened, and the theoretical elaboration of the law and its practical applications were prosecuted with glowing enthusiasm. The law which Ezra had introduced was essentially a ceremonial law. The religion of Israel is there reduced to strictly legalized forms, in order that it may be made more secure against the influences of heathenism. In the form of a law given by God Himself, the Jew was told what he had to do as a faithful servant of Jehovah, what festivals he should celebrate, what sacrifices he should offer, what tribute he should pay to the priests who conduct the services, and generally what religious ceremonies he should perform. Precision in the observance of all these prescribed rites was to be made henceforth the gauge and measure of piety. And in order to make this precision as exact as possible, it was necessary that an authentic interpretation be supplied. A special order under the name of "Scribes" devoted themselves to the study of the law as a profession, and engaged upon a subtle and refining exposition of it. But the pious considered it to be their chief business to fulfil with zeal and conscientiousness the law as thus expounded. That very considerable progress in this direction had been made even in the second century before Christ, is distinctly proved by the history of the Maccabean revolution.

There was a religious party which interpreted the Sabbath command so strictly, that they would rather surrender without a struggle than infringe upon the observance of the Sabbath by wielding the sword (1 Macc. 2:32-38). It also belonged to the ideal of piety, which even the author of the book of Daniel had already set before the eyes of his comrades in the faith as an essential condition, that they should not defile themselves with the eating of the food of the heathen (Dan. 1).

But alongside of this legalistic tendency there were operating in Palestine, from the time of Alexander the Great, influences of an altogether different kind, which proved the more decidedly and dangerously hostile to the interests of the law and its promoters the longer they existed. These were the Hellenizing tendencies. It had been the fond dream of Alexander to found a universal empire, which would be held together not merely by the unity of the government, but also by the unity of language, customs, and civilisation. All the Oriental races were to be saturated with Hellenic culture, and to be bound together into one great whole by means of this intellectual. force. He therefore took care that always Greek colonists should directly follow in the steps of his army. New cities were founded, inhabited only by Greeks, and also in the old cities Greek colonists were settled. Thus over one half of Asia a network of Greek culture was stretched, which had as its object the reducing under its influence of the whole surrounding regions. The successors of Alexander continued his work; and it is a striking testimony to the power of Greek culture, that it fulfilled in large measure the mission which Alexander had assigned it. All Western Asia, in fact, if not among the wide masses of the population, yet certainly among the higher ranks of society, became thoroughly Hellenized. Even in Palestine about the beginning of the second century this movement was in full progress. It cannot indeed be proved that all those cities, which we have come to reckon during the Roman period as Hellenistic cities (see § 22. 2 and § 23. 1), had been already Hellenized in the beginning of the Maccabean period. But this may safely be assumed in regard to the majority of them. Many had Hellenic institutions introduced by Alexander the Great himself, others by his successors, and everywhere Greek influence and Greek ideas were promoted. Even in the pre-Hellenic age, Gaza, as its coins prove, had lively commercial intercourse with Greece; from the time of its conquest by Alexander it was a Macedonian arsenal and residence for troops; and Josephus describes it as a πόλις Ἑλληνίς. Anthedon by its very name betrays its Greek origin. In Ashkelon coins of Alexander the Great were stamped. Ashdod on its coins, which date from the age of the Diadochae or even earlier, makes use indeed of the Hebrew language, but writes the letters in Greek characters (ΙΡ ΑΣΔΩΔ ΑΣΙΝΑ). Joppa is the old site of the myth of Perseus and Andromeda, and was in the age of the Diadochae a Macedonian garrison town. Apollonia is manifestly a foundation of the Greek times. Straton's Tower has indeed a Greek name, but was really founded at an earlier date by the Sidonians. On the other hand, Dora was possibly even in the fifth century before Christ put under tribute by the Athenians. In Acre, afterwards Ptolemais, as early as the times of Isaeus and Demosthenes, there was a Greek trading colony. The coins impressed there with the name of Alexander were already very numerous, and in the age of the Diadochae it was an important garrison town. The real Hellenizing and refounding of it as Ptolemais was probably the work of Ptolemy II. Philadelphus. — Along with these coast towns we must also include a number of inland cities. We know certainly of Samaria that it was colonized by Alexander. Scythopolis is met with bearing this Greek name as early as the third century; and even earlier we have Paneion, the grotto at the source of the Jordan, as the sanctuary of Pan. Along with Scythopolis, Polybius (v. 70) makes mention of an important city not otherwise known, Philoteria on the Lake of Gennesaret, in the time of Antiochus the Great, B.C. 218, which, like the similarly named city in Upper Egypt, had its name probably from a sister of Ptolemy II. Philadelphus. — Of the cities of the countries east of the Jordan, Hippus and

Gadara were distinctly reckoned πόλεις Ἑλληνίδες. Pella and Dium are denominated Macedonian cities, and were founded perhaps by Alexander the Great, and at latest during the Diadochean age. The derivation of the name Gerasa from the γέροντες, the veterans of Alexander the Great, is probably nothing more than an etymological fancy. This, however, is certain, that the old capital of the Ammonites was Hellenized by Ptolemy II. Philadelphus under the name of Philadelphia. And finally, the Second Book of Maccabees speaks generally of πόλεις Ἑλληνίδες within the boundaries of Judea (2 Macc. 6:8).

Within the encircling network of Hellenistic cities the small province of Judea kept itself clear of the influence of Greek customs and ways. There, too, Hellenism encroached more and more. The indispensable requirements of daily life obliged the Jews to make use of the universal language of the Greeks. How otherwise would commercial intercourse with foreign lands have been possible? But with the language came also the manners and customs, and indeed the whole culture of Greece. In the beginning of the second century the progress of Hellenism in Palestine must have already become quite observable. For only thus can we explain how a section of the people, including the upper classes and the educated, readily gave their consent to the Hellenizing projects of Antiochus Epiphanes, and even went beyond him in carrying them out. — Had this process been allowed to go on in its natural and peaceful course, then the Judaism of Palestine would probably have in time assumed a form in which it would be scarcely recognisable, — a form even more syncretistic than that of Philo. For it belonged to the very essence of Hellenism that it should dominate and colour the modes of religious worship, and at least clothe them in Grecian garments. We find it so in Syria as well as in Egypt. Nor would it have happened otherwise in Judea, if matters there had been permitted to take a smooth course. But the more perfect that legalistic Judaism had become on the one hand, and the more thoroughly developed the central principle of Hellenism had grown upon the other, the more decided and irreconcilable did the opposition between the two appear. Within the circle of the Jewish people itself there now arose two antagonistic parties: the party friendly to the Greeks and the party of "the pious" (חֲסִידִים, Ἀσιδαῖοι, 1 Macc. 2:42, 7:13), who held stoutly by the strict ideal of the scribes. But the whole preliminary history of the Maccabean revolution makes it evident that already the adherents of the former party were in the majority. Everything seemed conspiring to present before Hellenism an open door. It appeared as if nothing else was now left for "the pious" but to form themselves into a sect. But just then a powerful reaction set in, brought about by the attempt of an unintelligent despot, Antiochus Epiphanes, prematurely and with rude violence to force upon them Hellenic institutions. The Jewish worship was to be completely abolished, purely Greek rites were to be introduced, all Jewish ceremonies were all at once to be forbidden. It was just the extreme and radical character of this attempt that saved Judaism. For now not only the strict party of Chasidim, but the whole mass of the people, was roused to do battle for the old faith. And the further development of events led to the complete expulsion of Hellenism from Jewish soil, at least in matters of religion. So far as our information reaches, this is the only example of an Oriental religion completely emancipating itself from the influence of Hellenism.

Antiochus IV. Epiphanes, son of Antiochus the Great, had succeeded his brother Seleucus IV. in the government of Syria, after that king had been murdered by his minister Heliodorus, and held possession of the throne from B.C. 175 till B.C. 164. He was by nature a genuine despot, eccentric and undependable, sometimes extravagantly liberal, and fraternizing with the common people in an affected manner; at other times cruel and tyrannical, as he showed himself in his treatment of Judea. The picture drawn of him by Polybius describes him under the more pleasing aspect. This is the sketch he gives: —

“Sometimes he would slip away from the palace and would appear at one time here, at another time there, in the city, sauntering along in company with one or two. Very often he was to be found in the workshops of the silversmiths and goldsmiths, where he would chat away with the moulders and other workmen, and seek to impress them with his love of art. Then he would condescend to familiar intercourse with any sort of people he chanced to come across, and would carouse with the meanest strangers who might happen to be present. But when he learned that young folks anywhere were to have a drinking bout, he would appear among them unexpectedly with horn and bagpipe, so that most, through sudden fright, would rush precipitately away. Often, too, he laid aside his royal robes, and, dressed in a toga, would go to the forum as a suppliant for an office. He would then seize some by the hand, others he would embrace, and entreat them to give him their vote, sometimes for the office of aedile, sometimes for that of tribune of the people. If he succeeded in obtaining the office, and was seated according to Roman custom in the ivory chair of state, he would take into consideration the cases that were to be adjudicated upon in the forum, and give his decisions with much earnestness and conscientiousness. Rational people, therefore, were at a loss what to think about him. Some regarded him as a simple and homely man, others looked upon him as crazed. He acted in a similar manner in the bestowal of his gifts. To some he gave bone dice, to others dates, to others gold. But if perchance he should meet any one whom he had never seen before, he would give him unexpected presents. But in the sacrifices which he had offered up in cities, and in the honours which he gave to the gods, he went beyond all other kings. As a proof of this we may point to the Temple of Zeus at Athens, and the images around the altar at Delos. He was wont also to bathe in the public baths, when they were quite full of their habitual visitors, where vessels of the most costly perfumes would be brought to him. When somebody once said to him: ‘Happy art thou, O king, since thou hast such perfumes and givest forth such fragrance;’ he went on the following day, without having said anything to the man, to the place where he bathed, and showered upon his head the contents of a large vase of that most precious ointment called stacte; whereupon all made a rush forward in order to wash themselves with the ointment But on account of the slipperiness of the pavement many fell, amid shouts of laughter, the king himself joining in the mirth.” — Thus far Polybius. Diodorus and Livy give similar accounts. They give special prominence to his love of pomp and his munificence. Brilliant spectacles, magnificent buildings, kingly presents, these were the sort of things in which he delighted. But in everything he was inclined to rush to extravagant extremes, so that Polybius already styled him ἐπιμανής rather than ἐπιφανής.

Such being the character of the man, we need not trouble ourselves seeking to discover any very deep motives for his proceedings against Judea. Tacitus has, upon the whole, given a fair estimate of them when he said: Antiochus strove to overthrow the superstition of the Jews and to introduce among them Greek customs, but was prevented by the war with the Parthians “from improving the condition of this most detestable race.” His endeavour was to advance everywhere the lustre of Greek culture. In Judea a section of the people declared in favour of his plans. He was naturally prepared to give that party his support, and to make over to it the government of Judea. But when the Jewish people organized an opposition to these schemes, this roused the capricious humour of the despot. He first of all chastised the refractory people by plundering the rich treasures of their temple, which must have been very enticing to the king, now sorely in need of money. Then, as the opposition still continued, he proceeded to radical and sweeping measures. The Jewish worship was completely suspended, all Jewish ceremonies were strictly forbidden, and with rude violence a thoroughgoing Hellenizing process was attempted.

At the head of the party in Judea attached to the old faith at the time when Antiochus Epiphanes ascended the throne, stood the high priest of that day, Onias III. The leader of the party friendly to the Greeks was his own brother Jesus, or, as he is better known under his Greek name, Jason. In Jerusalem the inclination in favour of Greek customs was already so strong that the friends of the Greeks could venture upon the attempt to seize the government for themselves, and to carry out their plans by force. Jason promised the king a great sum of money, — whether as a gift bestowed once and for all, or as a regular tribute, is not very clear, — if he would transfer to him the high-priesthood, permit him to erect a gymnasium and an ephebeion, and finally allow "the inhabitants of Jerusalem to be enrolled as Antiocheans," τοὺς ἐν Ἱεροσολύμοις Ἀντιοχεῖς ἀναγράψαι, that is, grant them the title and privileges of citizens of Antioch. Antiochus was quite ready to concede all this. Onias was driven out, and Jason was installed as high priest. The Hellenizing process was now carried on with energy. There is indeed no mention of any attack having been made upon the Jewish religion. But in every other direction he put down "the institutions that were according to the law, and brought up new customs against the law" (2 Macc. 4:11). A gymnasium was erected below the castle; the young men of Jerusalem exercised themselves in the gymnastic arts of the Greeks. The very priests forsook their service at the altar and took part in the games of the palaestra. The contempt for Jewish customs went so far that many sought artificially to remove the traces of their circumcision. With a latitudinarianism of a genuinely Hellenistic type, Jason sent a contribution to the sacrificial festival of Hercules at the games celebrated every fourth year at Tyre. This, however, was so offensive to the Jews entrusted with the carrying of it, that they entreated that the money should be applied to building ships.

For three years, from B.C. 174 to B.C. 171, Jason administered his office after this fashion. Then he fell, through the machinations of a rival, who continued his work in a manner still more contemptible. Menelaus, by promising still larger gifts of money, was able to bring about Jason's overthrow, and to secure the transference to himself of the high priest's office. He roused against himself the bitter animosity of the people by appropriating the treasures of the temple. He also was the instigator of the murder of the former high priest Onias III., who had sought the asylum of the sanctuary at Daphne, from which, however, he was decoyed and treacherously murdered.

Meanwhile Jason had not abandoned his claims to the high-priesthood. In B.C. 170, when Antiochus was engaged upon his expedition against Egypt, he succeeded by a sudden stroke in making himself master of Jerusalem, and forcing his rival to betake himself for protection to the castle. This success of Jason was, according to the representation of the Second Book of Maccabees, the occasion that led to the king's direct interference against Jerusalem. Antiochus looked upon the proceeding as a slight to his majesty, and resolved to chastise the rebellious city.

When, toward the end of B.C. 170, he had returned from Egypt, he marched against Jerusalem in person with his army, and there gave direction for a terrible massacre, and plundered the enormous treasures of the Jewish temple, in which he is said to have received assistance from Menelaus himself. All the valuable articles, among them the three great golden pieces of furniture in the inner court of the temple, the altar of incense, the seven-branched candlestick, and the table of shewbread (on these see Div. ii. vol. i. p. 281 f.), he carried away with him to Antioch.

The cup of sorrow and humiliation for the believing Israelites, however, had not yet been completely drained, and the worst was yet to come. Two years later, in B.C. 168, Antiochus

undertook another expedition against Egypt. But this time the Romans took the field against him. The Roman general, Popilius Laenas, had sent him a decree of senate, in which he was required, if he were to avoid being regarded as an enemy of Rome, to abandon once for all his schemes against Egypt; and when Antiochus answered that he wished time to consider the matter, Popilius gave him that well-known brief ultimatum, describing a circle round about him with his staff and addressing him with a determined "ἐνταῦθα βουλεύου." Antiochus was thus compelled, whether he would or not, to yield to the demands of the Romans. The result of this blasting of his plans with regard to Egypt was that Antiochus directed his energies immediately to a war of extermination against the Jewish religion. Since nothing more could be done in Egypt, he would carry out all the more determinedly his schemes in Judea. He sent a chief collector of the tribute to Judea (his name is not given in 1 Macc. 1:29, but in 2 Macc. 5:24 he is called Apollonius), with orders to Hellenize Jerusalem thoroughly. The Jewish population which would not yield was treated with great barbarity; the men were killed, and the women and children sold into slavery. Whoever was able escaped from the city. In place of the Jewish population thus destroyed, strangers were brought in as colonists. Jerusalem was to be henceforth a Greek city. In order that such measures might have enduring effect, the walls of the city were thrown down; but the old city of David was fortified anew and made into a powerful stronghold, in which a Syrian garrison was placed. This garrison remained in possession of the citadel during all the subsequent struggles of the Maccabees, and maintained the supremacy of the Syrian kings amid all changes. Simon was the first, twenty-six years after this, in B.C. 142–141, to gain possession of the citadel, and so to vindicate the independence of the Jews.

The destruction of the Jewish population of Jerusalem was only a means towards the chief end after which Antiochus was striving. Throughout the whole land the Jewish religion was to be rooted out, and the worship of the Greek gods introduced. The observance of all Jewish rites, especially of the Sabbath and circumcision, was forbidden on the pain of death; the Jewish mode of worship was abolished. In all the cities of Judea sacrifices were to be offered to the heathen deities. Officers were sent into all the districts, charged with the duty of seeing that the commands of the king were strictly obeyed. Wherever any one showed reluctance, obedience was enforced with violence. Once a month a rigorous search was instituted: if a copy of the book of the law were found in the possession of any one, or if any one had had his child circumcised, he was put to death. In Jerusalem, on the 15th Chislen of the Seleucid year 145, that is, in December B.C. 168, at the great altar of burnt-offering a pagan altar was built, and on 25th Chisleu, for the first time, a sacrifice was offered upon it (1 Macc. 1:54, 59; this is "the abomination that maketh desolate," שִׁקּוּץ מְשֹׁמֵם or שִׁקּוּץ שֹׁמֵם, LXX.: βδέλυγμα τῆς ἐρημώσεως, of which the book of Daniel speaks, Dan. 11:31, 12:11). This sacrifice, according to the account given in the Second Book of Maccabees, was rendered to the Olympic Zeus, to whom the temple of Jerusalem has been dedicated. The Jews were also compelled to keep the Dionysiac festival, crowned with ivy, marching in procession as devotees of Bacchus.

The Second Book of Maccabees relates wonderful stories of the bright martyr courage with which a certain section of the people firmly adhered to the ancient faith. With considerable rhetorical extravagance it tells how an old man ninety years of age, called Eleasar, was tortured; and then also seven brothers, one after another, suffered before the eyes of their mother, who at last herself likewise met a martyr's death. The question of the accuracy of these details must be left undecided. The fact is that a large circle of the people, notwithstanding all the violent measures of the persecutors, remained true to the faith and customs of their fathers. For their encouragement an unknown author, under the name of Daniel, published a hortatory and consolatory treatise, in which he set before his fellow-believers, for stimulus and incitement,

stories culled from the history of earlier times, and with confident assurance of faith represents the speedy overthrow of the heathen rule, and the downfall of the worldly oppressors of the people of God (Div. ii. vol. iii. p. 44 ff.). The effect of such a work we can easily conceive must have been very great.

The passive resistance thus shown was soon succeeded by open revolt, — viewed from a human point of view, a foolhardy enterprise; for how could the small nation of the Jews secure any permanent advantage over the forces of the king? But religious enthusiasm waits not to ask about possibilities of success. The excitement broke forth into revolution in the town of Modein, at the call of a priest of the order of Joarib, named Mattathias, and his five sons, John, Simon, Judas, Eleasar, and Jonathan. When the king's officer had entered that place, in order to insist upon the presentation of the heathen sacrifice, Mattathias refused to obey the command. "Though all the nations," said he, "that are under the king's dominion obey him, and fall away every one from the religion of their fathers, and give consent to his commandments, yet will I and my sons and my brothers walk in the covenant of our fathers. God forbid that we should forsake the law and the ordinances." When he saw a Jew preparing to offer sacrifice, he rushed forward and slew him upon the altar. He also killed the king's commissioner, and levelled the altar to the ground.

He then fled along with his sons into the mountains. But soon a terrible disaster proved to him that mere flight meant nothing less than utter destruction. Multitudes of like-minded men had now withdrawn into hiding-places in the desert. There they were sought after by a detachment of the Syrian garrison of Jerusalem, and an attack was made upon them on a Sabbath day; and since they declined to offer any resistance because of the Sabbath, they were remorselessly hewn down to the last man, along with their wives and children. To the vigorous, strong-minded Mattathias such a martyrdom seemed a poor way of contributing to the cause of God. He and those about him resolved to proceed to action, and, in case of necessity, not even to scruple engaging in battle upon the Sabbath day. And now the "Pious," Ἀσιδαῖοι, חֲסִידִים, attached themselves to him; that is, those who proved faithful in their observance of the law, who had hitherto showed their resolution simply in endurance. Mattathias then gathered together all the men fit for battle, who were ready to fight for their faith, passed with them up and down through the country, overturned the altars, slew the apostate Jews, circumcised uncircumcised children, and gave encouragement to all to engage in open hostility to the heathen persecutors.

The work thus begun he was not to be permitted long to carry on. Soon after the beginning of the revolt, in B.C. 167–166, in the Seleucid year 146 (1 Macc. 2:70), Mattathias died, after exhorting his sons to continue the work, and recommending Simon as a man of counsel, and Judas as best qualified to act as leader in battle. Amid great lamentations he was buried at Modein.

And thus now Judas came to the front as head of the movement. His surname, ὁ Μακκαβαῖος, from which the whole party has received the name of Maccabees, was probably intended to designate him as the vigorous, sharp-beating warrior, from מַקָּבָה, "the hammer." "In his acts he was like a lion, and like a lion's whelp roaring for his prey." Thus the First Book of Maccabees (3:4) characterizes him a hero of chivalry, bold and powerful, not waiting to ask about the possibility of success, but enthusiastically sacrificing his goods and his blood in a noble cause. The triumphs which he achieved could indeed, in presence of such a terrible array of hostile forces, only be temporary. The cause which he represented must certainly have been lost if it had to depend only on the sword.

In its earliest stage the movement had a course of singularly good fortune. In one battle after another Judas won brilliant victories, which resulted in the restoring of the Jewish worship on Zion. A Syrian battalion, under Apollonius, probably the same of whom mention has already been made at page 206, was cut down by Judas, and Apollonius himself was slain. The sword which he took from him as spoil was the one which Judas from this time forth always himself used in battle. Also a second Syrian army, which Seron, "the prince of the army of Syria," whom Judas went forth to meet, was completely routed by him at Beth-horon, north-west of Jerusalem.

The king found it necessary to take vigorous measures in order to suppress the revolt in Judea. While he himself, in B.C. 166–165 (1 Macc. 3:37 gives the Seleucid year 147), went forth upon an expedition against the Parthians, he sent Lysias back to Syria as imperial chancellor and guardian of the minor Antiochus V., and gave him orders to fit out a large army against Judea to quell the rebellion there. Lysias sent three generals, Ptolemy, Nicanor, and Gorgias, with a large body of troops against Judea. The defeat of the Jews seemed so certain, that foreign merchants accompanied the Syrians in order to purchase as slaves the expected Jewish captives.

Meantime, however, Judas, and those adhering to him, had not been inactive. Now that Jerusalem had been wrested from the heathens, Judas collected his fighting men in Mizpah, the ancient stronghold of Israel in the times of the Judges, not far from Jerusalem. It no longer consisted merely of a small group of enthusiasts, but was a regular Jewish army, which he had there organized according to military rules; he "ordained captains over the people, even captains over thousands, and over hundreds, and over fifties, and over tens." By prayer and fasting he prepared himself for the unequal struggle. In the province of Emmaus, west of Jerusalem, at the entrance into the hill country, the armies encountered one another.

While the main body of the Syrian army remained in camp at Emmaus, Gorgias endeavoured with a strong detachment to engage the Jewish army. When Judas heard of this he circumvented him, and got between him and the main body lying at Emmaus. His brave words of encouragement aroused such enthusiasm among the Jews, that the Syrian troops were completely overpowered. When the detachment under Gorgias returned, they found the camp already in flames, and the Jews quite prepared to join with them in battle. Without venturing on such a conflict, they at once fled into the Philistine territory. This victory of the Jews, in B.C. 166–165, was complete.

In the following year, B.C. 165–164, and indeed, as further details show, in autumn of B.C. 165, Lysias himself led a new and still more powerful army against Judea. He did not make his attack directly from the north, but came against Judea from the south by the way of Idumea (1 Macc. 4:29). He must therefore have fetched a compass round about Judea; it may have begun, as Hitzig conjectures, p. 393, on the east, round about the Dead Sea, or, what is more probable, on the west, since he had marched along the Philistine coast and round about the hilly region. At Bethzur, south of Jerusalem, on the road to Hebron, the contending forces met. Although the Syrian army greatly exceeded in numbers, Judas this time again won so complete a victory that Lysias found himself obliged to return to Antioch in order to collect new forces.

After these two brilliant and decisive successes, Judas again took possession of Jerusalem, and directed his attention to the restoration of the services of divine worship. The citadel of Jerusalem was indeed still held by Syrian troops, but Judas kept them continually in check by his people, so that the works of the temple could not be destroyed by them. Thus protected, the

work was proceeded with. Everything impure was carried out from the temple. The altar of burnt-offering, which had been polluted by heathen sacrifices, was wholly taken down and a new one built in its place. The sacred garments and furniture were replaced by new ones; and when everything was ready, the temple was consecrated anew by the celebration of a great feast. This took place, according to 1 Macc. 4:52, on 25th Chisleu, in the Seleucid year 148, or December B.C. 165, or precisely the same day on which three years before, for the first time, the altar had been desecrated by the offering up of heathen sacrifices. The festivities lasted for eight days, and it was resolved that every year the memory of those events should be revived by the repetition of the festival observance.

The reconsecration of the temple forms the first era in the history of the Maccabean revolt. Hitherto the struggles of the heroes of the faith had been invariably crowned with success. Judas had led his followers on from one victory to another. The future must now prove whether their power was elastic enough, and their enthusiasm enduring enough, to keep permanent possession of what had thus in so rapid a course been won.

THE TIMES OF JUDAS MACCABAEUS, B.C. 165–161

SOURCES

1 Macc. 5–9, 22; 2 Macc. 12–15.

Josephus, Antiq. xii. 8–11. A summary of this is given in Zonaras, Annal. iv. 20–22.

Megillath Taanith, § 30, in Derenbourg, Histoire, p. 63.

The coins ascribed to Judas by de Saulcy, Recherches, p. 84 sq., belong rather in all probability to Aristobulus I.; see § 9.

LITERATURE

The works on Syrian history by Foy-Vaillant, Frölich, Clinton, Flathe, Stark, etc.

The treatises and commentaries on the Books of Maccabees by Wernsdorff, Michaelis, Grimm, Keil, Bissel, Wace, etc.

EWALD, History of Israel, vol. v. 306–323.

HERZFELD, Geschichte des Volkes Israel, ii. 272–296.

HITZIG, Geschichte des Volkes Israel, ii. 395–421.

GRÄTZ, Geschichte des Juden, Bd. ii. 2, pp. 352–376.

CONDER, Judas Maccabaeus and the Jewish War of Independence. London 1879.

STANLEY, Jewish Church, 1877, vol. iii. pp. 285–343.

Articles, of Judas Maccabaeus, in Winer, RWB., and in Schenkel's Bibellexicon.

During the next year and a half after the reconsecration of the temple down to the summer of B.C. 163, Judas remained master of Judea. The central government of Syria took no concern in the movements there, for its attention was wholly taken up elsewhere. Hence Judas was able unhindered to arrange for the strengthening of his position. The temple mount was furnished with stony fortifications. On the southern frontier of Judea, Beth-zur, which constituted the key to Judea, was strongly fortified and garrisoned with Jewish troops. And also throughout all the border districts military raids were made, partly in order to protect the Jews dwelling there, partly for the establishment of their own dominion. The Edomites, the Bajanites (a tribe otherwise unknown), and the Ammonites, all of whom had shown themselves hostile, were sharply chastised one after another.

Complaints soon came from Gilead, east of the Jordan, and from Galilee, of persecutions which

the Jews dwelling there had been subjected to on the part of the heathens. It was resolved that help should be sent to both. Simon went to Galilee with three thousand men, Judas to Gilead with eight thousand men. In neither case was there any idea of making a permanent conquest of the territory in question. But after Simon had won many battles against the heathen in Galilee, he gathered together the Jewish residents, with their women, children, and goods, and led them amid great rejoicing to Judea, where they would be kept secure. Judas acted in a similar manner in Gilead. In a series of successful engagements, especially in the north of the country east of the Jordan, he subdued the native tribes, whose leader was one Timotheus, then gathered together all the Israelites in Gilead, great and small, women and children, with all their possessions, and led them carefully, after he had been compelled to fight a passage for himself by Ephron, a town of the east Jordan country otherwise unknown, through Bethsean or Scythopolis to Judea.

During the period when Simon and Judas were absent from Judea, the direction of affairs there had been assigned to certain men called Joseph and Asariah. These two, in direct opposition to the orders of Judas, undertook a military expedition against Jamnia, but were driven back with considerable loss by Gorgias, who since his defeat had remained at Emmaus in Philistine territory. The First Book of Maccabees does not fail, in recording this incident, to call attention to the fact that it was by the hand of the family of the Maccabees that salvation was to be wrought for Israel.

But Judas carried his military expedition farther a-field. He went out again against the Edomites, besieged and destroyed Hebron; then passed through Marissa (for thus we are to read in place of Samaria in 1 Macc. 5:66) into the land of the Philistines, overthrew Ashdod, cast down the altars there and the idols, and returned back to Judea with rich spoil. The object now quite evidently was no longer the protection of the Jewish faith, but the strengthening and extending of the Jewish power.

Meanwhile a change had taken place in the affairs of Syria. Antiochus Epiphanes, in his undertakings in the eastern parts of the empire, had been no less unfortunate than his generals had been in Judea. He had advanced into the province of Elymais, but after making an unsuccessful attempt to appropriate the rich treasures of the temple of Artemis there, he had been compelled to retire back upon Babylon, and on the way, in the Persian town of Tabä, he died in B.C. 164, or, according to 1 Macc. 6:16, in the Seleucid year 149, that is, B.C. 164-163. Before his end he appointed one of his generals, Philip, to be imperial chancellor, and tutor to his son Antiochus V. Eupator during his minority. But instead of him Lysias secured possession of the person of the young king, and obtained absolute sovereign power in the empire.

The revolted Jews might not perhaps have been interfered with for a long time had not pressing appeals been made to Antioch directly from Judea. Judas now laid siege in B.C. 163-162, the Seleucid year 150 (1 Macc. 6:20), to the Syrian garrison in the citadel of Jerusalem. Some of the garrison, notwithstanding the siege, escaped, and in company with representatives of the Greek party among the Jews, betook themselves to the king in order to urge upon him the necessity of his interfering. The representatives of the Greek party, in particular, complained of how much they had to suffer from their hostile fellow-countrymen, so that many of them had been slain and had their possessions taken from them.

It was this that first again roused those in Antioch to take active measures. Lysias himself, in company with the youthful king, went forth at the head of a powerful army and marched against Judea. He once more made his attack from the south, and began with the siege of Beth-zur.

Judas was obliged to raise the siege of the citadel of Jerusalem, and to go forth to meet the king. At Beth-Zachariah, between Jerusalem and Beth-zur, the armies met. It soon appeared that over against the vigorous onslaught of the Syrian troops the Jews with all their valour could not secure any decisive or lasting victory. They went forth boldly to the conflict. Judas's own brother Eleasar distinguished himself above all the rest. He thought that he had discovered the elephant on which the young king was seated; he crept forward, stabbed the elephant from below, and was crushed under the weight of the falling animal. His self-immolation and all the efforts of the Jews, however, were in vain. The Jewish army was beaten, and that so completely, that the king's army soon appeared before the walls of Jerusalem, and laid siege to Zion, the temple mount.

Beth-zur also was obliged to yield and to receive a Syrian garrison. Those besieged in Zion, however, soon began to suffer from want of the means of life, since owing to the Sabbatical year no provision had been made beforehand. The utter discomfiture of the Jews now seemed imminent, when suddenly Lysias, on account of events occurring in Syria, found himself compelled to treat with the Jews for peace under favourable conditions. That same Philip whom Antiochus Epiphanes had nominated as imperial chancellor and tutor of his son Antiochus V. during his minority, had marched against Antioch in the hope of securing the power to himself. In order to have a free hand against him, Lysias granted to the Jews that which had hitherto been the occasion of the war, the liberty freely to celebrate their own religious ceremonies. It was henceforth to be permitted them to "observe their own institutions as formerly." On this condition those besieged in Zion capitulated; its strongholds were reduced, contrary to the promise sworn to by the king. The subjugation of the Jews was accomplished, but only after that had been granted to them on account of which the Syrian government had declared war against them five years before.

The understanding with the Jews at which Lysias and Antiochus V. in their own interests had arrived, was not interfered with by any of the following kings. None of them resorted again to the foolish attempt of Antiochus Epiphanes forcibly to introduce pagan culture and ceremonies among the Jews. The Jewish worship, which had been restored by Judas Maccabaeus amid all the changeful circumstances of the age, continued to be observed in essentially the same way. This deserves to be specially noted in order that a correct estimate may be formed of the conflicts which followed. The end aimed at in the struggle was now different from that previously before them. It had to do no longer with the preservation of religion, but, just as we have already seen in the preliminary history of the Maccabean revolt, with the question whether the friends of the Greeks or the national party within the Jewish nation itself should have the supremacy. It was essentially a Jewish internecine war, in which the Syrian superiors took part only in so far as they supported and put at the head of the provincial government sometimes the one, sometimes the other, of these two Jewish parties. To a certain extent, indeed, religious interests did come into consideration. For the Greek party were inclined to go farther in the way of favouring Greek institutions, while their nationalist opponents seemed more attached to the religion of Israel. But the fundamental points were no longer in dispute.

In consequence of the events of the previous year, the party in Judea friendly to the Greeks were driven out of the government, and were indeed for the most part persecuted. Judas stood practically at the head of the Jewish people. It may be readily supposed that the opposition party did not quietly submit to this arrangement, but made vigorous efforts on their part to obtain again the governing power. But they succeeded in their efforts only after a change had occurred in the occupancy of the throne. Antiochus V. and Lysias had, indeed, after a short struggle

overcome that Philip who had contended with them for the supremacy. But they themselves were soon driven out by a new pretender to the crown. Demetrius I., afterwards distinguished by the cognomen Soter, the son of Seleucus IV. Philopator, therefore nephew of Antiochus Epiphanes and cousin of Antiochus Eupator, who had previously lived as a hostage at Rome, and had vainly entreated from the Roman senate permission to return home, succeeded in secretly making his escape, and landed at Tripolis on the Phoenician coast. He was able soon to gather around him a considerable number of followers; indeed the very bodyguard of King Antiochus deserted him and his guardian Lysias, and joined Demetrius. By the orders of Demetrius both were murdered, and he himself proclaimed king in B.C. 162. The Roman senate was at first in consternation over the flight of Demetrius, but by and by Demetrius managed on his part to induce the Romans to recognise him as king.

Soon after Demetrius had entered upon the government, the leaders of the Hellenistic party, with a certain Alcimus at their head, or as his Hebrew name properly reads, Jakim, made representations to the king with reference to their oppression under the party of Judas. Judas and his brothers had meanwhile slain the adherents of the king, or expelled them from the country. Demetrius was naturally readily impressed by such a statement. Alcimus was appointed high priest, and at the same time a Syrian army under the command of Bacchides was sent to Judea, in order to instate Alcimus by force, if need be, in his office.

The further development of affairs is highly characteristic of the struggles of the Maccabees. The opposition to Alcimus on the side of the strict Jewish party was by no means engaged in by all its adherents. In consequence of quieting assurances which he gave, he was immediately acknowledged by the representatives of the strictest section of the scribes and the “pious” (Ἀσιδαῖοι, 1 Macc. 7:13), as the legitimate high priest of the family of Aaron. Only Judas and his adherents persevered in their opposition. They did not trust the promises of Alcimus, and considered that their religious interests could only be secured if they got the government into their own hands.

Results showed that they were not wrong. One of the first acts of Alcimus was to order the execution of sixty men belonging to the party of the Asidaeans. This struck fear and trembling into the hearts of the people, but had also the effect of arousing more determined opposition. Bacchides now thought that his presence in Judea was no longer necessary. Leaving behind a military force in Judea for the protection of Alcimus, he himself returned to Syria. Then Alcimus and Judas had practically an opportunity of measuring their strength and testing their own resources against one another. The open war between the two parties which now began seemed to tend more and more in favour of the Maccabees, so that Alcimus found it necessary to go to the king and to entreat of him further support.

Demetrius sent now against Judea another general, Nicanor, with a great army. Nicanor sought first of all through stratagem to obtain possession of the person of Judas. But Judas got information of this plot, and so the scheme miscarried. An engagement thus took place at Capharsalama, which resulted in the defeat of Nicanor. He then advanced upon Jerusalem, and wreaked his vengeance on the innocent priests. While they greeted him respectfully, he treated them with scorn and ridicule, and threatened that if they did not deliver up to him Judas and his army, he would on his victorious return set their temple on fire.

Therefore he returned to the district of Beth-Horon, north-west of Jerusalem, where he waited for reinforcements from Syria. Judas lay encamped over against him in Adasa. On 13th Adar, B.C. 161, a decisive conflict was engaged in which resulted in the utter defeat of the Syrians.

Nicanor himself fell in the tumult. When his people saw this, they threw their weapons away, and betook themselves to hasty flight. The Jews pursued them, surrounded them, and cut them down to the last man; so, at least, the First Book of Maccabees affirms. The victory must certainly have been overpowering and complete. For from this time the 13th Adar, corresponding roughly to our March, was annually observed as a festival under the name of "Nicanor's Day."

Judas was thus once more master of the situation. Josephus assigns to this period the death of Alcimus, and from this time reckons the priesthood of Judas. But the death of Alcimus, according to the First Book of Maccabees, occurred considerably later; and that Judas exercised generally the functions of the high priest, is extremely improbable.

There is, however, this element of truth in the statement of Josephus, that Judas now actually stood at the head of the Jewish commonwealth. And it was his determined plan to maintain himself, or at least his party, in that position. But the events which had occurred taught him that this was possible only after they had completely freed themselves from the Syrian yoke. The king of Syria had indeed showed his inclination to secure the supremacy in Judea to the opposition party by force of arms. The resolve was therefore made to shake off once and for all every sort of subordination to the Syrians. In order to accomplish this purpose, Judas applied to the Romans for help. The rulers of the Western empire, ever since their conflicts with Antiochus the Great, between B.C. 192 and B.C. 189, had taken the liveliest interest in matters that affected the Syrian empire, and looked closely into everything that occurred with watchful eyes. They repeatedly interposed their authority to decide upon the affairs of Syria. All centrifugal movements in that quarter might therefore count upon their support. It was thus very natural that Judas should make the attempt with the help of the Romans to secure permanently that freedom which had been temporarily wrung from their enemy. In grand pictorial style the First Book of Maccabees describes how Judas had heard of the deeds and might of the Romans, and how this led him to endeavour to obtain their aid. Even the inaccuracies which are mixed up in this story serve to set before us very strikingly the measure of the knowledge of the Romans, which was then current in Judea. Judas therefore sent two men of his party as ambassadors to Rome, Eupolemus son of John, and Jason son of Eleasar, the former perhaps identical with that Eupolemus who is known to us as a Hellenistic writer, see Div. ii. vol. iii. pp. 203–206. The end which he had in view in so doing was avowedly the throwing off of the Syrian yoke (1 Macc. 8:18: τοῦ ἆραι τὸν ζυγὸν ἀπ' αὐτῶν). The Roman senate readily granted an audience to the Jewish embassy, and a treaty of friendship was made of which the principal provisions were that the Jews should give help to the Romans and the Romans to the Jews in times of war (συμμαχία), but not on precisely equal terms, and in every case just as circumstances required (1 Macc. 8:25, 27: ὡς ἂν ὁ καιρὸς ὑπογραφῇ). It therefore practically depended on the pleasure of the Romans how far they should consider themselves bound by the agreement.

About the same time as this treaty was concluded the Romans issued a missive to Demetrius, wherein they ordered him to desist from every sort of hostile proceeding against the Jews, who were the allies of the Romans. Their interposition of authority came too late. Demetrius proceeded so rashly and energetically, that the overthrow of Judea had been already completed before there was any possibility of interference on the part of the Romans. Immediately after he had received news of the death and defeat of Nicanor, he sent a great army under Bacchides to Judea, which appeared in the neighbourhood of Jerusalem as early as the first month of the Seleucid year 152, that is, in April B.C. 161 (1 Macc. 9:3), only about two months after the fall of Nicanor. Bacchides encamped beside Berea, Judas beside Elasa (written also Eleasa and

Alasa). The superiority of the Syrians was so evident, that even in the ranks of Judas there no longer remained any hope of victory. His followers deserted in large numbers. With a few faithful men Judas ventured with the wild courage of despair on the hopeless conflict. The result was just what had been clearly foreseen: the troops of Judas were hewn down, and he himself fell in the battle. To his brothers Jonathan and Simon were granted the sad privilege of burying him in the grave of his father at Modein.

With the overthrow of Judas it was finally and definitely proved that it was a vain endeavour on the part of the Jewish nationalists to measure swords with the mighty forces of Syria. Brilliant as the earlier achievements of Judas had been, he was largely indebted to the recklessness and self-confidence of his opponents. Continuous military success was not to be thought of if only the Syrian authorities seriously roused themselves to the conflict. The following age cannot show even one conspicuous victory of the kind by which Judas had won renown. What the Maccabean party finally reached, it won through voluntary concessions of claimants of the Syrian throne contending with one another, and generally in consequence of internal dissensions in the Syrian empire.

THE TIMES OF JONATHAN, B.C. 161-143

SOURCES

1 Macc. 9:23-10:30.

Josephus, Antiq. xiii. 1-6. A summary of the history in Zonaras, Annal. iv. 22-24.

The coins ascribed to Jonathan by de Saulcy, Recherches, pp. 85-93, belong to Alexander Jannäus, see § 10.

LITERATURE

The works on Syrian history by Foy-Vaillant, Frölich, Clinton, Flathe, Stark, etc.

The Treatises and Commentaries on the Books of Maccabees by Wernsdorff, Michaelis, Grimm, Keil, Bissel, Wace, etc.

EWALD, History of Israel, v. 324-333.

HERZFELD, Geschichte des Volkes Israel, ii. 296-320.

GRÄTZ, Geschichte der Juden, Bd. iii. 4 Aufl., under title: Geschichte der Judäer von dem Tode Juda Makkabi's, etc., 1888, pp. 1-23.

HITZIG, Geschichte des Volkes Israel, ii. 421-450.

Articles "Jonathan" in Winer's RWB., and Schenkel's Bibellexicon.

THE power of the Jewish national party was quite annihilated by the defeat and death of Judas. The party friendly to the Greeks, with the high priest Alcimus at their head, was able now unhindered to carry on the government committed to it by the king. Wherever any opposition was offered, it was at once vigorously suppressed. The friends of Judas were sought out and brought to Bacchides, who "took vengeance on them." The "unrighteous" and the "ungodly," as the opponents of the Maccabees are designated in the First Book of Maccabees, had now the rule in Judea.

But the friends of Judas were by no means disposed to abandon all sort of resistance. They elected Jonathan, the brother of Judas, as their leader, "in order that he might direct the conflict." No regular or serious undertakings indeed were at first to be thought of. They required first of all gradually to gather together their forces and wait a favourable opportunity. The earliest incidents of this period which we have, represent the doings of Jonathan more in the light of the raiding of a freebooter than the acts of a religious party. When their personal property was no longer secure in Judea, they sent it under the guardianship of John, a brother of Jonathan, over into the country of the friendly Nabathaeans. While so engaged, John, along with his baggage, was attacked by a robber tribe of the sons of Ambri, near Medeba, in the country east of the Jordan, and slain. In order to avenge his death, Jonathan and Simon crossed the Jordan and fell upon the sons of Ambri when these were engaged in great

festivities in connection with a wedding celebration. Many were slain, and the rest fled into the mountains. On their return Jonathan and his followers were met at the Jordan by Bacchides and a Syrian army, and were in great jeopardy, but saved themselves by swimming across the Jordan.

Bacchides now took measures to secure that the subjection of Judea under the Syrian rule should be more decided than hitherto. He fortified the cities of Jericho, Emmaus, Beth-Horon, Bethel, Thamnatha, Pharathon, Tephon, and occupied them with Syrian garrisons. He likewise gave orders that the fortifications of Beth-zur, Gazara, and the citadel of Jerusalem should be strengthened. Finally, he took the sons of distinguished Jews as hostages, and put them in ward in the citadel of Jerusalem.

About this time, in the second month of the Seleucid year 153, that is, in May B.C. 160 (1 Macc. 9:54), the high priest Alcimus by his ungodly conduct caused great offence to those who adhered strictly to the observance of the law. He threw down the walls of the inner court, and "so destroyed the works of the prophets." In his death, which speedily followed, they beheld God's righteous judgment on such wickedness. The office of the high priest does not seem to have been again filled.

Soon after the death of Alcimus, Bacchides returned to Syria, believing that the subjugation of Judea was now complete. There follows a period of seven years, B.C. 160–153, about which the First Book of Maccabees says almost nothing. But these seven years must have been of very great importance for the reinvigorating of the Maccabean party. For at the close of that period it stands forward as the one party really capable of forming a government and as actually having Judea under its control, so that the Syrian kings in their contentions with one another are found eagerly seeking to secure its devoted adherence. Only by one episode is light shed upon the darkness of this era in the record of the First Book of Maccabees. Two years after the retirement of Bacchides, that is, in B.C. 158, the dominant party of the Jews favourable to the Greek customs made urgent representations to the king's government about the resuscitation of the Maccabean party. The consequence of this was that Bacchides went again with a still larger army in order to utterly destroy Jonathan and his adherents. But his following had already become so strong that Bacchides could not so easily be done with them. A portion of them entrenched themselves under Simon's leadership in the wilderness at Bethbasi, a place not otherwise known, and was there laid siege to by Bacchides in vain. With another portion Jonathan went forth on a plundering expedition into the country. When Bacchides observed how difficult the task assigned to him was, very much against the will of the Graeco-Jewish party which had brought him into such difficulties, he made peace with Jonathan and returned again to Syria.

The Jewish parties appear now to have made an attempt to come to terms with one another. The result of this seems to have been that Jonathan more and more secured again to himself the leadership. "The sword was now at rest in Israel, and Jonathan dwelt at Michmash; and he began to judge the people, and drove out the ungodly from Israel." With this laconic notice the First Book of Maccabees passes over the following five years. This can only mean that Jonathan, while the official Sanhedrim of Jerusalem was still filled by those friendly to the Greeks, established at Michmash a sort of rival government, which gradually won the position of main influence in the country, so that it was able even to drive out (ἀφανίζειν) the ungodly, that is, the Hellenizing party. The Hellenistic or Greek favouring party had no root among the people. The great mass of the Jews had still the distinct consciousness that Hellenism, even if it should tolerate the religion of Israel, was irreconcilable with the ideal of the scribes. So soon, then, as

pressure from above was removed, the great majority of the people gave themselves heart and soul to the national Jewish movement. The Maccabees, therefore, had the people soon again at their back. And this is the explanation of the fact that during the struggles for the Syrian throne now beginning, the claimants contended with one another in endeavouring to secure to themselves the good-will of the Maccabees. The Syrian kings were no longer in a position to force upon the people a Hellenistic government, but were obliged to do all in their power to conciliate and win the favour of the Jews. But this they could have only under the sway of the Maccabees. The concessions they made, however, furthered at the same time those tendencies which actually brought about the dissolution of the Syrian empire.

In the Seleucid year 160, or B.C. 153–152, and indeed, as the sequel shows, as early as B.C. 153 (1 Macc. 10:1, 21), Alexander Balas, a youth of mean extraction, and merely a tool of the kings leagued against Demetrius, made his appearance as a claimant of the throne. The despotic Demetrius was himself no favourite in the country, and so all the greater was the danger threatening him from the forces of the confederate kings. It was even feared that the Jews might go over to his opponent if he should be inclined to promise to set up among them a national government. Demetrius now sought to meet this danger by himself granting concessions to Jonathan. He gave him full authority to summon together an army in order to support the king, and for this purpose agreed to the liberation of the Jewish hostages who were still detained in the citadel of Jerusalem. Jonathan then went to Jerusalem invested with full power. The hostages were, in fact, set free, and given back to their parents. But Jonathan now formally seized possession of Jerusalem, and fortified the city and the temple mount. Also the Syrian garrisons of most of the fortresses built by Bacchides were sent away. Only in Beth-zur and in the citadel of Jerusalem did these garrisons remain.

But Demetrius was not sufficiently liberal in his concessions to Jonathan. He was immediately far outbidden by Alexander Balas. He appointed Jonathan high priest of the Jews, and sent him, as a badge of princely rank, the purple and the diadem. Jonathan was not slow to grasp these new offers. At the Feast of Tabernacles of the Seleucid year 160, in the autumn of B.C. 153, he put on the sacred vestments. He had thus all at once, even formally, become the head of the Jewish people. The Greek party was driven out of the government in Judea, and never again regained power, for Jonathan succeeded in maintaining his position amid all the changes of the following year. Favoured by circumstances, he was able to attain to that which Judas, with all his bravery, had never been able to reach.

When Demetrius heard that Jonathan had gone over to the party of Alexander Balas, he endeavoured by yet more liberal promises to win him back to his side. The gracious offers which he now made the Jewish leader were indeed too good to be credited: the tribute was to be remitted, the citadel of Jerusalem given over to the Jews, the Jewish territory to be enlarged by the addition of three districts of Samaria, the temple to be endowed with rich presents and privileges, the expense of building the walls of Jerusalem was to be defrayed out of the royal treasury.

Jonathan was prudent enough not to yield to these tempting offers. It was quite foreseen that Demetrius would succumb to the superior strength of his opponent. But even should he go forth conqueror, it was not to be expected that he would fulfil such extravagantly liberal promises. Jonathan therefore remained on the side of Alexander Balas, and never had occasion to regret his doing so. Demetrius was conquered by Alexander and his confederates in B.C. 150, and lost his own life in the battle. Alexander was crowned king.

In the same year, however, B.C. 150 (1 Macc. 10:57, Seleucid year 162), an opportunity was afforded Alexander of showing marked respect to Jonathan, and loading him with honours. Alexander had treated with King Ptolemy Philometor of Egypt for the hand of his daughter Cleopatra. Ptolemy had promised her to him, and the two kings now met together in Ptolemais, where Ptolemy himself gave away his daughter to Alexander, and the marriage was celebrated with great magnificence. Alexander also invited Jonathan to be present, and received him with marked respect. The deputies of the Hellenistic party in Judea, who made accusations against Jonathan, were indeed also there. But the king gave them no audience, but only showed his favour toward Jonathan the more conspicuously. He had him clothed in the purple and seated beside him, and appointed him στρατηγός and μεριδάρχης, presumably for the province of Judea, and thus the political privileges already actually exercised were now formally confirmed.

During the next year Jonathan was exposed to no danger from any side in maintaining the position which he had reached. The Greek party had been thoroughly silenced. Alexander Balas was an incapable ruler, who abandoned himself to sensual gratifications, and never thought of restricting the concessions that had been made to the Jewish high priest. The Syrian suzerainty continued indeed to exist. But since Jonathan and his party ruled in Judea, the aims hitherto striven after by the Maccabees were reached. Soon, however, the revolutions about the Syrian throne brought new dangers, but at the same time a new opportunity for the extension of political power. We see Jonathan now as a political partisan, sometimes of one, sometimes of another claimant of the Syrian throne, and using in a clever manner the weakness of the Syrian empire for the purpose of obtaining advantages to the Jewish people. But the aims of the Maccabean movement pointed higher than this. It no longer seemed enough that the party of Jonathan ruled unopposed in internal affairs. The troubles of the Syrian empire were made use of for the purpose of widening the boundaries of the Jewish territory – partly by donation, partly by conquest at their own hand, and finally with a dogged determination to accomplish the complete emancipation of the Jewish nation from the Syrian empire.

In B.C. 147 (1 Macc. 10:67, Seleucid year 165), Demetrius II., son of Demetrius I., set himself up as rival king in opposition to the contemptible weakling Alexander Balas. Apollonius, the governor of Coele-Syria, took his side, while Jonathan continued faithful to Alexander. Consequently hostilities were commenced between Apollonius and Jonathan, in which Jonathan was victorious. He drove out a garrison of Apollonius' from Joppa, then defeated an army under the command of Apollonius in the neighbourhood of Ashdod, destroyed Ashdod and the temple of Dagon in that city, and returned to Jerusalem with rich spoils. In acknowledgment of this support, Alexander Balas bestowed upon him the city of Ekron and its territory.

But Jonathan was the only one who stood by Alexander in opposition to Demetrius. The inhabitants of Antioch, and Alexander's own soldiers, declared in favour of Demetrius. Even his own father-in-law, Ptolemy, ranged himself on the side of Alexander's opponent, took Cleopatra back from Alexander, and gave her to the new candidate for the throne as his wife. Ptolemy also led a strong army against Alexander, with which he attacked him at the river Oenoparas, on the plains of Antioch. Alexander fled to Arabia, where his life was put an end to by the hand of an assassin. Immediately afterward Ptolemy also died of wounds received in the battle. Thus Demetrius became king in B.C. 145 (1 Macc. 11:19, Seleucid year 167. Comp. on this subject, above, page 175).

As the confederate of Alexander Balas, Jonathan had occupied a hostile attitude toward Demetrius. It would appear that he now felt himself strong enough to make the attempt to secure by force emancipation from the Syrian empire. In a regular manner he laid siege to the

citadel of Jerusalem, in which a Syrian garrison still lay. Here again, as so often happened in similar cases, it was the opposition party in his own nation, the ἄνδρες παράνομοι and ἄνομοι, as they are called in 1 Macc. 11:21, 25, who called the attention of the Syrian king to these revolutionary measures. In consequence of these reports, Demetrius summoned Jonathan to Ptolemais to answer for his conduct. But Jonathan was daring enough boldly to claim concessions from Demetrius. He allowed the siege still to proceed, betook himself with rich presents to Ptolemais, and demanded of Demetrius the cession to Judea of three provinces of Samaria, and immunity from tribute for this whole district. These were some of the most essential points in the concessions which Demetrius I. had made to Jonathan. Demetrius did not venture to refuse these demands. He agreed to add to Judea the three Samaritan provinces of Ephraim, Lydda, and Ramathaim, made over this enlarged Judea to Jonathan free from tribute, and confirmed him in all dignities which he had previously enjoyed. Of the citadel of Jerusalem no mention whatever was then made. Evidently these concessions were the price on account of which Jonathan agreed to raise the siege.

Such a receding ou the part of the Syrian king before the Jewish demands ten years previously would not have been thought of for a moment. But now the power of the Seleucidae was broken. None of the kings of Syria was henceforth sure of his throne. And Jonathan knew how to make use of this weakness, and skilfully to turn it to his own advantage. The next years gave him abundant opportunities for carrying out his policy of annexation. Demetrius had scarcely made these concessions, when he found himself obliged to make new promises in order to secure the support of Jonathan in circumstances of serious difficulty. A certain Diodotus, surnamed Tiypho, of Apamea, a former general of Alexander Balas, managed to get hold of the person of the youthful son of Alexander, called Antiochus, who had been brought up by an Arab Imalkue, and set him up as rival king in opposition to Demetrius. The situation was fraught with extreme peril to Demetrius, since his own troops deserted, and the inhabitants of Antioch assumed a hostile attitude. In face of these dangers, he promised to surrender to Jonathan the citadel of Jerusalem and the other fortresses of Judea, if Jonathan would place at his disposal auxiliary troops. Jonathan soon sent three thousand men, who just arrived at the right moment in order to afford powerful aid to the king in suppressing the revolt that had now broken out in Antioch. It was admittedly by their assistance that the rising in the city was crushed. With the thanks of the king, and with rich booty, the Jewish troops returned to Jerusalem.

But Demetrius did not fulfil the promise which he had made. It also soon appeared that he must yield before the new claimant to the throne. With the help of the troops that had deserted from Demetrius, Trypho and Antiochus made themselves masters of the capital Antioch, and in this way secured the sway in the centre of the empire. Without delay they sought also to win over Jonathan to their side. Antiochus confirmed him in possession of all that Demetrius had granted him. At the same time his brother Simon was appointed military commander for the king, from the ladder of Tyre down to the borders of Egypt.

In view of the faithlessness and weakness of Demetrius, Jonathan regarded it as justifiable as well as useful to pass over to the side of Antiochus. He therefore joined his party, and undertook, in connection with his brother Simon, to reduce the provinces of the empire lying next to Judea under the rule of the new claimant. A beginning was made in those districts over which Simon had been appointed military commander. So Jonathan, at the head of Jewish and Syrian troops, went out against the cities of Ascalon and Gaza. The former readily declared its submission to Antiochus; the latter yielded only after Jonathan had recourse to forcible measures. He compelled the city to give hostages, and took them with him to Jerusalem. Then

Jonathan proceeded to northern Galilee, and offered battle in the valley of Hazor to the general of Demetrius, which at first went against him, but at last resulted in a victory. At the same time Simon laid siege to the fortress of Bethzur in the south of Judea, where still a garrison adhering to Demetrius lay. After a long siege he compelled them to surrender the citadel, and placed in it a Jewish garrison.

While taking those steps toward the establishment of his power, Jonathan did not forget to strengthen his position still further by diplomatic negotiations with foreign nations. He sent two ambassadors, Numenius and Antipater, to Rome, in order to renew the covenant with the Romans that had been concluded in the time of Judas. These ambassadors were also bearers of letters from the high priest and Jewish people to Sparta and other places, in order to open up and secure friendly relations with them. From these documents we also learn that such relations between the Jews and foreign peoples were not wholly without example in earlier times. In the letter to the Spartans, Jonathan refers to the fact that King Areus of Sparta had addressed a friendly communication to the high priest Onias.

The conflict between Jonathan and Demetrius meantime continued, and was so conducted by him that he not only served the interests of Trypho and Antiochus, but also advanced his own. Soon after the defeat which the troops of Demetrius sustained in the valley of Hazor, Demetrius sent a new army to attack Jonathan. But this time the Jewish leader withdrew farther to the north, into the district of Hamath, north of Lebanon. No decisive engagement had taken place, when the Syrian army was recalled. Jonathan then turned his forces against the Arabian tribe of the Zabadeans, then against Damascus, and then, again, he directed his course southwards. When he had returned to Jerusalem he saw to the strengthening of the fortifications of the city, and by the erection of a high wall cut off the Syrian garrison from all intercourse with the city. Even before Jonathan's return Simon had placed a Jewish garrison in Joppa. He now also fortified Adida in the "Sephela," that is, in the lowlands in the west of Judea.

All these operations were avowedly carried on by Jonathan and Simon in the interests of the young king Antiochus and his tutor-regent Trypho. But the latter seems to have regarded with considerable misgivings the increase of the Jewish power. And not without reason. For the more the power of the Jews themselves increased, the greater became the danger of their shaking themselves free of the Syrian dominion altogether. It may therefore be quite easily understood how Trypho, so soon as Demetrius allowed him a free hand, turned against Jonathan. According to the First Book of Maccabees, this came about because Trypho wished himself to assume the crown, while Jonathan would not allow it This may indeed have been so, only the motives by which Jonathan was actuated were not so much moral as political.

Trypho went therefore with an army to Palestine, in order to reduce within moderate limits the increasing Jewish power. At Beth-sean or Scythopolis he met Jonathan. The interview was at first of a friendly nature, although Jonathan had with him as large an army as that of Trypho. Trypho sought to remove the suspicions of Jonathan by heaping upon him tokens of respect. He represented to him that a great army was superfluous, since they did not occupy toward one another a warlike attitude. If Jonathan should follow him with a small select company to Ptolemais, he should give over to him that city and "the rest of the fortresses and troops," meaning those between the Ladder of Tyre and the borders of Egypt, over which Simon had been appointed military commander. Jonathan actually allowed himself to be deceived by those promises. He dismissed his army, and followed Trypho to Ptolemais with only a thousand men. But scarcely had he reached that place when he was put in prison, and his people murderously cut down.

The news of this faithless proceeding of Trypho caused great excitement throughout Judea. It was natural that Simon, the last survivor of the five brothers of the Maccabees, should place himself at the head of affairs. By the decree of a popular assembly he was formally chosen leader. His first acts were the acceleration of the works on the fortifications of Jerusalem, and taking definite possession of Joppa. The latter place had never hitherto belonged to the Jewish territory. But in the exercise of his own official authority as military commander over the coast districts, Simon had placed there a Jewish garrison. The Gentile inhabitants were now expelled from Joppa, the city was Judaized and united with the Jewish territory.

Trypho, now carrying Jonathan as prisoner with him, went against Judea with a great army. At Adida, Simon obstructed his march into the interior by opposing him with his troops. Thereupon Trypho sent ambassadors to Simon and let him know that he kept Jonathan prisoner only for this reason, that he had failed to pay the money due for the offices that had been conferred upon him. If the money should be paid, and as a guarantee of future fidelity, the sons of Jonathan delivered up as hostages, he would then set him free. But although Simon now sent all that was demanded, Jonathan was not liberated. Trypho sought rather by going round about the mountains, to push on to Jerusalem over Adora in Idumaea from the south. When he was prevented from accomplishing this by a heavy snowfall, he marched his troops on to Gilead, that is, through the country east of the Jordan, caused Jonathan to be murdered at Bascama, and returned back to Syria.

Simon now actually entered into his brother's place as high priest of the Jews. He had the remains of Jonathan carried from Bascama, and buried him beside his parents and three brothers, at their native Modein. Over their common sepulchre, Simon, at a later period, erected a magnificent monument, which could be seen from the sea.

SIMON, B.C. 142–135

SOURCES

1 Macc. 13:31–16:22.

Josephus, Antiq. xiii. 6–7. A summary of it in Zonaras, Annal. iv. 24, v. 1.

Some dates from Megillath Taanith; see Derenbourg, pp. 67–69.

On the Shekel coins which have been ascribed by many to Simon, see Appendix IV.

LITERATURE

The works on Syrian history by Clinton, Foy-Vaillant, Frölich, Flathe, Stark, etc.

The treatises and commentaries on the books of Maccabees by Wernsdorff, Michaelis, Grimm, Keil, Bissel, Wace, etc.

EWALD'S History of Israel, v. 333–342.

HERZFELD, Geschichte des Volkes Israel, ii. 320–334.

GRÄTZ, Geschichte der Juden, Bd. iii., 4 Aufl., or Geschichte der Judäer von dem Tode Juda Makkabi's, etc., 1888, pp. 50–63.

HITZIG, Geschichte des Volkes Israel, ii. 450–459.

Art. "Simon" in Winer's RWB., and Schenkel's Bibellexicon.

STANLEY, Jemsh Church, vol. iii. (1877) 361–368.

BY the heroic deeds and successes of Jonathan, the Maccabean party had passed out far beyond its original aims. It had not at first intended to strive for anything more than the restoration of the Jewish worship, and the securing of the free exercise of the Jewish religion. But even Judas, when he had attained this end, did not rest satisfied therewith. He and his party then wished also to gain the supremacy in the control of home affairs. In the time of Jonathan this end was completely won. By Jonathan's appointment as high priest the ruling power was placed in the hands of the Maccabean party, and the Hellenistic party was driven out. But even this no longer seemed sufficient. Favourable circumstances — the weakness of the Syrian empire — tempted them to strive after thorough emancipation from the Syrian suzerainty. The last acts of Jonathan were important steps in this direction. The significance of the reign of Simon consists in this, that it completed the work of Jonathan, and made the Jewish people wholly independent of the Syrian empire.

In Syria, Demetrius and Trypho, as tutor-regent for the young king Antiochus, still occupied a position of antagonism to one another. Trypho, who had hitherto appeared only as representative of his youthful protégé, about this time or not much later, let fall the mask,

secured the assassination of Antiochus VI., and had himself crowned king.

After the last hostile proceeding on the part of Trypho, it was clear that Simon would unhesitatingly attach himself to Demetrius. But he did this only after he had exacted the promise that Demetrius would recognise the freedom of the Jews. While he continued eagerly to proceed with the building of the fortresses of Judea, he sent an embassy to Demetrius "to secure for his country exemption from tribute." Since Demetrius had actually no longer any power in the south of the empire, it was in his interest to act the part of the munificent, and to guarantee to the Jews all that they desired. He therefore not only granted remission of all outstanding taxes, but also perfect exemption from all paying of tribute in the future. Thus was the political independence of Judea recognised. "The yoke of the Gentiles," as the First Book of Maccabees expresses it, "was taken away from Israel." In order to give expression to this fact, they now adopted a mode of reckoning of their own, beginning with the Seleucid year 170, or B.C. 143–142. Documents and treatises were dated according to the year of Simon as high priest and prince of the Jews.

With this statement of the First Book of Maccabees we ought to combine a fact derived from a study of numismatics. There are Jewish shekel and half-shekel coins which, in the opinion of most numismatists, were stamped in the time of Simon. They bore on the one side the inscription ירושלם קדשה or ירושלים הקדושה, on the other side, according to their weight, either שקל ישראל, Israel's shekel, or חצי השקל, half-shekel. On the whole shekel and on the half-shekel the number of the year was impressed, and there are specimens of both coins with the year numbers 4 ,3 ,2 ,1) ד ,נ ,ב ,א), and one specimen of a whole shekel with the date הor 5. The era here used is held to be the era of Simon referred to in the First Book of Maccabees. Now these coins, if indeed they were stamped in the time of Simon, are not to be considered properly as coins of Simon, but as coins of the civic commune of Jerusalem, for after the fashion of the Hellenistic communes Jerusalem is regarded as in a position of authority over all Judea (compare § 23, I. and II.). Also the number of the year on the coins does not designate the year of Simon's reign, but the year of a civil era of Jerusalem; as also other cities of Phoenicia, such as Tyre, Sidon, Ascalon, had begun toward the end of the second century before Christ, in token of the freedom which they had obtained, to adopt a cycle of their own. But even were it possible that the era used upon the coins was identical with "the years of Simon" spoken of in the First Book of Maccabees, the first year of Simon is just the same as the first year of Jewish freedom. But a difficulty is presented by the fact that up to the present time out of the great number of specimens of shekel coins only one piece is found bearing the mark of the year 5; and that no higher numbers are found, whereas the era of Simon, according to 1 Macc. 13:41, 42 and 14:27, began in the Seleucid year 170, and Simon did not die before the Seleucid year 177 (1 Macc. 16:14), so that coins of his time might have been expected at least with the years 6 and 7. Merzbacher has therefore assumed that the era of Simon had been made in the First Book of Maccabees to begin two years too early. Its actual starting-point was the third year of Simon, the Seleucid year 172, or B.C. 141–140, in which Simon was pronounced by a popular decree hereditary high priest (1 Macc. 14:25–49). Then, too, for the first time did Demetrius confer the privileges that have been mentioned upon the Jews. But the author of the First Book of Maccabees has erroneously used the official "first" year of Simon as interchangeable with his actual first year. The reasons for this hypothesis are set forth by Merzbacher with acuteness and skill of combination, but on closer examination they do not prove convincing. The plain and distinct statement of the First Book of Maccabees, that a beginning was made in the Seleucid year 170 to number the years of Simon (13:41, 42; compare 14:27), cannot be thus set aside. Also Merzbacher's theory is set up simply in order to overcome the difficulty above referred to

which the year numbers on the shekel occasion. But besides this difficulty there are still other considerations which tell against the supposition that the shekel was issued under Simon. It cannot therefore be regarded as by any means certain, though indeed most numismatists are in favour of the idea.

The charter of Demetrius conferred privileges which, indeed, Demetrius had it not in his power to give away. It was Simon's policy rather to emphasize and give effect to these in face of the power of Trypho, which was more perilous to him. In order to confirm his position, Simon sought above all to get possession of two of the fortresses that would be of chief value to him – the city of Gazara and the citadel of Jerusalem; and in both cases he had the good fortune to be successful. Gazara, the old Geshur, not far from Emmans-Nicopolis in a westerly direction, at the base of the mountains, had been up to that time a Gentile city. Possession of it was of importance to the Jews, because it was one of the places which commanded the passes of the mountains, and the holding of it was thus absolutely necessary in order to maintain connection between Jerusalem and the port of Joppa, which had been already annexed by the Jews. Simon opened against the city a skilfully directed siege, conquered it, expelled all Gentile inhabitants from it, and settled it with "men who observed the law." Simon's son Jonathan was appointed governor of Gazara.

Soon after the conquest of Gazara, Simon compelled the Syrian garrison of the citadel of Jerusalem to capitulate through famine. The national struggles of the Maccabees had long been directed to the attainment of this object, for so long as the citadel was in the hands of the Syrian kings the Jews were really their subjects. Now at last Simon succeeded in making himself master of this stronghold. On the 23rd day of the second month of the Seleucid year 171, that is, in May B.C. 142, he entered with great pomp and ceremony into the citadel.

Since the Syrian kings were not in a position to be able to give any attention to proceedings in Judea, several years passed of undisturbed prosperity and peace for the Jews. As such a period the reign of Simon is generally characterized in the First Book of Maccabees. The securing of Joppa as a harbour, and the conquest of Gazara, Beth-zur, and the citadel of Jerusalem, are there represented as the chief services rendered by him. Also express mention is made of his care for the spiritual and material wellbeing of the country, for strict administration of justice and the re-establishment of the Jewish law. "Then did they till their ground in peace, and the earth gave her increase, and the trees of the field their fruit. The ancient men sat all in the streets, communing together of good things, and the young men put on glorious and warlike apparel. He provided victuals for the cities, and set in them all manner of munition, so that his honourable name was renowned unto the end of the world. He made peace in the land, and Israel rejoiced with great joy: for every man sat under his vine and his fig-tree, and there was none to fray them: neither was there any left in the land to fight against them: yea, the kings themselves were overthrown in those days. Moreover he strengthened all those of his people that were brought low: the law he searched out; and every contemner of the law and wicked person he took away. He beautified the sanctuary, and multiplied the vessels of the temple."

In these words of the First Book of Maccabees expression is given to the feeling of satisfaction which the majority of the people had in Simon's reign. The ultimate aims of the Maccabean struggles had been secured. The government was in the hands of the national party; the country was emancipated from the suzerainty of the Syrians. Thus Simon now reaped the full fruit of the common labours of the Maccabees: the formal legitimizing on the part of the people of their family as the ruling sacerdotal family. It had, indeed, been an act of usurpation by which the son of Mattathias attained unto the supremacy. Up to the outbreak of the Maccabean revolt

the office of high priest had been hereditary in another family. In the course of events that family had been driven out of its place. The Maccabean brothers had undertaken the leadership of the national party, and the Syrian king had transferred to them the high-priestly rank. For the maintenance of Simon's government it was of supreme importance that the legitimacy of his rule should be expressly recognised by a popular decree as affecting his own person and that of his descendants. Such an act was successfully carried out in the third year of Simon's reign. On the 18th Elul of the Seleucid year 172, that is, in September B.C. 141, it was resolved in a great assembly "of the priests, and the people, and the princes of the people, and the elders of the land," that Simon should be high priest and military commander and civil governor of the Jews (ἀρχιερεύς, στρατηγός and ἐθνάρχης), and that "for ever until there should arise a faithful prophet" (1 Macc. 14:41). By the last phrase it was meant that this popular decree should remain in force until an authentic communication from God should make some other enactment. Henceforth therefore Simon's official rank was regarded as "for ever," that is, hereditary. The significance of this popular resolution lies not so much in the fact that it conveyed to him any new dignity, but rather in this, that it legitimized and pronounced hereditary those dignities which he already had. In this way a new high-priestly priestly and princely dignity was founded, that of the Asmoneans. The terms of the popular decree were engraved on brazen tablets, and these were set up in the court of the temple.

The legitimizing on the part of the people was soon followed by recognition on the part of the Romans. Just about the time when that popular decree was issued, Simon sent an embassy, under the leadership of Numenius, to Rome, which carried as a present a golden shield weighing a thousand minas, and treated about the renewal of the covenant. The embassy was courteously received by the senate, and obtained a decree of senate, which guaranteed to the Jews unrestricted possession of their own territory. Information regarding the contents of the decree of senate was sent to the kings of Egypt, Syria, Pergamum, Cappadocia, and Parthia, and to many of the smaller independent states and communes of Greece and Asia Minor; while, at the same time, they were charged to deliver up to the Jewish high priest any evil-doers who might have fled to them from Palestine. The terms of the decree of senate is given us probably in the Senatus consultus communicated by Josephus, Antiq. xiv. 8. 5, which Josephus, however, assigns to the time of Hyrcanus II. The relations presupposed in this document are precisely the same as those of 1 Macc. 14:24 and 15:15-24: Jewish ambassadors, of whom one is named Numenius, carried as a present a golden shield, with a request for the renewal of the covenant; and the senate concluded in consequence of this to insist upon the autonomous cities and kings respecting the integrity of the Jewish territory. The session of senate referred to took place, according to Josephus, εἰδοῖς Δεκεμβρίαις, that is, on the 13th December, under the presidency of the praetor Lucius Valerius. This president may possibly be the same as "Consul Lucius," who, according to 1 Macc. 15:16, sent out the circular letter to the kings and cities. It is, however, also possible that by this term is intended L. Calpurnius Piso, one of the consuls for B.C. 139, who, according to the correct reading of Valerius Max. i. 3. 2, has the praenomen, not of Cneius, but of Lucius. In any case, the arrival of the Jewish ambassadors at Rome must be assigned to B.C. 139, for they returned to Palestine in the Seleucid year 174, that is, B.C. 139-138 (1 Macc. 15:10, 15). Without doubt, therefore, the statement of Valerius Maximus about the establishment of a Jewish propaganda at Rome in B.C. 139 has reference to the proceedings of these ambassadors.

Meanwhile the government of Simon seems not to have been going on so smoothly as it had hitherto. He became once more involved in Syrian affairs. Just about this time Demetrius II. had been temporarily withdrawn from the scene of Syrian politics. He had allowed himself to be

entangled in a tedious war with the Parthian king Mithridates I., which ended by Demetrius being taken prisoner by the Parthians in B.C. 138. In place of Demetrius, his father Antiochus VII. Sidetes now took up the struggle against Trypho. Like all Syrian pretenders, who had first of all to win their throne by conquest, Antiochus hasted to secure the aid of the Jews by flattering promises. He had heard in Rhodes of the imprisonment of Demetrius. Even before his landing on the Syro-Phoenician coasts, "from the islands of the sea" he wrote a letter to Simon, in which he confirmed to him all the privileges granted by former kings, and expressly gave him the right of coining money. Soon thereafter, in the Seleucid year 174, or B.C. 139–138 (1 Macc. 15:10), Antiochus landed in Syria, and quickly gained the victory over Trypho. The latter was obliged to fly to Dora, the strong fortress on the Phoenician coast, and was there besieged by Antiochus. Trypho, indeed, succeeded in effecting his escape from that place. He fled by Ptolemais and Orthosias to Apamea. But there he was again besieged, and in the siege lost his life.

No sooner had Antiochus gained some advantage over Trypho than he assumed another attitude toward the Jews. Even during the siege of Dora, Simon sent him two thousand auxiliary troops, and besides, silver and gold and weapons for their equipment. But Antiochus declined to accept what was offered, repudiated all his former promises, and sent one of his confidants, Athenobius, to Jerusalem in order to obtain from Simon the surrender of the conquered cities of Joppa and Gazara and the citadel of Jerusalem, as well as of all places outside of Judea that had been taken possession of by the Jews. If Simon should be unwilling to restore them, then he was to pay for them altogether the sum of a thousand talents, to be, as it was made to appear, once for all the sum of acquittance. The demands were justified by the plea that for their conquests the Jews had not been able to show any legal title. But Simon refused to yield to these terms, and declared that he would pay only one hundred talents. With this answer Athenobius returned to the king.

Antiochus had resolved to enforce his claims by violent measures. While he himself was still engaged in conflict with Trypho, he appointed his general Kendebäus to conduct the campaign against Simon. Kendebäus made Jamnia his headquarters, fortified Kedron, — a place not otherwise known, probably in the neighbourhood of Jamnia, — and made raids upon Judea. Simon was prevented by his age from personally taking the field. He sent, therefore, his sons Judas and John with an army against Kendebäus. Both justified the confidence placed in them by their father. In a decisive engagement Kendebäus was utterly defeated. When Judas was wounded, John undertook the pursuit, and chased the enemy to Kedron and down into the territory of Asbdod. He returned as conqueror to Jerusalem.

So long as Simon lived, the attack was not repeated on the part of Antiochus.

It thus seemed as if Simon were to be allowed to end his days in peace. But it was not so to be. Like all his brothers, he too died a violent death. His own son-in-law Ptolemy, who was military commander over the plain of Jericho, entertained bold and ambitious schemes. He wished to secure to himself the supreme power, and so plotted by what stratagem he could put Simon and his sons out of the way. When, therefore, in the month Shebat of the Seleucid year 177, that is, in February B.C. 135 (1 Macc. 16:14), Simon, on a tour of inspection through the cities of the land, visited Ptolemy in the fortress of Dok near Jericho, Ptolemy made a great feast, during which he had Simon and his two sons who were with him, Mattathias and Judas, treacherously murdered.

Thus was the last of the sons of Mattathias gathered unto his fathers.

JOHN HYRCANUS I., B.C. 135–105

SOURCES

The History of John Hyrcanus, referred to in 1 Macc. 16:23, 24, is not extant.

Josephus, Antiq. xiii. 8–10; Wars of the Jews, i. 2. Zonaras, Annal. v. 1–2 (a summary from Josephus).

Mishna, Maaser scheni v. 15; Sota ix. 10. Other rabbinical traditions in Derenbourg, pp. 70–82.

The most complete account of the coins is given by Madden, Coins of the Jews (1881), pp. 74–81.

LITERATURE

EWALD, History of Israel, v. 342–384.

GRÄTZ, Geschichte der Juden, iii., 4 Aufl. 1888, pp. 64–117.

HITZIG, Geschichte der Volkes Israel, ii. 459–472.

WERNER, Johann Hyrkan, ein Beitrag zur Geschichte Judäas im zweiten vorchristlichen Jahrhundert. Wernigerode 1877.

HAMBURGER, Real-Encyclop. für Bibel und Talmud, Abth. ii. pp. 421–426.

WELLHAUSEN, Die Pharisäer und die Sadducäer (1874), pp. 89–95.

Seeing that the high-priestly and princely offices had been declared hereditary in the family of Simon, his third son still surviving, John Hyrcanus, who had held the post of governor of Gazara, was nominated his successor. Against him, therefore, were first directed the attacks of the pretender Ptolemy, who had murdered his father and his two brothers. Immediately after the bloody deed the assassin Ptolemy sent to Gazara in order to do away also with John. That prince, however, had meanwhile been warned by friendly messengers, and so he had the murderers apprehended immediately upon their arrival. Then he hasted to Jerusalem, which he was fortunate enough to reach before Ptolemy. When the latter arrived, he found that the city was already in the power of Hyrcanus.

Ptolemy then retired to the fortress of Dagon, identical probably with that of Dok, near Jericho. There he was besieged by Hyrcanus; and undoubtedly the city would soon have been conquered, and the murderer given over to his welldeserved doom, had not Hyrcanus been restrained by affection for his mother. She had fallen into the power of Ptolemy. And so often as Hyrcanus threatened to storm the fortress, Ptolemy had her led out upon the walls, and threatened to hurl her down unless Hyrcanus would abandon his project. This caused him to hesitate in his proceedings. And so the siege was protracted, until at length the return of the Sabbatical year necessitated its abandonment. Ptolemy was thus set free; but nevertheless he had the mother of Hyrcanus murdered, and then fled.

Thus through Ptolemy had Hyrcanus lost both his parents and his two brothers, without having been able to take vengeance upon him.

An evil fate, however, overtook the murderer. Antiochus VII. Sidetes had hitherto made no further attempt upon Judea. We know not the reason of this, but it was perhaps because the home affairs of Syria were occupying all his attention. He was, however, by no means disposed to forget the demands which he previously made of Simon. In the first year of John Hyrcauus, B.C. 135–134, he invaded Judea, devastated the whole country, and finally laid siege to Hyrcanus in his capital, Jerusalem. He surrounded the whole city with a rampart and a trench. and cut off the besieged from all egress from the city. Hyrcanus on his part sought to harass the besiegers by sallies. In order to make the victuals last longer, he sent the non-combatants out of the city. But Antiochus would not let them pass, and drove them back again, so that they were obliged to roam about between the circle of the besiegers and the city, and many of them perished of hunger. It was not till the Feast of Tabernacles that Hyrcanus received them again into the city. For the celebration of this feast he had begged of Antiochus an armistice for seven days. Antiochus granted not only this, but sent also gifts for sacrifice into the city, which they were to present in the temple. This generous act raised the spirits of Hyrcanus, and he now hoped, by timely capitulation, to obtain favourable terms. He sent therefore an embassy to Antiochus to treat for conditions of peace. After protracted negotiations an understanding was at last come to. The terms of the arrangement were that the Jews should deliver up their arms, pay tribute for Joppa and the other towns lying outside of Judea which they had conquered, give hostages, and besides pay 500 talents. The conditions were indeed by no means satisfactory. Yet in the circumstances Hyrcanus was indeed very glad even at this price to obtain the raising of the siege and the withdrawal of the Syrian army. The walls of the city too were thrown down.

The remarkable moderation of Antiochus had perhaps other reasons than those assigned for it by the historians. In a decree of the Roman senate, which Josephus communicates in Antiq. xiii. 9. 2, it is assumed that a King Autiochus had taken from the Jews in war, Joppa, Gazara, and other towns (πολεμῶν ἔλαβεν Ἀντίοχος), on account of which a Jewish embassy had gone to Rome with the prayer that the senate should order Antiochus to restore these towns. This Antiochus can have been no other than Antiochus VII. Sidetes, for under no earlier Antiochus were the Jews in possession of the towns of Joppa and Gazara, and of the later kings there was none able to usurp any authority worth mentioning over the Jews. Evidently Antiochus, as is indeed in itself most probable, had in that war, before advancing to the siege of the capital, seized upon and taken from the Jews Joppa, Gazara, and the other towns that had been conquered by them. But then it is hardly credible that of his own accord, by a peaceful treaty, he would have left the Jews in possession of these cities, and only have imposed on them a tribute for the holding of them. The mild conditions are to be accounted for rather by the interference of the Romans. The senate certainly did not at first, in the decree referred to, formally accede to the prayer of the Jews, but rather put off any final decision. It appears, however, that very soon afterwards a second Jewish embassy went to Rorne, which did secure the result desired. In a subsequent passage, Antiq. xiv. 10. 22, a decree of the Roman senate is given by Josephus, erroneously inserted in a decree of the Pergamenes, which evidently refers to the matters now under discussion. In consequence of an embassy sent by Hyrcanus, a command is issued to King Antiochus that he must restore all the cities taken by him from the Jews, and in particular that he must withdraw the garrison from Joppa (τὴν ἐν Ἰόπῃ δὲ φρουρὰν ἐκβαλεῖν). The king is there indeed called “Antiochus, son of Antiochus,” instead of “son of Demetrius,” but he can scarcely be any other than Antiochus Sidetes. For if the Jews, since the conclusion of peace with him, obtained possession again of Joppa by the payment of tribute, it can scarcely be

supposed that any of the weak successors of Sidetes could have again placcd a garrison there. In any case, the Jews would have had no occasion to call in the help of the Romans against such an adversary. It may therefore be conjectured that the decree of senate in question preceded the conclusion of peace with Antiochus Sidetes, and was pre-eminently the means of securing for the Jews such mild and favourable conditions. — If these combinations are correct, we must assume that the war continued for more than a year.

The conflicts which took placc during those first years of Hyrcanus, gave new proofs that the small Jewish state could maintain its freedom from Syrian suzerainty only so long as the Syrian empire was internally weak. Before the first vigorous onslaught of Antiochus, the freedom that had previously been won by Simon was again lost. Hyrcanus' dependence on Antiochus VII. also obliged him to take the field with the Syrian monarch against the Parthians in B.C. 129. But he was not involved in the disaster that overtook Antiochus.

The death of Antiochus in the Parthian campaign, in B.C. 128, was for Hyrcanus a favourable occurrence. His place upon the Syrian throne was taken by the weak Demetrius II., who had previously been released from imprisonment by the Parthians. He was immediately involved in a civil war, which obliged him to seek to win the favour of the Jews.

Hyrcauus as soon as possible turned to account the altered circumstances. Without troubling himself about Demetrius, he began to seize upon considerable districts in the neighbourhood of Judea, to the east, to the north, and to the south. First of all he marched into the laud east of the Jordan, and conquered Medaba after a six months' siege. Then he turned to the north, took Shechem and Mount Gerizim, subdued dued the Samaritans, and destroyed their temple, Finally, he went south, took the Idumean cities Adora and Marissa, and compelled the Idumeans to submit to circumcision, and to receive the Jewish law. The policy of conquest, which had been already inaugurated by Jonathan and Simon, was carried out vigorously by Hyrcanus. The purely worldly character of his policy, however, is shown conspicuously in this, that first among the Jewish princes he no longer conducted the war by means of Jewish soldiers, but called in the aid of foreign mercenaries.

This independent procedure on the part of Hyrcanus was possible only on account of the internal weakness of the Syrian empire. Demetrius II, after his restoration to the throne, was again guilty of the folly of waging war with Ptolemy VII. Physcon, king of Egypt The Egyptian monarch therefore set up over against Demetrius a pretender to the throne, in the person of a young Egyptian, whom he gave out to be an adopted son of Antiochus Sidetes, who was, however, according to others, a son of Alexander Balas. This pretender was named Alexander, and was surnamed by the Syrians Zabinas, i.e. "the purchased." Conquered by this Alexander at Damascus, Demetrius was obliged to retire to Ptolemais, and to take ship from thence to Tyre, where as soon as he landed he was murdered, in B.C. 125 or 124.

Alexander Zabinas, however, had on his part to contest the sovereignty with the son of Demetrius, Antiochus VIII. Grypos. So he was not forced by necessity to live in peace and friendship with Hyrcanus.

After some years, somewhere about B.C. 122, Alexander Zabinas was subdued by his opponent. Antiochus VIII. Grypos conquered him, and had him executed; while, according to others, he brought his own life to an end by poison. — There now followed a long period of quiet. For eight years Antiochus VIII. Grypos held undisputed sway in Syria. Nevertheless even he made no attempt against Hyrcanus. He had no longer the ambition to restore to Syria its ancient

dimensions. In B.C. 113 he was driven out by his cousin and step-brother, Antiochus IX. Cyziceuos, who ruled Syria for two years, and then, when Antiochus Grypos again secured possession of the greater part of Syria in B.C. 111, he took up his residence in Coele-Syria, the part adjoining Palestine, and made it his headquarters.

Of Antiochus IX. Cyzicenos, who ruled in Coele-Syria from B.C. 113 to B.C. 95, Diodorus gives the following description: “So soon as he attained the throne, Antiochus Cyzicenos gave way to drunkenness and shameful sensuality, and to habits most unbecoming in a king. He took great delight in theatrical displays and the performance of comedies, and generally in all sorts of showmen, and tried to learn their art. He also zealously promoted the exhibition of marionettes, and sought to fabricate in silver and gold animals five ells long that would move of themselves, and other such arts. On the other hand, battering-rams and engines of war, which would have brought him great advantage and renown, he did not make. He also was passionately fond of adventurous expeditions; and often through the night, without the knowledge of his friends, accompanied only by two or three servants, he would go out into the country to hunt lions, panthers, and boars. In such escapades he often engaged to the extreme peril of his life in foolhardy encounters with wild beasts.”

We see here traditions of an earlier Antiochus IV. imitated again after a baser fashion. From such a ruler, who was taken up with such pursuits, Hyrcanus had nought to fear. And so it came about that from the death of Antiochus Sidetes, in B.C. 128, Judea had been able to keep itself absolutely independent of Syria. The taxes laid upon Judea by Antiochus Sidetes were not paid to any of the following kings. “Neither as their subject nor as their friend did he longer pay them any regard.”

In the last years of his reign Hyrcanus undertook an expedition for the conquest of the neighbouring districts. After having previously subdued the borders of Shechem and Mount Gerizim, he now directed his attack against the city of Samaria, whose inhabitants had given him occasion to complain. He had them enclosed by a wall and a trench, and then transferred the conduct of the siege to his sons Antigonus and Aristobulus. The Samaritans in their straits called in the aid of Antiochus Cyzicenos, who went indeed very willingly, but was driven back by the Jews. So then a second time Antiochus sought to bring them help by means of Egyptian auxiliary troops, which Ptolemy Lathurus supplied, and by their help devastated the Jewish territory, without, however, securing any decided advantage. After sustaining great loss, Antiochus withdrew from the scene of conflict, leaving his generals, Callimander and Epicrates, to carry on the campaign to its close. Of these the one was defeated by the Jews and lost his life, while the other, Epicrates, also achieved nothing, but treacherously gave over Scythopolis to the Jews. Thus Samaria, after a year’s siege, fell into the hands of the Jews, and was utterly razed to the ground. — The Jewish legends relate that on the day of the decisive victory of Antigonus and Aristobulus over Antiochus Cyzicenos, the occurrence was made known to Hyrcanus by a voice from heaven, while he was presenting a burnt-offering in the temple.

What has now been told is all that is known to us as to the external events of what seems to have been the truly brilliant reign of Hyrcanus. The record is scanty enough. But even still more fragmentary is the reports which have come down to us regarding the internal affairs of that government. Something may first of all be gained from the inscriptions on the coins. These, in common with the coins of the immediate successors of Hyrcanus, bear the inscription —

יהוחנן הכהן הגדל וחבר היהודים

or: יהוחנן הכהן הגדל ראש חבר היהודים

The reading of this last word is doubtful. Probably it is to be read: cheber hajjehudim; and by cheber, which literally means fellowship, association, is to be understood, not the γερουσία, but rather the assembly of the whole body of the people. The inscription would therefore run thus: "Jochanan the high priest and the congregation of the Jews," or "Jochanan the high priest, head of the congregation of the Jews." This official title shows us that John Hyrcanus regarded himself as in the full sense still high priest. As in the pre-Maccabean age, so also still the Jewish commonwealth was a government of priests, and the chief priest standing at its head was not an autocrat, but simply the chief of the congregation. The coins, at least those of the first order, were not only stamped in his name, but also in that of the congregation, On the other hand, it is a proof of the increasing prominence given to the possession of princely prerogatives, that John has had his name engraven on the coins. He is the first of the Jewish princes who did so. Then from the coins of the second order the name of "the congregation" disappears altogether, and instead thereof he is himself designated under his twofold title of rank as "High Priest," and as "Chief of the Congregation of the Jews."

In reference to the internal policy of Hyrcanus, daring his thirty years' reign, one fact at least is well established, and that one of the greatest importance: his breaking away from the Pharisees, and attaching himself to the Sadducees. These two parties now appear for the first time under those names upon the arena of history. Their beginnings lay far back; their consolidation under those names seems to have been a consequence of the Maccabean movement. The Pharisees are nothing else but the party of strict zealots for the law: essentially the same circles as we meet with in the beginning of the Maccabean movement under the name of the Pious or Chasidim. Diametrically opposed to them were those who in the most extreme fashion favoured everything Greek, who even went beyond the Hellenizing movement of Antiochus Epiphanes by opening the door to Hellenism, not only in the domain of social life, but also in that of religious worship. These extreme Grecianizers, who were found specially in the ranks of the higher priesthood, had been swept away before the blast of the Maccabean revolution. Ideas of this sort could no longer be allowed to find expression in the league of the Jewish commonwealth. But the foundations on which that type of thought had grown up had still continued to exist there. It was the essentially worldly spirit of the higher priesthood, opposed to any kind of religious enthusiasm. They wished to maintain their position on the basis of the Mosaic law. But whatever therein transcended the mere letter, they rejected with a lofty assumption of superiority. They had far heartier interest in the affairs of this life than in those of the time to come. The spirit which among the higher priests was represented pre-eminently by "the sons of Zadoc," was now called that of the Zadocites or Sadducees.

The Maccabees belonged properly neither to the Pharasaic nor to the Sadducean party. The zeal for the law, which had led them to take the sword in their hand, associated them indeed with the Chasidim, who also at the outset took part in the war of independence. But soon the two went their several ways, and as time advanced they parted farther and farther from one another. The Chasidim had no interest in political supremacy and political freedom. With the Maccabees this was the point of most vital importance. They did not indeed at a later period abandon their original aim, the preservation of the religion of their fathers. But as time wore on they became more and more deeply involved in other political schemes. In this way they were brought into closer relations with the Sadducees. As political up-starts, the Maccabees could not venture to ignore the influential Sadducean nobility. And it may be taken for granted that in the γερουσία of the Maccabean age, the Sadducean party was represented. – But in spite of all

this, in religious sympathies the Maccabees originally stood far nearer to the Pharisees than to the Sadducees. They were the conservers of their fathers' faith and their fathers' law. It may be unhesitatingly stated, even in regard to Hyrcanus, that in the earlier years of his reign, in regard to the observance of the law, he held the doctrines of the Pharisees. For it was his abandonment of the traditions of the Pharisees which formed the chief accusation brought against him by the stricter Jews.

The interests and activities of the Maccabees were thus going forth in two different directions, the religious and the political, and this explains to us the change of front which took place during the course of Hyrcanus' reign. The more the political interests were brought into the foreground by him, the more were the religious interests put in abeyance. And just in proportion as this policy was carried out, Hyrcanus was obliged to withdraw from the Pharisees and associate himself with the Sadducees. Any close and hearty relationship with the Pharisees could not possibly continue while he wrought out the devices of his purely worldly policy. Hence it was just what might have been expected, that he should openly break with the Pharisees and cast in his lot with the Sadducean party.

The ostensible occasion of the breach between Hyrcanus and the Pharisees is described by Josephus and the Talmud in a similar manner as follows. Hyrcanus once made the request, when many Pharisees were with him at dinner, that if they observed him doing anything not according to the law, they should call attention to it, and point out to him the right way. But all present were full of his praise. Only one, Eleasar, rose up and said: "Since thou desirest to know the truth, if thou wilt be righteous in earnest, lay down the high-priesthood and content thyself with the civil government of the people." And when Hyrcanus wished to know for what cause he should do so, Eleasar answered: "We have heard it from old men that thy mother had been a captive under the reign of Antiochus Epiphanes." But this statement was incorrect. On account of it Hyrcanus was incensed against him in the highest degree. When then Hyrcanus laid before the Pharisees the question as to the punishment which Eleasar deserved, they made answer, "stripes and bonds." Hyrcanus, who believed for such an offence nothing less than death was due, became now still more angry, and thought that Eleasar had given expression to a sentiment that was approved of by his party. Forthwith he separated himself entirely from the Pharisees, forbade under penalties the observance of the laws ordained by them, and attached himself to the Sadducees.

The story indeed, in its anecdotal form, bears on it the imprint of a thoroughly legendary character, and is even by Josephus given only as a tale derived from oral tradition. Nevertheless it may be accepted as a fact that Hyrcanus did turn away decidedly from the party of the Pharisees and abolished the Pharisaic ordinances. For it was a conscious reaction against the policy pursued from the time of Hyrcanus, when Alexandra returned again to the observance of the Pharisaic institutions. Two of the particular ordinances set aside by Hyrcanus are mentioned in the Mishna. But in view of the thoroughgoing opposition of Hyrcanus to every sort of Pharisaic ordinance, the cases referred to in the Mishna are spoken of as being only unimportant matters of detail.

On a review of Hyrcanus' government Josephus passes a favourable verdict upon him, saying that "he was esteemed of God worthy of the three privileges – the government of his nation, the dignity of the high-priesthood, and prophecy." Upon the whole, the reign of Hyrcanus seems to the Jewish historian a pre-eminently happy one. He is quite right, if political power is regarded as the measure of prosperity and success. After Hyrcanus' predecessors had already enlarged the Jewish territory to the sea-coast by the addition of Joppa and Gazara and other conquests

in the west, Hyrcanus, by new conquests in the east, south, and north, and by making still more secure his independence of Syria, built up a Jewish state such as had not been from the time of the overthrow of the ten tribes, perhaps not even since the partition of the kingdom after the death of Solomon.

Among the great sepulchral monuments in the neighbourhood of Jerusalem, that of “the high priest John” is frequently referred to by Josephus in his Wars of the Jews.

ARISTOBULUS I., B.C. 105–104

SOURCES

Josephus, Antiq. xiii. 11; Wars of the Jews, i. 3. A summary from Josephus in Zonaras, Annal. v. 3.

The coins are most completely given by Madden, Coins of the Jews (1881), pp. 81–83.

LITERATURE

EWALD, History of Israel, v. 385, 386.

STANLEY, Jewish Church, vol. iii. 370.

GRÄTZ, Geschichte der Juden, iii., 4 Aufl. pp. 118–123.

HITZIG, Geschichte des Volkes Israel, ii. 473–475.

JOHN HYRCANUS left five sons. But according to his will, the government was to pass to his wife, while only the high-priesthood was to go to his eldest son Aristobulus. The young prince, however, was not satisfied with this arrangement. He put his mother in prison, where he allowed her to die of hunger, and assumed the government himself. Also all his brothers, with the exception of Antigonus, he cast into prison. Only in the latter had he such confidence that he assigned to him a share in the management of the kingdom. But this very pre-eminence proved the occasion of disaster to Antigonus. It aroused the jealousy of many whose intrigues were at last successful in making Aristobulus the murderer of his favourite brother. It was represented to him that Antigonus was endeavouring to secure the supreme power to himself. Aristobulus in consequence became suspicious, and gave orders to his bodyguard, that if Antigonus should come to him armed, they should cut him down. At the same time he commanded his brother to come to him unarmed. But the enemies of Antigonus bribed the messengers, so that they should announce to him that Aristobulus desired him to obtain new weapons and new armour, and commanded him that he should come clad in armour in order that he might see his new equipment. Antigonus acted accordingly, and was cut down by the bodyguard when he, suspecting nothing, entered the citadel. After the deed was done, Aristobulus is said to have bitterly repented, and his sorrow seemed to have accelerated his death.

The whole domestic tragedy, if it can be taken as historical, presents the character of Aristobulus in a very dark light. His whole concern was with the civil government. All considerations of piety were sacrificed to that one end. In other directions also Aristobulus was estranged still more completely than his father from the traditions of the Maccabees. The monarchical selfish spirit led him to assume the title of king, which his successors maintained down to the time of Pompey. The Greek culture, against the introduction of which the Maccabees had first taken a stand, was directly favoured by him. Whether he assumed the title of Φιλέλλην is not with absolute certainty to be concluded from the words of Josephus. As already his father Hyrcanus had given his sons purely Greek names (Aristobulus, Antigonus, Alexander), it may be taken for granted that he was inclined to those tendencies afterwards openly avowed by Aristobulus.

On the coins Aristobulus has made use neither of his royal title nor of his Greek name. He calls himself on them, “Judas, high priest.” For the coins with the inscription —

יהודה כהן גדול וחבר היהודים

belong, as Cavedoni was the first to point out, to one Aristobulus, whose Hebrew name was Judas. — How thoroughly Aristobulus, notwithstanding his Greek leanings, still occupied the Jewish standpoint, is shown us by the most important occurrence which is recorded of his short reign: the conquest and Judaizing of the northern districts of Palestine. He undertook a military expedition against the Itureans, conquered a large portion of their land, united that to Judea, and compelled the inhabitants to allow themselves to be circumcised and to live according to the Jewish law. The Itureans had their residence in Lebanon. As Josephus does not say that Aristobulus subdued “the Itureans,” but only that he conquered a large portion of their country and judaized it; and as Galilee had not hitherto belonged to the territory of the Jewish high priest, the conquests even of John Hyrcanus extending northwards only as far as Samaria and Scythopolis; and as, yet again, the population of Galilee had been up to that time more Gentile than Jewish, — the conjecture has good grounds that the portion conquered by Aristobulus was mainly Galilee, and that the actual judaizing of Galilee was first carried out by him. In any case, he extended the Jewish power farther northward, as Hyrcanus had toward the south.

Aristobulus died of a painful disease after a reign of one year. Seeing that the judgment passed upon him by Gentile historians is a favourable one, we cannot avoid entertaining the suspicion that the cruelties which he, the Sadducee and friend of the Greeks, is said to have inflicted upon his relatives, are calumnious inventions of the Pharisees.

ALEXANDER JANNÄUS, B.C. 104–78

SOURCES

Josephns, Antiq. xiii. 12–15; Wars of the Jews, i. 4. Summary in Zonaras, Annal. v. 4.

Syncellus, ed. Dindorf, i. 558 sq., goes back to a source independent of Josephus.

Rabbinical Traditions in Derenbourg, pp. 95–102.

The coins are most completely collected in Madden, Coins of the Jews (1881), pp. 83–90.

LITERATURE

EWALD, History of Israel, v. 386–392.

STANLEY, Jewish Church, iii. (1877) 370, 386–388.

GRÄTZ, Geschichte der Juden, iii., 4 Aufl. pp. 123–135.

HITZIG, Geschichte des Volkes Israel, ii. pp. 475–488.

HAMBURGER, Real-Encyclop. für Bibel und Talmud, Abth. ii. pp. 430–434, art. "Janai, Alexander."

MENKE'S Bibelatlas, Bl. iv., special map of Judea and Phönicia in the Times of Alexander Jannäus.

WHEN Aristobulus was dead, his widow Salome Alexandra released from prison the three brothers of Aristobulus, whom he had placed in confinement, and raised the eldest of them to the throne and the high-priesthood, while at the same time she gave him her hand in marriage.

Alexander Jannäus, B.C. 104–78, was, during his reign of twenty-six or twenty-seven years, almost constantly involved in foreign or in civil wars, which for the most part were provoked by his own wilfulness, and resulted by no means invariably in his favour.

First of all he took the field against the citizens of Ptolemais, besieged them, and surrounded the city. The inhabitants applied for help to the Egyptian prince Ptolemy Lathurus, who, driven from the throne by his mother Cleopatra, was then exercising rule in Cyprus. Ptolemy arrived with an army, and Alexander through fear of him raised the siege. — He sought, however, by guile to get rid of Ptolemy, for he openly concluded peace and a friendly treaty with him, but secretly called his mother to his help against him. Ptolemy was at first disposed to enter into a mutual agreement. But when he heard that Alexander had secretly summoned his mother to his aid, he broke the truce and went forth with his army against Alexander. He conquered and plundered the city of Asochis in Galilee, and thus put himself in position against Alexander at Asophon on the Jordan. Alexander had a standing army, fairly well equipped. That of Ptolemy was not nearly so well armed, but his soldiers were experienced, and had thorough confidence in the tactical skill of their general Philostephanus. The two armies now lay on either side of the

river. The Egyptian troops began to cross. Alexander allowed them peacefully to accomplish this, because he hoped more completely to destroy them when once they had all come over. On both sides they fought bravely, and at first the army of Alexander gained some advantage. But then the Egyptian general managed by a clever manœuvre to cause a part of the Jewish army to retreat, and when once a part fled, the rest could no longer hold their ground. The whole Jewish army took to flight; the Egyptians pursued them, continuing the massacre without intermission, "and slew them so long that their weapons of iron were blunted, and their hands quite tired with the slaughter."

The whole country now lay open before Ptolemy. But now Cleopatra sent an army to Palestine, in order to check in time the increasing power of her son. While this army operated in Palestine, Ptolemy succeeded in pressing forward into Egypt. But he was driven out of it again and obliged to return to Gaza, and Cleopatra took possession of the whole of Palestine. When she had the power in her hands, some of her counsellors advised her to unite the land of the Jews again with Egypt. But the representations of her Jewish general Ananias prevailed in getting their scheme set aside, and in inducing her rather to conclude a treaty with Alexander. Ptolemy could no longer maintain his position in the Jewish territory, and so he returned to Cyprus. Cleopatra also withdrew her army from Palestine, and Alexander was again ruler of the country.

He was now in a position to make preparations for other conquests. He began these on the east of the Jordan, for he took Gadara and the strong fortress of Amathus on the Jordan. The former he succeeded in taking only after a two months' siege. Then he turned his attention to the land of the Philistines, conquered Raphia, Anthedon, and finally the city of Gaza, so celebrated in days of old. For a whole year Alexander lay before that city, and at last he obtained the mastery only through treachery, whereupon he plundered it and set it on fire.

The conquest of Gaza must have taken place in B.C. 96, for it was about the same time that Antiochus VIII. Grypos died.

No sooner was peace secured with those outside of the nation than conflicts arose within. The incurable dissension of parties which had already cast its shadows over the reign of Hyrcanus, became productive of strife and turmoil during Alexander's reign, especially in matters of internal government. The rabbinical legends tell of disputes between the king and the chiefs of the schools of the Pharisees which were of a very harmless kind, childish wranglings rather than serious contendings. But their tales are so utterly worthless from a historical point of view, that they can find a place here only as evidence of the peculiar lusts and equally peculiar morals of Talmudic Judaism. The hero of these tales is Simon ben Shetach, the celebrated Pharisee, reputed to be a brother of Alexander's wife Salome. Of his doings at court the following are told. There came once 300 Nazarites to Jerusalem in order to present there the prescribed sacrifices. Simon found ways and means to relieve them of the one-half of their burden. But with the other half he could not do so, and therefore he petitioned the king that he should bear the cost, pretending that he himself would bear the expense of the other half. The king agreed to this. But when he discovered that Simon had deceived him he was exceedingly angry, and Simon was obliged to go into hiding in order to escape his wrath. Some time thereafter Parthian ambassadors arrived at the king's court and wished to see the distinguished rabbis. The king turned to the queen, who knew Simon's place of concealment, and urged her to induce her brothers to bring him forth. The queen obtained from him a promise that no injury would be done the high priest, and then urged him to come. No sooner was the agreement come to than Simon entered in and seated himself between the king and the queen, whereupon the following conversation took place between him and the king. The king: "Wherefore didst thou flee?"

Simon: “Because I heard that my lord and king was angry with me.” The king: “And why didst thou deceive me ?” Simon: “I did not deceive thee. Thou didst give thy gold, and I my wisdom.” The king: “But why didst thou not tell this to me ?” Simon: “If I had told thee, thou wouldest not have given it me.” The king: “Wherefore hast thou taken thy place between the king and the queen?” Simon: “Because it is written in the book of Sirach, Exalt wisdom, and it will exalt thee among princes” (Sirach 11:1). — Thereupon the king ordered to set wine before him, and called upon him to invoke the blessing at table. Simon began: “Thanks be unto God for the nourishment which Jannai and his companions have enjoyed.” “Thou dost ever continue stiff-necked,” said the king; “I have never before in any grace at table heard the name of Jannai.” “Could I say,” retorted Simon, “we thank Thee for that which we have eaten, when I as yet have received nothing?” The king then gave orders that they should set food before Simon; and when he had partaken of it, he said: “Thanks be unto God for that which we have eaten.”

The real conflicts between Alexander on the one hand, and the Pharisees and those of the people who sympathized with them on the other, were of an entirely different and wholly tragic character. The deeper foundations of this strife lay in the general course of development taken by the internal affairs of the nation since the establishment of the Asmonean dynasty. Among the people the Pharisees gained power and influence more and more. The policy of the Asmoneans separated them always farther and farther from the popular movements, and brought them at last into direct antagonism with the nationalist party. It could only be with deep-seated resentment that pious Jews could look on and see a wild warrior like Alexander Jannäus discharging the duties of high priest in the holy place, certainly not with the conscientious and painstaking observance of the ordinances regarded by the Pharisees as divine. Even while he was discharging his priestly office it is said that for the first time they broke out in open rebellion. During the Feast of Tabernacles, when every one taking part in it was required to carry a palm branch (לוּלָב φοίνιξ) and a citron fruit (אֶתְרוֹג κίτριον) as a festal emblem, Alexander was once, as he stood beside the altar about to offer sacrifice, pelted by the assembled people with the citrons. At the same time they insulted him by calling out that he was the son of a prisoner of war, and was unworthy of the office of sacrificing priest. Alexander was not the man to bear this quietly. He called in the aid of his mercenaries, and 600 Jews were massacred. The bitterness of feeling created thereby among the people was so great, that only a favourable opportunity was waited for in order to break off the hated yoke.

By his love of war Alexander was soon again involved in further complications. He went forth against the Arab tribes which dwelt east of the Jordan, and of these he made the Moabites and Gileadites tributary. But Amathus, which had once previously been conquered but never very securely held, was now utterly destroyed. He then began hostilities against the Arabian king Obedas; but during the conflict with him in the neighbourhood of Gadara, Alexander fell into an ambuscade, in which he was so sore pressed that he narrowly escaped with his bare life. He went as a fugitive to Jerusalem. But there a poor reception awaited him. The Pharisees took advantage of the moment of Alexander’s political weakness to break down his power and influence at home. There was a general rebellion against him, and Alexander had for six full years to fight against his own people with mercenary troops. No less than 50,000 Jews are said to have perished during this period in these civil conflicts. When Alexander’s power had been established he held out the hand of peace. But the Pharisees wished to turn the state of affairs to account so as to secure a victory to their party. When therefore Alexander inquired what they wanted from him, and under what conditions they would agree to maintain the peace and yield obedience, they said that they wanted only his death. At the same time they called to their aid Demetrius III. Eucärus, a son of Antiochus Grypos, and at that time governor of a portion of

Syria, – somewhere about B.C. 88.

Demetrius arrived with an army. The Jewish national party united themselves with him at Shechem. Alexander was completely beaten, lost all his mercenary troops, and was obliged to flee to the mountains. But now it seemed as if among many of the Jews who now attached themselves to Demetrius, the national feeling had again wakened up. They would rather, in a free Jewish state, be subject to an Asmonean prince than be incorporated into the empire of a Seleucid ruler. Six thousand Jews went over to Alexander, and Demetrius was in consequence under the necessity of withdrawing again into his own land. The rest of the Jews who still continued in revolt had no other object than to get rid of Alexander. But they were by him defeated in many battles, and many of them were slain. The leaders of the rebellion at last fled to Bethome or Besemelis, where they were besieged by Alexander. After the overthrow of the city, Alexander carried them as prisoners to Jerusalem, and there within the city, at least according to the account of Josephus, while he along with his mistresses gave himself up to debauchery, he had somewhere about 800 of the prisoners crucified in his own presence, and while they were yet alive caused their wives and children to be slain before their eyes. His opponents in Jerusalem were by these atrocities so paralysed with terror, that they fled during the night to the number of 8000, and during his lifetime kept away from the land of Judea.

From this time forward Alexander, throughout his whole reign, enjoyed peace at home. It was not so in the matter of his relations with those outside.

The empire of the Seleucidae then, indeed, lay in its death-throes. Its last convulsions, however, were the occasion of again putting Judea into commotion. Antiochus XII., the youngest of the five sons of Antiochus Grypos, was at this time at war with his brother Philip and the king of the Arabians. When once he resolved to take his way to Arabia through Judea, Alexander Jannäus endeavoured to prevent that by constructing a great wall and trench from Joppa to Capharsaba, and fortifying Joppa with a wooden tower. But Antiochus laid everything low with fire, and made his way through it all.

When Antiochus met his death in battle against the king of the Arabians, and that monarch, whose name was Aretas, extended his rule to Damascus, he became from this time forth the most powerful and the most dangerous neighbour of the Jews. On the south and the east Palestine was bounded by districts which lay under the dominion of the Arabs. Very soon Alexander Jannäus also began to have experience of their power. He was obliged by an attack of Aretas to retreat to Adida, within the boundaries of Judea, where he suffered a rather serious defeat, and could only by making concessions purchase the withdrawal of the Arabian king.

More fortunate were the results of the campaigns which Alexander Jannäus during the next three years, B.C. 84–81, carried on in the country east of the Jordan, in order to extend his power in that direction. He conquered Pella, Dium, Gerasa, then advanced again northward and took Gaulana, Seleucia, and at last the strong fortress of Gamala. When, after these exploits, he returned to Jerusalem, he was then received by the people in peace.

Not long after this, as the result of a drunken debauch, he became sick, and this sickness continued throughout the last three years of his life, B.C. 81–78. He did not, however, abandon his military expeditions until at last, amid the tumult of war, during the siege of the fortress Ragaba he succumbed to his sickness and excrtions in B.C. 78. His body was brought to Jerusalem, where he was buried with great pomp.

Of the coins issued by him, those are of special interest which bear the inscription in two languages –

יהונתן המלך || ΒΑΣΙΛΕΩΣ ΑΛΕΞΑΝΔΡΟΥ.

They were known even to the earlier numismatists; but first de Saulcy stated the correct and now generally accepted view regarding them, that the Hebrew inscription supplies us with the Hebrew name of Alexander. Jannai is therefore a contraction for Jonathan, not, as was formerly supposed, for Jochanan. But if undoubtedly Alexander's name was Jonathan, then the coins of the high priest are to be ascribed to him which bear the inscription

יהונתן הכהן הגדל וחבר היהדים (or ינתן).

These high-priestly coins are of the same type as the coins of John Hyrcanus and Aristobulus. The bilingual royal coins are a novelty introduced by Alexander.

By the conquests of Alexander the boundaries of the Jewish state had now been extended far beyond the limits reached by John Hyrcanus. In the south, the Idumeans had been subdued and judaized. In the north, Alexander's dominion reached as far as Seleucia on the Lake Merom. The sea-coast, on which Joppa had been the first conquest of the Maccabees, was all now completely under Jewish rule. With the single exception of Ascalon, which had been able to maintain its independence, all the coast towns were conquered by Alexander, from the borders of Egypt as far as Carmel. But also the country east of the Jordan, from the Lake Merom to the Dead Sea, was wholly under his sway; among them a number of the more important towns, which had previously been centres of Greek culture, such as Hippos, Gadara, Pella, Dium, and others.

This work of conquest, however, proved at the same time a work of destruction. It did not lead, as once the conquests of Alexander the Great had done, to the furtherance, but to the extinction of Greek culture. For in this respect Alexander Jannäus was still always a Jew, who subjected the conquered territories, as far as they went, to Jewish modes of thought and manners. If the cities in question would not consent to this, they were laid waste. Such was the fate that befell the great and hitherto prosperous coast towns, and the Hellenistic cities on the east of the Jordan. The Romans, Pompey and Gabinius, were the first to rebuild again those ruins, and reawaken in them a new prosperity.

ALEXANDRA, B.C. 78-69

SOURCES

Josephus, Antiq. xiii. 16; Wars of the Jews, i. 5. Summary in Zonaras, Annal. v. 5.

Rabbinical traditions in Derenbourg, pp. 102-112.

The coins in Madden, Coins of the Jews (1881), p. 91 sq.

LITERATURE

JOH. MÜLLER (praeside G. G. Zeltner), De Alexandra Judaeorum regina tanquam specimine sapientis ex hac gente foeminae. Altdorffi 1711.

EWALD, History of Israel, v. 392-394.

GRÄTZ, Geschichte der Juden, iii., 4 Aufl. pp. 136-150.

HITZIG, Geschichte der Volkes Israel, ii. 488-490.

WELLHAUSEN, Die Pharisäer und Sadducäer (1874), pp. 97-99.

ACCORDING to the latest expression of Alexander's will, the succession of the throne went to his widow Alexandra, who again nominated her eldest son Hyrcanus high priest. Alexandra, or, as her Hebrew name runs, Salome, B.C. 78-69, was in all respects the direct antithesis of her husband. While he hated the Pharisees, and was hated by them, she befriended them, and committed to them the helm of government. While he was a despot of the real Oriental type, she was a God-fearing ruler, according to the very ideal of the Pharisees. Her rule, measured by the Pharisaic standard, was faultless.

Alexander, upon his deathbed, is said to have advised his wife to make peace with the Pharisees. This may be true, or it may not; this at least is a fact, that Alexandra, from the beginning of her reign, took her stand unhesitatingly on the side of the Pharisees, lent an ear to their demands and wishes, and in particular gave legal sanction again to all the Pharisaic ordinances abolished since the time of John Hyrcanus. During these years the Pharisees were the real rulers in the land. "She had indeed the name of regent, but the Pharisees had the authority; for it was they who restored such as were banished, and set such as were prisoners at liberty, and to say all at once, they differed in nothing from lords." To this period of Pharisaic reaction we may also assign a series of triumphs of the Pharisees, of which a report is given in the rabbinical traditions. But the authentic accounts which are given of these in the Festival-Calendar (Megillath Taanith, i.e. the list of the joyous days of thanksgiving on which fasting was not to be practised) are so brief and enigmatical, that they afford no satisfactory historical basis. And the quite modern Hebrew commentary thereon gives purely worthless fancies. Also the statement of the Mishna, that Simon ben Shetach had once caused eighty women to be hanged in Ascalon, cannot be used for this reason, that that celebrated rabbi had no connection with Ascalon. Historical information is therefore wholly to be derived from Josephus. And the picture of this queen with which he presents us, in respect of vividness leaves nothing to be desired.

The Pharisees, conscious of their power, went so far as to cause the execution of the former counsellors of King Alexander who had advised him to massacre the 800 rebels. This despotic proceeding did not involve in ruin the aristocracy of Jerusalem. An embassy representing them, including Alexandra's own son Aristobulus, approached the queen, and besought her to put a stop to the scheme of the Pharisees; and the queen was obliged, whether she wished it or not, to consent thereto.

In her foreign policy Alexandra showed circumspection and energy. There are, however, no very important political events to be recorded during her reign. The most important was a military expedition of her son Aristobulus against Damascus, which, however, ended without result. The Syrian empire was then in the hands of the Armenian king Tigranes. He assumed a threatening attitude toward the end of the reign of Alexandra. The danger, however, that thus hung over Judea was arrested, partly by Alexandra purchasing peace by bestowing rich presents, partly and mainly by the Romans having just then made a descent under Lucullus upon the empire of Tigranes, which obliged him to abandon his plans in regard to Judea.

Upon the whole, Alexandra's reign was looked upon by the people as one of prosperity. There was peace abroad as well as at home. The Pharisees were satisfied; and since they had the people at their bidding, all expressed themselves in favour of the God-fearing queen. In the Pharisaic tradition the days of Alexandra are naturally represented as a golden age, in which even the soil of the land, as if blessed on account of the piety of the queen, enjoyed a truly miraculous fruitfulness. "Under Simon ben Shetach and Queen Salome rain fell on the eve of the Sabbath, so that the corns of wheat were as large as kidneys, the barley corns as large as olives, and the lentils like golden denarii; the scribes gathered such corns, and preserved specimens of them in order to show future generations what sin entails."

But the Pharisees were not yet so exclusively in possession of power that the queen, without risk, could depend upon their support alone. The influence of the Sadducean nobles was not altogether broken. And the discontent of this circle was all the more considerable, from the fact that at its head stood Alexandra's own son Aristobulus. The queen must herself have felt, toward the close of her life, on what a shifting foundation she had built. When, in her seventy-third year, she fell sick of a serious complaint, and intended to bestow the succession to the throne upon her elder son Hyrcanus, Aristobulus thought that the time had now arrived for unfurling the standard of revolt. He succeeded in getting the strongest fortresses into his possession. As the number of his adherents rapidly grew, the elders of the people and Hyrcanus became sorely distressed, and made representations to the queen that it was necessary to adopt measures against him. The queen granted the necessary authority for this, but died even before the war broke out, in B.C. 69.

ARISTOBULUS II., B.C. 69–63

SOURCES

Josephus, Antiq. xiv. 1–4; Wars of the Jews, i. 6. 7. Zonaras, Annal, v. 5–6, a summary from Josephus.

Rabbinical traditions in Derenbourg, pp. 112–118.

LITERATURE

EWALD, History of Israel, v. 394–399.

GRÄTZ, Geschichte der Juden, iii., 4 Aufl. pp. 151–165.

HITZIG, Geschichte der Volkes Israel, ii. 490–500.

MENKE'S Bibelatlas, Sheet iv., special map of "Judea and Phoenicia according to the Arrangements of Pompey and Gabinius."

THE star of the Asmoneans was now hasting to its setting. After Alexandra's death a war immediately broke out between the brothers Aristobulus II. and Hyrcanus II., which, after a few years, ended in the Romans taking from the Jews that freedom which they had wrested from the Syrians. Alexandra had died just at the critical moment when the idea had taken possession of her son Aristobulus to grasp for himself the government by force. Her legitimate successor was her eldest son Hyrcanus, who had been already, during the reign of his mother, invested with the office of high priest. He also began to exercise civil government. But his brother Aristobulus was by no means disposed to acquiesce in his plans. He advanced against Hyrcanus with an army. Near Jericho they engaged in a battle, in which many of the soldiers of Hyrcanus went over to Aristobulus, and thus secured for him the victory. Hyrcanus fled to the citadel of Jerusalem, but was obliged there to surrender to Aristobulus. A truce was now concluded between the two brothers, according to the terms of which Hyrcanus, who undoubtedly was a weak and indolent character, was to renounce the royal and high-priestly rank, and to resign both to his brother Aristobulus. In return, he was to be left in the undisturbed enjoyment of his revenues.

By all this the state of affairs had been by no means improved. For now the Idumean Antipater or Antipas, the father of him who was afterwards King Herod, joined in the game. His father, who was also called Antipater, had by Alexander Jannäus been appointed governor, στρατηγός, of Idumea, and his son had now, as it seems, stepped into his place. But the younger Antipater saw clearly that he could assert his position much better under the government of the weak and unmanly Hyrcanus, than under the warlike and active Aristobulus. He therefore set all plans in motion for overturning Aristobulus and restoring again Hyrcanus to the head of affairs. First of all, he managed to win to himself adherents from the most distinguished of the Jews, representing to them that Aristobulus, against all right and fairplay, had seized upon the throne, while Hyrcanus was the legitimate ruler. Then he turned to Hyrcanus, made it appear to him that his life was in danger so long as Aristobulus held the reins of government, and that at once, for his own sake, he must seek his overthrow. The indolent

and easy-minded Hyrcanus at first gave him no hearing. But at last Antipater's endeavours were successful. He had also secured the confederacy of the Arabian prince Aretas, who promised that if Hyrcanus fled to him, he should receive him as a friend. Now at length Hyrcanus was induced to listen to the representations of Antipater. In company with him, he fled by night from Jerusalem, and betook himself to Petra, the capital of Aretas. To him he gave the promise that, after he had won again the sovereignty, he would restore to him the twelve cities which Alexander Jannäus had taken from the Arabians; while Aretas, on the other hand, undertook to lend him his support in recovering the throne.

In fulfilment of this promise Aretas went forth against Aristobulus with an army, and conquered him in a battle. In consequence of this victory a great part of the army of Aristobulus went over to Hyrcanus, and indeed the people as a whole attached themselves to their old king. Only a few remained faithful to Aristobulus, so that he was obliged to withdraw to the temple mount, where he was besieged by Aretas and Hyrcanus. Of the period of this siege Josephus relates certain episodes which are highly characteristic of the Jewish piety of that time. On the side of Hyrcanus there was a certain Onias, who had attained unto a great reputation by having prayed to God for rain during a great drought, and having had his prayer immediately answered. They wished to make use of this man, or rather of the irresistible power of his prayers, to secure the destruction of the besieged. They conducted him into the camp, and insisted that he should solemnly invoke God's curse upon Aristobulus and his adherents. But instead of doing so, Onias went forth into the middle of the camp and said: "O God, the King of the whole world, since those that stand now with me are Thy people, and those that are besieged are also Thy priests, I beseech Thee that Thou wilt neither hearken to the prayers of those against these, nor bring to effect what these pray against those." But the people were so little in sympathy with this spirit of brotherly love in Onias that they immediately stoned him to death. In connection therewith Josephus relates also another incident which places the besiegers in a by no means favourable light. The Passover festival came round, at which the priests who were among the followers of Aristobulus wished at any cost to offer the appointed sacrifices. But they had no animals for sacrifice, and they knew of no other way of procuring such but by obtaining them for payment from the people of Hyrcanus. A thousand drachmas were demanded for the supply. The price was indeed preposterously extravagant. Yet, notwithstanding, the besieged consented to the terms, and passed out the money through an opening in the wall. The besiegers, however, after accepting of the money, still kept the animals to themselves. For this wickedness, as Josephus thinks, retribution soon came upon them. A violent storm burst forth which destroyed all the fruits of the field, so that the modius of wheat cost eleven drachmas.

While this was going on, Pompey had meanwhile begun his victorious campaign in Asia. He had conquered Mithridates in B.C. 66, and had in the same year received the voluntary submission of Tigranes. While he himself now pressed on farther into Asia, he sent Scaurus to Syria in B.C. 65. When that general arrived at Damascus he heard of the war between the brothers in Judea, and pushed forward without delay to see how he might turn to account this strife between the rival princes. He had scarcely reached Judea when ambassadors presented themselves before him, both from Aristobulus and from Hyrcanus. They both sought his favour and support. Aristobulus offered him in return four hundred talents; and Hyrcanus could not be behind, and so promised the same sum. But Scaurus trusted Aristobulus rather because he was in a better position to fulfil his engagement, and so decided to take his side. He ordered Aretas to withdraw if he did not wish to be declared an enemy of the Romans. Aretas did not venture to show opposition. He therefore raised the siege, and thereupon Scaurus returned to Damascus. But Aristobulus pursued Aretas on his way homeward, and inflicted upon him a crushing defeat.

But the Roman favour which Aristobulus had so exerted himself to secure, under the protection of which he believed himself to be safe, soon proved fatal to his wellbeing and that of his country. He himself left no stone unturned in order to win the goodwill of Pompey as well as of Scaurus. He sent Pompey a costly present, a skilfully wrought golden vine worth five hundred talents, which Strabo found still on view at Rome in the temple of Jupiter Capitolinus. But all this could not save Aristobulus, whenever Pompey found it to be for his advantage to withdraw his favour and take the side of Hyrcanus. In the spring of B.C. 63, Pompey proceeded from his winter quarters into Syria, subdued the greater and smaller princes in the Lebanon, and advanced by way of Heliopolis and Chalcis upon Damascus. There he was met at one and the same time by representatives of three Jewish parties. Not only did Aristobulus and Hyrcanus appear, but the Jewish people also sent an embassy. Hyrcanus complained that Aristobulus, in defiance of all law, had violently assumed the government; Aristobulus justified his conduct by pointing out the incapacity of Hyrcanus. But the people wished to have nothing to do with either, asked for the abolition of the monarchy and the restoration of the old theocratic constitution of the priests. Pompey heard them, but cautiously deferred any decision, and declared that he would put all things in order when he had accomplished his contemplated expedition against the Nabateans. Till then all parties were to maintain the peace.

Aristobulus, however, was by no means satisfied with this arrangement, and betrayed his discontent by suddenly quitting Dium, whither he had accompanied Pompey on his expedition against the Nabateans. Pompey grew suspicious, postponed his campaign against the Nabateans, and marched immediately against Aristobulus. He passed by Pella and crossed the Jordan near Scythopolis, and at Corea entered the territory of Judea proper. Thence he sent messengers to Alexandrium, to which Aristobulus had fled, and ordered him to surrender the fortress. After long delay and manifold negotiations, Aristobulus did this, but at the same time went to Jerusalem in order that he might there prepare for resistance. Pompey pursued him through Jericho, and soon appeared in the neighbourhood of Jerusalem. But now Aristobulus lost heart. He betook himself to the camp of Pompey, gave him further presents, and promised to surrender to him the city if Pompey would suspend hostilities. Pompey was satisfied with this, and sent his general Gabinius to take possession of the city, while he retained Aristobulus in the camp. But Gabinius returned without having obtained his object, for the people in the city had shut the gates against him. Pompey was so enraged at this that he put Aristobulus in prison, and immediately advanced against the city. In Jerusalem opinions were now divided. The adherents of Aristobulus had no wish for peace, and resolved to defend themselves to the utmost. The adherents of Hyrcanus, on the other hand, regarded Pompey as their confederate, and wished to open the gates to him. The latter were in the majority, and succeeded in carrying out their purpose. The city was surrendered to Pompey, who sent in his legate Piso, and without drawing sword took possession of it. But the war faction gathered together on the temple mount and there prepared themselves for resistance.

The temple mount was then, as afterwards, the strongest point in Jerusalem. It presented to the east and the south a sheer precipice. Also on the west it was separated from the city by a deep ravine. Only on the north was there a gradual slope; but even there approach was made almost impossible by the construction of strong fortifications. In this fortress, well-nigh impregnable, the adherents of Aristobulus had now taken refuge, and Pompey, whether he would or not, had to engage upon a regular siege. It was quite evident from the nature of the ground that the north side must be the point of attack. A rampart was thrown up, and on it were placed the great battering-rams and engines of war which they had brought with them from Tyre. For a long time the powerful walls withstood the shock of their blows. At length, after a three months' siege, a

breach was made in the wall. A son of the dictator Sulla was the first to make way through it with his troops. Others quickly followed. Then began a frightful massacre. The priests, who were then engaged offering sacrifice, would not desist from the execution of their office, and were hewn down at the altar. No less than 12,000 Jews are said to have lost their lives in this general butchery. It was towards the close of autumn of the year B.C. 63, under Cicero's consulship, according to Josephus on the very day of atonement, according to Dio Cassius on a Sabbath, that this holy city bowed its head before the Roman commander.

Pompey himself forced his way into the Most Holy Place, into which only the feet of the high priest had ever before entered. But he left the treasures and precious things of the temple untouched, and also took care that the service of God should be continued without interruption. On the besieged he passed a severe sentence. Those who had promoted the war were beheaded; the city and the country were made tributary (τῇ χώρᾳ καὶ τοῖς Ἱεροσολύμοις ἐπιτάττει φόρον). The boundaries of the Jewish territories were greatly curtailed. All the coast towns from Raphia to Dora were taken from the Jews; and also all non-Jewish towns on the east of the Jordan, such as Hippos, Gadara, Pella, Dium, and others; also Scythopolis and Samaria, with the regions around them. All these towns were immediately put under the rule of the governor of the newly-formed Roman province of Syria. The contracted Jewish territory was given over to Hyrcanus II., who was recognised as high priest, without the title of king.

After Pompey had made these arrangements for the government of Palestine, he sent Scaurus back as governor of Syria, while he himself hasted away again to Asia Minor, and first of all to Cilicia. He took Aristobulus along with him as a prisoner of war. He had with him also his two daughters and his sons Alexander and Antigonus, the former of whom contrived almost immediately to make his escape. – When, in B.C. 61, Pompey celebrated his triumph in Rome with great magnificence and display, the Jewish priest-king, the descendant of the Maccabees, was made to march in front of the conqueror's chariot. Besides Aristobulus and his family, Pompey also had with him a great number of Jewish prisoners, who, at a later period being set at liberty, formed the original stock of the Jewish community at Rome, which quickly rose to a position of importance.

With the institutions of Pompey the freedom of the Jewish people, after having existed for scarcely eighty years, if we reckon it as beginning in B.C. 142, was completely over-thrown. Pompey, indeed, was acute enough to insist upon no essential change in the internal government of the country. He suffered the hierarchical constitution to remain intact, and gave the people as their high priest Hyrcanus II., who was favoured by the Pharisees. But the independence of the nation was at an end, and the Jewish high priest was a vassal of the Romans. This result, indeed, was inevitable from the moment the Romans set foot in Syria. For their power was altogether of a different sort from that of the Seleucidae. And even the most powerful of the princes, and one most loved by the people, would have been utterly unable to withstand the continued pressure of the superior forces of the Romans. But the work of conquest was made light to their Western assailants by the fact that the country was torn with internal strifes, and that the contending parties were so blind to their own interests as to seek protection and help from the strangers. There was no longer any trace left of that spirit which had led the people on to victory a hundred years before.

SECOND PERIOD: FROM THE CONQUEST OF JERUSALEM BY POMPEY TO THE WAR OF HADRIAN

THE ROMAN-HERODIAN AGE, B.C. 63-A.D. 135

PALESTINE, if not immediately incorporated with the province of Syria, was at least placed under the supervision of the Roman governor of Syria. Throughout this period, therefore, even more than throughout the previous period, its history became mixed up with that of Syria, and therefore here again we shall require to prefix a summary sketch or brief survey of the history of that country.

SKETCH OF THE HISTORY OF THE ROMAN PROVINCE OF SYRIA, B.C. 65-A.D. 70

SOURCES

For the period of the Republic and the Civil Wars, B.C. 65-30, the chief original sources are JOSEPHUS, DIO CASSIUS, APPIAN, CICERO, and PLUTARCH.

For the period of the Empire, B.C. 30-A.D. 70: JOSEPHUS, DIO CASSIUS, TACITUS, and SUETONIUS.

LITERATURE

NORIS, Cenotaphia Pisana Caii et Lucii Caesarum dissertationibus illustrata. Venetiis 1681. – A list of the governors of Syria from A.U. 707-822, or B.C. 47 to A.D. 69, is given in Dissertation ii. c. 16, pp. 267-335.

SCHÖPFLIN, Chronologia Romanorum Syriae praefectorum, etc., in Commentationes historicae et criticae, Basileae 1741, pp. 465-497. – It treats of the whole period of Pompey down to the Jewish war of Vespasian and Titus.

SANCLEMENTE, De vulgaris aerae emendatione libri quatuor. Romae 1793, fol. – Sanclemente gives in lib. iii. 3-4, pp. 330-349, a list of the governors of Syria from M. Titius under Augustus to Cn. Piso under Tiberius. Consult especially lib. iv. 3-6, pp. 413-448, on Quirinius and his taxing.

BORGHESI, Sul preside della Siria al tempo della morte di N. S. Gesù Cristo, 1847; reprinted in Oeuvres complètes de Bartolomeo Borghesi, vol. v. 1869, pp. 79-94.

ZUMPT, De Syria Romanorum provincia ab Caesare Augusto ad T. Vespasianum, in Commentationes epigraphicae, Part ii. 1854, pp. 71-150. Compare also, Zumpt, Das Geburtsjahr Christi, 1869, pp. 20-89.

GERLACH, Die römischen Statthalter in Syrien und Judäa von 69 vor Christobis 69 nach Christo. Berlin 1865.

MOMMSEN, De P. Sulpicii Quirinii titulo Tiburtino, in Res gestae divi Augusti, 2 Aufl. 1883, pp. 161-182.

MARQUARDT, Römische Staatsverwaltung, Bd. i., 2 Aufl. 1881, pp. 415-422, gives a short list of governors.

KELLNER, Die römischen Statthalter von Syrien und Judäa zur Zeit Christi und der Apostel (Zeitschrift für kathol. Theologie, 1888, pp. 460-486). — Treats of the governors of Syria from B.C. 44 to the destruction of Jerusalem.

On the organization, and history of the province of Syria generally, see KUHN, Die städtische und bürgerliche Verfassung des röm. Reichs, Bd. ii. 1865, pp. 161-201. — Marquardt, Römische Staatsverwaltung, i., 2 Aufl. pp. 392-430. — Mommsen, Römische Geschichte, Bd. v. 1885, pp. 446-552. Compare also, Bormann, De Syriae provinciae Romanae partibus capita nonnulla. Berol. 1865.

On the constitution of the Roman provinces generally, see Bein, art. Provincia in Pauly'a Real-Encyclop. vi. 142-155. — Kuhn, Die städtische und bürgerliche Verfassung des römischen Reichs bis auf die Zeiten Justinians, 2 Bde. 1864-1865. — Marquardt, Römische Staatsverwaltung, i., 2 Aufl. 1881, pp. 497-567. — Compare also Mommsen, Römisches StaatSrecht, iii. 1 (1887), pp. 590-832.

In connection with the Roman, Jewish, and New Testament history, the history of the province of Syria is treated of in the comprehensive work of Lewin, Fasti Sacri, London 1865. It embraces the period from B.C. 70 to A.D. 70. — In the Index also under Syria there is given, a list of the governors.

The Roman history generally is treated of in the form of chronological tables in: CLINTON, Fasti Hellenici, vol. iii.; Fasti Romani, vol. i. — E. W. Fischer, Römische Zeittafeln von Roms Gründung bis auf Augustus' Tod, Altona 1846. — Compare also the well-known works of Mommsen, Römische Geschichte, Bd. iii. (5 Aufl. 1869), from Sulla's death to the battle of Thapsus, B.C. 78-46. — Peter, Geschichte Roms, Bd. ii., 2 Aufl. 1866, Bd. iii. 1867, Bd. iii. 2, 1869, to the death of Marcus Aurelius in A.D. 180. — For the period of the Republic: Drumann, Geschichte Roms in seinem Uebergange von der republik-anischen zur monarchischen Verfassung, oder Pompeius, Cäsar, Cicero und ihre Zeitgenossen, 6 Bde. 1834-1844. Ludwig Lange, Römische Alterthümer, Bd. iii., 2 Aufl. 1876, treats of the transition from the republic to the monarchy. — For the period of the Empire: HÖCK, Römische Geschichte vom Verfall der Republik bis zur Vollendung der Monarchie unter Constantin, Bd. i. in 3 Abtheil. 1841-1850; reaches only to the death of Nero. Schiller, Geschichte der römischen Kaiserseit, Bd. i. in 2 Abtheil. 1883, down to Diocletian; Bd. ii. 1887, down to Theodosius the Great.

The Syrian history during this period falls naturally into two divisions, the one embracing the Period of the Republic, the other the Period of the Empire.

I. THE PERIOD OF THE DECAY OF THE REPUBLIC, B.C. 65-30

1. Syria Under the Predominating Influence of Pompey, B.C. 65-48

M. Aemilius Scaurus, B.C. 65, 62

Sent by Pompey, he arrived at Damascus in B.C. 65, where previously Lollius and Metellus had been stationed (Josephus, Antiq. xiv. 2. 3; Wars of the Jews, i. 6. 2; Clinton, Fasti Hellenici, iii. 346). From B.C. 64 to B.C. 63 Pompey himself was in Syria. He arrived there in B.C. 64, during the consulship of L. Julius Caesar and C. Marcius Figulus (Dio Cassius, xxxvii. 6). He passed the winter in Aspis (Dio Cassius, xxxvii. 7). He took the city of Jerusalem in B.C. 63, and went in B.C. 62 to Italy (Clinton and Fischer, under the year B.C. 62). On his departure, Pompey left Scaurus in Syria (Appian, Syr. 51; Josephus, Antiq. xiv. 4. 5). This governor carried on to its close the campaign against the Arabian prince Aretas, contemplated by Pompey (Josephus, Antiq. xiv. 5. 1; Wars of the Jews, i. 8. 1). Reference is made to this on the coins bearing the inscription Rex Arreas, M. Scaurus, Aed. cur., ex S. C. (Eckhel, Doctr. Num. v. 131; Babelon, Monnaies de la république romaine, t. i. 1885, p. 120 sq.). — A decree of the Tyrians in honour of Scaurus is communicated by Renan in Mission de Phénicie, p. 533 sq. From Joppa Scaurus took with him the skeleton of the sea monster to which Andromeda had been fastened (Pliny, Historia Naturalis, ix. 5. 11). — Compare, in reference to Scaurus generally, Drumann, Geschichte Roms, i. 28-32; Pauly's Real-Encycl. i. 1, 2 Aufl. pp. 372-374; Borghesi, Oeuvres, ii. 185 ff.; Gaumitz, Leipziger Studien zur class. Philologie, Bd. ii. 1879, pp. 249-289, especially p. 259.

Marcius Philippus, B.C. 61-60

According to Appian, Syr. 51, between Scaurus and Gabinius, Marcius Philippus and Lentulus Marcellinus were, for two years each, governors of Syria (τῶνδε μὲν ἑκατέρῳ διετὴς ἐτρίφθη χρόνος), both with praetorian power. Seeing that Gabinius arrived in Syria in the beginning of B.C. 57, we must assign to Marcius Philippus the years B.C. 61-60, and to Leutulus Marcellinus the years B.C. 59-58. Compare Clinton, iii 346, against Noris, p. 223, and Schöpflin, p. 466, who give to both only the two years B.C. 59-58. The correct statement is also given in: Lewin, Fasti Sacri, n. 101, 103; Godt, Quomodo provinciae Romanae per decennium bello civili Caesariano antecedens administratoe sint (Kiel 1876), pp. 7, 8.

Lentulus Marcellinus, B.C. 59-58

Compare what is said above. He too, like his predecessor, had still to carry on the war against the Arabians (Appian, Syr. 51).

A. Gabinius, B.C. 57-55

On account of the constant disturbances caused in Syria by the Arabs, it was resolved in B.C. 58 to send thither immediately a proconsul (Appian, Syr. 51), and indeed first of all they sent A. Gabinius, one of the consuls of the year B.C. 58 (Plutarch, Cicero, c. 30), who therefore arrived in Syria in the beginning of B.C. 57. — He used his power in an exceedingly oppressive and tyrannical manner (Dio Cassius, xxxix. 55, 56). Cicero also speaks frequently of his boundless rapacity. For example, it is declared in Pro Sestio, c. 43: "Gabinium haurire cotidie ex paratissimis atque opulentissimis Syriae, gazis inumerabile pondus auri, bellum inferre quiescentibus, ut eorum veteres illibatasque divitias in profundissimum libidinum suarum gurgitem profundat." In De provinciis consularibus, c. 4: "In Syria imperatore illo nihil aliud [neque gestum] neque actum est nisi pactiones pecuniarum cum tyrannis, decisiones, direptiones, latrocinia, caedes." — Gabinius was a favourite and an unswerving adherent of Pompey, and therefore when Pompey came into conflict with the senate he took the side of his patron, as he showed, for example, in his Egyptian campaign. He had engaged, as early as B.C. 56, in an expedition against the Parthians, well fitted to serve the interests of the republic,

when he received instructions from Pompey to reinstate King Ptolemy Auletes, who had been driven out of Alexandria by a popular revolt. Ptolemy himself gave to this command the necessary stimulus by a present of 10,000 talents. These two reasons moved Gabinius more powerfully than the contrary wishes of the senate, and the existing law which forbade the proconsul to overstep the limits of his province. He suspended his operations against the Parthians, pushed forward to Egypt, and conquered the Egyptian army. In this campaign young Marc Antony, the future triumvir, distinguished himself. King Ptolemy was restored to his throne in the beginning of the year B.C. 55 (Dio Cassius, xxxix. 56-58; Cicero, in Pison. c. 21; Josephus, Antiq. xiv. 6. 2; Plutarch, Anton. c. 3; Appian, Syr. 51; Fischer, Röm. Zeittafeln, pp. 244, 247). He was therefore at Rome on this account, mainly at Cicero's instigation, in B.C. 55, accused de majestate. The trial was already going on when he, in September B.C. 54, after the province had been meanwhile transferred to Crassus, arrived in Rome (Cicero, ad Quint. iii. 1. 5-7). His wealth and the influence of Pompey prevailed in securing for him a favourable judgment in this matter; but on account of his boundless oppressions he was sentenced to exile, although now Cicero himself, induced to do so by Pompey, pled on his behalf (Dio Cassius, xxxix. 59-63, cf. 55; Appian, Syr. 51; Civ. ii. 24; Cicero, ad Quint. fr. iii. 1-4; pro Ralirio Postumo, cc. 8 and 12). – Compare on Gabinius generally, Drumann, Geschichte Roms, iii. 40-62; Pauly's Real-Encyclop. iii. pp. 565-571.

M. Licinius Crassus, B.C. 54-53

In the year B.C. 60, Caesar, Pompey, and Crassus had formed what is called the first Triumvirate. In B.C. 56 this arrangement was renewed upon their meeting together at Luca. The result of this was that in B.C. 55 two of the triumvirs, Pompey and Crassus, obtained the rank of consuls. While they held the consulship, Pompey undertook the administration of Spain, Crassus that of Syria, to he entered upon by each in B.C. 55 (Dio Cassius, xxxix. 33-36; Livy, Epitome, 105; Plutarch, Pompeius, 52; Crassus, 15; Appian, Civ. ii. 18). Crassus started from Rome and went to Syria in November B.C. 55, even before the expiry of his consulship (see Clinton, ad ann. B.C. 54; Fischer, Röm. Zeittafeln, p. 250). – In B.C. 54 he fitted out an expedition against the Parthians, and pressed forward till he had crossed the Euphrates, but he then turned back and spent the winter in Syria. In the spring of B.C. 53 he renewed his campaign, crossed the Euphrates at Zeugma, but suffered a serious defeat, and was obliged to withdraw to Carrae. When he could not even here maintain his ground, he continued his retreat, and had reached as far as the Armenian mountain land when the Parthian general Surena offered him terms of peace on the condition that the Romans should confine themselves to the districts on the other side of the Euphrates. Crassus was obliged to agree to these terms; but when going to a conference with Surena, accompanied by a small retinue, he was treacherously set upon by the Parthian troops and murdered in B.C. 53 (according to Ovid, Fast. vi. 465: V. Idus Junias, or 9th June; see Clinton and Fischer, ad ann. B.C. 53). Many of his people were taken prisoners by the Parthians: part succeeded in making their escape; another part had even before this returned to Syria under the leadership of the quaestor Cassius Longinus (Dio Cassius, xl. 12-27; Plutarch, Crassus, 17-31; Livy, Epitome, 106; Justin, xlii. 4). – Compare on Crassus generally, Drumann, Geschichte Roms, iv. 71-115, Pauly's Real-Encyclop. iv. 1064-1068. On the Parthian campaign, Gutschmid, Geschichte Irans und Seiner Nachbarländer (1888), pp. 87-93; and the literature referred to by Gutschmid, p. 171 f.

C. Cassius Longinus, B.C. 53-51

After the death of Crassus the supreme command in Syria fell to Cassius Longinus. The Parthians now made inroads upon the Roman territory, pressed on in B.C. 51 as far as Antioch,

but were fortunately again driven back by Cassius in autumn of B.C. 51 (Dio Cassius, xl. 28-29; Josephus, Antiq. xiv. 7. 3; Livy, Epitome, 108; Justin, xlii. 4; Cicero, ad Atticum, v. 20; ad Familiares, ii. 10; Philipp. xi. 14; Drumann, Geschichte Roms, ii. 117 f.; Pauly's Real-Encyclop. ii. 194 ff. On the chronology, see especially, Fischer, Zeittafeln, p. 260 f.).

M. Calpurnius Bibulus, B.C. 51-50

Cassius Longinus was succeeded by Bibulus (according to Cicero, ad Familiares, ii. 10; ad Atticum, v. 20; Dio Cassius, xl. 30). He is called Λεύκιος Βύβλος in Appian, Syr. 51. But from the testimony of Cicero, ad Familiares, xii. 19, xv. 1 and 3, and Livy, Epitome, 108, and Caesar, Bell. Civ. iii. 31, it is put beyond dispute that he was M. Bibulus, the colleague of Caesar in the consulship in B.C. 59. – He arrived in Syria in autumn of the year B.C. 51 (Cicero, ad Atticum, v. 18 and 20). – He also had still trouble with the Parthians (compare Cicero, ad Familiares, xii. 19), but was able to rid himself of it in great measure by stirring up internal feuds among them. According to Dio Cassius, xl. 30, these civil conflicts took place as early as B.C. 51, during the consulship of M. Marcellus and Sulp. Rufus. Compare Cicero, ad Atticum, vii. 2, sub fin.: Parthi repente Bibulum semivivum reliquerunt. – Cicero, who at this same time administered the neighbouring province of Cilicia, in ad Atticum, vi. 1. 13, mentions Bibulus among those who in the administration of their province "valde honeste se gerunt." – Compare also Fischer, Röm. Zeittafeln, p. 264 f. On Bibulus generally, Drumann, Geschichte Roms, ii. 97-105; Pauly's Real-Encyclop. ii. 101 f.

Vejento, B.C. 50-49

"Bibulus de provincia decessit, Vejentonem praefecit." So writes Cicero in the beginning of December B.C. 50 (ad Atticum, vii. 3. 5).

Q. Metellus Scipio, B.C. 49-48

When, during the first days of the year B.C. 49, the civil war between Caesar and Pompey broke out, the provinces had just been partitioned among the Pompeian party, and the province of Syria had been conferred on the father-in-law of Pompey, Q. Metellus Scipio, who had held the consulship in the year B.C. 52 (Caesar, Bell. Civ. i. 6; compare Cicero, ad Atticum, ix. 1). – Toward the end of B.C. 49 he withdrew from Syria two legions for the support of Pompey, and wintered with them in the territory of Pergamum (Caesar, Bell. Civ. iii. 4 and 31). In the following year he proceeded to Macedonia, and joined Pompey shortly before the battle of Pharsalia (Caesar, Bell. Civ. iii. 33, 78-82). In the battle of Pharsalia he commanded the centre of Pompey's army (Caesar, Bell. Civ. iii. 86). – Compare on Metellus Scipio generally, Drumann, Geschichte Roms, ii. 44-49; Pauly's Real-Encyclop. ii. 32-34.

2. Syria During the Time of Caesar, B.C. 47-44

Sextus Caesar, B.C. 47-46

After the battle of Pharsalia, 9th August B.C. 48, Caesar followed Pompey by sea to Egypt, which he reached in the beginning of October, shortly after the assassination of Pompey, which had taken place on the 28th September. Contrary to expectation, he became involved in Egypt in a war with King Ptolemy, which detained him there for nine months (Appian, Civ. ii. 90). Not till the end of June B.C. 47 could he get away from Egypt, and then he went as speedily as possible (Dio Cassius, xlii. 47: τάχει πολλῷ χρησάμενος) through Syria to Asia Minor in order to

make war upon Pharnaces, king of Pontus (Auct. de Bell. Alexandr. c. 33, 65 ff.; Plutarch, Caesar, 49, 50; Suetonius, Caesar, 35; Appian, Civ. ii. 91). Hitherto Syria, as it would seem, had been left very much to itself. Now for the first time, during his short visit to the province (according to Cicero, ad Atticum, xi. 20, Caesar was at Antioch in the middle of July B.C. 47), Caesar organized the administration of Syria by setting up a relative of his own, Sextus Caesar, as governor (Bell. Alexandr. c. 66; Dio Cassius, xlvii. 26; compare Josephus, Antiq. xiv. 9. 2). — Many cities of Syria then obtained from Caesar important privileges, and, in consequence, began reckoning from a new era, the aera Caesariana; so, e.g., Antioch, Gabala, Laodicea, Ptolemais (see Noris, Annus et epochae Syromacedonum, ed. Lips. pp. 162 sqq., 270 sqq., 293 sqq., 424 sqq.; Eckhel, Doctr. Num. Vet. iii. 279 sqq., 313 sqq., 315 sqq., 423 sqq.). Compare Bell. Alexandr. 65: commoratus fere in omnibus civitatibus, quae majore sunt dignitate, praemia bene meritis et viritim et publice tribuit. Marquardt. Römische Staatsverwaltung, i. 397.

Caecilius Bassus, B.C. 46

While Caesar in the spring of B.C. 46 had still to fight in Africa with the party of Pompey, a Pompeian, Caecilius Bassus, sought to secure to himself the governorship of Syria. He was indeed beaten by Sextus, but he succeeded in getting the governor put out of the way by assassination, won over the soldiers to his side, and made himself master of Syria (Dio Cassius, xlvii. 26–27; Livy, Epitome, 114; Josephus, Antiq. xiv. 11. 1. Diverging in points of detail, Appian, Civ. iii. 77, iv. 58, with whom Drumann, Geschichte Roms, ii. 125–127, and Pauly's Real-Encyclop. ii. 36 f., agree).

C. Antistius Vetus, B.C. 45

In opposition to Caecilius Bassus the party of Caesar was headed by Antistius Vetus. In autumn of the year B.C. 45 he besieged Bassus in Apamea, but could gain no decided advantage over him, because the Parthians brought assistance to Bassus (Dio Cassius, xlvii. 27. Compare Josephus, Antiq. xiv. 11. 1. The date is given by Cicero, ad Atticum, xiv. 9. 3, and Dio Cassius, xlvii. 27, as διὰ τὸν χειμῶνα).

L. Statius Murcus, B.C. 44

In order to put down Caecilius Bassus, Caesar sent, probably in the beginning of B.C. 44 L. Statius Marcus to Syria with three legions. He was supported by the governor of Bithynia, Q. Marcius Crispus, who also had three legions under his command. By both Bassus was again besieged in Apamea (Appian, Civ. iii. 77, iv. 58; Dio Cassius, xlvii. 27; Josephus, Antiq. xiv. 11. 1. Compare Strabo, xvi. p. 752).

3. Syria Under the Administration of Cassius, B.C. 44–42

C. Cassius Longinus, B.C. 44–42

Affairs took a new turn in consequence of the murder of Caesar on 15th March B.C. 44. Among the conspirators who accomplished that deed was, besides Brutus, the celebrated C. Cassius Longinus, the same man who, in the years B.C. 53–51, had successfully defended Syria against the attack of the Parthians. He had been already nominated by Caesar as governor of Syria for the year B.C. 43 (Appian, Civ. iii. 2, iv. 57). But after Caesar's death Marc Antony contrived it so that Syria was given to Dolabella, and another province, possibly Cyrene, to Cassius (Appian, Civ. iii. 7–8, iv. 57). Cassius, however, did not agree to these arrangements, but went to Syria as

the province assigned to him by Caesar. He arrived there in the end of the year B.C. 44, before Dolabella had made his appearance (Appian, Civ. iii. 24, iv. 58; Dio Cassius, xlvii. 21, 26). — At the time of his arrival Caecilius Bassus was still under siege by Statius Murcus and Marcius Crispus in Apamea. He succeeded in winning over to himself the two besieging generals, where-upon also the legion of Bassus went over to him. Cassius himself relates to Cicero that this occurred in March and May B.C. 43 (Cicero, ad Familiares, xii. 11 and 12. Compare ad Brutum, ii. 5; Philippic, xi. 12, 30; Appian, Civ. iii. 78, iv. 59; Dio Cassius, xlvii. 28; Josephus, Antiq. xiv. 11. 2; Drumann, Geschichte Roms, ii. 128). — Thus Cassius had considerable fighting power at his command before Dolabella, who had meanwhile established himself in the interests of Marc Antony in Asia Minor, made his appearance in Syria in B.C. 43, and pressed forward as far as Laodicea, on the sea-coast south of Antioch (Appian, Civ. iii. 78, iv. 60; Dio Cassius, xlvii. 29-30). Cassius laid siege to him there (Cicero, ad familiares, xii. 13-15), and compelled him to yield, whereupon Dolabella had his head struck off by a soldier of his bodyguard (Appian, Civ. iv. 60-62; Dio Cassius, xlvii. 30; Drumann, Geschichte Roms, ii. 129 ff., 514 ff.; Wegehaupt, P. Cornelius Dolabella, 1880). — After the defeat of Dolabella, Cassius intended to turn to Egypt, but instead of this was called by Brutus to Asia Minor in B.C. 42. He therefore left his nephew with a legion in Syria (Appian, Civ. iv. 63), met with Brutus at Smyrna, then undertook an expedition against Rhodes, again joined Brutus at Sardes, and then accompanied him to Macedonia, where, late in autumn of the year B.C. 42, at Philippi, the troops of the conspirators were defeated by Marc Antony and Octavian. Cassius, as well as his confederate Brutus, ended his life by his own hand (Appian, Civ. iv. 63-138; Dio Cassius, xlvii. 31-49; Plutarch, Brutus, 28-53).

4. Syria Under the Rule of Marc Antony, B.C. 41-30

Decidius Saxa, B.C. 41-40

After the battle of Philippi, Octavian went to Italy, while Marc Antony proceeded first of all to Greece and afterwards to Asia (Plutarch, Antonius, 23-24). On his march through Asia, Antony met for the first time, in B.C. 41, at Tarsus, Cleopatra, who managed so to fascinate him by her charms, that he followed her to Egypt, where he spent the winter of B.C. 41-40 in inactivity and self-indulgence (Plutarch, Antonius, 25-28). — During B.C. 41, before he went to Egypt, he arranged the affairs of Syria, exacted on every hand an exorbitant tribute (Appian, Civ. v. 7), and left Decidius Saxa as governor (Dio Cassius, xlviii. 24; Livy, Epitome, 127).

In the spring of B.C. 40, Antony left Egypt, and in the summer of the same year arrived in Italy, with the intention of engaging in conflict with Octavian; but after some unimportant skirmishing, he concluded with him at Brundisium a treaty, according to which the provinces were to be partitioned between Octavian and Antony, in such a way that the former should have the West and the latter the East (Appian, Civ. v. 52-65; Dio Cassius, xlviii. 27-28. The dividing line was at Scodra, now called Scutari, in Illyria, Appian, v. 65). Antony remained for somewhere about a year in Italy, during which time he appointed several vassal kings, among whom was Herod, and then went in autumn of B.C. 39 to Athens (Appian, Civ. v. 75-76; Dio Cassius, xlviii. 39), where, with several intervals of absence, he remained till the spring of B.C. 36 (Drumann, Geschichte Roms, i. 441 f., 447 f.).

At the time when Antony secured to himself from Octavian the rule over the East, a large portion of the eastern territory, the whole province of Syria, had been taken possession of by the Parthians. These had, in B.C. 42, just about the time when Cassius left Syria (Appian, Civ. iv. 63), been invited by Cassius to join a league against Octavian and Antony. But nothing came of

that plan then, for the whole programme fell through at Philippi, and the negotiations that had been for a long while under consideration were brought to an end. But Labienus, the chief of the embassy, remained at the Parthian court, and succeeded by his persistent representations in persuading King Orodes at length to make an inroad upon the Roman territory. As early perhaps as the autumn of B.C. 41, at latest in the spring of B.C. 40, a great Parthian army, under the command of Labienus and Pacorus, the son of King Orodes, invaded Syria, and attacked Decidius Saxa, who fell in the battle. He then conquered all Syria, Phoenicia (with the exception only of Tyre), and Palestine, and finally pressed on to Asia Minor, and even went as fur as the Ionian coast (Dio Cassius, xlviii. 24-26; Appian, Syr. 51; Civ. v. 65; Plutarch, Antonius, 30; Livy, Epitome, 127). — On the chronology, see especially, Bürcklein, Quellen und Chronologie der römisch-parthenischen Feldzüge in den Jahren 713-718 d. St. (Leipziger Dissertat. 1879) pp. 49-51. Generally, Gutschmid, Geschichte Irans und seiner Nachbarländer (Tüb. 1888), p. 93 ff., and the literature there referred to by Gutschmid.

P. Ventidius, B.C. 39-38

Toward the end of the year B.C. 40, according to Bürcklein, or, according to the usual reckoning, in B.C. 39, Antony sent P. Ventidius with an army to Asia. This general, in B.C. 39, drove Labienus back to Taurus, and defeated him there in a decisive battle. Labienus was himself taken prisoner and put to death. Ventidius then overran Cilicia, gained a victory over Pharnapates, a general under Pacorus, at Amanus, the mountain boundary between Cilicia and Syria, and took possession now without difficulty of Syria and Palestine (Dio Cassius, xlviii. 39-41; Livy, Epitome, 127; Plutarch, Antonius, 33). — In B.C. 38 the Parthians made a new invasion, but suffered a complete defeat in the district of Cyrrestic at the hands of Ventidius. Pacorus was slain in the battle, on the same day on which Crassus had fallen fifteen years before. This gives as the date of the battle V. Idus Junias, or 9th June (Dio Cassius, xlix. 19-20; Livy, Epitome, 128; Plutarch, Antonius, 34. Compare also Dio Cassius, xlix. 21: ἐν τῇ αὐτῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἑκατέρου τοῦ ἔτους ἀμφότερα συνηνέχθη). — Ventidius now went forth against Antiochus of Comagene. While he laid siege to his enemy in Samosata, Antony himself arrived, dismissed Ventidius, and continued the siege. But he met with little success, was satisfied with an apparent submission on the part of Antiochus, and went back to Athens, leaving C. Sosius governor in Syria (Dio Cassius, xlix. 20-22; Plutarch, Antonius, 34). — On the chronology, see Bürcklein, Quellen und Chronologie des röm. parth. Feldzüge, pp. 51-61.

C. Sosius, B.C. 38-37

Sosius completed the subjugation of Syria by conquering the Jewish king Antigonus, the confederate of the Parthians, and taking Jerusalem. He then set up Herod as king, who had been nominated before by Antony. Dio Cassius, xlix. 22, assigns this to B.C. 38, under the consulship of Ap. Claudius Pulcher, and C. Norbanus Flaccus. But compare what is said under § 14.

In the year B.C. 36 Antony himself again appeared in the East. Wishing to deal a decisive blow at the Parthians, he advanced against them with a great force, but accomplished nothing, and was obliged, after the beginning of the winter, to retire again with heavy losses (compare Gutschmid, Geschichte Irans, pp. 97-101). — But before he went forth against the Parthians, in the spring of B.C. 36, he had again met with Cleopatra in Syria. And after his return from that unfortunate expedition, he gave himself up in Leuke Kome, between Sidon and Berytus, to the usual luxurious indulgences in her company (Dio Cassius, xlix. 23-31; Plutarch, Antonius, 36-51). — He then followed her, before the end of the year B.C. 36 (Fischer, Röm. Zeittafeln, p. 358

f.), to Egypt, and remained there till B.C. 33, abandoning himself to unbounded revels and pleasures, which were interrupted only by two short campaigns against Armenia in B.C. 34 and B.C. 33 (Dio Cassius, xlix. 33, 39-41, 44; Plutarch, Antonius, 52-53; Drumann, Geschichte Roms, i. 461-467; Pauly's Real-Encyclop. i. 1, 2 Aufl. p, 1178).

During this period and that immediately following, down to the battle of Actium, only two governors of Syria are known to us.

L. Munacius Plancus, B.C. 35

In B.C. 35, while L. Cornificius and Sextus Pompeius were consuls (Dio Cassius, xlix. 18), Sextus Pompeius, who after his defeat by Octavian had fled to Asia Minor, was there put to death. Appian, Civ. v. 144, says that it is uncertain whether the order for his execution was given by Antony himself or by Plancus the governor of Syria (εἰσὶ δ' οἳ Πλάγκον, οὐκ Ἀντώνιον λέγουσιν ἐπιστεῖλαι, ἄρχοντα Συρίας). We see from this incidental statement that at this time L. Munacius Plancus was governor of Syria. He was one of the most trusty friends of Antony, but went over to the side of Octavian before the outbreak of the war between that prince and Antony in B.C. 32 (Dio Cassius, 1. 3). — Compare also generally, Drumann, Geschichte Roms, iv. 207-213; Pauly's Real-Encyclop. v. 204-208; Borghesi, Oeuvres, ii. 83 ff.

L. Calpurnius Bibulus, B.C. 32-31 (?)

Appian, Civ. iv. 38, makes a passing reference to L. Bibulus among the conspirators who subsequently effected a reconciliation with Octavian and Antony. "But Bibulus reconciled himself [with Antony and Octavian] at the same time as Messala, and served under Antony as the commander of a ship, and was often employed in negotiations for peace between Antony and Octavian, and was appointed by Antony governor of Syria, and died while he held the office of governor." Since Bibulus is here said to have died during his governorship, but was, according to the evidence of the coins, alive at least in B.C. 33 (Drumann; Geschichte Roms, ii. 106), Noris, Cenot. Pison. p. 286; Schöpflin, p. 477, and others correctly place his term as governor in the period of the wars between Antony and Octavian. Compare also Drumann, Geschichte Roms, ii. 105 f.; Borghesi, Oeuvres, ii. 92 ff.; Lewin, Fasti sacri, n. 581. The coins in Babelon, Monnaies de la république romaine, t. i. 1885, p. 304 sq.

Antony was meanwhile becoming more and more enslaved by the caresses of Cleopatra. He had allowed himself to be persuaded to promise Roman provinces to her and to her children. Thus Cleopatra obtained, among others, Coele-Syria, Phoenicia as far as Eleutherus, with the exception of Tyre and Sidon, portions of Judea and Arabia, which were taken away from their kings Herod and Malchus, and, finally, a part of Iturea, the king of which, Lysanias, had been slain (Josephus, Antiq. xv. 3. 8, 4. 1-2; Wars of the Jews, i. 18. 5; Dio Cassius, xlix. 32; Plutarch, Antonius, 36. On the time at which these donations were made, see below at § 15). Cleopatra's son, Ptolemy, whom she had borne to Antony, at a somewhat later period obtained Syria as far as the Euphrates and Phoenicia, while Coele-Syria continued the portion of his mother (so Plutarch, Antonius, 54; compare Dio Cassius, xlix. 41). See generally, Mommsen, Res gestae divi Augusti, 2 Aufl. p. 118. — These donations were not indeed confirmed by the senate (Dio Cassius, xlix. 41). And the glory of Antony soon came to an end. After the last Armenian campaign of B.C. 33 he went to Greece. While he was there in B.C. 32 the war between him and Octavian broke out, and in the following year, by the battle of Actium of 2nd September B.C. 31, the power of Antony was finally and completely overthrown.

II. THE PERIOD OF THE EMPIRE, B.C. 30-A.D. 70

1. Octavianus Augustus, B.C. 30-19th August A.D. 14

Q. Didius, B.C. 30

After the battle of Actium, Antony fled to Egypt. Octavian pursued him, but was obliged, on account of the unfavourable season, to pass the winter in Samos (Suetonius, Augustus, 17). It was not until the year B.C. 30 that he made a land journey through Asia and Syria (Asiae Syriaeque circuitu Aegyptum petit, Suetonius, Augustus, 17) to Egypt, where, on 1st August B.C. 30, before the gates of Alexandria, he engaged in a battle in which Antony was beaten, while at the same time his fleet went over to Octavian. In consequence of this, Antony and Cleopatra took away their own lives, and Octavian became supreme and absolute sovereign over the whole of the Roman empire (Dio Cassius, li. 1-14; Plutarch, Antonius, 69-86. Compare Clinton, ad ann. 30; Fischer, Zeittafeln, p. 370 f.).

During the period that elapsed between the battle of Actium and the death of Antony, from September B.C. 31 to August B.C. 30, a certain Q. Didius is said to have been governor of Syria. He incited the Arab tribes to burn the ships which had been built for Antony in the Arabian Gulf, and prevented the gladiators, who sought to proceed from Cyzicus to the aid of Antony, from passing over into Egypt, in which King Herod also lent him assistance (Dio Cassius, li. 7; Josephus, Antiq. xv. 6. 7). — It seems that this Didius had been appointed by Antony; but after the battle of Actium, when he saw that the cause of Antony was lost, he joined the party of Octavian.

Toward the end of B.C. 30 Octavian returned back again from Egypt to Syria, and now for the first time had affairs there thoroughly well arranged (Dio Cassias, li. 18). The winter of B.C. 30-29 was spent by Octavian in Asia.

M. Messala Corvinus, B.C. 29

Those gladiators whom Didius had prevented from taking part in the campaign in Egypt, were driven about into various places, and ultimately slain by Messala, i.e. M. Messala Corvinus, consul of the year B.C. 31 (Dio Cassius, li. 7). Messala must therefore have been governor of Syria after Didius.

M. Tullius Cicero, B.C. 28(?)

From Appian, Civ. iv. 51, we know that M. Tullius Cicero, the son of the great orator, after he had held the office of consul for the year B.C. 30, was appointed governor of Syria But nothing can with certainty be said about the time of his administration. Schöpflin, p. 478, and Zumpt, ii. 74 sq., make him follow immediately after Messala. Mommsen was formerly disposed to set him down in the period following the year 741 A.U., or B.C. 13 (Res gestae divi Augusti, 1 Aufl. p. 114 f.), but now leaves the date of his governorship undetermined (Res gestae, 2 Aufl. p. 165). The words of Appian are at least favourable to the view of Schöpflin and Zumpt. The inscription on which Cicero is mentioned as governor of Syria (Orelli, Inscr. Lat. n. 572) has now been proved to be not genuine (Corp. Inscr. Lat. t. x. falsae n. 704; Mommsen, Res gestae divi Augusti, p. 165, note). — Compare generally, Drumann, Geschichte Roms, vi. 711-719; Pauly's Real-Encyclop. vi. 2. 2232 ff.).

In B.C. 27 the well-known partition of the Roman provinces between Augustus and the senate was carried out. Augustus had hitherto administered all the provinces through his legates. But now he gave a part of them back to the senate, reserving to himself only the more important, that is, those which were most difficult to manage. Among the latter was Syria, which was in itself one of the most important of the provinces, and which, on account of the attacks which were constantly threatened on its eastern frontier, could not be left without a strong military guard.

Varro, Down to B.C. 23

Immediately before Agrippa had been sent to the East (in B.C. 23), a certain Varro is spoken of as governor of Syria (Josephus, Antiq. xv. 10. 1; Wars of the Jews, i. 20. 4). Whether this was one of the otherwise well-known bearers of that name can no longer be determined. It is equally uncertain when he first went to Syria. – Zumpt, Commentt. epigr. ii. 75–78, identifies our Varro with the Terentius Varro referred to by Dio Cassius, liii. 25, and Strabo, iv. 6. 7, p. 205, who in B.C. 25, as legate of Augustus, subdued the Salassi, a nation of Gallia Transpadana, and, at least according to Zumpt's conjecture, died in B.C. 24. Zumpt therefore assigns his administration of Syria to the years B.C. 28–26. But Josephus affirms decidedly that our Varro was still in Syria when Augustus gifted to Herod the district of Trachonitis, which Zumpt correctly places at the end of B.C. 24 or beginning of B.C. 23. Varro must then have been still in Syria, and so cannot be identical with that Terentius Varro. – On the other hand, Mommsen's view (Res gestae, p. 165 sq.), that Varro may have been a legate of Agrippa, is also improbable; for Josephus places Varro in the period preceding that of Agrippa's stay in the East.

M. Agrippa, B.C. 23–13

In B.C. 23 Augustus sent M. Agrippa, his trusted friend and counsellor, who soon after, in B.C. 21, became his son-in-law, to Syria (Dio Cassius, liii. 32). Josephus describes him as "the representative of Caesar in the countries beyond the Ionian Sea" (Antiq. xv. 10. 2: τῶν πέραν Ἰονίου διάδοχος Καίσαρι). He had therefore evidently very extensive powers – more than an ordinary legatus Caesaris. According to Josephus, Antiq. xvi. 3. 3, he held this position (the διοίκησις τῶν ἐπὶ τῆς Ἀσίας) for ten years, that is, down to B.C. 13. – Agrippa did not, indeed, go to Syria in B.C. 23, but waited from B.C. 23 to B.C. 21 in Mitylene, on the island of Lesbos, and then returned to Rome (Dio Cassius, liii. 32, liv. 6; Suetonius, Augustus, 66; comp. Josephus, Antiq. xv. 10. 2; Fischer, Röm. Zeittafeln, pp. 388, 392). Then he was engaged for five years in the West, and did not again go to the East till B.C. 17 or 16, where he remained till B.C. 13 (Dio Cassius, liv. 19, 24, 28; Josephus, Antiq. xvi. 2. 1–3. 3, fin.; Fischer, Röm. Zeittafeln, pp. 402–408). He was therefore by no means during the ten years always even in the East, let alone in Syria. But since, to use the phrase of Mommsen, Agrippa's position was more that of a collega minor than that of an adjutor (Res gestae, p. 164), he could discharge his official duties in absentia by means of legates, and so indeed he actually did send his legates in B.C. 23 from Lesbos (τοὺς ὑποστρατήγους), Dio Cassius, liii. 32) to Syria. He is therefore during this period, at least during B.C. 23–21 and B.C. 17–13, to be regarded as governor of Syria.

During the period B.C. 21–19 occurred the two years' visit of Augustus to the East (Dio Cassius, liv. 7–10; Fischer, Röm. Zeittafeln, pp. 392–396. Comp. Josephus, Antiq. xv. 10. 3; Wars of the Jews, i. 20. 4).

M. Titius, About B.C. 10

About the time when Herod made his third journey to Rome (probably in B.C. 10; see below at § 15, the Chronology of Herod), M. Titius was appointed governor of Syria (Josephus, Antiq. xvi. 8. 6). He was consul in B.C. 31. – Nothing more definite can be said about the date of his administration. Compare regarding him, Strabo, xvi. 1. 28, p. 748; Mommsen, Res gestae div. Aug. p. 166; Pauly's Real-Encyclop. vi. 2. 2011 f.

C. Sentius Saturninus, B.C. 9-6

Titius was succeeded by Sentius Saturninus (Josephus, Antiq. xvi. 9. 1), who had held the office of consul in B.C. 19. Josephus names alongside of him also Volumnius as Καίσαρος ἡγεμών. But Volumnius must certainly have been subordinate to Saturninus, since the supreme command in a province was always in one hand. Sentius Saturninus is also referred to in Josephus, Antiq. xvi. 10. 8, 11. 3; xvii. 1. 1, 2. 1, 3. 2.

P. Quinctilius Varus, B.C. 6-4

The immediate successor of Saturninus was Quinctilius Varus (Josephus, Antiq. xvii. 5. 2), consul in B.C. 13, who at a subsequent period undertook the disastrous campaign against Germany. From evidence afforded by the coins (as shown in Eckhel, Doctr. Num. Vet. iii. 275; Mionnet, v. 156), it is proved that Varus was governor of Syria in the, years 25, 26, 27 of the aera Actiaca. The twenty-fifth year of the aera Actiaca, as that era begins with 2nd September B.C. 31, extends from autumn B.C. 7 to autumn B.C. 6. Varus must therefore have gone to Syria at least before autumn B.C. 6; but he remained there till after the death of Herod (Josephus, Antiq. xvii. 9. 3, 10. 1, 10. 9, 11. 1), i.e. till the summer of B.C. 4, or longer. Compare in regard to him also, Mommsen, Res gestae, p. 166.

P. Sulpicius Quirinius, B.C. 3-2 (?)

During the period B.C. 3-2 there is no direct evidence about any governor of Syria. But it may be concluded with a fair amount of probability from a passage in Tacitus, that about this time P. Sulpicius Quirinius, consul in B.C. 12, was appointed governor of Syria. Tacitus in the Annals, iii. 48, expressly records the death of Quirinius in A.D. 21 (coss. Tiber. iv., Drus. ii.), and on that occasion gives the following account of him: Consulatum sub divo Augusto, mox expugnatis per Ciliciam Homonadensium castellis insignia triumphi adeptus, datusque rector Gaio Caesari Armeniam optinenti. Strabo, xii. 6. 5, p. 569, tells the story of the war with the Homonadensians in the following words: Ἐκείνους δὲ (τοὺς Ὁμοναδέας) Κυρίνιος ἐξεπόρθησε λιμῷ καὶ τετρακισχιλίους ἄνδρας ἐζώγρησε καὶ συνῴκισεν εἰς τὰς ἐγγὺς πόλεις, τὴν δὲ χώραν ἀπέλιπεν ἔρημον τῶν ἐν ἀκμῇ. Quirinius therefore had previously conquered the Homonadensians, on account of which the honour of a triumph had been accorded him, and this indeed took place after his consulship in B.C. 12, but before he had been appointed by C. Caesar, his counsellor, on his arrival in Armenia in A.D. 3 (Fischer, Röm. Zeittafeln, p. 430). But a war could not at any time be carried on except by the governor of that province in which or from which the war was being conducted. Quirinius must therefore have been then governor of that province to which the Homonadensians belonged, or from which the war against them proceeded. Seeing that the Homonadensians occupied the Taurus Mountains, we might have to do with the provinces of Asia, Pamphylia, Galatia, Cilicia, Syria. But of these the first three must be at once set aside, because they had no legions, so that their governors could not carry on a war. And further, Cilicia was probably at that time only a part of the province of Syria (and with this agrees the judgments of Zumpt, Commentt. epigr. ii. 95-98; Geburtsjahr Christi, pp. 57-61; and Mommsen, Res gestae, p. 172 sq.), at least it was, as also Pamphylia and Galatia were, no consular

province, whereas Quirinius led the war against the Homonadensians as one who had been consul. Now, one who had been a consul was never sent to a praetorian province, which was administered by one who had been a praetor. The only conclusion then that remains is that Quirinius at the time of that war with the Homonadensians was governor of Syria. But since this governorship belongs to the period before the year A.D. 3, that is, to the period before he had been appointed counsellor to C. Caesar in Armenia, it cannot be identical with the one of A.D. 6, referred to by Josephus. The only date, therefore, that we can assign to it is the interval between Varus and C. Caesar, that is, B.C. 3–2.

It is wholly on this combination, in regard to which Zumpt, Commentt. epigr. ii. 90–98; Geburtsjahr Christi, pp. 43–62; and Mommsen, Res gestae div. Aug. p. 172 sq., are thoroughly agreed that the assumption of an earlier governorship than that of A.D. 6, referred to by Josephus, is based (for a full statement of Zumpt's theory, see note in Wieseler, Chronological Synopsis, pp. 129–135). For the inscription, which some have sought to make use of in this question, cannot prove anything material to the point at issue. It does, indeed, prove that the individual to whom it refers was twice governor of Syria. But whether it is to be applied to Quirinius is open to question, since the name is not given in the inscription. The main ground upon which Mommsen and others have referred it to Quirinius is just that they regard the fact of Quirinius having been twice governor to be proved from other sources, that is, from Tacitus and Josephus. The theory that Quirinius was twice governor of Syria is not therefore to be based upon the inscription, but, on the contrary, the application of the inscription to Quirinius is based upon the proof, elsewhere obtained, that he held the governorship a second time.

C. Caesar, B.C. 1–A.D. 4 (?)

In the year B.C. 1, that is, A.U.C. 753, Augustus sent his grandson, C. Caesar, son of Agrippa and Julia, now eighteen years of age, to the East, in order to compel the Parthians and Armenians, who refused any longer to recognise the authority of Rome, again to yield submission. Caesar went first of all to Egypt, then, probably, still before the end of the year B.C. 1, to Syria, without, however, entering Palestine (Suetonius, Aug. 93). There he remained probably during the year A.D. 1, and then went onward against the Parthians in A.D. 2, and against the Armenians in A.D. 3. After he had succeeded in putting matters right, Augustus called him back to Rome. But he died on his homeward journey, on 21st February A.D. 4, at Limyra in Lycia (Zonaras, x. 36; Dio Cassius, lv. 10a, where he introduces a quotation from Xiphilinus; Velleius Paterculus, ii. 101–102; Tacitus, Annals, i. 3. The date of the death according to the Cenotaphium Pisanum. Compare, Clinton, ad ann. B.C. 1 – A.D. 4. Fischer, Röm. Zeittafeln, pp. 426–431). – According to Zonaras, x. 36, C. Caesar had proconsular authority (τὴν ἐξουσίαν αὐτῷ τὴν ἀνθύπατον ἔδωκεν); according to Orosius, vii. 3, he was sent ad ordinandas Aegypti Syriaeque provincias; according to Suetonius, Tiberius, 12, he was Orienti praepositus. He must therefore have held during this period the administration of Syria. Compare Mommsen, Res gestae, p. 165.

Zumpt, Geburtsjahr Christi, pp. 32–40, decidedly opposes this view, because he assumes that, in addition to C. Caesar, ordinary legati Augusti were also then present in the imperial provinces, only that Caesar had the right of independent action, having authority wherever he went superior to the governors of the provinces concerned. Zumpt depends for support to this opinion mainly upon the fact that, if the case were otherwise, Augustus would have renounced all power in the East, which is not to be supposed. But this argument will not by any means stand the test; for then we should have to suppose that, besides Agrippa, ordinary legati Caesaris were also to be found in the provinces, which, however, even Zumpt does not

assume. In favour of Mommsen's theory (which had previously been for the most part set forth by Baronius in his Annals, and by Schöpflin) is to some extent the circumstance that no legati Augusti of that period are known to us, although, considering the scantiness of our information, this cannot be regarded as by any means conclusive; and also, and much more decidedly, the testimony of Orosius, vii. 3, that C. Caesar had been sent ad ordinandas Aegypti Syriaeque provinoias. One cannot see why Augustus should have assigned to him the ordering of the affairs of Egypt and Syria, if there had been already at that very time imperial legates in those provinces.

Apart from these points, the positive conjectures of Zumpt about the legates of Syria during that period are extremely hazardous. He assumes that the counsellors (rectores) appointed for the youthful Caesar were always at the same time governors of Syria. Such rectores were, according to Zumpt, first of all P. Sulpicius Quirinius (Tacitus, Annals, iii. 48); after him, M. Lollius (Suetonius, Tiberius, 12); and last of all, C. Marcius Censorinus (Velleius Paterculus, ii. 102). Compare Zumpt, Commentt. epigr. ii. 98–104, 107 sq.; Geburtsjahr Christi, pp. 40–43, 62–71. — But Quirinius was counsellor of Caesar certainly not before, but after Lollius, viz. in A.D. 3, when Caesar was already in Armenia (Tacitus, Annals, iii. 48: datusque rector Gaio Caesari Armenian optinenti), Lollius having meanwhile died during the Parthian campaign in A.D. 2 (Velleius Paterculus, ii. 102). Compare Mommsen, Res gestae, pp. 173–175. On the chronology, Fischer, Röm. Zeittafeln, pp. 428–430. — It is particularly. questionable whether Censorinus ought to be reckoned among those rectores at all. He is at least never expressly named as such. — And, finally, the hypothesis is utterly without support, that these rectores were at the same time governors of Syria.

L. Volusius Saturninus, A.D. 4–5

Consul suffectus in B.C. 12. — From a coin we know that he was governor of Syria in the year 35 of the Actian era, which corresponds to autumn 757–758 A.U.C., or A.D. 4–5 (Eckhel. Doctr. Num. iii. 275 sq.; Mionnet, v. 156).

P. Sulpicius Quirinius, A.D. 6 ff

After the banishment of Archelaus, ethnarch of Judea, in A.D. 6, P. Sulpicius Quirinius went to Syria, and immediately on his arrival took the census in Judea (Josephus, Antiq. xvii. 13. 5; xviii. 1. 1, 2. 1). How long he continued governor of Syria cannot be determined. — Reference is made to his operations in Syria in an inscription which was long regarded as ungenuine, but has now been proved to be undoubtedly genuine by the discovery of the second half of it in the original (see especially, Mommsen, Ephemeris epigraphica, vol. iv. 1881, pp. 537–542; also, Lecoultre, De censu Quiriniano, Lausannae 1883, pp. 48–51; a facsimile of the restored piece in De Rossi, Bullettino di archeologia cristiana, 1880, tav. ix., comp. p. 174). — On the inscription one Q. Aemilius Q. or Pal. Secundus says of himself among other things: jussu Quirini censum egi Apamenae civitatis millium homin(um) civium CXVII. Idem missu Quirini adversus Ituraeos in Libano monte castellum eorum cepi.

Q. Caecilius Creticus Silanus, A.D. 11–17

Consul in A.D. 7. — That he went to Syria as governor at the latest in A.D. 11, is proved by a coin of the year 41 of the Actian era, that is, autumn 763–764 A.U.C., or A.D. 10–11 (so Sanclemente, p. 348). Other coins for the years 42, 43, 44, 45, 47 of the Actian era were given by Eckhel, Doctr. Num. iii. 276; Mionnet, v. 156–159. The latest of these coins, that of the year

47 of the Actian era, belongs to A.D. 16-17. In accordance with this, Tacitus, Annals, ii. 43, records the recall of Silanus by Tiberius in A.D. 17. — Compare also, Tacitus, Annals, ii. 4; Josephus, Antiq. xviii. 2. 4; Mommsen, Res gestae, p. 166.

2. Tiberius, 19th Aug. A.D. 14-16th March A.D. 37

Cn. Calpurnius Piso, A.D. 17-19

In the year A.D. 17, probably toward the end of the year, Tiberius sent his nephew and adopted son Germanicus to the East that he might look to the settlement of various matters. He obtained higher powers than the governors of the provinces to which he went (decreto patrum permissae Germanico provinciae quae mari dividuntur, majusque imperium, quoquo adisset, quam iis qui sorte aut missu principis obtinerent. Tacitus, Annals, ii. 43). At the same time Silanus was recalled, and in his place Cn. Calpurnius Piso, consul in the year B.C. 7, was appointed governor of Syria, a man of a violent and unbending character (ingenio violentus et obsequii ignarus, Tacitus, Annals, ii. 43).

Germanicus went first of all to Greece, where in the beginning of the year A.D. 18 he entered on his second consulship. He then passed over to Byzantium and then to Troy, and proceeded west along the Ionian coast to Rhodes, and from thence to Armenia. After he had put matters there to rights, he went to Syria, where Piso had already arrived before him (Tacitus, Annals, ii. 53-57). Owing to the violent character of Piso, hostilities between them could not long be avoided. Yet these outbursts had at first no ulterior consequences (Tacitus, Annals, ii. 57-58). In the year A.D. 19 Germanicus undertook a journey to Egypt, chiefly to inquire into the antiquities of that country (Tacitus, Annals, ii. 59-61). Soon after he returned to Syria he fell sick, and died on 9th Oct. A.D. 19. Common report charged his death upon Piso (Tacitus, Annals, ii. 69-73; Clinton, Fasti Romani, i. p. 4). Even before the death of Germanicus occurred, Piso had quitted Syria, having been commanded by Germanicus to leave the province (Tacitus, Annals, ii. 70).

Cn. Sentius Saturninus, A.D. 19-21

After the death of Germanicus his generals transferred the supreme command to Cu. Sentius Saturninus, consul in A.D. 4 (Tacitus, Annals, ii. 74). But Piso, on his return voyage, obtained in the neighbourhood of the island of Cos the intelligence of the death of Germanicus, and now resolved to take violent possession of Syria. He landed in Cilicia, gained possession of the stronghold of Celenderis (Κελένδερις, Strabo, pp. 670, 760; compare Josephus, Antiq. xvii. 5. 1; Wars of the Jews, i. 31. 3), but was obliged there, on surrendering to Sentius, to agree to the condition that he should return to Rome (Tacitus, Annals, ii. 75-81). — He reached Rome in the beginning of the year A.D. 20, was there accused by the friends of Germanicus, but avoided condemnation by committing suicide (Tacitus, Annals, iii. 8-15.)

How long Sentius Saturninus remained in Syria is not known. He is referred to as legatus Caesaris in an inscription found at Nicopolis, on the borders of Syria and Cilicia, on the Gulf of Issus, which at the earliest belongs to the year A.D. 21, Tiber. iv. cos. (Ephemeris epigraph. vol. v. 1884, p. 573, n. 1336). According to this inscription, it would seem that he had been also formally appointed governor of Syria; for it is in this sense probably that the title legatus Caesaris is to be understood (see Mommsen's remarks as above).

L. Aelius Lamia, Down to A.D. 32

From the Annals of Tacitus, i. 80; Suetonius, Tiberius, 41, 63, we know that Tiberius repeatedly appointed legates without actually allowing them to go to their provinces (Tacitus: qua haesitatione postremo eo provectus est, ut mandaverit quibusdam provincias, quos egredi urbe non erat passurus). By this measure L. Aelius Lamia among others was affected. Tacitus, in his Annals, vi. 27, has given the following particular account of his death: Extremo anni (A.D. 33) mors Aelii Lamiae funere censorio celebrata, qui administrandae Suriae imagine tandem exsolutus urbi praefuerat. Genus illi decorum, vivida senectus; et non permissa provincia dignationem addiderat. We see from this that Aelius Lamia, immediately after he had been released from the imago administrandae Suriae, i.e. from the nominal, not actual, administration of Syria, was appointed praefectus urbi. He did not, however, hold the office of praefectus urbi until after the death of L. Piso, see Dio Cassius, lviii. 19: τόν τε Πίσωνα τὸν πολίαρχον τελευτήσαντα δημοσίᾳ ταφῇ ἐτίμησεν, ὅπερ που καὶ ἄλλοις ἐχαρίζετο καὶ Λούκιον ἀντ' αὐτοῦ Λαμίαν ἀνθείλετο, ὃν πρόπαλαι τῇ Συρίᾳ προστάξας κατεῖχεν ἐν τῇ Ῥώμῃ. Seeing then that Piso, according to Tacitus, Annals, vi. 10, and Dio Cassius, lviii. 19, died in A.D. 32, Aelius Lamia must have been appointed praefectus urbi in that year, and was therefore up to that date, at least in name, governor of Syria (Zumpt, Commentt. epigr. ii. 131 sq.; Geburtsjahr Christi, pp. 184, 265). — Josephus, in his Antiq. xviii. 6. 2-3, seems indeed to contradict this view. He makes the statement that Agrippa I., before he became king of Judea, once paid a visit to Pomponius Flaccus, governor of Syria, and successor of Aelius Lamia (see below), and that then, after many adventures by the way, he returned to Rome, and there, after he had been for some time resident in Rome, charged his freedman Eutychus with theft, and had him brought up before Piso as praefectus urbi (Antiq. xviii. 6, 5). It seems therefore at first sight necessary to assume that Flaccus some time before the death of Piso had been made governor of Syria, for apparently Lamia could not have held the office down to that date. But, in truth, on closer examination of the facts this argumentation will not be found convincing. That particular Piso before whom Eutychus was brought (Josephus, Antiq. xviii. 6. 5) cannot possibly have been the Piso who died in A.D. 32, since the occurrence referred to took place, as will be shown farther on, under the history of Agrippa, in § 18, in the year A.D. 36. We have here then to do with another Piso, who at a later period, A.D. 36-37, held the office of praefectus urbi, so that mention of him contributes nothing to the solution of the question when Flaccus succeeded Lamia. — We must accordingly confine ourselves wholly to the statements of Tacitus, which represent Lamia as occupying his nominal office of governor of Syria up to the date of his entrance upon his civic prefecture, i.e. up to A.D. 32. When the governorship was conferred upon him we cannot determine. He had held it certainly for a long time, as is evident from the "tandem" of Tacitus and the "πρόπαλαι" of Dio Cassius.

L. Pomponius Flaccus, A.D. 32-35 (?)

Since Lamia withdrew from the office of governor of Syria in A.D. 32, Flaccus, who had been consul in A.D. 17, succeeded him in that year. The death of Flaccus is reported by Tacitus in his Annals, vi. 27, in immediate connection with the above passage about Aelius Lamia in the following words: exim (that is to say, after the death of Aelius Lamia) Flacco Pomponio Suriae pro praetore defuncto recitantur Caesaris literae, quis incusabat egregium quemque et regendis exercitibus idoneum abnuere id munus, seque ea necessitudine ad preces cogi, per quas consularium aliqui capessere provincias adigerentur, oblitus Arruntium, ne in Hispaniam pergeret, decumum jam annum attineri. Since Tacitus, however, mentions this among the events of the year 33, the first suggestion that would occur to the reader is that the death of Flaccus took place during that year. And this is the opinion almost universally entertained. Yet it is not to be regarded as by any means impossible that Tacitus had gathered his facts about

Lamia and Flaccus from materials that had been supplied him, and that the death of Flaccus did not occur till a subsequent date. In fact, Keim has raised the supposition to a high degree of probability that Flaccus did not die before A.D. 35. In favour of this view may be alleged: — 1. The remark of Tacitus, that then, at the time of Flaccus' death, Arruntius had been already detained for ten years from going to his province, Spain. By Hispania only Hispania citerior can be intended; for Hispania ulterior was a senatorial province (see Tacitus, Annals, iv. 13). But that province did not become vacant before A.D. 25 (Tacitus, Annals, iv. 45). Accordingly the tenth year of Arruntius must correspond to A.D. 35. 2. Agrippa I. went to Rome in the spring of the year 36 (ἐνιαυτῷ πρότερον ἢ τελευτῆσαι Τιβέριον, Josephus, Antiq. xviii. 5. 3), after having not long before visited Flaccus in Syria (Josephus, Antiq. xviii. 6. 2-3). If then, allowing for hindrances and delays that may have occurred, we allow for Agrippa's journey to Rome after his visit to Flaccus a whole year (Josephus, Antiq. xviii. 6. 3-4), it must still be assumed that Flaccus was in Syria in A.D. 35. — Finally, it may further be alleged in favour of taking A.D. 35 as the year of the death of Flaccus, that his successor Vitellius, who certainly went to Syria in A.D. 35, is thus made immediately to follow, whereas in the other case a vacancy must have occurred.

A coin of Flaccus of the year 82 of the aera Caesariana, corresponding to autumn 786-787 A.U.C., or A.D. 33-34, is given in Eckhel, Doctr. Num. iii. 279; Mionnet, v. 167. — Compare also generally, Suetonius, Tiberius, 42; Pauly's Real Encyclopaedie, v. 1878 f.; Henzen, Acta fratrum Arvalium (1874), Index, p. 195.

L. Vitellius, A.D. 35-39

In A.D. 35 Tiberius sent L. Vitellius, who had been consul in A.D. 34, father of the next emperor, as legate to Syria (Tacitus, Annals, vi. 32). Tacitus bears testimony on his behalf that, in contrast to his subsequent manner of life, he was blameless in his administration of the province (eo de homine haud sum ignarus sinistram in urbe famam, pleraque foeda memorari, ceterum in regendis provinciis prisca virtute egit). — In A.D. 39 he was recalled by Caligula, and Petronius appointed his successor (Josephus, Antiq. xviii. 8. 2). Compare also generally, Suetonius, Vitellius, 2; Dio Cassius, lix. 27; Pliny, Hist. Nat. xv. 83; Pauly's Real-Encyclopaedie, vi. 2. 2682 f.; Liebenam, Forschungen zur Verwaltungsgeschichte des römischen Kaiserreichs, 1 Bd. p. 373.

3. Caligula, 16th March A.D. 37-24th January A.D. 41

P. Petronius, A.D. 39-42

Petronius had been sent by Caligula into Syria in A.D. 39. We know from a coin (given in Eckhel, Doctr. Num. iii. 280; Mionnet, v. 167) that he was still governor in the year 90 of the aera Caesariana, corresponding to autumn 794-795 A.U.C., or A.D. 41-42; therefore for somewhere about a year after the beginning of the reign of Claudius. — Compare in regard to him Josephus, Antiq. xviii. 8. 2-9; xix. 6. 3; Philo, Legat. ad Cajum, § 31-34, ed. Mangey, ii. 576-584; Pauly's Real-Encyclopaedie, v. 1402.

4. Claudius, 24th January A.D. 41-13th October A.D. 54

C. Vibius Marsus, A.D. 42-44

As successor of Petronius, Claudius sent C. Vibius Marsus, Consul suffectus in A.D. 17, into

Syria (Josephus, Antiq. xix. 6. 4). He had occasion repeatedly to protect Roman interests against King Agrippa (Josephus, Antiq. xix. 7. 2, 8. 1). His recall took place soon after the death of Agrippa in A.D. 44, therefore towards the end of A.D. 44 or in the beginning of A.D. 45 (Josephus, Antiq. xx. 1. 1). — Compare also Tacitus, Annals, xi. 10. This passage does not prove that Marsus was still governor of Syria in A.D. 47; for Tacitus there, under the history of the year 47, recapitulates earlier occurrences in the history of Parthia. See Zumpt, Commentt. epigr. ii. 137; Gerlach, p. 67. Compare generally, Pauly's Real-Encyclopaedie, vi. 2. 2571.

C. Cassius Longinus, A.D. 45-50

Marsus was succeeded by C. Cassius Longinus, Consul suffectus in A.D. 30 (Josephus, Antiq. xx. 1. 1). He was celebrated in his day as a jurist (ceteros praeminebat peritia legum, Tacitus, Annals, xii. 12), yea, as the founder of a special school of jurisprudence (Cassianae scholae princeps et parens, Pliny, Epist. vii 24. 8). Coins with his name belonging to the years 94 and 96 of the aera Caesariana, corresponding to A.D. 45-46 and 47-48, are given by Eckhel, Doctr. Num. iii. 280; Mionnet, v. 167. Tacitus speaks of him as governor of Syria as late as A.D. 49 (Annals, xii. 11-12). Not long afterwards he seems to have been recalled by Claudius. In regard to his subsequent fortunes, see Tacitus, Annals, xvi. 7 and 9; Suetonius, Nero, 37. Generally, Digest. i. 2. 2. 51; Pauly's Real-Encyclopaedie, ii. 201; Rudorff, Römische Rechtsgeschichte, i. 169 f.; Teuffel, History of Roman Literature, § 298. 3; Mommsen, Index to Pliny's Epistles, ed. Keil, p. 406; Liebenam, Forschungen zur Verwaltungsgeschichte, 1 Bd. p. 375 f.

C. Ummidius Quadratus, A.D. 50-60

In A.D. 51, C. Ummidius Quadratus is spoken of by Tacitus, Annals, xii. 45, as governor of Syria. It may therefore be assumed with Zumpt, Commentt. epigr. ii. 138, that he went there in A.D. 50. Coins bearing his name belonging to the years 104-108 of the aera Caesariana, corresponding to A.D. 55/56-59/60, are given in Eckhel, Doctr. Num. iii. 280; Mionnet, v. 159. He died while governor of Syria in A.D. 60 (Tacitus, Annals, xiv. 26). — His public career (he had been quaestor as early as A.D. 14) is sketched in the inscriptions: Orelli, Inscr. Lat. n. 3128=Inscr. Regni Neapol. n. 4234=Corp. Inscr. Lat. x. n. 5182. His full name, C. Ummidius Durmius Quadratus, is also given on a brazen tablet which contains the oath of the inhabitants of Aritium in Lusitania upon Caligula's assuming the reins of government (Orelli, n. 3665=Corp. Inscr. Lat. ii. n. 172=Ephemeris epigr. v. p. 155). — Compare also with reference to him, Tacitus, Annals, xii 54, xiii. 8-9; Josephus, Antiq. xx. 6. 2; Pauly's Real-Encyclopaedie, v. 743; Nipperdey on Tacitus, Annals, xii. 45.

5. Nero, 13th October A.D. 54-9th June A.D. 68

Cn. Domitius Corbulo, A.D. 60-63

After the death of Ummidius Quadratus in A.D. 60, Domitius Corbulo went to Syria as governor (Tacitus, Annals, xiv. 26). On his doings in that capacity, see Tacitus, Annals, xv. 1-17; Dio Cassius, lxii. 19 ff. He held the position of governor till A.D. 63, in which year a higher office was given him, while another governor was sent to Syria; Tacitus, Annals, xv. 25: Suriae exsecutio Citio (?), copiae militares Corbuloni permissae et quinta decuma legio ducente Mario Celso e Pannonia adjecta est. Scribitur tetrarchis ac regibus praefectisque et procuratoribus et qui praetorum finitimas provincias regebant, jussis Corbulonis obsequi, in tantum ferme modum aucta potestate, quem populus Romanus Cn. Pompeio bellum piraticum gesturo dederat. The name of the individual who obtained the province cannot be determined with certainty. The best

manuscript has Citius. The editors make various conjectures: Cincius, C. Itius, Cestius. Most might be said in favour of Cestius, for we certainly meet with him as governor of Syria in A.D. 65 (so, e.g., Zumpt, Commentt. epigr. ii. 141). — In regard to Corbulo's death in A.D. 67, see Dio Cassius, lxiii. 17. An inscription of A.D. 64 has been found in Armenia, on which he is called leg. Aug. pro pr. (see Ephemeris epigr. v. p. 25). Generally, Pauly's Real-Encyclopaedie, ii. 1218 f.; Teuffel, History of Roman Literature, § 291. 3, and the monographs there quoted from of Held (1862) and Wolffgramm (1874). Liebenam, Forschungen zur Verwaltungsgeschichte, 1 Bd. p. 169 f. For an estimate and characterization of Corbulo, see also Gutschmid, Geschichte Irans und seiner Nachbarländer (1888), p. 131, Anm.

C. Cestius Gallus, A.D. 63-66

If the conjecture given above is correct, Cestius Gallus went to Syria as early as A.D. 63. He was there undoubtedly in A.D. 65, for he went up to Jerusalem at the Passover of A.D. 66, in the twelfth year of Nero=October A.D. 65-A.D. 66 (Josephus, Antiq. xx. 11. 1; Wars of the Jews, ii. 14. 4), after having been already for a long time in Syria (Wars of the Jews, ii. 14. 3). Coins with his name of the years 114 and 115 of the aera Caesariana=A.D. 65/66-66/67, are given in Eckhel, Doctr. Num. iii. 281 sq.; Mionnet, v. 169; Supplem. viii. 131. — During his governorship in May A.D. 66, the month Artemisios (Wars of the Jews, ii. 14. 4), the Jewish war broke out of which Cestius Gallus lived only to see the opening campaign. For he died in the winter of A.D. 66-67 "by accident or through fatigue" (fato aut taedio occidit, Tacitus, History, v. 10).

C. Licinius Mucianus, A.D. 67-69

When Palestine was separated from Syria and transferred to Vespasian as a distinct province, Syria was assigned to Licinius Mucianus. Josephus speaks of him in A.D. 67 when referring to the siege of Gamala (Wars of the Jews, iv. 1. 5), and in A.D. 69 when referring to the election of Vespasian as emperor (Wars of the Jews, iv. 10. 5-6). Compare also, Tacitus, History, i. 10; Josephus, Antiq. xii. 3. 1. Coins with his name of the time of Galba (9th June A.D. 68-15th January A.D. 69) and of Otho (15th January-16th April A.D. 69) are given in Eckhel, Doctr. Num. iii. 282; Mionuet, v. 169; Suppl. viii. 131. — In the autumn of A.D. 69, in order to oppose Vitellius, he brought an army from Syria to Rome (Josephus, Wars of the Jews, iv. 11. 1; Tacitus, History, ii. 82 sq.; Suetonius, Vespasian, 6; Dio Cassius, lxv. 9), where he did not, however, arrive until after the death of Vitellius, which occurred on 20th December A.D. 69. He had then for a long time the supreme power in his hands (Josephus, Wars of the Jews, iv. 11. 4; Tacitus, History, iv. 11, 39, 49, 80; Dio Cassius, lxv. 22, lxvi. 2). — Compare in regard to him also, Borghesi, Oeuvres, iv. 345-353; Pauly's Real-Encyclopaedie, iv. 1069 f.; L. Brunn, De C. Licinio Muciano, Lips. 1870; Teuffel, History of Roman Literature, § 314. 1; Henzen, Acta fratrum Arvalium, Index, p. 190 sq.; Liebenam, Forschungen zur Verwaltungsgeschichte, i. 257 f.

The later governors of Syria do not come within the range of our investigation, since from this time forth Palestine continued to be a separate province from. Syria. For the governors of Palestine from the time of Vespasian to Hadrian, see § 21.

HYRCANUS II, B.C. 63–40.

REBELLION OF ANTIPATER AND HIS SONS PHASAEL AND HEROD

SOURCES

JOSEPHUS, Antiq. xiv. 5–13; Wars of the Jews, i. 8–13. ZONARAS, Annales, v. 7–9 (abstract of Josephus).

LITERATURE

EWALD, History of Israel, v. 394–412.

GRÄTZ, Geschichte der Juden, iii., 4 Aufl. pp. 167–189.

HITZIG, Geschichte des Volkes Israel, ii. 500–523.

STANLEY, History of the Jewish Church, vol. iii. 408–421.

SCHNECKENBURGER, Neutestamentliche Zeitgeschichte, pp. 166–173.

HAUSRATH, Neutestamentliche Zeitgeschichte, 2 Aufl. i. pp. 179–203.

LEWIN, Fasti sacri, pp. 8–54.

OWING to the meagreness of the sources, it is difficult to give an exact account of the position which Palestine at this time occupied in reference to the Romans. This much is certain, that it was tributary (Josephus, Antiq. xiv. 4. 4; Wars of the Jews, i. 7. 6), and lay under the general oversight of the Roman governor of Syria. But the question is, whether it was immediately incorporated or not with the province of Syria. In favour of the latter supposition might be alleged the statement of Josephus, that by the enactment of Gabinius, who divided Palestine into five sections, the country was now freed from monarchical rule: ἀσμένως δὲ τῆς ἐξ ἑνὸς ἐπικρατείας ἐλευθερωθέντες τὸ λοιπὸν ἀριστοκρατίᾳ διῳκοῦντο (Wars of the Jews, i. 8. 5). Hyrcanus therefore had stood at the head of the government of the country, and was subordinate only to the supervision of the Roman governor.

After the campaign of Pompey there followed for Palestine some years of peace. Scaurus as well as his two successors, Marcius Philippus and Lentulus Marcellinus, had still indeed some skirmishes with the Arabians. But these had no influence upon the fortunes of Palestine. In A.D. 57, however, Aristobulus' son Alexander, who had escaped from his keepers on his way to Rome, sought to secure to himself the government of Palestine. He succeeded in collecting an army of 10,000 heavy-armed soldiers and 1500 horsemen, and got into his power the fortresses of the Alexandrium, Hyrcania, and Machaerus. Gabinius, who had just then arrived as proconsul in Syria, sent against him, first of all, his lieutenant M. Antonius, afterwards the well-known triumvir, and soon followed with the main body of his troops. Alexander was defeated in an engagement near Jerusalem, and withdrew into the stronghold of the Alexandrium. Here he was besieged by Gabinius, and was compelled to surrender; but it would seem that, on condition of his yielding up the fortresses which were m his possession, he was allowed his

freedom. At this time, too, Gabinius made an important change in the political relations of Palestine. He assigned to Hyrcanus only the care of the temple, but took from him the political administration; for he divided the country into five districts (σύνοδοι, συνέδρια), with Jerusalem, Gazara, Amathus, Jericho, and Sepphoris as their capitals. What is to be understood by those five σύνοδοι or συνέδρια is not altogether clear. They may be regarded as either customs, districts, or circuits, making the jurisdiction of law courts (conventus juridici). The term συντελεῖν (Wars of the Jews, i. 8. 5: οἳ δ' ἵνα συντελῶσιν εἰς Ἀμαθοῦντα) favours the former view; the term σύνοδοι (Wars of the Jews, i. 8. 5) favours the latter. Possibly the one view may not exclude the other. At least this measure of Gabinius took away the remnant of political independence which Palestine had hitherto enjoyed. Pompey having already deprived Hyrcanus of the title of king, the next step was to strip him of all political prerogatives and to restrict him to his priestly functions. The country was parted into five divisions, which were "delivered" from the dominion of Hyrcanus, i.e. were incorporated in the province of Syria. This arrangement was not indeed of long duration. By the ordinances of Caesar it was again wholly set aside.

Soon after this, in A.D. 56, the country was anew involved in a revolution by Aristobulus and his son Antigonus, who had both escaped from their Roman imprisonment. Aristobulus so completely failed to learn caution from the abortive attempt of his son Alexander, that he made himself a similar endeavour in that direction in which his son had failed. But he himself had no better fortune. A detachment of the Roman army attacked him, and the little band which he had gathered was, without much difficulty, driven across the Jordan. He attempted to defend himself in Machaerus; but was obliged after a two years' siege to yield, and was sent again as a prisoner to Rome. His children, however, were set at liberty by the senate. Just then Gabinius, against the will of the senate, undertook the Egyptian campaign, in order to set up Ptolemy Auletes again as king (see above, p. 331). When he returned from thence, in A.D. 55, he had once again to deal with a revolt in Judea. Alexander had made a fresh attempt to secure the sovereignty, and had won over to his side at least a part of the people. His proceedings, however, were also this time again brought to a speedy end.

In A.D. 54 the triumvir, M. Licinius Crassus, went to Syria as proconsul in place of Gabinius. While Gabinius had already sorely oppressed the country by his exactions, Crassus at once began to indulge in open robbery. Pompey, upon the taking of the temple, had left its rich treasures untouched. Crassus now laid hold for himself of all these: in pure gold alone, 2000 talents; of other articles of value, 8000 talents. Palestine was soon indeed delivered from his rapacity, for he met his death in A.D. 53 in the war against the Parthians.

During the period B.C. 53–51 C. Cassius Longinus, the quaestor of Crassus, held the supreme authority in Syria. He had not only to be on his guard against the Parthians, but also to suppress the revolutionary elements that were still always present in Palestine. Aristobulus, indeed, was detained in his Roman imprisonment, and his sons had for the time no wish to risk anew sharing his fate. But a certain Pitholaus now undertook to play their role, and gathered together the malcontents. He did not indeed succeed in his aim any better than those who had tried before. For the final issue of his undertaking was this, that he himself was slain, and 30,000 of the disturbers of the peace were sold as slaves.

With the year B.C. 49 begins the period of the civil wars, disastrous for Italy as well as for the provinces, but peculiarly disastrous for the provinces, inasmuch as they were obliged to find the enormous sums which the contesting parties required for carrying on their operations. During these twenty years, from Caesar's crossing the Rubicon down to the death of Antony, B.C. 49–30, the whole Roman history was reflected in the history of Syria and also in that of Palestine.

Every change and turn in the Roman history was answered by a corresponding movement in Syrian history, and during this short period Syria and Palestine changed sides and owned new masters no less than four times.

When, in the beginning of the year B.C. 49, Pompey and the party of the senate had fled from Italy, and Caesar had established himself in Rome, Caesar and his friends wished to make use of the prisoner Aristobulus for their own ends. And so they released him from prison and gave him two legions, in order that with these he might fight in Syria against the party of Pompey. But the adherents of Pompey who still remained in Rome put a stop to the enterprise by ridding themselves of Aristobulus by poison. At the same time also one of Aristobulus' sons, Alexander, fell a victim to the party strifes of the civil war. He too had made his appearance as an adherent of Caesar, and so he was now, at the express command of Pompey, beheaded at Antioch by Q. Metellus Scipio, Pompey's father-in-law, who was then proconsul for Syria (see above, p. 334).

After the battle of Pharsalia, on 9th August B.C. 48, and Pompey's death, on 28th September of the same year, Hyrcanus and his old friend Antipater immediately attached themselves to Caesar's party. They clearly perceived that their safety depended wholly upon his grace, and therefore they hastened to prove their capacity for serving him. Caesar, after his landing in Egypt, in October B.C. 48, had become involved in a war with King Ptolemy. Mithridates started from Pergamum in the spring of B.C. 47 to go into Egypt with an auxiliary force. When he encountered obstacles at Pelusium, Antipater went to his help, at the command of Hyrcanus, with 3000 Jewish troops, which had been indeed collected for this very purpose, and he had also arranged that the neighbouring powers should contribute auxiliaries. With these Jewish troops Antipater rendered most important service to Mithridates, not merely in the capture of Pelusium, but also throughout the whole of the Egyptian campaign. Not less important was the aid rendered by Hyrcanus in seeing to it that the Egyptian Jews ranged themselves upon Caesar's side.

When, therefore, Caesar, at the conclusion of the Alexandrian war, in the summer of B.C. 47, went to Syria and rewarded, by proofs of his clemency, the governing families that had favoured him, Hyrcanus and Antipater were treated in the most generous manner. Antigonus indeed appeared before Caesar as the only remaining son of Arietobulus, complained that Hyrcanus and Antipater had violently thrust themselves forward, and sought to show that his claims were older and better. But Caesar estimated the trustworthiness and usefulness of Hyrcanus and Antipater more highly than the professions of Antigonus, ignored the claims of the latter, and showed favour exclusively to the other two. Even before the intervention of Antigonus, Hyrcanus seems to have been established as high priest, and upon Antipater the right of Roman citizenship and immunity from tribute had been conferred. Hyrcanus was now appointed ἐθνάρχης of the Jews, i.e. he was reinstated in the political authority that had been taken from him by Gabinius; but Antipater was made procurator, ἐπίτροπος, of Judea, and so confirmed in the authority with which he had been already invested. At the same time permission was given to rebuild the walls of Jerusalem.

We obtain further details with respect to the proceedings of Caesar from documents communicated by Josephus, Antiq. xiv. 10. 2–10, which. however, are so slight and fragmentary that in regard to many particulars no certain conclusion can be reached. This, at least, is unquestionable, that the letter of Caesar to the Sidonians, Antiq. xiv. 10. 2, was written in the year B.C. 47, and that the formal decree of Caesar appointing Hyrcanus was issued in that same year. According to this document, Hyrcanus was appointed hereditary ἐθνάρχης and

ἀρχιερεύς of the Jews, with all the rights and privileges which belonged to him as high priest according to the Jewish law, and jurisdiction in all Jewish matters was conceded to the Jews. Hyrcanus also, for himself and for his children, was declared the "confederate" of the Romans, and it was stipulated that the Roman troops should not seek winter quarters in his territory, nor should levies of money be exacted. It is uncertain whether some of .the other documents belong to this same year or not, but it is certain that Hyrcanus, not long before Caesar's death, somewhere about the end of the year B.C. 45, sent an embassy to Rome, which procured a decree of senate granting new concessions to the Jews. The beginning of this decree of senate, under Caesar's fourth dictatorship and fifteenth consulship, i.e. B.C. 44, is given in Josephus, Antiq. xiv. 10. 7. Its date is probably correctly preserved in Antiq. xiv. 10. 10: πρὸ πέντε εἰδῶν Φεβρουαρίων i.e. 9th February. As it was not immediately put down in the tables of the treasury, a new decree of senate was passed, after Caesar's death, during the consulship of Antony and Dolabella, τῇ πρὸ τριῶν εἰδῶν Ἀπριλλίων i.e. 11th April B.C. 44, by which the recording of the former decree of the senate in the tables of the treasury was now ordered (Antiq. xiv. 10. 9–10). Since the new decree is of a purely formal character, we gain no information from it regarding the contents of the claims conceded to the Jews. Also, the fragment of the earlier decree preserved in Antiq. xiv. 10. 7 contains only the formal introduction. It is extremely probable, however, that other portions of it are contained among the fragments in Josephus, Antiq. xiv. 10. 3–6. Yet it is just here that the difficulties of the investigation begin. The question arises as to what pieces belong to the decree of senate of B.C. 44 and what to former years, such as B.C. 47 or other years. Owing to the corruptness of the text, no certain result can ever be reached. The chief portion of the passage peculiarly rich in material, Antiq. xiv. 10. 6, belongs most probably to B.C. 44. Among the concessions there said to have been secured to the Jews, the most important are these: that Joppa, "which the Jews had originally, when they made a league of friendship with the Romans," was made over to them; that also the villages in the great plain, which they had previously possessed, should be restored to them; and that, finally, also still other places "which belonged to the kings of Syria and Phoenicia, the confederates of the Romans," should now be given to them. It may be assumed that these were merely possessions that had been taken away from them by Pompey. Of the places thus restored, Joppa, as affording a harbour, was the most important.

The Jews also, through Caesar's favour, obtained important privileges beyond the limits of Palestine. The Alexandrian Jews gained protection by having the privilege of Roman citizenship conferred upon them; and the Jews of Asia Minor were guaranteed the undisturbed exercise of their religion. It was in accordance with the general course of Caesar's policy to keep the provincials contented, so as to secure the interests of the empire. But by none of the foreign peoples was so great a lamentation made over his death as by the Jews.

The weak Hyrcanus, who had been installed in Palestine as "Ethnarch" of the Jews, held the government only in name. This was exercised in reality by the crafty and active Antipater. He now even appointed his two sons, Phasaël and Herod, governors, στρατηγοί, the one in Jerusalem and the other in Galilee. Herod, whom we meet with here for the first time, was then a young man twenty-five years of age. But even as early as this he gave proofs of that energy which brought him afterwards to the throne. In Galilee a robber chief named Hezekiah, with his numerous band, made the country insecure. Herod gained possession of his person, and had him executed along with many of his followers. They were little accustomed in Jerusalem with such summary procedure. The aristocracy of that city regarded Herod's conduct as an infringement of the privileges of the Sanhedrim, to which tribunal alone it belonged to pass a death sentence; and they therefore insisted that Hyrcanus would call young Herod to answer for

what he had done. Hyrcanus yielded to their request, and summoned Herod before the Sanhedrim at Jerusalem. Herod indeed appeared, not, however, as became an accused person, in mourning garments, but decked in purple, and attended by a bodyguard. When he thus entered the presence of the Sanhedrim, complaints were hushed, and he would undoubtedly have been exculpated, had not the celebrated Pharisee Sameas (Shemaiah ?) arisen and aroused the conscience of his colleagues. They were now disposed to insist upon their prerogatives and condemn Herod. But Hyrcanus had received orders from Sextus Caesar, governor of Syria, to secure Herod's acquittal. When he therefore perceived that things were taking a dangerous turn, he suspended the sitting, and advised Herod to withdraw secretly from the city. Herod did so; but he soon returned with an army against Jerusalem in order to avenge himself for the insult that had been given him. Only the most urgent representations of his father Antipater succeeded in appeasing his wrath, and restraining him from open violence. He then returned to Galilee, comforting himself with the reflection that he had at least given an exhibition of his power, and put a wholesome terror upon his opponents. — During this conflict with the Sanhedrim Herod was appointed, by Sextus Caesar, governor of Coele-Syria, στρατηγὸς τῆς Κοίλης Συρίας.

All this happened in B.C. 47, or in the beginning of B.C. 46. In the spring of B.C. 46, while Caesar had to be away fighting against the adherents of Pompey in Africa, one of Pompey's party, Caecilius Bassus, succeeded in making himself master of Syria by getting Sextus Caesar put out of the way by the hand of an assassin. He was afterwards besieged in Apamea by the Caesarian party, under the command of C. Antistius Vetus, in the autumn of B.C. 45 (see above, p. 336). To the forces of Vetus were also added the troops of Antipater, which, as a new proof of his serviceableness to Caesar, he had sent to the aid of the Caesarian party. The struggle of the two parties meanwhile continued without yielding any decisive result; and even the new governor, L. Statius Murcus, who arrived in Syria in the beginning of B.C. 44, and was supported by Marcius Crispus, the governor of Bithynia, obtained no decided advantage over Caecilius Bassus.

Meanwhile, on the 15th March B.C. 44, Caesar was murdered. Marc Antony resolved to avenge his death and continue his work. And it was only the fact that just then the fortunes of the party were in a rather backgoing condition that prevented the conspirators from also taking immediate steps in their own interest. It was only after Antony had proceeded against them in an openly hostile manner that the leaders of the conspiracy went to the East in order to collect their forces there: M. Brutus to Macedonia, L. Cassius to Syria. When Cassius, in the end of the year B.C. 44, arrived in Syria, Caecilius Bassus was still besieged by Statius Murcus and Marcius Crispus in Apamea. Although Murcus and Crispus had hitherto belonged to Caesar's party, they now placed their army at the service of Cassius, and Statius Murcus even offered his own personal aid. The legion of Caecilius Bassus also went over to Cassius. Thus did Cassius become master of Syria, and gained possession of a considerable fighting force. But for the support of the large and now further increasing army immense sums of money were necessary. And to this even the small Jewish land must contribute its share. It was laid by him under an arrestment of 700 talents, in the collection of which Antipater and his son Herod showed themselves particularly useful. For, with the same zeal with which they had once secured to themselves Caesar's favour, they now sought to win the goodwill of Cassius. How useful this zeal was, some frightful examples in Judea itself showed. The inhabitants of the towns of Gophna, Emmaus, Lydda, and Thamna, because they could not contribute their share, were sold by Cassius as slaves. But young Herod, as a reward for services rendered, was appointed by Cassius, as he had previously been by Sextus Caesar, governor (στρατηγός) of Coele-Syria.

About this time, B.C. 43, Antipater became the victim of personal enmity. A certain Malichus endeavoured, just as Antipater had done, to gain an influential position in Judea. But Antipater, more than any one else, stood in the way of his realizing his ambition. He must therefore, if he was to gain his end, rid himself of that man. By bribery he won over the cupbearer of Hyrcanus, who put Antipater to death by poison as he was one day dining with Hyrcanus.

Herod undertook to avenge the death of his father. While, therefore, Malichus was busying himself in the endeavour to carry out his ambitious plans and secure to himself the government of Judea, he was murdered in the neighbourhood of Tyre by hired assassins, whom Herod, with the connivance of Cassius, had sent.

After Cassius had departed from Syria, in B.C. 42, still harder fortunes befell the province. Cassius had indeed wrung from it the most exorbitant sums, but now that the province was left to itself affairs fell into such a state of utter anarchy that there was no law but the will of the stronger. During this period Antigonus also made an attempt, with the assistance of Ptolemy the son of Mennaeus of Chalcis, to secure the sovereignty of Palestine. Favoured by fate and fortune, Herod indeed frustrated this attempt, but he was not able to prevent Marion, tyrant of Tyre, from snatching to himself certain portions of Galilean territory.

A new crisis arose in Palestine, and especially in the fortunes of the two Idumeans Phasael and Herod, when, late in autumn of the year B.C. 42, Brutus and Cassius were defeated at Philippi by Antony and Octavian. With this one stroke all Asia fell into the hands of Antony. The situation was all the more critical for Phasael and Herod, after an embassy of the Jewish nobility appeared before Antony in Bithynia about the beginning of B.C. 41, and made complaints against these two princes. Yet Herod succeeded by personal explanations in neutralizing for the time being the effect of these charges. Soon after this, while Antony lingered in Ephesus, an embassy from Hyrcanus appeared before him asking that Antony should give orders for the emancipation of the Jews sold into slavery by Cassius, and for the restoration of the places that had been conquered by the Tyrians. Antony readily assumed the role of the protector of all rights and privileges, and issued the orders prayed for, with violent denunciation of the lawless proceedings of Cassius. — Some time afterwards, in the autumn of B.C. 41, when Antony had gone to Antioch, the Jewish nobles renewed their charges against Phasael and Herod. But neither at this time did they lead to any result. Antony, when he was serving in Syria under Gabinius in B.C. 57-55, had been for many years the intimate friend of Antipater. That friendship he did not now forget. And since, besides, Hyrcanus, who had also gone to Antioch, gave a favourable account of the two brothers, Antony appointed Phasael and Herod tetrarchs of the country of the Jews. Hyrcanus was then stripped of his political authority. He did not indeed mourn over the loss, for he had for a long time possessed political authority only in name.

The period of Antony's residence in Syria was for the province a time of sore oppression. His luxurious style of living consumed enormous sums of money, and these the provinces were required to provide. Thus, wherever Antony went exorbitant taxes were invariably imposed; and Palestine was not by any means allowed to escape.

In the year B.C. 40, while Antony was during part of the time held in thrall by Cleopatra in Egypt, and during another part occupied with the affairs of Italy, the great invasion of the Parthians occurred, who overran all Further Asia with their wild hordes. And in consequence of this occurrence Antigonus succeeded, for a while at least, in securing the end for which he had been striving.

As the Parthians under Pacorus and Barzapharnes, the former the son of King Orodes, the latter a Parthian satrap, had already occupied Northern Syria, Antigonus succeeded in persuading them, by great promises, to aid him in securing possession of the Jewish throne. Pacorus marched along to the Phoenician coast, Barzapharnes advanced into the interior of the country toward the south. Pacorus sent to Jerusalem a detachment under the leadership of the king's cupbearer, whose name was also Pacorus. Before that company arrived at the city, Antigonus had already succeeded in gathering around him a company of adherents from among the Jews, and had with it advanced upon Jerusalem, where the battle was waged daily between him on the one hand and Phasael and Herod on the other. In the meantime the Parthian troops under Pacorus arrived. The Parthian gave out that he desired to settle terms of peace, and demanded of Phasael that he should go to the camp of Barzapharnes in order that he might put an end to this strife. Although Herod earnestly warned his brother, Phasael walked into the snare, and went along with Hyrcanus and Pacorus, the cupbearer, to the camp of Barzapharnes. A small detachment of Parthian horsemen remained behind in Jerusalem. In the Parthian camp the mask was soon thrown aside, and the two princes, Phasael and Hyrcanus, were put in irons. When Herod was told of this, not being strong enough to offer open opposition, he resolved to escape from Jerusalem by flight. Without attracting the attention of the Parthians, he had the female members of his family and the children carried out of the city and brought to the fortress of Masada, which he put under the charge of his brother Joseph. Meanwhile, on the spot where at a later period he built the fortress Herodium, he had to fight with the Jews, who were still hostile to him. He was able, however, successfully to repel their attack. After he had thus secured all belonging to him in a stronghold, he continued his flight farther southward, and went first of all to Petra in Arabia.

Their friendship for Antigonus did not restrain the Parthians from plundering the country round about the capital. Phasael and Hyrcanus were now placed at the disposal of Antigonus. The ears of Hyrcanus were cut off, so that he might no longer be eligible for the office of high priest. Phasael, on the contrary, escaped the hands of his enemies by dashing his head upon a rock after he had received the joyful tidings of the fortunate flight of his brother.

Afterwards the Parthians carried away Hyrcanus with them as a prisoner, and set up Antigonus as king.

ANTIGONUS, B.C. 40–37

SOURCES

JOSEPHUS, Antiq. xiv. 14–16; Wars of the Jews, i. 14–18. 3. ZONARAS, Annales, v. 10–11 (abstract from Josephus).

LITERATURE

EWALD, History of Israel, v. 411–416.

STANLEY, Jewish Church, iii. 419–423.

GRÄTZ, Geschichte der Juden, iii., 4 Aufl. pp. 190–197.

HITZIG, Geschichte des Volkes Israel, ii. 523–533.

SCHNECKENBURGER, Zeitgeschichte, pp. 173–175.

HAUSRATH, Zeitgeschichte, 2 Aufl. i. 200–210.

LEWIN, Fasti sacri, pp. 52–62.

BÜRCKLEIN, Quellen und Chronologie der römisch-parthischen Feldzüge in den Jahren 713–718 d. St. Dissertat. 1879.

ANTIGONUS, or, as he was called according to the evidence of the coins by his Hebrew name, Mattathias, had thus by the help of the Parthians reached that position after which his father and brother had vainly striven. After the example of his forefathers, from the time of Aristobulus I., he assumed the rank and title of “king” and “high priest” (on the coins: ΒΑΧΙΛΕΩΧ ΑΝΤΙΓΟΝΟΥ, מתתיה הכהן הגדל).

The hopes of Herod rested simply and wholly on Roman aid. Without going to Petra — for the Arabian prince Malchus had forbidden him to visit his country — he proceeded to Alexandria, and thence took ship for Rome, although already the autumn storms had begun. After passing through various dangers, he managed to reach Rome by Rhodes and Brundusium, and immediately upon his arrival he laid his sad complaint before Antony. Herod knew how to win favour, whenever that had to be gained, by means of money. And so it happened that he, after having secured also the goodwill of Octavian, was declared at a formal session of the senate to be king of Judea. The appointment was celebrated by a sacrifice at the capitol and a banquet by Antony.

From the appointment to the actual possession of the office was now indeed a longer and a more difficult step. For the time being the Parthians, and their protégé Antigonus, still maintained their authority in the country. The Parthians were indeed driven out of Syria in B.C. 39 by Ventidius, the legate of Antony (see above, p. 341). But from Antigonus, Ventidius only exacted a heavy tribute, and left him otherwise undisturbed. And Silo also, his lieutenant, pursued a similar policy after the departure of Ventidius.

This was the state of matters when Herod, in B.C. 39, landed at Ptolemais. He quickly collected an army; and as now Ventidius and Silo, at the command of Antony, supported him, he soon made progress. First of all Joppa fell into his hands. Then also he gained possession of Masada, where his relatives had hitherto been besieged. As he succeeded, the number of his adherents increased, and he could even venture to go to Jerusalem and lay siege to it. He made nothing, however, of this attempt at the time, for the Roman troops of Silo, which were to have supported him, assumed a stubborn and defiant attitude, and insisted upon withdrawing into winter quarters.

In the spring of the year B.C. 38, the Parthians renewed the attack upon Syria. While thus Ventidius and Silo had to go forth to fight against them, Herod sought to subdue the country wholly under him, and to rescue it out of the hands of many adventurers. Vast bands of brigands concealed themselves, especially among the inaccessible caverns in the mountain gorges of Galilee. But even of these Herod knew how to gain possession, for he let down his soldiers in large chests (λάρνακες) from the lofty rocky peak, and thus secured for them an entrance into the caves.

Meanwhile, however, the Parthians were conquered by Ventidius on 9th June B.C. 38. And that general then turned his attention against Antiochus of Commagene, and laid siege to him in his capital of Samosata. During the siege Antony himself arrived at Samosata. Herod could not let this opportunity escape of speaking to his patron; for he had good grounds for complaining of the way in which support had been withheld from him. He therefore now proceeded to Samosata in order to pay his respects to Antony. He received him very graciously, and as the surrender of Samosata soon afterwards took place, Antony instructed Sosius, the successor of Ventidius, to afford efficient assistance to Herod.

In Palestine, during the absence of Herod, matters were in a bad way. Joseph, the brother of Herod, to whom he had in the meantime transferred the chief command, had been attacked by an army of Antigonus, and was himself slain in the battle, and Antigonus had ordered his head to be struck off. In consequence of these events, the Galileans had seized the opportunity to rise again against Herod, and had drowned his adherents in the lake of Gennesareth.

A full report of all these proceedings reached Herod at Antioch, and he now hastened to avenge the death of his brother. Galilee was without difficulty reconquered. At Jericho he encountered the army of Antigonus, but did not, it would seem, venture upon any decisive engagement It was only when Antigonus divided his forces, and sent a portion of his troops under Pappus to Samaria, that Herod courted a regular contest. Pappus and Herod came together near Isana. The first attack was made by Pappus, but he was utterly defeated by Herod, and driven into the city, where all who had not managed to save themselves by flight were ruthlessly cut down. Pappus himself there met his death. With the exception of the capital, all Palestine thereby fell into the hands of Herod. Only the coming on of winter hindered him from beginning immediately the siege of Jerusalem.

In the spring of B.C. 37, so soon as the season of the year admitted of it, Herod laid siege to the capital, and began by the erection of military engines of assault. When these were ready for operating, he left the army for a little while and went to Samaria, in order there to celebrate his marriage with Mariamme, a granddaughter of Hyrcanus, to whom he had been engaged for five years. This engagement had been entered into in B.C. 42 (Antiq. xiv. 12. 1; Wars of the Jews, i. 12. 3).

After the celebration of the marriage he returned again to the camp. Sosius also now appeared before Jerusalem with a great army; and Herod and Sosius made a joint attack upon the city. They made their onslaught, as Pompey had done, from the north. On this side mighty ramparts were raised, and against these the battering-rams began to play. Forty days after the beginning of these operations, the first rampart was taken; after fifteen days more the second also fell. But the inner court of the temple and the upper city were always still in the hands of the besieged. At last these too were stormed, and the besiegers now went on murdering in the city all whom they could lay their hands upon. Antigonus himself fell at the feet of Sosius and entreated of him mercy. The Roman looked upon him with scorn, called him Antigone, and had him bound in fetters. It was now Herod's greatest care to rid himself as soon as possible of his Roman friends. For the murdering and plundering that was going on in what was now again his capital could not possibly be pleasing to him. By means of rich presents he succeeded at last in inducing Sosius and his troops to take their departure.

In this way was Herod, almost three years after his appointment, enabled to enter on the actual possession of his sovereignty. Antigonus was carried away by Sosius to Antioch, and there, in accordance with the wish of Herod, he was by Antony's orders led to the block. It was the first time that the Romans had executed such a sentence on a king.

The rule of the Asmonean dynasty was thus brought to an end.

HEROD THE GREAT, B.C. 37–4

SOURCES

JOSEPHUS, Antiq. xv., xvi., xvii. 1–8; Wars of the Jews, i. 18–33. ZONARAS, Annales, v. 12–26 (summary of Josephus).

On the non-extant works of Herod, Ptolemy, Nicolas of Damascus, and Justus of Tiberias, see above, pp. 56–69.

The Rabbinical traditions are given in DERENBOURG, Essai sur l'histoire et la géographie de la Palestine (1867), pp. 149–165.

The Coins are treated of in the most complete manner by MADDEN, Coins of the Jews (1881), pp. 105–114.

LITERATURE

EWALD, History of Israel, v. 417–449.

STANLEY, Lectures on the Jewish Church, iii. 412–448.

GEIKIE, The Life and Words of Christ, 7th ed., 2 vols., London 1879, vol. i. pp. 33–63.

FARRAR, Life of Christ, 18th ed., London, 2 vols., vol. i. pp. 11–48.

HAUSRATH, History of New Testament Times, i. 207–ii. 57.

LEWIN, Fasti sacri; or a Key to the Chronology of the New Testament, 1865, pp. 62–127.

VICKERS, The History of Herod, or another look at a man emerging from twenty centuries of calumny. London 1885.

GRÄTZ, Geschichte des Juden, iii., 4 Aufl. pp. 197–245.

HITZIG, Geschichte des Volkes Israel, ii. 534–559.

SCHNECKENBURGER, Zeitgeschichte, pp. 175–200.

WINER, Realwörterbuch, i. 481–483.

ARNOLD in Herzog's Real-Encyclopaedie, 1 Aufl. vi. 8–14.

KEIM, Jesus of Nazara, i. 233–253. In Schenkel's Bibellexicon, iii. 27–38.

VAN DER CHIJS, Dissertatio chronologico-historica de Herode Mayno, Judaeorum rege. Lugd. Bat. 1855.

DE SAULCY, Histoire d'Hérode, roi des Juifs. Paris 1867.

SIEFFERT in Herzog's Real-Encyclopaedie, 2 Aufl. vi. 47-55

REUSS, Geschichte der heiligen Schriften A.T.'s 1881, § 541-545.

MOMMSEN, Römische Geschichte, v. 503-507.

KELLNER, Die Regierungszeit des Herodes und ihre Dauer (Katholik, 1867, zweite Hälfte, pp. 64-82, 166-182).

MENKE'S Bibelatlas, Sheet iv. Map of "Judea and Phoenicia after the arrangement of M. Antony," and Sheet v. Map of "Judea and neighbouring countries at the time of the birth of Christ."

CHRONOLOGICAL SUMMARY.

(B.C.)

37 – Conquest of Jerusalem, some time in July.

Executions, Josephus, Antiq. xv. 1. 2; compare xiv. 9. 4, fin.; Wars of the Jews, i. 18. 4.

36 – Hyrcanus II. returns from the Parthian imprisonment, Antiq. xv. 2. 1-4.

35 – Beginning of the year: Aristobulus III., brother of Mariamme, is at the instigation of his mother Alexandra nominated high priest by Herod, Antiq. xv. 2. 5-7, 3. 1.

End of the year: Aristobulus III. is by Herod's order, soon after the Feast of Tabernacles, drowned in the bath at Jericho, τὴν ἀρχιερωσύνην κατασχὼν ἐνιαυτόν, Antiq. xv. 3. 3 Wars of the Jews, i. 22. 2.

34 – Herod is summoned by Antony to Laodicea to answer for the death of Aristobulus, but is dismissed with Antony's favour, Antiq. xv. 3. 5 and 8. 9.

34 – Joseph, the husband of Herod's sister Salome, is executed, Antiq. xv. 3. 9.

Antony presents to Cleopatra the Phoenician coasts, with the exception of Tyre and Sidon, and portions of Arabia and Judea; the region around Jericho being specially excepted, Antiq. xv. 4. 1-2; Wars of the Jews, i. 18. 5.

Cleopatra with Herod in Jerusalem, Antiq. xv. 4. 2; Wars of the Jews, i. 18. 5.

32 – War of Herod with the Arabians, after the out-break of hostilities between Antony and Octavian, Antiq. xv. 5. 1; Wars of the Jews, i. 19. 1-3.

Earthquake in Palestine, Antiq. xv. 5. 2; Wars of the Jews, i. 19. 3: κατ' ἔτος μὲν τῆς βασιλείας ἕβδομον, ἀκμάζοντος δὲ τοῦ περὶ Ἄκτιον πολέμου, ἀρχομένου ἔαρος.

32 – Herod conquers the Arabians, Antiq. xv. 5. 2-5; Wars of the Jews, i. 19. 3-6.

After the battle at Actium on 2nd September, Herod attached himself to the party of Augustus, for he supported Didius in the struggle with Antony's gladiators; compare Antiq. xv. 6. 7; Wars of

the Jews, i. 20. 2. Also above, p. 345.

30 – Spring: Hyrcanus II. executed, Antiq. xv. 6. 1-4; Wars of the Jews, i. 22. 1; πλείω μὲν ἢ ὀγδοήκοντα γεγονὼς ἐτύγχανεν ἔτη, Antiq. xv. 6. 3.

Herod visits Augustus at Rhodes, and is by him made king, Antiq. xv. 6. 5-7; Wars of the Jews, i. 20. 1-3.

He attaches himself to Augustus on his march to Egypt at Ptolemais, Antiq. xv. 6. 7; Wars of the Jews, i. 20. 3.

Autumn: Herod visits Augustus in Egypt, and gets Jericho back from him, as also Gadara, Hippo, Samaria, Gaza, Anthedon, Joppa, Straton's Tower, Antiq. xv. 7. 3; Wars of the Jews, i. 20. 3.

End of the year: he accompanies Augustus on his return from Egypt as far as Antioch. Antiq. xv. 7. 4.

29 – End of the year: Mariamme executed, Antiq. xv. 7. 4-6; Wars of the Jews, i. 22. 3-5 (Antiq. xv. 7. 4: ἥ τε ὑποψία τρεφομένη παρέτεινεν ἐνιαυτοῦ μῆκος, ἐξ οὗ παρὰ Καίσαρος Ἡρώδης ὑποστρέφει).

28? – Alexandra executed, Antiq. xv. 7. 8.

25 – Costobar, the second husband of Salome, and the sons of Babas, executed, Antiq. xv. 7. 10. The date is discovered from the statement of Salome: ὅτι διασώζοιντο παρ' αὐτῷ χρόνον ἐνιαυτῶν ἤδη δώδεκα, that is, after the overthrow of Jerusalem in B.C. 37.

? – The four years' contendings begun. Theatre and amphitheatre built in Jerusalem, Antiq. xv. 8. 1.

? – Conspiracy against Herod, Antiq. xv. 8. 3-4.

27 – Samaria rebuilt and named in honour of Augustus Sebaste, Antiq. xv. 8. 5; Wars of the Jews, i. 21. 2.

25 – Famine and pestilence (κατὰ τοῦτον μὲν οὖν τὸν ἐνιαυτόν, τρισκαιδέκατον ὄντα τῆς Ἡρώδου βασιλείας =B.C. 25-24, from Nisan to Nisan), Antiq. xv. 9. 1.

The famine continues also into the following year, B.C. 24-23, Antiq. xv. 9. 1, when Petronius was governor of Egypt, Antiq. xv. 9. 2.

25 – Herod sends 500 men as auxiliaries to the expedition of Aelius Gallus against Arabia, Antiq. xv. 9. 3; compare Strabo, xvi. 4. 23, p. 780: συμμάχων, ὧν ἦσαν Ἰουδαῖοι μὲν πεντακόσιοι. – The campaign ended in the following year, B.C. 24, disastrously, and without any appreciable results.

? – Herod builds for himself a royal palace, and marries the priest's daughter, Mariamme, Antiq. xv. 9. 3 (the name: Wars of the Jews, i. 28. 4, 29. 2, 30. 7).

The building of Caesarea is begun, Antiq. xv. 9. 6. Since the building after twelve years' labour

was completed in B.C. 10, the works must have been begun in B.C. 22.

23 – The sons of the first Mariamme, Alexander and Aristobulus, are sent to Rome for their education, Antiq. xv. 10. 1.

Augustus bestows upon Herod the provinces of Trachonitis, Batanaea, and Auranitis, Antiq. xv. 10. 1; Wars of the Jews, i. 20. 4 (μετὰ τὴν πρώτην Ἀκτιάδα).

22 – Herod visits Agrippa in Mytilene in Lesbos, Antiq. xv. 10. 2.

20 – Augustus comes to Syria and bestows upon Herod the territory of Zenodorus, Antiq. xv. 10. 3: ἤδη αὐτοῦ τῆς βασιλείας ἑπτακαιδεκάτου παρελθόντος ἔτους (the seventeenth year of Herod extended to 1st Nisan at the end of the year B.C. 20); Wars of the Jews, i. 20. 4: ἔτει δεκάτῳ πάλιν ἐλθὼν εἰς τὴν ἐπαρχίαν (also reckoned from the end of the year B.C. 30). – Dio Cassius, liv. 7, places the visit of Augustus to Syria in the consulship of M. Appuleius and P. Silius, A.U.C. 734. – Also Dio Cassius, liv. 9, makes mention of that presentation.

Pheroras appointed tetrarch of Perea, Antiq. xv. 10. 3; Wars of the Jews, i. 24. 5; compare i. 30. 3.

Herod remits one-third of the taxes, Antiq. xv. 10. 4.

Begins the temple building, Antiq. xv. 11. 1: ὀκτωκαιδεκάτου τῆς Ἡρώδου βασιλείας γεγονοτος ἐνιαυτοῦ=B.C. 20–19.

18 or 17 – Herod fetches his sons Alexander and Aristobulus home from Rome: the first Roman voyage of Herod, Antiq. xvi. 1. 2. – Since Herod met Augustus in Italy, and as Augustus did not return to Italy before the summer of B.C. 19, the journey of Herod must be placed at the earliest in the middle of the year B.C. 19, and at latest before the summer of B.C. 16, since Augustus was in Gaul from the summer of B.C. 16 till the spring of B.C. 13.

15 – Agrippa visits Herod in Jerusalem, Antiq. xvi. 2. 1 (Philo, Legat. ad Cajum, § 37, ed. Mangey, ii. 589). – He left Judea again before the end of the year: ἐπιβαίνοντος τοῦ χειμῶνος.

14 – Herod with Agrippa in Asia Minor, Antiq. xvi. 2. 2–5 (ἔαρος ἠπείγετο συντυχεῖν αὐτῷ). Compare also: Antiq. xii. 3. 2; Nicolas of Damascus in Müller, Fragment. Hist. Graecor. iii. 350.

After his return he remits a fourth part of the taxes, Antiq. xvi. 2. 5.

Beginning of quarrels with the sons of Mariamme, Alexander and Aristobulus. – Antipater brought to the court, Antiq. xvi. 3. 1–3; Wars of the Jews, i. 23. 1.

13 – Antipater is sent with Agrippa to Rome that he might be presented to the emperor, Antiq. xvi. 3. 3; Wars of the Jews, i. 23. 2. (On the date compare: Dio Cassius, liv. 28; Fischer, Zeittafeln, p. 408.)

12 – Herod goes with his sons Alexander and Aristobulus to Rome in order to accuse them before the emperor. Herod's second Roman journey. He meets the emperor at Aquileia. Augustus reconciles the discord. – Antipater returns back with them to Judea, Antiq. xvi. 4. 1–6; Wars of the Jews, i. 23. 3–5.

10 – The celebration of the completion of the building of Caesarea fell εἰς ὄγδοον καὶ εἰκοστὸν ἔτος τῆς ἀρχῆς=B.C. 10-9, Antiq. xvi. 5. 1; after it had been twelve years in building, Antiq. xv. 9. 6: ἐξετελέσθη δωδεκαετεῖ χρόνῳ (xvi. 5. 1 says: ten years, which is certainly wrong). On the building, compare also Wars of the Jews, i 21. 5-8.

? – The quarrel in Herod's family becomes more and more bitter and complicated, Antiq. xvi. 7. 2-6; Wars of the Jews, i. 24. 1-6.

? – Herod by torturing Alexander's dependants seeks to fasten guilt upon him; Alexander is cast into prison, Antiq. xvi. 8. 1-5; Wars of the Jews, i. 24. 7-8.

10? – Archelaus, king of Cappadocia, Alexander's father-in-law, effects once more a reconciliation between Herod and his sons, Antiq. xvi. 8. 6; Wars of the Jews, i. 25. 1-6.

Herod's third journey to Rome, Antiq. xvi. 9. 1.

9? – Campaign against the Arabians, Antiq. xvi. 9. 2.

8? – Herod in disfavour with Augustus, Antiq. xvi. 9. 3.

Herod having extorted by torture damaging statements against Aristobulus and Alexander, has them cast into prison, and accuses them to Augustus of high treason, Antiq. xvi. 10. 3-7; Wars of the Jews, i. 26. 3, 27. 1.

7? – Augustus, having again become favourable to Herod through the good offices of Nicolaus of Damascus (Antiq. xvi. 10. 8-9), gives him full power to deal with his sons according to his own discretion, Antiq. xvi. 11. 1; Wars of the Jews, i. 27. 1.

Alexander and Aristobulus condemned to death at Berytus, and strangled at Sebaste (Samaria), Antiq. xvi. 11. 2-7; Wars of the Jews, i. 27. 2-6.

Antipater all-powerful at Herod's court, Antiq. xvii. 1. 1, 2. 4; Wars of the Jews, i. 28. 1, 29. 1.

Executions of suspected Pharisees, Antiq. xvii. 2. 4.

6? – Antipater goes to Rome, Antiq. xvii. 3. 2; Wars of the Jews, i. 29. 2.

First testament or will of Herod, in which he named Antipater, or if he should die before himself, Herod, the son of the second Mariamme, his successor, Antiq. xvii. 3. 2; Wars of the Jews, i. 29. 2.

5 – Beginning of the year: Pheroras, Herod's brother, dies, Antiq. xvii. 3. 3; Wars of the Jews, i. 29. 4.

Herod discovers Antipater's hostile designs, Antiq. xvii. 4. 1-2; Wars of the Jews, i. 30. 1-7.

Antipater returns again to Judea, Antiq. xvii. 5. 1-2; Wars of the Jews, i. 31. 3-5; seven months after Herod had made that discovery, Antiq. xvii. 4. 3; Wars of the Jews, i. 31. 2.

Antipater on his trial; seeks in vain to justify himself, and is put in chains, Antiq. xvii. 5. 3-7; Wars of the Jews, i. 32. 1-5.

Herod reports the matter to the emperor, Antiq. xvii. 5. 7-8; Wars of the Jews, i 32. 5.

Herod is ill and makes his second testament, in which he appoints his youngest son Antipater his successor, Antiq. xvii. 6. 1; Wars of the Jews, i. 33. 5.

4 — Revolt of the people under the rabbis Judas and Matthias rigorously suppressed by Herod, Antiq. xvii 6. 2-4; Wars of the Jews, i. 33. 1-4.

Herod's illness becomes more severe, Antiq. xvii. 6. 5; Wars of the Jews, i. 33. 5.

Antipater, after leave had been obtained from the emperor, is executed, Antiq. xvii. 7; Wars of the Jews, i. 33. 7.

Herod again changes his will, for he appoints Archelaus king, and Antipas and Philip tetrarchs, Antiq. xvii. 8. 1; Wars of the Jews, i. 33. 7.

Herod dies five days after the execution of Antipater, βασιλεύσας μεθ' ὃ μὲν ἀνεῖλεν Ἀντίγονον, ἔτη τέσσαρα καὶ τριάκοντα, μεθ' ὃ δὲ ὑπὸ Ῥωμαίων ἀπεδέδεικτο, ἑπτὰ καὶ τριάκοντα, Antiq. xvii. 8. 1; Wars of the Jews, i. 33. 8.

Herod was born to be a ruler. Blessed by nature with a powerful body capable of enduring fatigue, he early inured himself to all manner of hardships. He was a skilful rider, and a bold, daring huntsman. He was feared in pugilistic encounters. His lance was unerring, and his arrow seldom missed its mark. He was practised in the art of war from his youth. Even in his twenty-fifth year he had won renown by his expedition against the robbers of Galilee. And then again, in the later period of his life, when over sixty years of age, he led in person the campaign against the Arabians. Rarely did success forsake him where he himself conducted any warlike undertaking.

His character was wild and passionate, harsh and unbending. Fine feelings and tender emotions were strange to him. Wherever his own interests seemed to demand it, he carried matters through with an iron hand, and scrupled not to shed streams of blood that he might reach his object Even his nearest relatives, even his most passionately loved wife, he could not spare, so soon as the wish arose in him.

He was, besides, cunning and adroit, and rich in devices. He understood thoroughly what measures should be taken to suit the circumstances of each changing day. Hard and unpitying as he was toward all who fell into his power, he was cringing and servile before those that were high in place. His glance was wide enough in its range, and his judgment sufficiently keen to perceive that in the circumstances of the world at that time nothing was to be reached except through the favour and by the help of the Romans. It was therefore an unvarying principle of his policy to hold firmly by the Roman alliance under all circumstances and at any cost. And he knew how to carry out this principle happily and cleverly.

Thus in his composition were linked together cunning and energy.

But these most conspicuous characteristics of his nature were set in motion by an insatiable ambition. All his devices and endeavours, all his plans and actions, were aimed directly toward the one end: the extending of his power, his dominion, his glory. This powerful lever kept all his powers in restless activity. Difficulties and hindrances were for him so much greater inducement

to put forth more strength. And this indefatigableness, this unwearied striving, continued to characterize him in extreme old age.

Only by a combination of all these characteristics was it possible to attain to such greatness, as he unquestionably reached, amid the perilous circumstances of his times.

His reign falls into three periods. The first period, which reaches from B.C. 37 to B.C. 25, is the period of the consolidation of his power. He has still to contend with many hostile powers, but goes forth at last from the conflict victorious over them all. The second period, from B.C. 25 to B.C. 13, is the period of his prosperity. The friendship of Rome has reached its highest point. Agrippa visits Herod in Jerusalem. Herod is repeatedly received by the emperor. It is at the same time the period of great buildings, preeminently the work of peace. The third period, from B.C. 13 to B.C. 4, is the period of domestic trouble. Everything else now passes out of view in presence of the disturbances in Herod's own house.

I

In the first period of his reign Herod had to contend with many powerful adversaries: the people, the nobles, the Asmonean family, and – Cleopatra.

The people, who were wholly in the hands of the Pharisees, tolerated only with deep aversion the dominion of the Idumean, half-Jew and friend of the Romans. It must have been Herod's first care to secure their obedience. By the utmost rigour he was able to reduce the rebellious elements; while he won the more pliant by bestowing on them favours and honours. Even of the Pharisees themselves two performed good services for Herod – Polio (Abtalion) and his scholar Sameas (Shemaia or Shammai). They saw in the dominion of the foreigner a judgment of God, which as such they were under obligation patiently to bear.

Among the nobles of Jerusalem there were numerous adherents of Antigonus. Herod delivered himself from them by executing forty-five of the most wealthy and the most prominent of their number. By confiscating their property he gained possession of abundance of money, which he employed so as to secure a firmer hold upon his patron Antony.

Of the members of the Asmonean family, it was particularly Alexandra, Herod's mother-in-law, the mother of Mariamme, who pursued him with unremitting enmity. The aged Hyrcanus had indeed returned from his Parthian exile; but he was before that time on good terms with Herod. And this good understanding still continued undisturbed. Since he could not, owing to his physical mutilation, enter again on the high priest's office, Herod chose as high priest an utterly unknown and insignificant Babylonian Jew of the saccrdotal family called Ananel. But even this was considered by Alexandra an infringement of Asmonean privileges. According to her view, it was her young son Aristobulus, brother of Mariamme, who alone was entitled to the high priest's office. She therefore set every wheel in motion in order to secure her rights. In particular, she applied to Cleopatra, urging her to exert her influence upon Antony, so as to force Herod to appoint Aristobulus high priest. Mariamme also pressed her husband with petitions in favour of her brother. Thus Herod at last felt himself obliged to set aside Ananel (which was unlawful, inasmuch as the high priest held his office for life), and in the beginning of B.C. 35 made young Aristobulus high priest, who was now only in his seventeenth year.

The peace, however, was not of long duration. Herod saw, and not without reason, in all the members of the Asmonean family his natural enemies. He could not rid himself of suspicion and

distrust, especially in regard to Alexandra, and he kept a careful watch upon her proceedings. This constant espionage Alexandra found intolerable, and thought to escape such supervision by flight. The coffins were already prepared in which she and her son Aristobulus were to have had themselves carried out of the city and thence to the sea-coast, so as to fly to Egypt to Cleopatra. But their secret was betrayed, and so their scheme proved futile, and thus it only served to increase the suspicions of Herod. – When, moreover, the people, at the next Feast of Tabernacles, in B.C. 35, made a public demonstration in favour of young Aristobulus while he officiated as high priest, Herod became thoroughly determined to rid himself, without delay, of Aristobulus as his most dangerous enemy and rival. Soon an opportunity for doing so was given him. Herod had been invited to Jericho to a feast by Alexandra. And after the meal, as young Aristobulus along with others was refreshing himself in the bath, he was pushed under the water as if in sport by some of those with him who had been bribed by Herod, and kept down so long that he was drowned. After the affair was done Herod pretended the most profound grief, and shed tears, which, however, nobody regarded as genuine.

Alexandra, who clearly perceived the true state of matters, agitated again through Cleopatra, so that Herod was summoned to make answer before Antony for the deed. Antony, who since the spring of B.C. 36 had been again residing in the East, and under the spell of Cleopatra, was just then, in the spring of B.C. 34, undertaking a new expedition to the West, ostensibly against the Parthians, really against the Armenian king Artavasdes. When he had now reached Laodicea, that is, Laodicea by the sea, south of Antioch, Herod was summoned to meet him there, – for Alexandra had, through Cleopatra, actually obtained her wish, – to give an account of his conduct. Herod did not dare to refuse, and, no doubt with a heavy heart, presented himself before Antony. But it may be readily supposed he did not go empty-handed. This circumstance and his clever representations soon prevailed in dispelling all clouds. He was pronounced innocent, and returned to Jerusalem.

His absence was the occasion of fresh disturbances. He had on his departure appointed his uncle Joseph, who was also his brother-in-law, for he had married his sister Salome, as his viceroy, and had committed Mariamme to his care. And as he considered his going before Antony as dangerous, he had commanded Joseph, in case he should not return, to kill Mariamme, for his passionate love for her could not brook the thought that any other should ever obtain his beloved. When, then, he did return, Salome calumniated her own husband, charging him with having himself had unlawful intercourse with Mariamme. Herod at first gave no heed to the calumny, as Mariamme maintained her innocence. But when he learned that Mariamme knew about that secret command, which the chattering old man had told her as a proof of the peculiar love of Herod, Herod thought that he had in this a confirmation of those charges, and caused Joseph to be executed, without affording him an opportunity of being heard.

The fourth hostile power during this first period of Herod's reign was Cleopatra. She had even previously, by her combination with Alexandra, been the means of giving troubled days to Herod. It was still more unfortunate for him that she now sought to use her influence with Antony to obtain an increase of territory. Antony at first gave no heed to her demands. But at length, during that same expedition against Armenia, in B.C. 34, he was induced to bestow upon her the whole of Phoenicia and the coast of the Philistines south of Eleutherus, with exception only of Tyre and Sidon, and besides, a part of the Arabian territory, and the fairest and most fertile part of the kingdom of Herod, the celebrated district of Jericho, with its palm trees and balsams. Opposition on the part of Herod was not to be thought of, and he was now

obliged to take his own land in lease from Cleopatra. He had indeed to accept the disagreeable with as good a grace as possible, and to receive Cleopatra with all honour and with royal munificence when she, on her return from the Euphrates, to which point she had accompanied Antony, paid a visit to Judea. But when she sought to draw him also into her net, he was cunning enough not to commit himself any more into her power.

Thus Herod's first four or five years were spent amid various struggles for his own very existence. The outbreak in B.C. 32 of the war between Antony and Octavian caused fresh anxieties. Herod wished to hasten with a powerful army to the help of Antony; but at the instigation of Cleopatra he was instead ordered by Antony to fight against the Arabian king. That prince had latterly failed to pay regularly his tribute to Cleopatra, and was now to be punished for that fault. And Cleopatra wished that the war should be committed to Herod, in order that the two vassal kings might naturally weaken and reduce one another. And thus Herod was sent against the king of Arabia rather than against Octavian. But as Athenio, Cleopatra's commander, went to the help of the Arabians, he suffered a crushing defeat, and found himself obliged to stop the great war, and rest satisfied with mere robber raids and plundering expeditions.

Then again in the spring of B.C. 31 a new calamity befell him, for a terrible earthquake visited the country, by which 30,000 men lost their lives. Herod now wished to treat for peace with the Arabians; but these slew his ambassadors and renewed their attack. Herod required to use all his eloquence in order to induce his dispirited troops again to enter into the engagement. But this time his old fortune in war returned to him. He drove before him the Arabian army in utter rout, and compelled its remnants, which had sought refuge in a fortress, soon to surrender. Proud of this brilliant success, he returned home.

Soon thereafter, on 2nd September B.C. 31, the decisive battle at Actium was fought, by which Antony finally lost his power. It was at the same time a sore blow to Herod. But with that adroitness which was characteristic of him, he passed over at the right time into the camp of the conqueror, and soon found an opportunity for proving his change of mind by action. In Cyzicus there was a troop of Antony's gladiators, who held themselves in readiness for the games, by which Antony had intended to celebrate his victory over Octavian. When these now heard of the defeat and flight of Antony, they wished to hasten to Egypt to the assistance of their master. But Didius, the governor of Syria, hindered their departure, and Herod afforded him in this zealous and efficient aid.

After he had given such a proof of his disposition, he could venture to present himself before Augustus. But in order to secure himself against any miscarriage, he contrived to have the aged Hyrcanus, the only one who might prove a dangerous rival, as nearer to the throne than himself, put out of the way. That Hyrcanus was condemned to death for conspiring with the Arabian king, as was affirmed in Herod's own journals, is highly improbable when we consider the character and the extreme age of Hyrcanus. Other contemporary writers have expressly declared his innocence. For Herod in his critical position, the mere existence of Hyrcanus was sufficient motive for the bloody deed. Thus fell the last of the Asmoneans, a memorial of past times, an old man more than eighty years of age, a sacrifice to the jealousy and ambition of Herod.

Herod now set out to meet Augustus, who had passed the winter, B.C. 31-30, for the most part in Samos. He met him in the spring of B.C. 30 in Rhodes. At the meeting he played his part skilfully. He boasted of his friendship with Antony, and of the service which he had rendered

him, and wished in this way to prove how useful he might be to any one whose party he might join. Augustus was not inclined to give too much heed to this speech, but found it to his advantage to win over to himself the crafty and energetic Idumean who had been the steady friend of the Romans. He was very gracious to him, and confirmed him in his royal rank. With this joyful result Herod returned to his own home.

Soon thereafter, in the summer, Augustus left Asia Minor and touched at the Phoenician coast on his way to Egypt, and Herod failed not to receive him with all pomp at Ptolemais, and took care that during that hot season of the year his army in its march should want for nothing.

After Augustus in Egypt had done with Antony, who, as well as Cleopatra, had committed suicide in August B.C. 30, Herod again visited Augustus, undoubtedly with the intention of wishing him success, and securing for himself as great a reward as possible. In this latter object he was completely successful. Augustus now gave him back, not only the district of Jericho, but also Gadara, Hippos, Samaria, Gaza, Anthedon, Joppa, and Straton's Tower. — In proof of his gratitude, Herod gave his patron, on his return from Egypt in the end of B.C. 30, the pleasure of his company as far as Antioch.

While thus he had exchanged his outward dangers for good fortune, Herod had nothing but confusion and strife in his own house. Even when he had gone away to Rhodes, he had committed the guardianship of Mariamme to a certain Soemus, and to him again he had given the same command as before to Joseph. Mariamme had also this time again come to know it, and gave to Herod on his return proofs of her aversion. The mother of Herod, Cypros, and his sister Salome, who had both for a long time been disaffected toward the proud Mariamme, were greatly gratified at this misunderstanding, and they knew how to inflame the quarrel by giving currency to the most scandalous calumnies. At last Salome managed to bribe the king's cupbearer, and got him to declare that Mariamme had given him a poison draught in order that he should give it to Herod. When Herod heard this, he had Mariamme's eunuch examined by torture in reference to this matter. This servant indeed knew nothing of the poison draught, but confessed that Mariamme hated her husband on account of the command which he had given to Soemus. When, now, Herod heard that Soemus, as well as Joseph, had betrayed the secret of his command, he saw again in this a proof of unlawful intercourse, and cried out saying that he had now evidence of his wife's unfaithfulness. Soemus was immediately executed; Mariamme, after a judicial investigation, was condemned, and then executed in the end of B.C. 29.

In Herod's relations with Mariamme were revealed all the savagery and sensuality of his nature. Ungovernable and passionate as his love for her was, such was also his hatred so soon as he thought himself deceived by his wife. But equally ungovernable and passionate was also his yearning over his beloved whom he himself had murdered. In order to drown the pangs of remorse, he sought relief in wild excesses, drinking bouts, and the pleasures of the chase. But even his powerful frame could not endure such an excessive strain. While he was hunting in Samaria he fell ill, and was obliged there to take to his bed. As his recovery was doubtful, Alexandra began to scheme, so that in the event of his death she might secure the throne to herself. She applied herself to those in command of the two fortified places in Jerusalem, and sought to win them over to her side. But they reported the matter to Herod, and Alexandra, who had long deserved that fate far more than others, was then executed some time in B.C. 28.

Gradually Herod recovered, and soon found occasion for further bloodshed. A distinguished Idumean, Costobar, had been, soon after his accession, appointed by Herod governor of

Idumea, and had subsequently been married to Salome, whose first husband, Joseph, had been executed in B.C. 34. Even during this first period he had secretly conspired against Herod with Cleopatra, but had been received into Herod's favour again at the entreaty of Salome. But now Salome herself was tired of her husband, and in order to rid herself of him she had recourse to denunciation. She knew that her husband had preserved the sons of Babas, as it seems, distant relatives of the Asmonean house, whom Herod ever since his conquest of Jerusalem had in vain sought to track out. This information she communicated to her brother. Herod, when he heard this, promptly resolved upon the course he would pursue. Costobar, together with his protégés, whose place of concealment Salome had betrayed, was seized and executed in B.C. 25. And now Herod could console himself with the thought that of all the relatives of the aged Hyrcanus there was no longer one surviving who could dispute with him the occupancy of the throne. — Here then the first period closes, the period of conflict with hostile powers.

II

The period from B.C. 25 to B.C. 13 is the period of glory and enjoyment, although the enjoyment was not altogether unchequered and undisturbed.

Among the glories of the period are to be reckoned the magnificent buildings which he erected. All the provinces vied with one another in their celebration of the emperor-cultus, and in the lavishness of display every fourth year at the festal games in honour of Caesar. For the former purpose emperor-temples (Καισάρεια) were erected; for the latter, theatres, amphitheatres, race-courses for men and for horses. New cities also were founded in honour of Caesar, and called after his name. "Provinciarum pleraeque super templa et aras ludos quoque quinquennales paene oppidatim constituerunt. Reges amici atque socii et singuli in suo quisque regno Caesareas urbes condiderunt." All these endeavours were entered upon by Herod with that energy by which he was characterized. But he was also unweariedly active in erecting other buildings for purposes of use and luxury, and in the reconstruction of entire cities.

In Jerusalem a theatre was reared; in the valley near Jerusalem, an amphitheatre. Some time later, about B.C. 24, Herod built for himself a royal palace, upon which marble and gold were lavished with profusion. It was provided with strong fortifications, and thus was made to serve also as a castle for the upper city. Even during the time of Antony he had had the citadel north of the temple rebuilt and named Antonia in honour of his patron. — In the non-Jewish cities of his territory, and farther away in the province of Syria, he built numerous temples, especially such as he built in honour of Caesar (Καισάρεια), and adorned them with statuary of the most beautiful description.

New cities in large number were built under his direction throughout the land. The old Samaria, which after its destruction had been already rebuilt by Gabinius, was now reconstructed by Herod in a magnificent style, and received from him the name of Sebaste. Not satisfied with this, he engaged in the year B.C. 22 on a still more ambitious undertaking, for he erected on the coast, on the site of the ancient Straton's Tower, a new city of large and imposing dimensions, to which he gave the name of Caesarea. As deserving of special mention, Josephus speaks of the commodious haven attached to the city. In order to secure ships while receiving their cargo from the storms, a powerful breakwater was carried far out into the sea, the material for which had to be brought from a considerable distance. On the breakwater were erected dwellings for the seamen, and in front of these paths were made for pleasure walks. In the midst of the city was a hill, on which a temple in honour of the emperor was built, which could be seen far out at

sea. Twelve full years were occupied in the building of the city. And when it had been completed, a grand celebration of the event was made with great pomp in the 28th year of Herod, corresponding to B.C. 10-9.

But Herod's love of building had not yet received full satisfaction. In place of the ancient Capharsaba, he founded a city, which he named in honour of his father Antipatris. At Jericho he built a citadel which he named after his mother Cypros. In the Jordan valley, north of Jericho, he founded, in a previously unbuilt but fruitful district, a new city, and named it after his brother Phasaelis. The ancient Anthedon he reconstructed, and, in honour of Agrippa, named it Agrippaeum. In honour of himself, he named two new strongholds Herodium; the one lay in the mountainous region toward Arabia; the other on the spot, three leagues south of Jerusalem, where he had conquered the Jews who pursued him after his flight from Jerusalem. The latter fortress was also supplied with rooms beautifully fitted up for the use of the king. The strongholds of Alexandrium and Hyrcania, built by the Armenians but destroyed by Gabinius, were now restored by Herod, and furnished with new fortifications. He dealt similarly also with the fortresses of Machärus and Masada, both of which he adorned with royal palaces. Military requirements also led to the rebuilding of Gaba in Galilee and Esbon in Perea, in which places he established military colonies.

Also far beyond the bounds of Palestine architectural works proclaimed the liberality of Herod. For the Rhodians, Herod built at his own cost the Pythian temple. He aided in the construction of most of the public buildings of the city of Nicopolis, which had been founded by Augustus near Actium. In Antioch he caused colonnades to be erected along both sides of the principal street. Happening on one occasion to visit Chios, he spent a large sum on the rebuilding of the piazza, destroyed during the Mithridatic war. In Ascalon he built baths and fountains. Tyre and Sidon, Byblus and Berytus, Tripolis, Ptolemais, and Damascus were also graced with memorials to the glory of Herod's name. And even as far as Athens and Lacedæmonia proofs of his liberality were to be found.

But the most magnificent of all his building operations was the restoration of the temple of Jerusalem. The old temple, built by Zerubbabel, was no longer in keeping with the magnificence of the modern structures. The palaces in its neighbourhood quite eclipsed it in grandeur. But now, as was only proper, it was to be brought into harmony with its beautiful surroundings. The rebuilding was begun in the eighteenth year of Herod, corresponding to B.C. 20-19, or A.U.C. 734-735. After the temple proper was completed it was consecrated; but still the building was carried on for a long period, and only a few years before its destruction, in the time of Albinus (A.D. 62-64), was it actually finished. Its beauty was proverbial. "He who has not seen Herod's building has never seen anything beautiful," was a common proverb of that day.

Besides the buildings, the games, celebrated with great pomp and magnificence, belonged to the glory of the Augustan period. In this department also Herod was quite abreast of the requirements of the age. Not only in the predominantly pagan Caesarea, but even in Jerusalem, competitive games were celebrated every fourth year. To the eyes of legalistic Jews these pagan exhibitions, with their slight valuation of the life of men and animals, constituted a serious offence, which could be tolerated only under threat of severe measures. The zeal of the king, however, went so far that he even gave liberal grants in support of the old Olympic games.

How unweariedly and extravagantly he also in other ways promoted culture and learning of every kind we are informed from explicit statements by Josephus. Very serviceable indeed was the colonizing of the districts west of the lake of Gennesareth hitherto traversed only by robber

nomad tribes. He laid out at great cost the parks and gardens about his palace at Jerusalem. Walks and water canals were made through the gardens; water fountains decorated with iron works of art were to be seen, through which the water gushed. In the neighbourhood of these stood dovecots with tamed pigeons. The king seemed to have a special fondness for pigeon-breeding; it is, indeed, only in connection with this that mention is made of Herod in the Mishna. "Herodian pigeons" is the phrase used for pigeons kept in captivity. It seems, therefore, that Herod was the first in Judea to keep and rear wild pigeons in an enclosed place.

In order that he might pose before the eyes of the Graeco-Roman world as a man of culture, Herod, who continued to the last a barbarian at heart, surrounded himself with a circle of men accomplished in Greek literature and art. The highest offices of state were entrusted to Greek rhetoricians. In all more important matters he availed himself of their counsel and advice. The most distinguished of these was Nicolas of Damascus, a man of wide and varied scholarship, versed in natural science, familiar with Aristotle, and widely celebrated as a historical writer. He enjoyed the unconditional confidence of Herod, and was by him entrusted with all serious and difficult diplomatic missions. Beside him stood his brother Ptolemy, also a trusted friend of the king. Another Ptolemy was at the head of the finance department, and had the king's signet ring. In addition to these, we find in the circle immediately around the king two Greeks or half-Greeks – Andromachus and Gemellus. The latter of those was also the tutor of Herod's son Alexander. Finally, in the proceedings after Herod's death we meet with a Greek rhetorician, Irenaeus. Among those Hellenic counsellors of the king there were indeed some very bad characters, most conspicuous among them that Lacedfæmonian Eurykles, who contributed not a little in fomenting and intensifying the trouble between Herod and his sons.

Herod to all appearance had very little real interest in Judaism. His ambition led him. to foster the liberal arts and culture. But any other form of culture than that of Greece was scarcely recognised by the world of that day. So he himself submitted to receive instructions, under the direction of Nicolas of Damascus, in philosophy, rhetoric, and history, and boasted of being more nearly related to the Greeks than to the Jews. But the culture which he sought to spread throughout his land was essentially Greek and pagan. He even erected heathen temples in the non-Jewish towns of his kingdom. – Under these circumstances it is interesting to observe the place which he gave to the law and the national aspirations of his people. The Pharisaic-national movement had grown up, especially since the reaction under Alexandra, into a power so strong and so firmly rooted in the hearts of the people, that Herod could not possibly think of a violent Hellenizing like that carried on by Antiochus Epiphanes. He was sagacious enough to show respect in many points to the views of the Pharisaic party. Hence it is particularly worthy of notice that his coins bear no human image, but only innocent symbols, like those of the Maccabean coins; at most only one coin, and that belonging probably to Herod's latest period, bears the figure of an eagle. In the building of the temple he was anxiously careful to avoid giving any offence. He allowed only priests to build the temple proper, and even he himself ventured not to go into the precincts of the inner temple, which should be entered only by the priests. Upon none of the many beautiful buildings in Jerusalem were images placed. And when the people once looked with suspicion on the imperial trophies of victory which were set up in the theatre at Jerusalem, because they took them for statues which were covered with the armour, Herod had the trophies taken down in the presence of the most distinguished men, and showed them to their complete satisfaction the bare wooden frames. When the Arabian Sylläus sought to win for himself the hand of Herod's sister Salome, it was required of him that he should adopt the Jewish customs (ἐγγραφῆναι τοῖς τῶν Ἰουδαίων ἔθεσι), and thereupon the proposed marriage was abandoned. Some of the most famous Pharisees, among whom Polio

and Sameas may be specially named, were held by Herod in high esteem, and were not punished even when they refused to take the oath of allegiance.

But clearly a thoroughgoing carrying out of Pharisaic views was impossible under his scheme for the furtherance of culture, and he had no intention of promoting them. For a time, what he raised with the one hand he overthrew with the other. After he had carefully studied the Pharisaic requirements in the building of the temple, he at last had an eagle put up over the temple gate as if in insult. Theatre and amphitheatre were already in themselves heathen abominations. The Greek surroundings of the king, the administration of state business by men of Greek culture, the development of heathen splendour within the Holy Land, the provision for heathen worship within the borders of Judea, in the king's own territory, all this completely outweighed those concessions to Pharisaism, and in spite of these lent to Herod's reign more of a heathen than a Jewish character. The Sanhedrim, which according to the opinion of the people was the only court that had any right to exist, under Herod was stripped of all importance, so that doubts have been entertained as to its very existence. The high priests, whom he appointed and removed at his pleasure, were his creatures, and were for the most part Alexandrians, with a veneer therefore of culture, and so offensive to the Pharisees. The treatment of the high-priesthood is quite typical of the home policy of the king. As he had tossed aside with ruthless violence the old Sadducean nobles on the one hand, because of their sympathy with the Asmonean dynasty (see above, p. 420); so, on the other hand, he was just as little satisfied with the Pharisees. Their ideals went far beyond the concessions of the king, and the friendships enjoyed among the Pharisees were only exceptions.

When one considers that in addition to this contempt of the claims and the actual or imagined rights of the people, Herod oppressed them by imposing a heavy taxation, it may be readily supposed that his rule was endured amid much murmuring. All foreign glory could only be distasteful to the people so long as it was secured by the oppression of the citizens and accompanied by the disregarding of the laws of their fathers. Most of the Pharisees regarded the government of the Roman vassal king generally as not existing in right, and refused twice over the oath of allegiance which Herod demanded, first for himself and then for the emperor. The prevailing dissatisfaction sought vent once in the earlier period of his reign, about B.C. 25, in a conspiracy. Ten citizens conspired to murder the king in the theatre. Their plan, indeed, failed, since it was betrayed beforehand. When they were just on the eve of committing the deed, they were seized, dragged before Herod, and immediately condemned to death.

In order to hold the revolting populace in check, Herod had recourse on his part to means of violence; and so his reign the longer it lasted the more despotic it became. The fortresses, which were partly new erections of his own, partly old places made stronger, served not only to protect him from foreign foes, but also for keeping down his own people. The most important were Herodium, Alexandrium, Hyrcania, Machärus, Masada, to which may also be added the military colonies at Gaba in Galilee and Esbon in Perea (compare above, pp. 435–437). Especially to Hyrcania many political offenders were deported in order there to disappear for ever. As props of his government against foreign as well as home foes Herod had dependable mercenary troops, in which there were many Thracians, Germans, and Gauls. — But, finally, he sought by strict police regulations to nip in the bud every attempt at rebellion. All idle loitering about the streets, all common assemblies, yea, even meeting together on the street, was forbidden. And where anything of the kind was nevertheless done, the king had information about it immediately conveyed to him by his secret spies. He is said at times to have in his own person acted the part of the spy.

In order to be just, one must, however, admit that his government had also its good side. Among his buildings many were of a useful description. We need only mention the haven of Caesarea. By his strong hand were conditions created under the protection of which trade and travel became safe. He also for a time at least made attempts to win the hearts of his subjects by proofs of his magnanimity. Once, in the year B.C. 20, he remitted a third of the taxes; at another time, in B.C. 14, he remitted a fourth of them. Quite amazing was the energy with which he sought to put a stop to the famine which spread over the land in B.C. 25. He is said on that occasion to have converted into money even his own table plate.

But the people in presence of prevailing evils had only a very feeble and transitory gratitude for such benefits. And so, while upon the whole his reign was undoubtedly glorious, it was by no means happy.

The chief glory of his reign lay in his foreign policy, and in this department he undeniably achieved great success. He had secured the confidence of Augustus to such a degree, that by imperial favour the extent of his territory was about doubled.

This is the place to estimate, according to its most essential and characteristic feature, the position in the eye of the law of a rex socius in the Roman empire of that day. The dependence, in which all kings on this side of the Euphrates stood to the Roman power, was expressed most strikingly in this, that none could exercise royal authority and use the title of king without the express approval of the emperor, with or without confirmation by the senate. The title was, as a rule, granted only to such princes as reigned over a territory of considerable extent; the smaller princes were obliged to be satisfied with the title of tetrarch or such like. The permission extended only to the person of the individual who then received it, and ceased with his death. Hereditary monarchies were not generally recognised within the domain of the Roman authority. Even the son appointed by his father as his successor could enter upon his government only after his nomination had been confirmed by the emperor. This confirmation was refused if there appeared reasons for so doing, and then the territorial domain of the father was either granted to the son with restricted boundaries and with an inferior title, or given to another, or even taken under direct Roman administration as a province. All this may indeed be learned from the history of the Herodian dynasty, but it is also confirmed by all other records. — The title socius et amicus populi Romani (φίλος καὶ σύμμαχος Ῥωμαίων) seems as a special designation to have been granted only to individuals, so that not all who actually assumed this position had really formally received the title. The possession of Roman citizenship is indeed expressly witnessed to only on behalf of a few, but is to be assumed in regard to all as probable. The family of Herod came into possession of it early through Antipater, the father of Herod. From the time of Caligula, too, honorary senatorial rights (praetorian and consular rank) were for a time conferred upon confederate kings. — Their power was restricted especially in the following particulars: 1. They could neither conclude treaties with other States nor engage in a war on their own account, and so could exercise sovereign rights only within the boundaries of their own land. 2. They had the right of coining money only in a limited degree. The minting of gold coins seems to have been almost entirely forbidden; in many cases also the minting of silver coins. To the latter class belonged Herod and his successors; at least only copper coins have come down to us from the whole line of Herodian princes. This fact is particularly instructive, since it shows us that Herod by no means belonged to the most distinguished of those kings, as by many of his statements Josephus would lead us to suppose. 3. A special obligation resting on them was the providing of auxiliary troops in case of a war, as well as the protection of the frontiers of the empire against foreign attacks. Also contributions in money were on special

occasions demanded. But a regular tribute seems not to have been raised for the kings during the time of the empire. Only of Antony is it said that he appointed kings ἐπὶ φόροις τεταγμένοις. — The rights of sovereignty which were left to dependent kings embraced, under the reservations specified, the whole administration of home affairs and the execution of the laws. They had unlimited power of life and death over their subjects. Their whole territory was generally not regarded as belonging to the province. Within the bounds of their territory they could impose taxes at will, and they administered the revenue independently. Their army also was under their own control, and was organized by themselves.

The position thus described, which afforded such abundant scope to the energy of the individual, was taken advantage of by Herod with all his might. He availed himself, as others ought also to have done, of every opportunity of presenting himself to the emperor and proving his devotion to him. Even in B.C. 30 he had several times visited Augustus. Ten years later, in B.C. 20, Augustus went again to Syria, and Herod did not lose the chance of paying him his respects. In B.C. 18 or 17 Herod fetched home his two sons, Alexander and Aristobulus, who were in Rome for their education, and was on that occasion very graciously received by the emperor. Subsequently he met with Augustus on two occasions, in the years B.C. 12 and 10–9. Herod was also on terms of friendly intercourse with Agrippa, the trusted friend and son-in-law of Augustus. While Agrippa was residing in Mytilene, B.C. 23–21, he there received a visit from Herod. And later still, in B.C. 15, Agrippa himself went to Judea and offered a hecatomb in the temple at Jerusalem. The people were so enthusiastic over the Roman who showed himself so friendly to the Jews, that they accompanied him amid shouts of good-will to his ship, strewing his way with flowers, and expressing admiration at his piety. In the spring of the following year, B.C. 14, Herod returned Agrippa's visit; and as he knew that Agrippa had planned an expedition to the Crimea, he took with him a fleet in order to afford him assistance. At Sinope he met his noble friend and then went with him, after the warlike operations were finished, over a great part of Asia Minor, dispensing everywhere lavish gifts and granting petitions. — His relations with Augustus and Agrippa were so intimate that flatterers affirmed that Herod was dearest to Augustus next to Agrippa, and to Agrippa next to Augustus.

These Roman friendships also bore their fruits. Even as early as B.C. 30, when Herod was with Augustus in Egypt, he had obtained from him important enlargement of territory (see above, p. 428). New gifts were added at a later period. Herod had in B.C. 25, in the campaign of Aelius Gallus against Arabia, supplied 500 men of select auxiliary troops. There may possibly be some connection between this and the fact that soon afterwards, in B.C. 23, at the time when Herod sent his sons Alexander and Aristobulus for their education to Rome, he received the districts of Trachonitis, Batanea, and Auranitis, which previously had been occupied by nomad robber tribes, with whom the neighbouring tetrarch Zenodorus had made common cause. When some years later, in B.C. 20, Augustus visited Syria, he bestowed upon Herod the tetrarchy of Zenodorus, the districts of Ulatha and Panias, and the surrounding territories north and north-west of the lake of Gennesareth. At the same time Herod obtained permission to appoint his brother Pheroras tetrarch of Perea. And the unbounded confidence which Augustus had in him is shown conspicuously in this, that he, perhaps only during the period of Agrippa's absence from the East (see above, p. 349 f.), gave orders to the procurators of Syria (Coele-Syria ?) to take counsel with Herod in regard to all important matters.

It is not left untold how Herod used his influence with the Roman governors to secure the Jews of the dispersion againat all oppression and infringement of their rights on the part of their non-Jewish neighbours. Thus the power of the Jewish king told in favour even of those Jews who

were not immediately under his rule.

The period from B.C. 20 to B.C. 14 was decidedly the most brilliant in his reign. In spite of dependence upon Rome, his court, so far as outward grandeur was concerned, might bear comparison with the best times that the nation had seen. Internal affairs were indeed in a miserable state. Only by force could the people be brought to tolerate the semi-pagan rule of the Idumean; and only his despotic, iron hand prevented an uprising of the fermenting masses.

III

The last nine years of Herod, B.C. 13–4, constitute the period of domestic misery. Especially his unhappy quarrels with the sons of Mariamme cast a deep, dark shadow over this period.

Herod had a numerous family. In all he had ten wives, which was indeed, as Josephus points out, allowed by the law; but it affords a striking proof of his sensuality. His first wife was Doris, by whom he had one son, Antipater. Both were repudiated by Herod, and Antipater was allowed to appear at Jerusalem only at the great feasts. In the year B.C. 37, Herod married Mariamme, the grand-daughter of Hyrcanus (see above, p. 396), who bore him five children, three sons and two daughters. Of the sons, the youngest died at Rome; the two elder ones, Alexander and Aristobulus, are the heroes of the subsequent history. The third wife, whom Herod married about B.C. 24, was also called Mariamme. She was daughter of a famous priest belonging to Alexandria, who was appointed high priest by Herod just at the time when he married his daughter. By this wife he had a son called Herod. Of the other seven wives, carefully enumerated by Josephus, Antiq. xvii. 1. 3, and Wars of the Jews, i. 28. 4, only the Samaritan Malthoe, mother of Archelaus and Antipas, and Cleopatra of Jerusalem, the mother of Philip, are of interest to us.

About the year B.C. 23, Herod sent the sons of the first Mariamme, Alexander and Aristobulus, for their education to Rome, where they were hospitably entertained in the house of Asinius Pollio. Some five years later, in B.C. 18 or 17, . he himself fetched them home again, and from that time onward kept them at the court in Jerusalem. They would then be young men about seventeen or eighteen years of age. In accordance with the customs of the age and country, they were soon married. Alexander received a daughter of the Cappadocian king Archelaus, whose name was Glaphyra; Aristobulus had given him a daughter of Herod's sister Salome, called Berenice. Although in this way the Asmonean and Idumean line of the Herodian family were connected together by affinity in the closest relationship, they still stood over against one another as two hostile camps. The sons of Mariamme, conscious of their royal blood, might well look down with a certain pride upon the Idumean relationship; and the Idumeans, pre-eminently the estimable Salome, returned the haughtiness of those Asmoneans by common abuse. And so even thus early, after the sons had no more than re-entered their father's house, the knots began to be tied, which afterwards became so twisted that they could not be loosed. For a time, however, Herod did not allow these janglings to interfere with the love he had for his sons.

The evil conscience of the king, however, offered so fruitful a soil for such sowing of slanders, that they could not fail ultimately to take root and to bring forth fruit. He was obliged to admit to himself that the natural heritage of the sons was the desire to avenge the death of their mother. And as now Salome again and again pictured to him the danger which threatened from both, he at last began to believe it, and to look upon his sons with suspicion.

In order to provide what would counterbalance their aspiring projects, and to show them that

there was still another in existence who might possibly be heir to the throne, he called back his exiled Antipater, and sent his sons for that reason to Rome, in company with Agrippa, who just then, in B.C. 13, was leaving the East, in order that he might present him to the emperor. But by so doing he put the weapon into the hand of the bitterest foe of his domestic peace. For Antipater from this time forth laboured incessantly, by calumniating his step-brothers, to carve out his way to the throne. The change in their father's attitude was naturally not without effect upon Alexander and Aristobulus. They returned his suspicion with undisguised aversion, and already openly complained of the death of their mother, and of the injurious treatment to which they were subjected. Thus was the rift between father and sons becoming always deeper, until at last Herod, in B.C. 12, came to the conclusion to accuse his sons before the emperor. Along with the two he started on his journey, and appeared before the emperor at Aquileia as complainant against his sons. The mild earnestness of Augustus succeeded for that time in reconciling the opposing parties, and restoring again domestic peace. With thanks to the emperor, father and sons returned home; and Antipater also himself joined them, and pretended to rejoice in the reconciliation.

Scarcely had they reached home when the old game began afresh. Antipater, who now again was one of those in immediate attendance on the king, continued unweariedly the work of slander, and in this he was faithfully supported by the brother and sister of Herod, Pheroras and Salome. On the other hand, Alexander and Aristobulus assumed a more decidedly hostile attitude. Thus the peace between father and sons was soon again broken. The suspicion of the king, which from day to day received new fuel, became more and more morbid, and by and by reached a climax in a superstitious fear of ghosts. He now caused the adherents of Alexander to be subjected to the torture, at first unsuccessfully, until at last one, under the agony of torture, made injurious admissions. On the ground of these, Alexander was committed to prison. — When the Cappadocian king, Alexander's father-in-law, heard of the unfortunate state of matters at the Jewish court, he began to fear for his daughter and son-in-law, and made a journey to Jerusalem in order, if at all possible, to bring about a reconciliation. He appeared before Herod very angry over his good-for-nothing son-in-law, threatened to take his daughter back again to his own house, and expressed himself so ferociously that Herod himself espoused the side of his son, and undertook his defence against Archelaus. By such a manœuvre the sly Cappadocian succeeded in bringing about the reconciliation which he desired, and was able to return home quite satisfied. Thus once again the wild storm was broken by a short temporary lull.

In that excited period Herod had also to contend with foreign enemies, and even with imperial disfavour. The free-booting inhabitants of Trachonitis wished to rid themselves of his strict and severe government, and somewhere about forty of the worst disturbers of the peace found ready shelter in the neighbouring parts of Arabia, where a certain Sylleus carried on the government in the place of the weak King Obodas. When Sylleus refused to deliver up these robbers, Herod undertook, with consent of the governor of Syria, Saturninus, a warlike expedition against Arabia, and enforced his rights. But now Sylleus agitated at Rome, represented the matter as an unlawful breach of national peace, and was able thereby to bring Herod seriously into disfavour with the emperor. — In order to justify himself in regard to his conduct, Herod sent an embassy to Rome; and when this was not successful, he sent a second, under the leadership of Nicolas of Damascus.

Meanwhile the family discord was with rapid strides approaching its tragical end. The reconciliation, as might have been expected, was not of long duration. In order to make the

unhappiness complete, there now arrived at the court a worthless Lacedæmonian, Eurykles, who inflamed the father against the sons and the sons against the father. At the same time, all the other mischief-makers continued their work. At last matters came to such a pass that Herod cast Alexander and Aristobulus into prison, and laid a complaint against them before the emperor of being concerned in treasonable plots.

Nicolas of Damascus had meanwhile accomplished the task of his mission, and had again won over the emperor to Herod. When, therefore, the messengers bearing the accusation reached Rome, they found Augustus already in a favourable mood, and at once spread out before him their documents. Augustus gave to Herod absolute power to proceed in this matter as he thought best, but advised him to summon to Berytus a justiciary court consisting of Roman officials and his own friends, and to have the charges against his sons investigated by it.

Herod accepted the advice of the emperor. The court almost unanimously pronounced the sentence of death. Only the governor of Syria, Saturninus, and his three sons were of another mind. – Still it was doubtful whether Herod would carry out the sentence. An old soldier, Teron, therefore ventured publicly to sue for favour to the condemned. But the old man and three hundred others, who were denounced as adherents of Alexander and Aristobulus, were put to death, and the sentence was now without delay carried into execution. At Sebaste (Samaria), where thirty years before Mariamme's marriage had been celebrated, her sons were executed upon the gibbet, probably in B.C. 7.

But such proceedings failed utterly in restoring peace to Herod's household. Antipater was now indeed all-powerful at court, and enjoyed the unconditional confidence of his father. But this did not satisfy him. He wished to have the government wholly in his own hand, and held secret conferences with Herod's brother Pheroras, tetrarch of Perea, at which it was suspected that nothing good was done. Salome, the old serpent, had soon discovered these ongoings, and reported the matter to the king. And so the relations of Antipater and his father soon became strained. Antipater, in order to avoid a conflict, found it convenient to allow himself to be sent to Rome. That Herod did not meanwhile entertain any serious suspicion against him is shown by his will, in which even at that time he nominated Autipater his successor on the throne; only in the event of Antipater dying before himself was Herod, the son of Mariamme the high priest's daughter, named his successor.

While Antipater was in Rome, Pheroras died; and by this also Antipater's fate was sealed. Some freedmen of Pheroras went to Herod and showed him that there was a suspicion that Pheroras had been poisoned, and that Herod should investigate the matter more closely. On examination it came out that poison certainly had been present, that it was sent by Antipater, but that it was intended, not for Pheroras, but was only given to him by Antipater in order that he might administer it to Herod. Herod also now learned from the female slaves of Pheroras' household all the utterances which had escaped Antipater at those secret conclaves, his complaining about the long life of the king, about the uncertainty of his prospects, and other such things. Herod could now no longer entertain any doubt as to the deadly intentions of his favourite son. Under all sorts of false pretences, he recalled him from Rome in order to put him on trial at home. Antipater, who anticipated no trouble, returned, and to his great surprise – for although since the discovery of his plots seven months had passed, he had heard nothing of the matter – he was on his arrival committed to prison in the king's palace. Next day he was brought forth to trial before Varus, the governor of Syria. As in face of the manifest proofs brought against him he could say nothing in defence of himself, Herod had him put in fetters, and made a report of the matter to the emperor.

Herod was now almost seventy years of age. His days were indeed already numbered. He suffered from a disease from which he could not recover. In a new will, which he now executed, he named his youngest son Antipas, the son of the Samaritan Malthace, as his successor.

During his sickness he could not but perceive how anxiously the people longed to be delivered from his yoke, and yearned for the moment when they would be emancipated from his heathenish government. As soon as the news got abroad that his disease was incurable, two rabbis, Judas the son of Sariphäus, and Matthias the son of Margaloth, stirred up the people to tear down the offensive eagle from the temple gate. Only too readily they found an audience, and amid great uproar the work pleasing to God was accomplished. Meanwhile Herod, in spite of his sickness, was still strong enough to pass sentences of death, and to have the principal leaders of the tumult burnt alive.

The days of the old king were now at an end. The disease was always becoming worse, and dissolution rapidly approached. The baths of Callirrhoë, on the other side of the Jordan, to which the king had gone, no longer benefited him. When he had returned to Jericho, he is said to have given orders that upon his death the most distingnished men of the nation, whom he had caused to be that up in the arena of that place, should he cut down, so that there might be a great lamentation as he passed away. Amid all the pains which his disease caused him, he lived long enough to have the satisfaction of accomplishing the death of his son Antipater, the chief instigator of his domestic misery. Just in the last days of his life the permission of the emperor arrived for the execution of Antipater, which soon afterwards was carried out.

A few days before his death Herod once again altered his will, for he named Archelaus, the older son of Malthace, king, his brother Antipas tetrarch of Galilee and Perea, and Philip, the son of Cleopatra of Jerusalem, tetrarch of Gaulonitis, Trachonitis, Batanea, and Panias.

At last, five days after the execution of Antipater, Herod died at Jericho in B.C. 4, unwept by those of his own house, and hated by all the people. — A pompous funeral procession accompanied the royal corpse from Jericho, a distance of eight furlongs, in the direction of Herodium, where it was laid in its last resting-place.

The end of his reign was bloody as its beginning had been. The brighter portion lay in the middle. But even during his better days he was a despot, and upon the whole, with all the glory of his reign, “he was still only a common man” (Hitzig, ii. 559). The title of “the Great,” by which we are accustomed to distinguish him from his more feeble descendants of the same name, is only justified when it is used in this relative sense.

VOLUME II: FIRST DIVISION POLITICAL HISTORY OF PALESTINE, FROM B.C. 175 TO A.D. 135

DISTURBANCES AFTER HEROD'S DEATH, B.C. 4

SOURCES

JOSEPHUS, Antiq. xvii. 9-11; Wars of the Jews, ii. 1-6. ZONARAS, Annales, vi. 1-2 (summary from Josephus).

NICOLAS OF DAMASCUS in Müller, Fragmenta Historicorum Graecarum, iii. 353 sq.; Feder, Excerpta Escurialensia, p. 67 sq.

LITERATURE

EWALD, History of Israel, v. 449-457.

GEIKIE, Life and Words of Christ, 7th ed., London 1879, i. 263-272.

GRÄTZ, Geschichte der Juden, 4 Aufl. iii. pp. 246-253.

HITZIG, Geschichte des Volkes Israel, ii. 559-562.

SCHNECKENBURGER, Zeitgeschichte, pp. 200-203.

HAUSRATH, Neutestamentliche Zeitgeschichte, 2 Aufl. i. 275-283.

LEWIN, Fasti sacri ad Ann. 4.

BRANN, De Herodis qui dicitur Magni filiis patrem in imperio secutis, pars 1, 1873 (treats only of the events of B.C. 4).

MENKE, Bibelatlas, Bl. V. "Judea and neighbouring countries in the time of Christ and the Apostles."

BY the last will of Herod, Archelaus had been named his successor on the throne. Archelaus therefore made it his first business to secure the emperor's confirmation of his father's arrangement, and with this end in view he resolved to make a journey to Rome. But before he could start on such an expedition, he had to stamp out a rebellion in Jerusalem. The people

could not so easily forget the execution of the two rabbis, Judas and Matthias, and violently insisted that Archelaus should bring to punishment the counsellors of Herod. Archelaus endeavoured at first in a conciliatory manner to dissuade the people from their purpose. But when he could not succeed in this way, the only result of his proposals being the increase of the tumult, he resolved to crush the revolt by violence. He accordingly sent forth a detachment of soldiers against the people assembled in the temple, where the people who had flocked into Jerusalem in prospect of the approaching Passover festival were wont to gather at that season in great crowds. But the detachment sent was not strong enough to make way against the excited masses. A portion of the soldiers was stoned by the people; the rest, together with their leader, took to flight. Archelaus was now obliged to call out his whole fighting force; and only by the help of his entire army, amid great bloodshed, was he able to put down the rebellion.

After Archelaus had thus by the exercise of force secured quiet, he hastened to Rome, leaving his brother Philip to act as administrator of the kingdom. Scarcely had he gone, when Antipas also started for Rome in order to press his own claims there. He had by the third and last will of Herod received only Galilee and Perea, whereas in the second will he had been appointed successor to the throne. He therefore now wished to represent to the emperor that to him, and not to Archelaus, did the kingdom properly belong. Many other members of the Herodian family were also present in Rome at the same time as Archelaus and Antipas, and these now mostly appeared against Archelaus, and expressed a strong desire that Palestine should now be put under immediate Roman government; or if this could not be, then they would rather have Antipas than Archelaus.

Hence the sons of Herod plotted and schemed against one another in Rome. Augustus, in whose hands the decision lay, meanwhile convoked at his palace a consultative assembly, at which the opposing brothers were called upon to make a statement of their conflicting claims. A certain Antipater spoke on behalf of Antipas, while Nicolas of Damascus, formerly the minister of Herod, appeared on behalf of Archelaus. Each party sought to win over the emperor to his side, partly by advancing arguments, partly by insinuating suspicions against his opponent. When Augustus had heard both parties, he inclined more to the side of Archelaus, and made a statement to the effect that he was most fit to ascend the royal throne. Yet he did not wish immediately to decide the matter, and so dismissed the assembly without issuing a final and formal judgment.

But before the question about the succession to the throne had been decided in Rome, new troubles had broken out in Judea. Soon after the departure of Archelaus the Jews had again risen in revolt, but had been restored to quiet by Varus, the governor of Syria. Varus had then returned to Antioch. leaving behind him in Jerusalem a legion to maintain order. But scarcely had he gone when the storm broke out afresh. After Herod's death, pending the settlement of the question of succession to the throne, the emperor had sent to Palestine a procurator, Sabinus. But he oppressed the people in every sort of way, and behaved in all directions in the most reckless manner. Hence it was that a revolt broke out again immediately after the withdrawal of Varus. It was now the season of the Passover festival, and therefore crowds of people were present in Jerusalem. They were divided into three great divisions, and attacked the Romans at the three different points: on the north of the temple, south beside the racecourse, and on the west of the city beside the royal palace. The keenest struggle took place, first of all, at the temple. The Romans pressed forward successfully into the temple court; but the Jews offered a most stubborn resistance, – mounted upon the roofs of the buildings which surround the temple court, and hurled down stones upon the soldiers. Thses were

therefore obliged to have recourse to fire, set flames to the roofs, and in this way succeeded at last in reaching the temple mount. When the longed for booty of the treasury of the temple fell into their hands, Sabinus appropriated to himself 400 talents.

But this first defeat of the rebels was only the signal for the further spread of the rebellion. In Jerusalem a portion of the soldiers of Herod joined the rebels, and consequently they were able to lay siege to Sabinus and his fighting force in the palace of Herod. In the neighbourhood of Sepphoris in Galilee, Judas, the son of that Hezekiah with whom Herod had once, to the great indignation of the Sanhedrim, made so short a process (see vol. i. p. 383), gathered a number about him, gained possession of the weapons stored up in the royal arsenal, distributed these among his followers, and was able then to make all Galilee unsafe. He is even said to have aimed at obtaining the royal crown. In Perea a certain Simon, formerly a slave of Herod, collected a band, and had himself proclaimed king by his followers; but was soon afterwards conquered by a Roman detachment, and put to death. Finally, it is reported of one termed Athronges, formerly a shepherd, that he had assumed the royal crown, and for a long time, along with his four brothers, kept the country in a ferment. – It was a time of general upheaval, when every one sought to secure the greatest possible benefit for himself. On the part of the people there was agreement only on this one point, that every one wished at any cost to be freed from the power of the Romans.

When Varus was informed of these proceedings, he hastened from Antioch, with the two legions which he still had with him, in order to restore order in Palestine. On the way he also procured, in addition, Arabian auxiliary troops sent by King Aretas, as well as other auxiliaries. With this fighting force he first of all reduced Galilee. Sepphoris, where that Judas had been fermenting disorder, was consigned to the flames, and the inhabitants sold as slaves. Thence Varus proceeded to Samaria, which, however, he spared because it had not taken part in the revolt. He then directed his course toward Jerusalem, where the legion stationed there was still being besieged by the Jews in the royal palace. Varus had there an easy game to play; for when the besiegers saw the powerful Roman forces approach, they lost their courage and took to flight. In this way Varus became lord of city and country. But Sabinus, who in consequence of his robbing the temple and of other misdeeds had no good conscience, made off as quickly as possible. Varus then led his troops up and down through the country, apprehending the rebels who were now lurking here and there in small parties. He had two thousand of them crucified, while he granted pardon to the mass of the people. After he had then stamped out the rebellion, he returned to Antioch.

While these things were going on in Judea, Archelaus and Antipas were still in Rome waiting for the decision of the emperor. Before this was issued an embassy from the people of Judea appeared before the emperor, asking that none of the Herodians should be appointed king, but that they should be permitted to live in accordance with their own laws. About the same time Philip also, the last of the three brothers, to whom territories had been bequeathed by Herod, made his appearance in Rome in order to press his claims, and likewise to support those of his brother Archelaus. In regard to these conflicting claims, Augustus was obliged at last to give a decision. In an assembly which he fixed precisely for this purpose in the temple of Apollo, he heard first of all the ambassadors from the Jewish people. These reported a long list of scandalous misdeeds which Herod had allowed and sought them to buttress, their demand that none of the Herodian race should any more govern in Palestine, but that it should be granted them to live according to their own laws under Roman suzerainty. When they had ended, Nicolas of Damascus arose and spoke on behalf of his master Archelaus. When Augustus had

thus heard both sides, he issued his decision after a few days. By it the will of Herod was in all essential points sustained. Archelaus obtained the territory assigned to him: Judea, Samaria, Idumea; only the cities of Gaza, Gadara, and Hippos were severed from these domains and attached to the province of Syria; and instead of the title of king, that of ethnarch was given him. Antipas obtained Galilee and Perea, with the title of tetrarch; Philip, also as tetrarch. received the districts of Batanea, Trachonitis, and Auranitis. Archelaus was to derive from his territories an income of 600 talents, Antipas 200 talents, and Philip 100 talents. Also Salome, the sister of Herod the Great, obtained the portion assigned to her, the cities of Jamnia, Azotus, Phasaelis, and 500,000 pieces of silver, in addition to the palace at Ascalon. – Salome lived in the enjoyment of these possessions for some twelve or fourteen years. She died about A.D. 10, in the time of the procurator M. Ambivius, and bequeathed her property to the Empress Livia.

What had been the empire of Herod was therefore now parted into three territories, each of which has for a while its own history.

THE SONS OF HEROD

a. PHILIP, B.C. 4–A.D. 34.

HIS TERRITORY UNDER THE ROMANS, A.D. 34–37

SOURCES

JOSEPHUS, Antiq. xviii. 2. 1, 4. 6, 6. 10; Wars of the Jews, ii. 9. 1–6.

On the coins, see below.

LITERATURE

EWALD, History of Israel, vi. 71–74, 347.

WESTCOTT in Smith's Dictionary of the Bible.

WINER, Realwörterbuch, ii. 250.

LEYRER in Herzog's Real-Encyclopaedie, 2 Aufl. xi. 618.

KEIM, Jesus of Nazara, i. 258, 274; in Schenkel's Bibellexicon, iii. 40–42.

LEWIN, Fasti Sacri (see Index, p. 408).

BRANN, Die Söhne des Herodes, 1873 (reprint from the Monatsschrift für Geschichte und Wissenschaft des Judenthums), pp. 77–87.

THE extent of the territory which Philip received is variously stated in different places by Josephus. Putting altogether, it embraced the districts of Batanea, Trachonitis, Auranitis, Gaulanitis, Panias, and, according to Luke 3:1, also Iturea. The districts named were not ancient tribal possessions of the Jewish people, but were in great part added to the Jewish territory in later times. The population was a mixed one; and the non-Jewish, i.e. Syrian and Greek, element prevailed. Philip himself was certainly a real exception among the sons and grandsons of Herod. While all the others, copying fathers and grandfathers, were ambitious, imperious, harsh, and tyrannical toward their subjects, nothing but what is honourable is told of Philip. His reign was mild, just, and peaceful. To the traditions of his father he remained faithful only in this, that he also sought renown in the construction of great buildings. The building of two cities by him is expressly reported. The ancient Panias, at the sources of the Jordan, north of the lake of Gennezaret, he rebuilt, with larger dimensions, and gave it, in honour of the emperor, the name of Caesarea. To distinguish it from the well-known Caesarea by the sea, it was called Caesarea Philippi, under which name we are familiar with it in the Gospel history (Matt. 16:13; Mark 8:27). The other city which he rebuilt was the Bethsaida situated at the point where the Jordan enters into the lake of Gennezaret, which, in honour of the daughter of Augustus, he named Julias. Josephus tells of him, incidentally, that he first discovered and proved that the supposed sources of the Jordan at Panias obtained their water by a subterranean passage from the so-called Phiala. Philip demonstrated this by throwing in chaff

into the Phiala, which came out again at Panias.

We know, however, nothing more about his reign beyond what Josephus tells us in reporting his death: “He had shown himself a person of moderation and quietness in the conduct of his life and government He constantly lived in that country which was subject to him. He used to make his progress with a few chosen friends; his tribunal, also, on which he sat in judgment, followed him in his progress; and when any one met him who wanted his assistance, he made no delay, but had his tribunal set down immediately, wheresoever he happened to be, and sat down upon it and heard his complaint; he then ordered the guilty, that were convicted, to be punished, and absolved those that were accused unjustly.” — Of his private life we know only that he was married to Salome, daughter of Herodias, and that there were no children by this marriage. — According to his political principles, he was a consistent friend of the Romans, and laid great value upon the favour of the emperor. This is shown not only in his giving to his cities the names of Caesarea and Julias, but also in his impressing upon his coins the images of Augustus and Tiberius, — this being the first instance in which any likeness was engraven on the coins of a Jewish prince.

Philip died, after a reign of thirty-seven years, in the 20th year of Tiberius, A.D. 33-34, and was buried in the tomb built by himself. His territory was then added to that of Syria, but retained the right of administering its own revenues; and was again, after a few years, made over to a prince of the Herodian family. The Emperor Caligula, immediately after his succession to the throne, in March A.D. 37, gifted the tetrarchy of Philip to Agrippa, a son of that Aristobolus who had been executed by his father Herod, and so a grandson of Herod and Mariamme.

b. HEROD ANTIPAS, B.C. 4-A.D. 39

SOURCES

JOSEPHUS, Antiq. xviii. 2. 1 and 3, 4. 5, 5. 1-3, 7. 1-2; Wars of the Jews, ii. 9. 1, 6.

In the New Testament: Matt. 14:1-11; Mark 6:14-28; Luke 3:19 f., 9:7-9, 13:31, 23:7-12.

On the coins, see below.

LITERATURE

GEIKIE, Life and Words of Christ, 7th ed. London 1879, i. 298-302, 500, ii. 182.

EWALD, History of Israel, vi. 74-80, vii. 241, 242.

HAUSRATH, Neutestamentliche Zeitgeschichte, 2 Aufl. i. 284 ff., 325 ff., ii. 207 ff., 221 ff.

WINER, Realwörterbuch, i. 484.

WIESELER, Chronological Synopsis of the Four Gospels, pp. 50, 159, 216. Also in Herzog’s Real-Encyclopaedie, 2 Aufl. i. 465 f.

KEIM, Jesus of Nazara, i. 269, ii. 333, 340, 392, iv. 217, vi. 103. Also in Schenkel’s Bibellexikon, iii. 42-46.

GERLACH in the Zeitschrift für luth. Theologie, 1869, pp. 32-53.

LEWIN, Fasti Sacri (see Index, p. 408).

BRANN, Die Söhne des Herodes, 1873 (reprint from the Monatsschrift für Geschichte und Wissenschaft des Judenthums), pp. 17–76.

In the partition of their father's possessions, a larger slice than that given to Philip fell to the lot of his half-brother Antipas, or, as he is frequently called by Josephus, on the coins, and in the New Testament, Herod, to whom, as well as to Philip, was given the title of tetrarch. His territory, embracing Galilee and Perea, was indeed broken up into two parts by the so-called Decapolis, which came in like a wedge between Galilee and Perea. But for this he was amply indemnified by the fact that the half of his domains consisted of the beautiful, fertile, and thickly-populated Galilee, with its vigorous and brave, though freedom-loving inhabitants. In point of character, Antipas was a genuine son of old Herod, – sly, ambitious, and luxurious, only not so able as his father. In regard to his slyness we have unmistakable evidence from the life of Jesus, who, on a memorable occasion, attached to him the designation of "that fox." It was always necessary to have recourse to craft in order to keep the Galileans in order, and to guard the frontiers of Perea against the robber raids of the Arabians. For the defence of Galilee he rebuilt Sepphoris, that had been destroyed by fire by the soldiers of Varus (see above, p. 4), and surrounded it with strong walls. And for the defence of Perea he fortified Betharamphtha, and named it after the emperor's wife Livias or Julias. He was also undoubtedly induced by political motives to marry the daughter of the Arabian king Aretas. He thought that in this way he would be better able than by all fortifications to secure the country against the inroads of the Arabians; and perhaps it was Augustus himself who persuaded him to enter on this marriage.

Like all the Herods, Herod Antipas delighted in magnificent buildings. In this direction he was particularly taken up with the idea of building a splendid capital, which he undertook during the time of Tiberius. He selected, as the site for his city, the most beautiful spot in Galilee, the western bank of the lake of Gennezaret, in the neighbourhood of the warm springs of Emmaus. The choice of this spot was in one respect not a happy one. For just on that spot on which the city was built, as became apparent from the sepulchral monuments, was an ancient burying-ground, and the inhabiting of such a place was impossible to the Jews who strictly observed the law, since every contact with a grave occasioned ceremonial impurity of seven days. Herod was therefore obliged, in order to secure inhabitants for his city, to settle there by force many foreigners, adventurers, and beggars, so that the population was of a very mixed description. But in regard to the beauty of the buildings nothing more perfect could be desired. It had, among other public structures, a δτάδιον and a royal palace, which, indeed, by its figures of animals gave offence, and during the war with the Romans was sacrificed to the fanaticism of the Jews. Also there was not wanting a Jewish προσευχή, a μέγιστον οἴκημα. The constitution of the city was wholly modelled upon the Hellenistic pattern. It had a council, βουλή, of 600 members, with an ἄρχων, and a committee of the δέκα πρῶτοι; also Hyparchs and an Agoranomos. In honour of the emperor the new capital was named Tiberias.

During the time of Pilate, A.D. 26–36, Antipas, together with his brother, successfully made complaints against Pilate on account of his having set up an offensive votive shield in the palace at Jerusalem. And as he was in this instance the representation of the Jewish claims, he also did not venture otherwise, notwithstanding his paganish buildings at Tiberias, to break away completely from the traditions of Judaism, and even in this respect showed himself a true son of Herod. From the Gospel we know that he went up to the feast at Jerusalem (Luke 23:7); and his coins, just like those of old Herod, have upon them no image.

The complaint against Pilate was probably not made before A.D. 36. Also what we otherwise known of Herod Antipas belongs to the later period, somewhere in the last ten years of his reign. During that period he was almost wholly under the influence of a woman, who occasioned to him a whole series of misfortunes. When once he made a journey to Rome, we know not for what purpose, nor exactly at what time, he started before the departure of his half-brother Herod, the son of Mariamme the high priest's daughter, who had been designated eventual successor to the throne in the first will of Herod (see vol. i. p. 462). That Herod was married to Herodias, a daughter of Aristobulus, executed in B.C. 7. The issue of this marriage was Salome, the wife of the tetrarch Philip, who was then not the first husband, as the Gospels tell us, but the son-in-law of Herodias. When now Antipas paid a visit to the house of his brother, he was fascinated by Herodias, and made his proposals of marriage, to which the ambitious woman readily assented. It was arranged that Herod on his return from Rome should divorce his wife, the daughter of Aretas, and should be married to Herodias. With this promise he proceeded on his journey to Rome. On his return, his wife, who had meanwhile obtained information about the proposed procedure, entreated him that he would have her sent to Machärus, the strong fortress east of the Dead Sea, which then belonged to Aretas. Since Antipas did not desire that his wife should know about his secret plans, he granted her wish. But scarcely had the daughter of Aretas reached Machärus, when she fled thence to her father, and let him know what friendly intentions her husband entertained regarding her. From that moment the Arabian king took up an attitude of direct opposition to Herod Antipas. Nevertheless Antipas seems to have proceeded immediately with his marriage with Herodias.

At the time of this marriage, or soon thereafter, John the Baptist and Jesus Christ made their appearance, both of them carrying on their labours in the domains of Antipas, the Baptist in Perea, Jesus in Galilee. Of John the Baptist, Josephus gives the following account: "He was a good man, and commanded the Jews to exercise virtue, both as to righteousness towards one another and piety towards God, and so to come to baptism. For the washing would be acceptable to Him, if they made use of it, not in order to the putting away of some sins only, but for the purification of the body; supposing still that the soul was thoroughly purified beforehand by righteousness. Now, when many others came to crowd about him, for they were greatly moved by hearing his words, Herod, who feared lest the great influence John had over the people might put it into his power and inclination to raise a rebellion (for they seemed ready to do anything he should advise), thought it best by putting him to death to prevent any mischief he might cause, and not bring himself into difficulties by sparing a man who might make him repent of it when it should be too late. Accordingly he was sent a prisoner, out of Herod's suspicious temper, to Machärus, the castle I before mentioned, and was there put to death." — This account by Josephus, if it really belongs originally to him, and the accounts of the New Testament about the Baptist and his relation with the tetrarch Herod, mutually supplement one another. What Josephus says about the contents of the Baptist's preaching of repentance has indeed very much of the style of the cultured Græco-Roman world. In this respect the short statements of the synoptic Gospels are truer and more reliable. On the other hand, it is highly probable that the real occasion of the imprisonment of the Baptist by Antipas was, just as Josephus states, fear of political trouble. The powerful popular preacher did undoubtedly produce a great excitement, which was indeed first of all of a religious kind, but certainly not without the mingling of a political element. For the masses of the people were not then able to keep separate their religious and political hopes. It is therefore quite credible that Antipas feared political troubles from the labours of the Baptist, and so, when he extended his activity to Perea, cast him into prison. Nevertheless the evangelists may be right (Matt. 14:3 f.; Mark 6:17; Luke 3:19 f.) when they say that he did this because John blamed him for his marriage with Herodias. The two

statements are not inconsistent with one another. — The place where John was imprisoned is not named by the evangelists. From Josephus we learn that it was Machärus, the strong fortress on the east of the Dead Sea. It must then have been no longer in the possession of the Arabian king Aretas, as it was at the time of the flight of the first wife of Antipas, but in the possession of Herod Antipas himself. We do not indeed know in what way it had meanwhile come into his hands. — According to Josephus, it would seem as if the execution of the Baptist followed immediately upon his arrestment and imprisonment But from the Gospel narrative we see that Herod kept the Baptist a longer time in prison, being undecided as to what he should do with him. At last the decision was brought about by Herodias, the chief foe of the rigid preacher of repentance. When on the occasion of the celebration of Antipas' birthday in the palace of Machärus, for there it was that the whole business was carried out, a great banquet was given, the daughter of Herodias, Salome (she was still a κοράσιον, Matt. 14:11; Mark 6:22, 28; therefore not yet married to Philip), by her dancing so delighted the tetrarch, that he promised to fulfil to her any wish she might express. At the instigation of her mother, she demanded the head of the Baptist. Herod was weak enough to gratify the wish immediately, and to give orders that the Baptist should be beheaded in the prison at Machärus.

Even before John had been removed from the scene, the "Mightier," to whom he had pointed, had already made His appearance, and had begun to preach the gospel in Galilee. He, too, could not remain unnoticed by the nobles of the land. Yet Antipas first heard of the deeds of Jesus after the Baptist had been put to death. Hence, tormented by his evil conscience, he felt convinced that the Baptist had risen again, and was continuing his dangerous and revolutionary work. In order to make sure whether this was so, he desired to see the miracle-worker who preached in Capernaum, and attracted all the people. He meant in time to get rid of Him, not, however, by violence, but by craft. He won over to him the Pharisees, and got them to undertake the attempt to induce Jesus voluntarily to quit the country by representing to Him that Herod sought His life. The plan was indeed very craftily conceived; but it failed in execution, because Jesus saw through it. Subsequently, indeed, Jesus did quit Galilee in order to take His death journey to Jerusalem. There also Antipas, who was at that time living at Jerusalem that he might keep the Passover, had the satisfaction of meeting with his mysterious subject. Pilate sent the prisoner to him, in order that he, as ruler of the province, might pronounce the death sentence clamoured for by the Jewish hierarchy. Antipas, however, would not lend himself to this scheme, but contented himself with pouring contempt upon Jesus, and sending Him back again to Pilate.

The chronology of the public ministry of the Baptist and of Jesus Christ, which has hitherto been based for the most part on Luke 3:1 and John 2:20, has been in recent times completely turned upside down by Keim. Whereas previously almost the only subject of contention had been whether the year 30 or the year 31 was the year of Christ's death, Keim sets down the execution of the Baptist in the end of A.D. 34 (Jesus of Nazara, vi. 226, 232), the death of Christ at Easter of A.D. 35 (Jesus of Nazara, vi. 232). His chief argument is the following. Josephus remarked (Antiq. xviii. 5. 2) that the defeat which Herod Antipas sustained in the war with the Arabian king Aretas in A.D. 36, was considered by the people as a judgment for the execution of John the Baptist. Accordingly, says Keim, the execution must be placed as near as possible to the year 36; and since, in view of the deposition of Pilate before Easter A.D. 36, Jesus must have been put to death not later than Easter A.D. 35, and the execution of the Baptist must be put down as occurring in the end of the year 34. There is also one other reason for insisting upon this late dating of these events. The attack of Aretas upon Antipas was an act of vengeance on the part of Aretas, because his daughter had been divorced by Antipas. Hence

both events must have occurred very nearly about the same time. And, seeing that the execution of the Baptist could not have occurred until after the divorce of the daughter of Aretas and the marriage with Herodias, the death of the Baptist and of Christ could not for this reason have occurred in A.D. 29 and 30 respectively.

Against this theory Wieseler particularly has urged a series of arguments which indeed are not all of a convincing character. He seeks especially as the ground of Agrippa's residence with Antipas (see under § 18) to prove that the marriage with Herodias occurred at an earlier date. When Agrippa had been appointed by Antipas agoranomos of Tiberius, Antipas was already married to Herodias. Afterwards Agrippa was sent away by Antipas, and then stayed for a long time with Flaccus, the legate of Syria, and then went to Rome, where he, or rather his freedman Eutychus, became intimate with the city prefect Piso (Antiq. xviii. 6. 2-5). Seeing then – so argues Wieseler – that Flaccus died in A.D. 33, Piso having previously died in A.D. 32, the marriage with Herodias must have taken place before A.D. 32, Wieseler thinks in A.D. 29. But we saw already that that Piso was not the man who died in A.D. 32, but a later one, and that Flaccus possibly, indeed probably, did not die till A.D. 35 (see vol. i. pp. 360-364). By these arguments, therefore, nothing can be proved.

But the rock upon which Keim's chronology suffered shipwreck is the definite statement of Luke 3:1, that the Baptist made his appearance before the public in the fifteenth year of Tiberius, i.e. between August A.D. 28 and August A.D. 29; which statement indeed Keim rejects as unworthy of belief. The tendency now is not to overestimate the trustworthiness of Luke, and certainly in reference to the tracing of Quirinius he has erred grievously. But it is surely impossible that in this case an error of five full years should have been made. Evidently Luke took great care in examining into this particular date. We have here therefore before us, not so much his opinion, as that of the entire Christendom of his time. Can it be thought possible that all Christendom was wrong to the extent of five full years about the date of their Lord's death? More powerful reasons must be given than those brought forward from Josephus before we can feel justified in adopting such a view.

The reasons advanced by Josephus are indeed nothing less than convincing. This is at least correct, and also generally admitted, that the defeat of Antipas in A.D. 36 took place somewhere about half a year before the death of Tiberius, in March A.D. 37. But that the people could not have regarded it as a divine judgment for the execution of the Baptist, seeing that that event was now seven years past, cannot be maintained. A couple of years more would in this matter make no difference. For Pharisaism was wont to discover such causal connections after the expiry of very long periods indeed. Further, that the divorce of the daughter of Aretas, followed by the marriage with Herodias, and the war with the Arabian king, must have followed immediately upon one another, still remains a point that cannot be proved. Josephus says expressly, that only from the divorce is to be dated the beginning of the hostility between Antipas and Aretas (Antiq. xviii. 5. 1: ὃ δὲ ἀρχὴν ἔχθρας ταύτην ποιησάμενος), and that after additional reasons arose, such as contentions about boundaries. Even Keim himself admits the possibility of setting down the marriage to A.D. 32-33 (Jesus of Nazara, ii. 397). Why then not to the year 29, if once an interval of several years has to be admitted? Hausrath, who in other respects agrees with Keim, put it back as far as the year 27, and in this way deprives himself of the main ground upon which he had supported his position (Neutestamentliche Zeitgeschichte, vol. i. p. 326, 328).

Upon the whole, therefore, we feel entitled to hold by the statements of the New Testament, and to place the death of Christ at Easter A.D. 30, that of the Baptist in A.D. 29, and the marriage of

Herodias somewhat earlier, perhaps in A.D. 29, perhaps even some years earlier (Gutschmid, Literarisches Centralblatt, 1874, Sp. 523, places it about A.D. 26).

The connection with Herodias brought little good to Antipas. The Arabian king Aretas could not forget that Antipas on her account had repudiated his daughter. The feud arising from this cause was increased through boundary disputes about Galaaditis, – for so we should read the name rather than Gamalitis. Finally, in A.D. 36 the misunderstanding between the two neighbours broke out into the war which ended in the utter destruction of the army of Antipas. The conquered monarch had now no other resource but to complain of his victorious opponent to the Emperor Tiberius.

When Tiberius heard of the bold proceedings of the Arabian prince, he gave Vitellius, governor of Syria, express orders to gain possession of Aretas, dead or alive. Vitellius had indeed little heart to enter on the expedition, for he was not greatly drawn toward Antipas. But he could not oppose the imperial command, and so he prepared himself for the war against Aretas. After he had ordered his army to march round about Judea to Petra, he himself went on a visit to Jerusalem, where a feast was then being celebrated, probably that of the Passover. He waited in that city three days. On the fourth, he received news of the death of Tiberius, which had taken place on 16th March A.D. 37. He considered himself thereby released from his undertaking, and turned back with his army to Antioch. Thus the defeat of Antipas remained unavenged.

About this time we find our Jewish tetrarch present on one occasion at the Euphrates during important negotiations between Vitellius and the king of the Parthians. But it seems that the account of this affair in Josephus is not free from error. “We know, for instance, that in the years 35 and 36 the Parthian king Artabanus had to do repeatedly with the Romans. His affairs seemed to be taking a favourable turn when, by the threats of Vitellius and the revolt of his own subjects, he was obliged to betake himself to flight into the remoter provinces. In consequence of this, Vitellius, in the summer of A.D. 36, went to the Euphrates along with the pretender Tiridates, supported by the Romans, and established him as king over the Parthians. Nevertheless, before the end of that same year, Artabanus returned, drove out Tiridates, and secured the government again to himself. Subsequently Vitellius arranged a meeting with Artabanus at the Euphrates, at which Artebanus concluded a peace with the Romans, and in pledge thereof, sent his son Darius to Rome as a hostage. At this meeting, according to Josephus, Herod Antipas was also present. He entertained Vitellius and Artabanus in a magnificent tent erected upon the Euphrates bridge, and hastened, as soon as the negotiations were concluded, to communicate the favourable result to the emperor, – a piece of officiousness which annoyed Vitellius at him exceedingly, since he had thereby completely anticipated his official report. – Thus Josephus places this meeting in the time of Tiberius, and considers that the quarrel arising out of this between Vitellius and Herod Antipas was the reason why Vitellius, after the death of Tiberius, immediately abandoned the campaign against Aretas. But Suetonius and Dio Cassius say expressly, and the silence of Tacitus, in the sixth book of his Annals, indirectly proves, that the meeting between Vitellius and Artabanus took place under Caligula. Josephus therefore is certainly in one particular in error. The only question is, in what particular. If it is correct that Herod Antipas took part in the Parthian negotiations on the Euphrates in the time of Tiberius, then these must have been the negotiations between Vitellius and Tiridates in the summer of A.D. 36 (Tacitus, Annals, vi. 37). But if it is correct that he took part in the negotiations between Vitellius and Artabanus, it cannot have been before the time of Caligula. The latter supposition is most probably the true account of the matter. For in summer A.D. 36 Herod was engaged in the war against Aretas.

If Antipas had his passion for Herodias to thank as the real occasion of his defeat and damage at the hand of Aretas, the ambition of this wife of his brought about at last the loss of his government and of his freedom. One of the first acts of the new Emperor Caligula on his taking the reins of government into his hands was to assign to Agrippa, the brother of Herodias, what had been the tetrarchy of Philip, together with the title of king. Agrippa at first remained still at Rome. But in the second year of Caligula, March A.D. 38 to March A.D. 39, he went to Palestine, and made his appearance there as king. The success of the adventurer, whose fortunes had once been at so low an ebb, and who had even himself sought aid at the hand of Antipas, excited the envy of Herodias, who therefore insisted upon her husband seeking also from the emperor the royal title. Herod Antipas was not very much disposed to go forth on such an errand. At last, however, he was obliged to yield to the persistent entreaty of his wife, and proceeded to Rome, accompanied by Herodias, to prosecute his suit. But they were immediately followed by a representative of Agrippa, Fortunatus, with a document containing charges against Herod Antipas, in which he was accused of old and recent offences, of having made a compact with Sejanus (who died in A.D. 31), and with the Parthian king Artabanus. In proof of these charges, his accuser pointed to the accumulation of arms made by Antipas. Both parties came at the same time before Caligula at Baiae. When the emperor had heard the petition of Antipas and the accusations against him, he asked Antipas how it was that he had made such a collection of arms. And when Antipas could give no proper account of this, Caligula credited also the other charges, deposed Antipas from his tetrarchy, and banished him to Lyons in Gaul. He wished to allow Herodias, as the sister of Agrippa, to live on her private estate. But the proud woman scorned the imperial favour, and followed her husband into his exile. As a new proof of imperial favour, the tetrarchy was conferred upon the accuser Agrippa. Herod Antipas died in banishment. A confused statement in DioCassius seems to imply that he was put to death by Caligula.

c. ARCHELAUS, B.C. 4–A.D. 6. HIS TERRITORY UNDER ROMAN PROCURATORS, A.D. 6–A.D. 41

SOURCES

JOSEPHUS, Antiq. xvii. 13, xviii. 1–4. 8; Wars of the Jews, ii 7–10.

PHILO, De legatione ad Cajum (Opera, ed. Mangey, ii. 545–600). On the coins, see below.

LITERATURE

EWALD, History of Israel, v. 449–457, vii. 235–257.

GEIKIE, Life and Words of Christ, i. 263–272.

GRÄTZ, Geschichte der Juden, 4 Aufl. iii. pp. 253–271, 315–317, 341–344.

HITZIG, Geschichte des Volkes Israel, ii. 562 f., 573–583.

HAUSRATH, Zeitgeschichte, 2 Aufl. i. 287–308, ii. 199–270.

KEIM, Jesus of Nazara, i. 253–262, ii. 223, vi. 79, 183, 227; and art. “Archelaus” in Schenkel’s Bibellexikon, iii. 38–40.

GERLACH, Zeitschrift für luth. Theologie, 1869, pp. 30-32; Die römischen Statthalter in Syrien und Judäa, pp. 44-48, 53-65.

WINER, Realwörterbuch, i. 82 f. (Archelaus), and ii. 261-263 (Pilatus).

BRANN, Die Söhne des Herodes, 1873 (reprint from the Monatsschrift für Geschichte und Wissenschaft des Judenthums), pp. 1-16.

LEWIN, Fasti Sacra, ad ann., 4 B.C.-41 A.D.

MOMMSEN, Römische Geschichte, v. 508 ff.

KELLNER, Die römische Statthalter von Syrien und Judäa. 2. Art. Die kaiserlichen Procuratoren von Judäa (Zeitschrift für kathol. Theologie, 1888, p. 630 ff.).

KELLNER, Politische und administrative Zustände von Palästina zur Zeit Christi (Der Katholik, 1888, i. pp. 47-63). A summary of the history during the time of Pompey.

MENKE, Bibelatlas, Bl. V. Special map of Judea and neighbouring countries in the time of Pontius Pilate.

Judea proper with Samaria and Idumea (including the large cities of Caesarea, Samaria, Joppa, and Jerusalem, but excluding Gaza, Gadara, and Hippos) was in the partition assigned to Archelaus, the elder brother of Antipas, not indeed, as Herod had intended, with the title of king, but only with that of an ethnarch. Yet Augustus promised him the kingdom if he should prove himself to be worthy of it. Archelaus also, like Antipas, named himself on the coins and elsewhere by the family name of Herod.

Among the sons of Herod he procured for himself the worst reputation. His rule was violent and tyrannical He set up and removed the high priests at his pleasure. He gave special offence by his marriage with Glaphyra, daughter of the Cappadocian king Archelaus. She had been married first to Alexander, the half-brother of Archelaus, executed in B.C. 7. See vol. i. p. 456 of this work. After his death she was married to Juba, king of Mauritania. Upon the dissolution of this marriage, Glaphyra lived in her father's house. There Archelaus became acquainted with her, fell in love with her, and took her to he his wife, for he divorced his own wife Mariamme. Seeing that Glaphyra had children by Alexander, the marriage was unlawful, and therefore gave great offence. The marriage was not indeed of long duration, for Glaphyra died soon after her arrival in Judea, after having had a remarkable dream, in which her first husband, Alexander, appeared to her, and made known to her her approaching death.

It will almost go without saying that Archelaus as son of Herod engaged upon great building enterprises. The palace at Jericho was restored in the most magnificent style. An aqueduct was built to lead the water necessary for the palmgroves, which he had laid out anew in the plain north of Jericho, from the village of Neara. He also founded a city, and called it in honour of himself Archelais.

But these beautiful and useful undertakings could not reconcile his subjects to his misgovernment. After tolerating his rule for more than nine years, a deputation of the Jewish and Samaritan aristocracy set out for Rome, in order to lay their complaints against him before Augustus. The points in their accusation must have been very serious; for the emperor felt

himself obliged to summon Archelaus to Rome, and, after having heard him, to depose him from his government, and banish him to Vienne in Gaul in A.D. 6. To him also, as to his wife, his fate had been foretold by a remarkable dream.

The territory of Archelaus was taken under immediate Roman rule, for it was attached to the province of Syria, but received a governor of its own from the equestrian order. In consequence of this arrangement the condition of Judea became essentially changed. Herod the Great and his sons had in spite of all their friendship for the Romans considerable respect for and understanding of the national traditions and peculiarities of the Jews, so that they, apart from individual exceptions, did not wantonly wound the most sacred sensibilities of the people. Common prudence demanded in regard to such matters care and consideration. The Romans, on the other hand, had scarcely any appreciation of what was peculiar to the Jewish nationality. As the religious views of the Pharisees and the accumulation of traditions which encompassed the daily life of the people like a net were altogether unknown to the Romans, they could not at all understand how a whole people would offer the most persistent resistance even unto death, and would suffer annihilation on account of merely ceremonial rites and what seemed matters of indifference. The Jews again saw in the simplest rules of administration, such as the proposal of a census made at the very beginning, an encroachment upon the most sacred rights of the people, and from day to day the feeling more and more gained ground that the immediate government of the Romans, which at the death of Herod they had wished for, was irreconcilable with the principles of the theocracy. Thus, even had there been the best of intentions on both sides, the relations inevitably became strained and ultimately hostile. But this good-will was only partially exhibited. Those at the head of the government, with the exception of the times of Caligula, were indeed ready on their part to make concessions and to exercise forbearance in a very large measure. But their good intentions were always rendered nugatory by the perversity of the procurators, not infrequently also by gross miscarriage of justice on the part of these officials. Those subordinate officers, like all petty governors, were usually puffed up by a consciousness of their absolute authority, and by their insolent demeanour at last drove the oppressed and burdened people to such a pitch of excitement that they rushed headlong with wild fanaticism into a war that plainly involved annihilation.

Seeing that the political affairs of Judea during the period A.D. 6–41 were in all essential respects the same as those of Palestine generally during the period A.D. 44–66, in the following exposition we take the two periods together, and make use of materials from the one period as well as from the other.

Judea, and subsequently all Palestine, was not in the strict sense of the term incorporated with the province of Syria, but had a governor of its own of equestrian rank, who stood only to a certain extent in dependence upon the imperial legate of Syria. It therefore belonged to the third class of imperial provinces, according to Strabo's classification. And this third class is to be regarded as an exception to the rule; for most of the imperial provinces were, just like the senatorial provinces, administered by men of senatorial rank; the greater provinces, like that of Syria, by men who had been consuls, the smaller ones, by those who had been praetors. Only a few particular provinces were in an exceptional manner placed under governors of equestrian rank, namely, those in which, on account of special tenacity in adhering to peculiar national customs, or on account of the rudeness and savage state of the country, the government could not be carried on by the usual methods. The best known example is that of Egypt. Elsewhere there were also territories inhabited by a still semi-barbarous people which were administered in this manner.

The usual title for such an equestrian governor was procurator, ἐπίτροπος. It seems indeed that Augustus, not only in Egypt, but elsewhere as well, preferred the title praefactus, ἔπαρχος. Very soon, however, at farthest in the time of Claudius, except in the case of Egypt, the title procurator had become the prevailing one. Josephus, as a rule, designates the governor of Judea ἐπίτροπος, sometimes ἔπαρχος or ἡγεμών. In the New Testament, ἡγεμών=praeses, is the term usually employed. That ἐπίτροπος (procurator) is the correct title may be also proved by witnesses of another kind. In general this title was used for all imperial finance officers, while praefactus was more of a military title. Such finance procurators were found also in all other provinces, in the imperial as well as the senatorial provinces. They were chosen not only from the equestrian order, but even from among the freedmen of the emperor. Those procurators, on the other hand, who had to administer a province, on account of the military command that was necessarily connected with such an appointment, were chosen exclusively from the ranks of the equestrians. It was an unheard of novelty when under Claudius the office of procurator of Judea was given to a freedman, Felix (see below under § 19).

The procurators of Judea seem to have been subordinate to the governor of Syria only to this extent, that it was the right and duty of the governor to interfere in the exercise of his supreme power in cases of necessity. Writers have indeed sometimes expressed themselves as if Judea had been incorporated into the province of Syria. But they do not continue consistent to such a view. The investing the procurator with a military command, and with independent jurisdiction, of itself conferred upon him a position, in virtue of which he was, in regard to ordinary transactions within the limits of his province, as independent as the governors of other provinces. On the other hand, the governor of Syria had the right, according to his own discretion, to interfere if he had reason to fear revolutionary uprisings or the appearance of other serious difficulties. He would then take command in Judea as the superior of the procurator. Whether this superior authority went so far that he might even call the procurator to account seems questionable, since in the two cases in which this happened, the governor concerned had been probably entrusted with a special commission.

The residence of the procurator of Judea was not at Jerusalem, but at Caesarea. Since the dwelling of the commander-in-chief or governor was called praetorium, the πραιτώριον τοῦ Ἡρώδου in Caesarea (Acts 23:35) was nothing else than a palace built by Herod, which served as a residence for the procurator. — On special occasions, especially during the chief Jewish feasts, when, on account of the crowds of people that streamed into Jerusalem, particularly careful oversight was necessary, the procurator went up to Jerusalem, and resided then in what had been the palace of Herod. The praetorium at Jerusalem, in which Pilate was staying at the time of the trial and condemnation of Jesus Christ (Matt. 27:27; Mark 15:16; John 18:28, 33, 19:9), is therefore just the well-known palace of Herod, on the west side of the city. It was not only a princely dwelling, but at the same time a strong castle, in which at times (during the rebellion in B.C. 4, and again in A.D. 66) large detachments of troops could maintain their position against the assaults of the whole mass of the people. Hence, also, during the residence there of the procurator, the detachment of troops accompanying him had their quarters within its walls (Mark 15:16).

With reference to the military arrangements, it deserves specially to be remembered that the Roman army of the days of the empire was divided into two divisions of a thoroughly distinct kind: the legions and the auxiliaries. The legions formed the proper core of the troops, and consisted only of Romau citizens, for those provincials who served in the legions had obtained citizen rights. Each legion formed a compact whole of ten cohorts, or sixty centuries, altogether

embracing from 5000 to 6000 men. The auxiliary troops consisted of provincials who, at least in the early days of the empire, did not as a rule possess the right of citizenship. Their arms were lighter and less harmonious than those of the legions; often in this they were allowed to follow their own national usages. Their infantry was formed into cohorts, whose strength varied from 500 to 1000 men; the cavalry was formed into aloe, of similarly varying strength. Cohorts and alae were named after the nation from which they had been recruited.

In regard to the provinces administered by procurators, it may, as a rule, be assumed that in them, and under the command of the procurator, there would be only auxiliary troops. This rule is also confirmed by the history of Judea. There were legions only in Syria; in the time of Auguetus three, from the time of Tiberius four. But in Judea, down to the time of Vespasian, there were only auxiliary troops, and, indeed, mostly such as had been raised in the country itself. The honour and burden of this levy lay only on the non-Jewish inhabitants of Palestine. The Jews were exempted from military service. This is abundantly proved to have been the state of matters, at least, from the time of Caesar, and, from all that we positively know about the Palestinian troops down to the days of Vespasian, may also be assumed as certain throughout the imperial period. Remarkable as this unequal treatment of the population may appear to us, it is in thorough correspondence with what is otherwise known regarding the Roman procedure in the conscription. Indeed, in regard to the use made of the inhabitants and the confidence reposed in them, the provinces were treated in very diverse ways and varying measures in the matter of military service.

For the period A.D. 6–41 we are without any direct information about the troops stationed in Judea. But it is highly probable that the Sebastians, i.e. the soldiers drafted in the region of Sebaste or Samaria, whom we meet with subsequently, constituted even then a considerable portion of the garrison. In the struggles which followed the death of Herod in B.C. 4, the best equipped part of the troops of Herod fought on the side of the Romans, namely, the Σεβαστηνοὶ τρισχίλιοι, under the command of Rufus and Gratus, the former of whom commanded the cavalry, the latter the infantry. The troops thus proved would be undoubtedly retained by Archelaus, and it is highly probable that, after his deposition in A.D. 6, they would be taken over by the Romans, then, from A.D. 41 to A.D. 44, by Agrippa, and after his death again by the Romans. The following also speaks in favour of this supposition. At the death of Agrippa in A.D. 44, the troops of the king stationed in Caesarea, which were Καισαρεῖς καὶ Σεβαστηνοί, gave expression in a very unseemly manner to their joy at the death of the ruler that had shown himself friendly to the Jews. In order to show respect to the memory of Agrippa, the emperor ordered these troops, namely, τὴν ἴλην τῶν Καισαρέων καὶ τῶν Σεβαστηνῶν καὶ τὰς πέντε σπείρας (therefore an ala of cavalry and five cohorts), to be sent by way of punishment to Pontus. On their presenting a petition, however, it was agreed that they should remain in Judea, from which they were first removed by Vespasian. From this it appears that the troops of Agrippa were certainly taken over by the Romans. From this it may be inferred that in the same way they were taken over after the deposition of Archelaus. It is also somewhat remarkable that the one ala of cavalry and five cohorts of infantry, if we reckon the latter at 500 men, would make together a force of 3000 men, which is the same number as is ascribed to the Sebastian troops of B.C. 4. — During the period A.D. 44–66 these troops are often referred to. The procurator Cumanus led the ala Sebastenorum and four cohorts of infantry from Caesarea against the Jews. During the struggles between the Jewish and Gentile inhabitants of Caesarea, the latter boasted of the fact that the Roman troops in Caesarea consisted in great part of Caesareans and Sebastians. Finally, in A.D. 67, Vespasian was able to draft into his army from Caesarea five cohorts and one ala of cavalry; therefore the same detachments as

were there in A.D. 44. Probably also the Sebasteni so often referred to on the inscriptions are identical with our Sebastian troops. Also the σπεῖρα Σεβαστή, which at the time of the imprisonment of Paul, about A.D. 60, lay in Caesarea (Acts 27:1), is undoubtedly one of the five cohorts which we hear about from Josephus. Many theologians, however, have erroneously come to the conclusion that the expression σπεῖρα Σεβαστή is synonymous with σπεῖρα Σεβαστηνῶν. This is not possible. Σεβαστή is rather an exact translation of Augusta, a title of honour very frequently bestowed upon auxiliary troops. The cohort in question was therefore probably called cohors Augusta Sebastenorum. In Caesarea it was called simply σπεῖρα Σεβαστή, since this sufficed to distinguish it from others. – It is, on the other hand, remarkable, after other results we have reached, that in Caesarea, about A.D. 40, a σπεῖρα Ἰταλική should have been stationed (Acts 10:1), by which probably a cohort of Roman citizens of Italy is to be understood. Such a band would naturally not have served in Caesarea during the period A.D. 41-44 under the Jewish king Agrippa. But even in reference to a later period, it is after the above made investigations not probable. The story of the centurion Cornelius lies, therefore, in this respect under suspicion, the circumstances of a later period having been transferred back to an earlier period. That at some time or other a cohors Italica was in Syria is made perfectly clear by the evidence of an inscription.

We have hitherto become acquainted only with the state of the garrison of Caesarea. In other cities and towns of Palestine there were also small garrisons. At the outbreak of the Jewish war in A.D. 66, we find, for example, a Roman garrison in the fortified castle of Jericho and in Machärus. Throughout Samaria such detachments were stationed. In the Great Plain there was a decurio; in Ascalon (which, however, did not belong to the domains of the procurator) there were a cohort and an ala. Vespasian, in the winter of A.D. 67-68, placed garrisons in all conquered villages and towns; those in the former under the command of Decurions, those in the latter under the command of Centurions. This was indeed an extraordinary proceeding, which we are not to regard as the rule in time of peace.

In Jerusalem there was stationed only one cohort. For the χιλίαρχος, so often referred to in the Acts of the Apostles (more exactly, Acts 21:31: χιλίαρχος τῆς σπείρης, "One having command of the cohort"), appears throughout as the officer holding the chief command in Jerusalem. With this also Josephus' statement agrees, that in the fortress of Antonia a τάγμα of the Romans regularly lay, for the τάγμα there means, not as it often does, a legion, but, as in the passage quoted in note 4 a cohort. The fort of Antonia, which Josephus describes as the regular quarters of the detachment, lay to the north of the temple. At two points, stairs (καταβάσεις) led down from the fort Antonia to the court of the temple. This is just the position given it in the Acts of the Apostles. For when Paul, during the tumult in the temple, had been taken by the soldiers for his own safety and was being carried thence into the barracks (παρεμβολή), he was on account of the pressure of the crowd borne by the soldiers up the steps (τοὺς ἀναβαθμούς), and then, with the permission of the chiliarch. he made from these steps a speech to the people (Acts 21:31-40). The officer in command at fort Antonia, who is certainly identical with the chiliarch. is also called by Josephus φρούραρχος. The direct connection between the fort and the court of the temple was of importance, since the latter required to be under constant supervision. At the chief feasts, guards were stationed in the corridors which surrounded the temple. – From one passage in the Acts of the Apostles (chap. 23:23) we see that there was a detachment of cavalry along with the Jerusalem cohort, an arrangement that very frequently existed. The precise character and position of the δεξιολάβοι (from λαβή, "the grip," therefore: "those who grasped their weapons by the right hand"), mentioned in that passage (23:23) as accompanying the regular soldiers and cavalry, are somewhat obscure. Seeing that the expression occurs

elsewhere in Greek literature only twice, and even then appears without explanation, we are no longer in a position to explain it. This much only is certain, that it designated a special class of light-armed soldiers (javelin-throwers or slingers).

After the great war of A.D. 66–73 the garrison arrangements of Palestine were essentially changed. The governor was then no longer a procurator of the equestrian order, but a legate of senatorial rank (in the earlier period, one who had been praetor; in the later period, one who had been consul). On the site of the destroyed Jerusalem a legion, the legio X. Fretensis, had its headquarters (see under § 20, toward the end). The native troops, which for decades had formed the garrison of Caesarea, were drafted by Vespasian to other provinces. In their place were put auxiliary troops of foreign origin, drawn in part from the farthest lands of the West.

Besides the troops forming the standing army, the provincial governors sometimes organized a militia, i.e. in special cases of need those of the people capable of bearing arms were drafted into military service, without being permanently organized as a part of the army. An instance of this sort occurred in the arming of the Samaritans by Cumanus on the occasion of the war against the Jews.

Like the governors of senatorial rank, the procurators also had, besides the supreme military command, supreme judicial authority within their province. This authority was exercised by the procurators of Judea only in extraordinary cases; for the ordinary administration of the law, both in criminal and in civil matters, was left in the hands of the native and local courts (see Div. II. vol. i. 184–190). — The range of the procurator's judicial jurisdiction extended also to the right of deciding matters of life and death, jus gladii or potestas gladii. That this also is true of the governors is proved by several inscriptions. With reference to Judea, Josephus says expressly that the procurator had μέχρι τοῦ κτείνειν ἐξουσίαν. This right of the governor over life and death down to the third century after Christ extended even to the case of Roman citizens, with this restriction, however, that such a one had the right of appealing against the sentence of the governor to the emperor In the earlier days of the empire, it would seem that a Roman citizen accused of an offence constituting a capital charge had the important privilege of appealing to the emperor, even at the beginning of the proceedings and any subsequent stage of the trial, claiming that the investigation be carried on at Rome and the judgment pronounced by the emperor himself. The governor's absolute penal jurisdiction therefore applied only to provincials. It was a gross violation of the law when Florus in Jerusalem, in A.D. 66, had the Jews crucified who were in possession of equestrian rank. But even provincials might be sent by the governor for trial to Rome, if he wished on account of the difficulty of the case to have the decision of the emperor. — The fact known from the Gospels, that the procurator of Judea at the feast of the Passover set free a prisoner, was grounded indeed on a special authorization of the emperor; for the right of remitting a sentence was not otherwise given to the governors.

Although the governor, as sole judge, had to give the decision, he frequently availed himself of the advice of his comites. These were partly the higher officials of his court, partly the younger people, who, for the sake of their own training, accompanied the governor. They supported him, not only in administrative matters, but also assisted him in the execution of the law as consilium, συμβούλιον (Acts 25:12).

The execution of the death sentence was, as a rule, carried out by soldiers. Le Blant has, indeed, in a learned dissertation, sought to prove that those appointed to this duty were not soldiers, but belonging to the class of apparitores, i.e. the non-military servants of the governor. But the opposite opinion, at least with regard to capital sentences pronounced by the imperial

governors, must be considered as absolutely certain. The imperial governors were military administrators; their judicial power therefore the outcome of their military authority. It is, however, unquestionable, and is not disputed even by Le Blant, that the death sentences on soldiers were executed by soldiers. According to Le Blant's view, this inference should be drawn from that fact, namely, that the governor carried out the death sentences on soldiers by different parties than those employed upon civilians. This, in view of the military character of his judicial authority, is extremely improbable, and it even forms a positive proof for the opposite theory. The many executions of distinguished men and women in the times of Claudius and Nero were carried out by military men, some of them officers of high rank. Numerous examples of a similar kind might be cited from the history of the following emperors. Although these cases might not apply to ordinary courts, yet this much is clear, that the carrying out of executions by soldiers was not opposed to Roman sentiment. But further, not infrequently speculatores are spoken of as executing the condemned. These were certainly soldiers; for (1) the speculatores are frequently described as holding a military office; and (2) in several of the passages quoted the speculatores referred to are distinctly characterized as soldiers; and so those elsewhere spoken of under the same title, and as discharging the same functions, will have been also soldiers. When Le Blant expressly refers to the fact that in many passages the term speculator is interchanged with the expression lictor, and with other words which designate non-military offices, this may be said in the first place to result from a certain laxity in the use of language. On the contrary, one would be equally justified in saying that those expressions are now also used for designating military persons. In the New Testament the agents entrusted with the carrying out the sentence, both at the crucifixion of Christ and at the imprisonment of Paul, are named στρατιῶται, and are also plainly described as such.

The third chief function of the procurator-governor, in addition to the command of the troops and judicial authority, was the administration of the finance department. From this, indeed, those equestrian governors got their title; for the imperial finance officials generally were called "procurators." Since everything that is of consequence about the different sorts of revenue and methods of taxation will be considered in the Excursus on the Census of Quirinius (§ 17, Excursus 1), it is not necessary here to say more than this, that the revenue of Judea as imperial province went, not into the treasury of the Senate, the aerarium, but into the imperial treasury, the fiscus. Judea therefore, in the strict sense of the word, paid its taxes "to Caesar" (Matt. 22:17 ff.; Mark 12:14 ff.; Luke 20:22 ff.), which could only in a certain degree be said of the senatorial provinces. — It was probably for the purposes of tax collection that Judea was divided into eleven toparchies (see Div. II. vol. i. pp. 157–161). In the gathering of the revenue the Romans seem to have made use of the Jewish courts, as was their custom in other places (see Div. II. vol. i. p. 162). — That the taxes were oppressive, is seen from the complaints made by the provinces of Syria and Judea in A.D. 17.

From the taxes in the proper sense are to be distinguished the customs, i.e. duties upon articles on their being exported from the country. These were imposed in all the provinces of the Roman empire. The great trade emporium which yielded the largest returns in this direction was Egypt. From the days of the Ptolemies it had taken advantage of its geographical position in order to secure the flourishing traffic between India and Europe. But even in Palestine they were acquainted with the "custom" as early as the Persian era (Ezra 4:13, 20, 7:24). — The range to which the "custom" applied, varied certainly according to circumstances. In general it may be assumed that every province of the Roman empire formed a customs district by itself. But also the States and Communes recognised by the Romans as autonomous, and the number of these was very large, had the right of independently levying duties within their own boundaries.

To the proofs in regard to these matters already in earlier times acknowledged, there has now to be added: a long inscription in Greek and Aramaic, which contains the customs-tariff of the city of Palmyra in the time of Hadrian. From this inscription it appears that Palmyra, although it was at that time a Roman city in the same sense as many other autonomous communes within the Roman empire, administered independently its own customs, and enjoyed the revenues thereof. It is therefore perfectly evident that the kings and tetrarchs "confederate" with Rome within their own territories could levy their customs for their own behoof, only with this restriction, that the Roman citizens (Romani ac socii nominis Latini, as it is phrased by Livy) should be exempted from them. The customs raised at Capernaum, within the borders of Galilee, in the times of Christ (Matt. 9:9; Mark 2:14; Luke 5:27) went therefore, undoubtedly, not into the imperial fiscus, but into the treasury of Herod Antipas. On the other hand, in Judea at that time, the customs were raised in the interests of the imperial fiscus. We know from the Gospels that in Jericho, on the eastern borders of Judea, there was an ἀρχιτελώνης (Luke 19:1, 2). In the seaport town of Caesarea in A.D. 66, among the influential men of the Jewish community, there John, a τελώνης, is mentioned. It is stated by Pliny that the merchants who exported incense from Central Arabia through Gaza had to pay a high duty, not only to the Arabians on passing through their territory, but also to the Roman customs officers, who, it may be supposed, were stationed at Gaza. – Besides the import and export duties, it would seem as if in Judea, as well as elsewhere, indirect duties of another sort had also to be paid, e.g. a market toll in Jerusalem, introduced by Herod, but abolished in A.D. 36 by Vitellius.

The collecting of the customs was not done by officers of the State, but by lessees, the so-called publicani, who leased the customs of a particular district for a fixed annual sum; so that whatever in excess of that sum the revenue yielded was their gain; whereas, if the revenue fell below it, they had to bear the loss. This system was widely prevalent throughout ancient times, and came often to be applied, not only to the customs, but also to the taxes properly so called. Thus, e.g. during the Ptolemaic government of Palestine the taxes of each city were annually leased out to the highest bidder. In the days of the Roman empire the system of leasing was no longer applied to the taxes, i.e. the land-tax and poll-tax. These were now collected by officers of State: in senatorial provinces, by the quaestor; in imperial provinces, by an imperial procurator, assistants to the governor; in provinces like Judea, administered by an equestrian, the governor was himself at the same time procurator. The customs, on the other hand, were, even in the days of the empire, still commonly leased out to publicani. So, undoubtedly, it was in Judea. The contrary opinion of Wieseler rests manifestly on a misunderstanding. In the passage cited from Pliny, in note 10 it is expressly said, that for the incense exported from Arabia by way of Gaza a duty bad also to be paid to the Roman publicani. From the universality of the system, it may be assumed that territorial princes like Herod Antipas would also make use of it. Even city communes like Palmyra did not have their customs collected by municipal officials, but rented them out to lessees. – The lessees again, as may be readily supposed, had their subordinate officials, who would usually be chosen from the native population. But even the principal lessees were by no means necessarily Romans. The tax-gatherers of Jericho (Luke 19:1, 2) and of Caesarea – Zaccheus and John – were therefore Jews. Since they are described as well-to-do and respectable people, they certainly cannot have belonged to the lowest class of publicans. – The extent to which custom might be charged was indeed prescribed by the court; but since these tariffs, as we see from the case of Palmyra, were in early times often very indefinite, abundant room was left for the arbitrariness and rapacity of the tax-gatherer. The advantage taken of such opportunities, and the not infrequent overcharges that were made by these officials, made them as a class hated by the people. Not only in the New Testament are the terms "publican and sinner" almost synonymous, but also in rabbinical

literature tax-gatherers (מוֹבְסִין) appear in an even less favourable light. — On the other hand, the people generally then, just as in the present day, were inventive of contrivances of ways and means for defrauding the revenue.

Within the limits, which were stated in the very regulations themselves, the Jewish people enjoyed even yet a very considerable measure of freedom in home affairs and self-administration. — The oath of allegiance which the people had to take to the emperor, presumably on every change of government, was, if we may judge from analogous cases, more an oath of confederates than one of subjects, such as had been given even so early as the times of Herod. — The constitution as regards home affairs, during the age of the procurators, is characterized by Josephus, in opposition to the monarchial rule of Herod and Archelaus, in the words: ἀριστοκρατία μὲν ἦν ἡ πολιτεία, τὴν δὲ προστασίαν τοῦ ἔθνους οἱ ἀρχιερεῖς ἐπεπίστευντο. He sees, therefore, in the change which took place after the deposition of Archelaus, a transition from monarchy to aristocracy, because he, and that not incorrectly, considers the Roman procurator only as an overseer, but the aristocratic Sanhedrim as the real governing body. He who held the office of high priest for the time, who also held the presidency of the Sanhedrim, is called by Josephus προστάτης τοῦ ἔθνους. Yet certainly these very high priests were set up and removed at the arbitrary pleasure of the overseer. But even in this matter the Romans restrained themselves within certain limits. Whereas during the period A.D. 6–41 the appointments had been made by the Roman governors, either the legate of Syria or the procurator of Judea, during the the period A.D. 44–66 the right of appointment was transferred to the Jewish princes, Herod of Chalcis and Agrippa II., although these did not reign in Judea. And in both periods the appointments were not made in a purely arbitrary manner, but respect was paid to the claims of certain families (Phabi, Boethos, Ananus, Kamith).

Of greater importance is the fact that the Sanhedrim exercised to a very large extent the right of legislating and of executing the law, to a larger extent indeed than on the average was the case among non-autonomous communities in the Roman empire. The state of the law was in general this, that the communities recognised by Rome as “free” or “autonomous” had expressly guaranteed to them the right of passing and executing their own laws, in fact, even over Roman citizens dwelling within their bounds. In the subject, non-autonomous communities, to which Judea belonged, the practical state of matters was very nearly the same; but with this twofold restriction: (1) That this practical state of matters was not guaranteed them; and (2) that the Roman citizens residing within their bounds had their own law and their own judicatories. The first point was of most importance. The Roman authorities could, in consequence of it, interfere at pleasure in the legislation and in the administration of the law in non-autonomous communities. In Judea this right seems to have been taken advantage only to a very limited extent It may be assumed that the administration of the civil law was wholly in the hands of the Sanhedrim and native or local magistrates: Jewish courts decided according to Jewish law. But even in the criminal law this was almost invariably the case, only with this exception, that death sentences required to be confirmed by the Roman procurator. In such case the procurator decided if he pleased according to the standard of the Jewish law, as is shown in the trial of Jesus Christ. Even Roman citizens were not wholly exempt from the requirements of the Jewish law. When, indeed, the procurator Festus proposed to judge the Apostle Paul according to Jewish law, this was frustrated by the objection of the apostle (see above, p. 59). But the Jewish law, that no Gentile should be allowed to enter the inner court of the temple, was recognised by the Roman authorities, and any one who transgressed it was punished with death, even if he were a Roman citizen. There was only one limitation to the far-reaching application of this right, and that certainly a very important one; the procurator and his agents could at any time interfere

according to their own discretion.

The Jewish worship was not only tolerated, but, as the enactment just referred to with regard to the temple shows, stood under State protection. The cosmopolitan tendency, which characterized the pagan piety of the time, made it quite possible for distinguished Romans to present gifts to the Jewish temple, and even to offer sacrifices there. The oversight of the temple by the State, especially of the administration of its large finances, seems to have been carried out during the period A.D. 6–41 by means of the Roman authorities. During the period A.D. 44–66 it was transferred to the same Jewish princes who had also received the right of appointing the high priests, namely, Herod of Chalcis, and then Agrippa II. A restriction in the freedom of worship, which was in itself quite harmless, but was regarded by the Jews as oppressive, was set aside in A.D. 36. During the period A.D. 6–36 the beautiful robe of the high priest was in the keeping of the Roman commandant in the fort of Antonia and was only four times in the year, at the three chief feasts and on the Day of Atonement, brought forth for use. At the request of the Jews, in A.D. 36, Vitellius ordered that the robe should be given up. And when the procurator Cuspius Fadius, in A.D. 44, wished again to have the robe put under Roman control, a Jewish embassy went to Rome and procured a rescript from the Emperor Claudius by which the order of Vitellius was confirmed.

Great deference was shown to the religious opinions of the Jews. Whereas in all other provinces the worship of the emperor was zealously insisted upon, and was claimed as a matter of course by the emperor as a proof of respect, no demand of this sort, except in the time of Caligula, was ever made of the Jews. The authorities were satisfied with requiring that twice a day in the temple at Jerusalem a sacrifice was made “for Caesar and the Roman people.” The sacrifice for the whole day consisted in two lambs and an ox, and, according to Philo, was provided by Augustus himself, ἐκ τῶν ἰδίων προσόδων, whereas the opinion of Josephus is that it was made at the cost of the Jewish people. Also on extraordinary occasions the Jewish people evidenced their loyal sentiments by a great sacrifice in honour of the emperor. In the Diaspora the emperor was remembered in the prayers of the synagogue, which, however, cannot be proved to have been the case in Palestine. Next to the worship of the emperor, the emperor’s images on the coins and the standards of the soldiers were specially offensive to the Jews. But in these matters also they were treated with tolerance. It could not, indeed, be avoided that Roman denaria with the figure of the emperor should circulate in Judea (Matt. 22:20; Mark 12:16; Luke 20:24), for silver and gold coins were not minted in Judea. But the copper coinage restored to the country bore, even in the time of the direct Roman rule, as well as in the times of the Herodians, no human likeness, but only the name of the emperor and inoffensive emblems. The troops were required in Jerusalem to dispense with standards having on them the likeness of the emperor. The wanton attempt of Pilate to break through this custom was frustrated by the violent opposition of the people. Pilate found himself compelled to withdraw again the imperial likenesses from Jerusalem. When Vitellius, the legate of Syria, took the field against the Arabian king Aretas, at the urgent entreaty of the Jews, he so directed the course of his march that the troops carrying the likeness of the emperor on their standards should not enter Jewish territory.

So far, then, as the civil enactments and the orders of the supreme authorities were concerned, the Jews could not complain of any want of consideration being paid them. It was otherwise, however, with respect to the practical carrying out of details. The average Roman official was always disposed to disregard all such nice, delicate consideration. And the unfortunate thing was, that Judea, especially in the last decades before the war, had had more than one governor

who had lost all sense of right and wrong. Besides this, notwithstanding the most painstaking efforts to show indulgence to Jewish views and feelings, the existing relations were in themselves, according to Jewish ideas, an insult to all the lofty, divine privileges of the chosen people, who, instead of paying tribute to Caesar, were called rather to rule over all nations of the world.

Their first administrative measures which they introduced there show how hard a task the incorporation of Judea into the empire proved to the Romans. Contemporaneously with the appointment of Coponius, the first procurator of Judea, the emperor had sent a new legate, Quirinius, into Syria. It was now the duty of the legate to take a census of the population of the newly-acquired territory, in order that the taxes might be appointed according to the Roman method. But no sooner had Quirinius, in A.D. 6 or A.D. 7, begun to carry out his commission, than he was met with opposition on every hand. Only the quieting representations of the high priest Joazar, who clearly perceived that open rebellion would be of no avail, led to the gradual abandonment of the opposition that had already begun, and then the people with mute resignation submitted to the inevitable, so that, at last, the census was made up. It was, however, no enduring peace, but only a truce of uncertain duration. Judas of Gamala in Gaulanitis, called the Galilean, who is certainly identical with that Judas, son of Hezekiah, of whom we have already learnt on p. 4, in company with a Pharisee of the name of Sadduc, made it his task to rouse the people into opposition, and in the name of religion to preach rebellion and revolutionary war. This movement had not, indeed, any immediate marked success. But the revolutionists got so far as to found now among the Pharisees a more strict fanatical party, that of the patriotic resolutes, or, as they called themselves, the Zealots, who wished not to remain in quiet submission till by God's decree the Messianic hope of Israel should be fulfilled, but would rather employ the sword in hastening its realization, and would rush into conflict with the godless enemy. It is to their machinations that we are to ascribe the nursing of the fires of revolution among the smouldering ashes which sixty years later burst forth in vehement flames.

Of Coponius and some of his successors little more is known to us than their names. Altogether there were seven procurators who administered Judea during the period A.D. 6–41: (1) Coponius, probably A.D. 6–9; (2) Marcus Ambivius, probably A.D. 9–12; (3) Annius Rufus, probably A.D. 12–15; (4) Valerius Gratus, A.D. 15–26; (5) Pontius Pilatus, A.D. 26–36; (6) Marcellus, A.D. 36–37; (7) Marullus, A.D. 37–41. The long period during which Valerius Gratus and Pontius Pilate held office was owing to the general principles on which Tiberius proceeded in his appointment of governors. In the interest of the provinces he left them as long as possible at their posts, because he thought that governors acted like flies upon the body of a wounded animal; if once they were gorged, they would become more moderate in their exactions, whereas new men began their rapacious proceedings afresh.

Among those named, Pontius Pilate is of special interest to us, not only as the judge of Jesus Christ, but also because he is the only one of whom we have any detailed account in Josephus and Philo. Philo, or rather Agrippa I., in the letter which Philo communicates as written by him, describes him as of an "unbending and recklessly hard character" (τὴν φύσιν ἀκαμπὴς καὶ μετὰ τοῦ αὐθάδους ἀμείλικτος), and gives a very bad account of his official administration. "Corruptibility, violence, robberies, ill-treatment of the people, grievances, continuous executions without even the form of a trial, endless and intolerable cruelties," are charged against him. The very first act by which Pilate introduced himself into office was characteristic of him who treated with contempt the Jewish customs and privileges. Care had constantly been taken by the earlier procurators that the troops entering Jerusalem should not carry flags having

the figure of the emperor, in order that the religious feelings of the Jews should not be offended by the sight of them (see in regard to these, above, p. 78). Pilate, on the other hand, to whom such tolerance appeared unworthy weakness, caused the garrison soldiers of Jerusalem to enter the city by night with the figure of the emperor on their flags. When the news spread among the people, they flocked out in crowds to Caesarea, and besieged the procurator with entreaties for five days and nights that the offensive articles might be removed. At last, on the sixth day, Pilate admitted the people into the race-course, into which at the same time he had ordered a detachment of soldiers. When the Jews also here again repeated their complaints, he gave a signal, upon which the soldiers surrounded the people on all sides with drawn swords. But the Jews remained stedfast, bared their necks, and declared that they would rather die than submit to a breach of the law. As further opposition seemed to Pilate hazardous, he gave orders to remove the offensive images from Jerusalem.

A new storm burst forth when on one occasion he applied the rich treasures of the temple to the certainly very useful purpose of building an aqueduct to Jerusalem. Such an appropriation of the sacred treasures was no less offensive than the introduction of the figures of the emperor. When, therefore, he once went to Jerusalem while the building was being proceeded with, he was again surrounded by a complaining and shrieking crowd. But he had previously obtained information of the projected outburst, and had given orders to the soldiers to mix among the people dressed in citizen garb armed with clubs. When the multitude therefore began to make complaints and to present petitions, he gave the preconcerted signal, whereupon the soldiers drew forth their clubs which they had concealed under their upper garments, and mercilessly beat down the helpless crowds. Many lost their lives in this melee. The opposition to the useful undertaking was thus indeed crushed; but also the popular hatred against Pilate was stirred up afresh.

The New Testament also contains hints about the popular uprisings in the time of Pilate. “There were present at that season,” so runs the narrative in Luke 13:1, “some that told Jesus of the Galileans, whose blood Pilate had mingled with their sacrifices.” This statement is to be understood as indicating that Pilate had put to the sword a number of Galileans while they were engaged in the act of presenting their offerings at Jerusalem. But nothing more definite as to this incident is known. And just as little do we know about “those who had made insurrection, and had committed murder in the insurrection” (Mark 15:7; comp. Luke 23:19), to whom among others that Barabbas belonged, whose liberation the Jews demanded of Pilate.

Probably to the later days of Pilate belongs an occurrence about which we are informed in the letter of Agrippa I. to Caligula, which is communicated by Philo. Pilate had learnt from the outburst at Caesarea that the setting up of the figures of the emperor in Jerusalem could not be carried out against the stubborn resistance of the Jews. He thought he now, at least, might attempt the introduction of votive shields without figures, on which the name of the emperor was written. Such shields, richly gilt, did he set up in what had been the palace of Herod, which Pilate himself was now wont to occupy, “less for the honour of Tiberius than for the annoyance of the Jewish people.” But the people would not tolerate even this. First of all, in company with the nobles and with the four sons of Herod, who were then present in Jerusalem attending a feast, they applied to Pilate in order to induce him to remove the shields. When their prayer proved unsuccessful, the most distinguished men, among whom certainly were those four sons of Herod, addressed a petition to the emperor, asking that he should order the removal of the offensive shields. Tiberius, who plainly perceived that it was a piece of purely wanton bravado on the part of Pilate, ordered the governor on pain of his severe displeasure to remove at once

the shields from Jerusalem, and to have them set up in the temple of Augustus at Caesarea. This accordingly was done. “And thus were preserved both the honour of the emperor and the ancient customs of the city.”

At last by his utter recklessness Pilate brought about his own overthrow. It was an old belief among the Samaritans that on the mountain of Gerizim the sacred utensils of the temple had been buried since Moses’ times. A Samaritan pseudo-prophet once promised in A.D. 35 to show these sacred things if the people would assemble on Mount Gerizim. The light-minded multitude gave him a hearing, and in great crowds the Samaritans gathered together armed in the village of Tirathana at the fort of Mount Gerizim, so that from thence they might ascend the mountain and behold the sacred spectacle. But before they could carry out their project, they were arrested by Pilate in the village by a strong force, a portion of them was slain, a portion hunted in flight, and again another portion cast into prison. Of those imprisoned also Pilate had the most powerful and the most distinguished put to death. But the Samaritans were convinced that no revolutionary intentions lay to the basis of their pilgrimage to Gerizim, and so they complained of Pilate to Vitellius, the legate in Syria at that time. Their complaints had actually this result, that Vitellius sent Pilate to Rome to answer for his conduct, while he made over the administration of Judea to Marcellus.

Soon thereafter, at the Passover festival of A.D. 36, Vitellius himself went to Jerusalem, and won for himself on that occasion the goodwill of the inhabitants of the capital, for he remitted the taxes on the fruits sold in the city, and gave up for free use the high priest’s robe, which since A.D. 6 had lain in the possession of the Romans.

After he had meanwhile been occupied with the Parthian expedition (see above, p. 34), the campaign against Aretas, which he had been ordered by Tiberius in the spring of A.D. 37 to undertake, led him again to Jerusalem (see above, p. 33). On this occasion also he again established a good understanding by showing consideration for Jewish sentiments. The way from Antioch to Petra had led him, together with his army, through Judea proper. But the Roman standards, as is well known, were offensive to the Jews. They therefore sent to Vitellius at Ptolemais an embassy, which entreated him with tears that he should not lead his army through the Holy Land. Vitellius was so reasonable as to perceive the grounds of their request, caused the army to march through the Great Plain, and went himself alone to Jerusalem. On the fourth day of his stay there he received tidings of Tiberius’ death, whereupon he led his whole army back to Antioch.

The reign of Caligula, A.D. 37–41, was, after the rule of Tiberius, the enemy of the human race, joyfully greeted throughout the whole empire, and especially among the Jews. Since Vitellius was residing in Jerusalem when the news of the change of government reached him, the Jews were the first of the nationalities of Syria who professed to the new emperor the oath of allegiance, and presented sacrifices for him. Also during the first eighteen months of his reign the Jews enjoyed peace and quiet. But in the autumn of A.D. 38 a bloody persecution of the Jews broke out in Alexandria, which, though apparently at the instance of the Alexandrian mob, was yet indirectly the work of the emperor. In his overweaning self-conceit, joined with a beclouded intellect, he took up the idea of his divine rank with terrible earnestness. With him the worship of the emperor was no mere form of homage which the emperors had taken over as a heritage of the Greek kings; but he actually believed in his divinity, and regarded the refusal to worship him as a proof of hostility to his person. During the second year of his reign this idea seems to have obtained a complete mastery over him, and to have become known in the provinces. The provincials developed a corresponding zeal. The Jews, who could not follow this

course, fell under suspicion of hostility to Caesar. This was to the Jew hating populace of Alexandria a welcome excuse for giving free expression to their hatred of the Jews; for they might well suppose that by persecuting the Jews they would earn the favour of the emperor. The governor of Egypt at that time, A. Avillius Flaccus, was weak enough for the sake of his own interests to agree to the plans of the enemies of the Jews. He had been governor of Egypt under Tiberius for five years, A.D. 32–37, and, according to the testimony of Philo, had during that time administered his office in a faultless manner. Under Caligula he more and more lost that reputation. As an intimate friend of Tiberius, he stood, as a matter of course, in disfavour with Caligula. With the death of young Tiberius, grandson of the Emperor Tiberius, and of the praetorian prefect Macro, both of whom were compelled by Caligula to commit suicide, he completely lost every support at the court. Thenceforth he set no other end before him than this, namely, to endeavour by all means to secure the favour of the young emperor. This was the one principle that determined his proceedings toward the Jews.

The presence of the Jewish king Agrippa in Alexandria gave the ostensible occasion for the outbreak of the persecution of the Jews. He arrived in Alexandria, on his homeward journey from Rome to Palestine, in August A.D. 38. Although, as Philo has assured us, he avoided everything calculated to produce a commotion, the mere appearance of a Jewish king was an offence to the mob of Alexandria. Agrippa was first of all treated with indignity and insult in the gymnasium, and then exposed to ridicule in the performances of a pantomime. A man called Karabas, suffering from mental derangement, was decked in uniform similar to the king's dress, and was mockingly greeted as king, the people addressing him in the Syrian as Μάριν, Lord. The mob, however, once roused to riot, was not disposed to be pacified. They now insisted upon placing statues of the emperor in the Jewish synagogues, called by Philo simply προσευχαί. Flaccus did not venture to oppose them, but rather agreed to all the demands of the enemies of the Jews. These again, the more the governor seemed disposed to yield to them, became the more extravagant in their demands. Flaccus gave permission successively to the setting up of images in the synagogues, to the pronouncing of the Jews, by an edict, no longer in the enjoyment of the rights of citizens, and, finally, he gave his sanction to a general persecution of the Jews. Dreadful sufferings were now endured by the Jewish population of Alexandria. Their houses and warehouses were plundered; the Jews were themselves maltreated, murdered, the bodies mutilated; others publicly burned; others, again, dragged alive through the streets. The synagogues were, some of them destroyed, others profaned by the setting up of the image of Caligula as a god; in the largest synagogue the image of Caligula was set up on a high damaged Quadriga, which they had dragged thither from the gymnasium. The governor Flaccus not only let all this go on without interfering, but also himself proceeded with severe measures against the Jews, for which, according to Philo, he had no other reason than the refusal of the Jews to take part in the worship of the emperor. He caused thirty-eight members of the Jewish Gerousia to be carried bound into the theatre, and there to be scourged before the eyes of their enemies, so that some of them died under the infliction of the lash, and others were thrown into long and severe illnesses. A centurion was commanded to search with a select band through the houses of the Jews for arms. Jewish women were compelled before spectators in the theatre to partake of swine's flesh. Flaccus had even before this shown his hostility to the Jews by failing to send to the emperor, as he had promised to do, but retaining in his own possession, a petition from the Jewish community, in which an explanation was given of the attitude of the Jews in reference to the honours demanded by the emperor. This writing was first sent up by Agrippa, with a statement of the reason of the delay.

We are not in possession of any detailed information as to the circumstances of the Alexandrian

community after the severe persecution of the autumn of A.D. 38 down to the death of Caligula in January A.D. 41. In autumn of A.D. 38 Flaccus was suddenly, at the command of the emperor, carried as a prisoner to Rome, and banished to the island of Andros in the Aegean Sea, where subsequently he was, together with other distinguished exiles, put to death by the orders of Caligula. Who his successor was is unknown. It may be accepted as highly probable that the Jews did not get back their synagogues during Caligula's lifetime, and that the worship of the emperor continued a burning question, and one involving the Jews in danger. In A.D. 40, probably in spring, in consequence of the still continuing conflicts between the heathen and Jewish population of Alexandria, an embassy from both parties went to the emperor to complain against one another, and seek to win over the emperor to their side. The leader of the Jewish embassy was Philo; the leader of his opponents was the scholar Apion. The result was unfavourable to the Jews. They were ungraciously received by the emperor, and were obliged to return without having effected their object. So Josephus briefly tells the story. A few incidents connected with this embassy are also told by Philo in his work about Caligula. But it is difficult to obtain any definite information from these fragmentary notices. Without having referred to the sending of one of the two embassies, Philo first of all states that the ambassadors of the Alexandrians won over completely to their interests the slave Helicon, a favourite of Caligula. When the Jews perceived this, they made similar endeavours on their part, but in vain. They then concluded to pass on to the emperor a written statement, which contained the main points embraced in the petition shortly before sent in by King Agrippa. Caligula received the Jewish ambassadors first of all in the Campus Martius at Rome, and promised to hear them at a convenient time. The ambassadors then followed the emperor to Puteoli, where, however, they were not received. Only at a later period – we know not how much later – the promised audience took place at Rome, in the gardens of Maecenas and Lamia, at which the emperor – while he inspected the works that were going on, and gave orders regarding them – caused the Jews to keep moving on always behind him, throwing out to them now and again a contemptuous remark, amid the applause of the ambassadors of the other party, until at last he dismissed them, declaring that they were to be regarded rather as foolish than as wicked men, since they would not believe in his divinity.

Affairs at Alexandria remained in suspense down to the death of Caligula. One of the first acts of the new emperor, Claudius, was to issue an edict by which all their earlier privileges were confirmed to the Alexandrian Jews, and the unrestricted liberty to practise their own religion was anew granted them.

While the Alexandrian embassy to Rome waited for the imperial decision, a serious storm burst upon the mother country of Palestine. It had its origin in Jamnia, a town on the Philistine coast which was mainly inhabited by Jews. When the heathen inhabitants of that place, in order to show their zeal for Caesar and at the same time to aggravate the Jews, erected a rude altar to the emperor, this was immediately again destroyed by the Jews. The incident was reported by the imperial procurator of the city, Herennius Capito, to the emperor, who, in order to avenge himself upon the refractory Jews, gave orders that his statue should be set up in the temple of Jerusalem. As it was foreseen that such an attempt would call forth violent opposition, the governor of Syria, P. Petronius, received a command to have the one half of the army stationed "on the Euphrates," i.e. in Syria, in readiness to proceed to Palestine, in order by their assistance to carry out the will of the emperor. This moderate and reasonable man obeyed the childish demand with a heavy heart during the winter of A.D. 39–40. While he was getting the statue prepared in Sidon, he gathered about him the heads of the Jewish people, and sought to persuade them to yield with a good grace; but all in vain.

Soon the news of what was proposed spread over all Palestine, and now the people assembled in great crowds at Ptolemais, where Petrouius had his headquarters. “Like a cloud the multitude of the Jews covered all Phoenicia.” Well arranged, divided into six groups – old men, able-bodied men, boys, old women, wives and maidens, the mass deputation appeared before Petronius. Their mournful complaints and groans made such an impression upon Petronius that he resolved at all hazards to make the attempt to put off the decision for a time at least. The full truth, that he really wished to have a stop put to the whole business, he dared not indeed write to the emperor. He wrote him rather that he entreated for delay, partly because time was required for the preparing of the statue, partly because the harvest was approaching, which it would be advisable to see gathered in, since otherwise the exasperated Jews might in the end destroy the whole harvest. When Caligula received that letter, he was greatly enraged at the dilatoriness of his governor. But he did not venture to give expression to his wrath, but wrote him a letter of acknowledgment in which he praised his prudence, and only advised him to proceed as quickly as possible with the preparation of the statue, since the harvest would be already about an end.

Petronius, however, did not even yet proceed with any vigour in the matter, but entered anew into negotiations with the Jews. Yea, even late in autumn, down to the season of sowing in November, we find him at Tiberias besieged for forty days by crowds of people to be numbered by thousands, who besought him with tears that he would yet save the country from the threatened horror of temple desecration. When at length Aristobulus also, the brother of King Agrippa and other relatives of his joined their prayers to those of the people, Petronius resolved to take the decisive step of asking the emperor to revoke his order. He led his army back from Ptolemais to Antioch, and set before the emperor, in a letter which he sent for this purpose to Caligula, how upon grounds of equity and prudence it would be advisable to recall the offensive edict.

Meanwhile affairs at Rome affecting matters in question had taken a more favourable turn. King Agrippa I., who in spring of the year 40 had left Palestine, met with Caligula in Rome or at Puteoli in autumn, when the emperor had just returned from his German campaign. He had as yet heard nothing of what was going on in Palestine. But the glance of the emperor’s eye assured him that he was nursing secret wrath in his heart. When he sought in vain for the cause of such feelings, the emperor observed his embarrassment, and let him know in a very ungracious tone what the cause of his displeasure was. The king on hearing this was so horror-stricken that he fell into a fainting fit, from which he did not recover till the evening of the following day. On his recovery he made it his first business to address a supplication to the emperor, in which he endeavoured to persuade him to recall his order by showing that none of his predecessors had ever attempted anything of that sort. Contrary to all expectation, the letter of Agrippa had the desired effect. Caligula caused a letter to be written to Petronius, commanding that nothing should be changed in the temple at Jerusalem. The favour was certainly not unmixed; for along with this order there was an injunction that no one who should erect a temple or altar to the emperor outside of Jerusalem should be hindered from doing so. A good part of the concession that had been made was thus again withdrawn; and it was only owing to the circumstance that no one took advantage of the right thus granted, that new disturbances did not arise out of it. The emperor, indeed, soon repented that he had made that concession. And so, as he made no further use of the statue that had been prepared at Sidon, he ordered a new one to be made in Rome which he intended himself, in his journey to Alexandria which he had in prospect, to put ashore on the coast of Palestine as he passed, and have it secretly brought to Jerusalem. Only the death of the emperor that soon followed

prevented the carrying out of this enterprise.

For the person of Petronius as well as for the land of Judea the death of the emperor was a favourable occurrence. When, further, Caligula, after he himself had arranged for the stopping of proceedings, received the letter of Petronius expressing the wish referred to, he fell into a furious passion about the disobedience of this officer, and caused a command immediately to be issued, that as a punishment for that he should take away his own life. Soon thereafter, however, Caligula was murdered, 24th January A.D. 41; and Petronius received the news thereof twenty-seven days before the messengers arrived with the order for self-destruction; for these, in consequence of unfavourable weather, had been three full months upon their way. There was now just as little idea of carrying out the order for self-murder as there was of setting up the statue in the temple of Jerusalem.

The new emperor, Claudius, who had been raised to the throne by the soldiers, immediately upon his accession gifted to Agrippa, besides the dominion which he already had possession under Caligula, Judea and Samaria, so that now again all Palestine, to the same extent which it formerly had under Herod the Great, was united in the hand of a Herodian.

EXCURSUS I – THE VALUATION CENSUS OF QUIRINIUS, LUKE 2:1-5

LITERATURE

GRESWELL, Dissertations upon the Principles and Arrangement of a Harmony of the Gospels, 3 vols. Oxford 1830, vol. i. pp. 443-524. By the same author, Supplementary Dissertations, Oxford 1834, p. 114 sqq. These works have not been accessible to me.

FAIRBAIBN, Hermeneutical Manual, Edinburgh 1857, pp. 461-475.

HUSCHKE, Ueber den zur Zeit der Geburt Jesu Christi gehaltenen Census, 1840 (125 pp.).

HUSCHKE, Ueber den Census und die Steuerverfassung der früheren römischen Kaiserzeit, 1847 (208 pp.).

WIESELER, Chronological Synopsis of the Four Gospels, Cambridge 1864 (Original, 1843), pp. 95-135.

WINER, Bealwörterbuch, arts. “Quirinius” and “Schatzung.”

GUMPACH, “Die Schatzung” (Studien und Kritiken, 1852, pp. 663-684).

LICHTENSTEIN, Lebensgeschichte des Herrn Jesu Christi, 1856, pp. 78-90.

KÖHLER, art “Schatzung” in Herzog’s Real-Encyclopaedie, 1 Aufl. xiii. 1860, pp. 463-467.

BLEEK, Synoptische Erklärung der drei ersten Evangelien (1862), i. 66-75.

GODET, Commentary on Gospel of St. Luke, 2 vols. Edin. 1875, vol. 1. pp. 120-129.

MEYER on Luke 2:1, 2; also the revision by Weiss; and generally the Commentaries on Luke’s Gospel.

STRAUSS, Leben Jesu, 1864, pp. 336-340; Die Halben und die Ganzen, 1865, pp. 70-79.

ABERLE, "Ueber den Statthalter Quirinius" (Tüb. Theolog. Quartalscrift, 1865, pp. 103-148; 1868, pp. 29-64; 1874, pp. 663-687).

HILGENFELD, "Quirinius als Statthalter Syriens" (Zeitschrift für wissenschaftliche Theologie, 1865, pp. 408-421; 1870, pp. 151-167).

GERLACH, Die römischen Statthalter in Syrien und Judäa, 1865, pp. 22-42.

LUTTEROTH, Le récensement de Quirinius en Judée, Paris 1865 (134 pp.).

RODBERTUS, "Zur Geschichte der römischen Tributsteuern seit Augustus" (Hildebrand's Jahrbücher für Nationalökonomie und Statistik, Bd. iv. 1865, pp. 341-427; Bd. v. 1865, pp. 135-171, 241-315; Bd. viii. 1867, pp. 81-126, 385-475. On the passage in Luke, Bd. v. 155 ff.).

EWALD, History of Israel, vi. pp. 155-157.

KEIM, Jesus of Nazara, ii. 116-123.

EBRARD, Gospel History.

WIESELER, Beiträge zur richtigen Würdigung der Evangelien, 1869, pp. 16-107. By same author, Studien und Kritiken, 1875, pp. 535-549.

FARRAR, Life of Christ, vol. i. p. 7, note; vol. ii. p. 450.

CASPARI, Chronological and Geographical Introduction to the Life of Christ, pp. 34-38.

ZUMPT, Das Geburtsjahr Christi, 1869, pp. 20-224.

WOOLSEY, "Historical Credibility of Luke ii. 1-5" (New Englander, 1869, pp. 674-723. This paper has not been accessible to me). By the same author: Review of Zumpt's Geburtsjahr Christi in the Bibliotheca Sacra, 1870, pp. 290-336. Very carefully done.

STEINMEYER, "Die Geschichte der Geburt des Herrn und seiner ersten Schritte im Leben" (Apologetische Beiträge, iv.), Berlin 1873, pp. 29-41.

SEVIN, Chronologie des Lebens Jesu (1874), pp. 20-39.

SCHENKEL'S Bibellexikon, Bd. v. pp. 23-27, art. "Quirinius" by Weizsäcker, and pp. 398-405, art "Steuern" by Kneucker).

HEHLE, Theolog. Quartalschrift, 1875, pp. 666-684; 1876, pp. 85-101 (review of Zumpt's Geburtsjahr Christi).

MARQUARDT, Römische Staatsverwaltung, Bd. ii. 1876, pp. 198-216 (2 Aufl. revised by Dessau und Domaszewski 1884, pp. 204-223).

KEIL (1879) and SCHANZ (1883) in their Commentaries on Luke.

BIESS, Das Geburtsjahr Christi (1880), pp. 66–78. — By the same author, Nochmals das Geburtsjahr Jesu Christi (1883), pp. 59–68.

HOFMANN (J. Chr. K. von), Die heilige Schrift Neuen Testaments zusammenhängend untersucht, Thl. viii. 1 (1878), p. 46 ff.; x. (1883) p. 64 ff.

LECOULTRE, De censu Quiriniano et anno nativitatis Christi secundum Lucam evangelistam, Lausannae 1883 (100 pp.). A review of it in Theologische Literaturzeitung, 1883, p. 481.

PÖLZL, art. "Census" in Wetzer and Weite's Kirchenlexikon, 2 Aufl. Bd. iii. 1884, pp. 1–7.

SIEFFERT, art. "Schatzung" in Herzog's Real-Encyclopaedie, 2 Aufl. xiii. 1884, pp. 446–455.

MOMMSEN, Res gestae divi Augusti, ed. 2, 1883, pp. 175–177. — By the same author, Römisches Staatsrecht, ii. 1 (1874), pp. 391–394.

UNGER, "De censibus provinciarum Romanarum" (Leipziger Studien zur class. Philologie, Bd. x. 1887, pp. 1–76). Mainly a collection of inscriptions in which tax-collectors are mentioned.

It has been mentioned above, at p. 79, that after the banishment of Archelaus the imperial legate, Quirinius, arrived in Judea, and there, in A.D. 6 or 7, proceeded to make a census, i.e. a list of the inhabitants, and a reckoning of their landed property, for the purpose of apportioning the taxation. The evangelist Luke, 2:1–5, makes mention of a valuation census such as that made by Quirinius; but he places it in the last days of Herod the Great, that is, somewhere about ten or twelve years earlier than that census was really made. It is a matter of debate how this story is related to the similar one recorded by Josephus; whether there were actually two different valuations in Judea conducted by Quirinius, or whether Luke has erroneously set down the valuation that was made in A.D. 7 in the last years of Herod the Great. In order that we may be in a position to form a deliberate judgment on this much-debated question, and generally on the credibility of the narrative of Luke, it is necessary first of all to understand, at least in its most general outlines, the Roman system of taxation during the days of the empire.

The original Roman census, as it was drawn up during the period of the republic, was strictly confined to the enrolment of Roman citizens. It consisted of a list of Roman citizens and their possessions, made for a double purpose: (1) The regulating of military service, and (2) the levying of the direct taxes. The party whose property had to be valued was obliged to present himself before the censor and give in a statement of his possessions; but it was the custom that the father of the family should pay taxes for himself and for the whole family. In the time of the republic there was no one regular valuation census of the subjects of the Roman nation. Valuations were indeed made here and there; but these had no intimate connection or coherence with one another nor with the census of the Roman citizens.

In the days of the empire, as even before in the days of the republic, the census of Roman citizens had completely lost its original significance; for the Roman citizens, i.e. therefore all Italy and the colonies with Italian privileges, were no longer sufficient for military service, and also no longer paid direct taxes. When therefore Augustus, Claudius, and Vespasian still made valuation rolls of Roman citizens, this was done only for statistical purposes, or on account of the religious festivities associated therewith, but not for taxation purposes. Fundamentally different was the census of the provinces, the main purpose of which was to regulate the levying of the taxes. Even in this direction there existed in the earlier days of the empire a very great

diversity; but in general even then those principles had become pretty well established which in later juristic documents (Digest. L. 15: De censibus) are assumed as everywhere prevailing. From these we learn that there were for the provinces two kinds of direct taxes: (1) The property-tax on possessions in land, tributum soli or agri, and (2) The poll-tax, tributum captis. The former was paid partly in kind, partly in money. Under the latter, the tributum capitis, there seems to have been summed up various sorts of personal taxes, such as the income-tax, which varied according to the amount of the income, and the poll-tax proper, which was of equal amount for every caput. In Syria, e.g., there was raised in Appian's time a personal tax, which amounted to one per cent. of the valuation. This was therefore properly an income-tax. When, on the other hand, Josephus reckons from the poll-tax that Egypt, with the exclusion of Alexandria, had a population of seven and a half millions, he is evidently referring to a tax of the same amount for every caput. At any rate, during the earlier days of the empire, the taxes levied were of the most diverse kinds. Women and slaves had also to pay the poll-tax. Only children and old men were exempted. In Syria, e.g., men from the age of fourteen and women from the age of twelve years, and both up to the age of sixty-five years, were obliged to pay the poll-tax. As to the valuation census of the provinces, i.e. the preparation of lists for the sake of the apportioning of the taxes, the same principles regulated procedure as in the drawing up of the census of Roman citizens. In regard to the one as well as the other, the expressions were used: edere, deferre censum, profiteri; from which it is evident that the party liable had to give in the valuation himself, and his taxes were only controlled by the officers. The taxes had to be paid in the chief towns of the particular taxation districts; and, indeed, the landed estates had to be registered for taxation in those communes in whose domain they lay. At what intervals the valuation was repeated is not with any certainty known. Huschke assumes a ten years' period for the census, similar to the five years' period of the earlier census of Roman citizens. Zumpt contests the correctness of this assumption, and believes that by standing taxation boards the list was kept carefully revised. Many hints favour the idea of a five years' census period. Since the fourth century after Christ it is well known that the fifteen year indiction period became prevalent.

So much on the question of valuations and taxation in general. Now, Luke says in the passage referred to, chap. 2:1-5, that about the time of the birth of Christ, therefore certainly while Herod the Great still reigned (Luke 1:5; Matt. 2:1-22), a decree (δόγμα) went out from the Emperor Augustus requiring that "all the world should be taxed," ἀπογράφεσθαι πᾶσαν τὴν οἰκουμένην. By "all the world," in accordance with the well-known use of the phrase among the Romans, we can understand nothing else than the whole Roman empire, the orbis Romanus. Strictly taken, the phrase would include Italy as well as the provinces. Yet it would be a pardonable inexactness in the use of the expression, even were it found to have been employed actually to designate only a general census of the provinces. Absolutely impossible is the limitation of the phrase to Palestine sometimes favoured by earlier expositors. The verb ἀπογράφειν means first of all only "to register," and is therefore more general than the definite ἀποτιμᾶν, "to value." But there is no other purpose of registration that naturally suggests itself than that of forming a basis for taxation (for the Jews were exempted from military service); and certainly Luke has so understood the word, since in ver. 2 he brings this registration ("taxing") into connection with the well-known census of Quirinius, whether to identify with that taxing or to distinguish it from it. He proceeds in ver. 2 to say: αὕτη [ἡ] ἀπογραφὴ πρώτη ἐγένετο ἡγεμονεύοντος τῆς Συρίας Κυρηνίου. Whether the article is to be inserted before ἀπογραφή or not, it is difficult to say, since important authorities may be cited in favour of both readings. At any rate the order πρώτη ἐγένετο is to be maintained over against the isolated readings ἐγένετο πρώτη (א) and ἐγένετο ἀπογραφὴ πρώτη (D). For the sense it is almost indifferent whether one insert the article or not;

for in the former case it would be translated: “This taxing took place as the first;” and in the other case: “This took place as the first taxing,” while Quirinius was governor of Syria. But it may now be asked, in what sense Luke uses the term “first.” Does he mean to say that it was the first general imperial valuation, or the first Roman valuation in Judea, or that it was the first among several made by Quirinius? The first of these explanations would make Luke assume a number of general imperial valuations. But if, as will appear, even the one imperial valuation census under Augustus is problematical, a frequent repetition of such a census would be yet more problematical. We shall therefore do well in not unnecessarily attributing this serious error to the evangelist. The first tenable explanation then is that mentioned above in the second place. We shall then have to stand by it, if it can be proved that Quirinius only made one valuation census for Judea, and that also Luke intended to refer to that one. Provisionally, therefore, we may assume this as the sense of the words, that the general imperial valuation census ordered by Augustus for Judea was the first which had been made there by the Romans, and that it took place while Quirinius was governor of Syria. In this case the only point that we must still, according to p. 111, leave undecided is, whether the valuation census was subsequently repeated at regular intervals of time, or was kept up to date by constant revision of the lists. — In what follows, in vv. 3-5, Luke further states that in obedience to that decree, all (in the land of Judea) went to be taxed, every one εἰς τὴν ἑαυτοῦ πόλιν, i.e. every one who was away from the native place of his family (his οἶκος), had now to go to that place in order to be taxed there. And so also Joseph went from Galilee to Bethlehem, because he was of the house of David, to be taxed with Mary his espoused wife (σὺν Μαριάμ is to be joined with ἀπογράψασθαι, not with ἀνέβη, which is much further removed from it).

This account by Luke, however, now calls forth the following considerations: —

1. Of a general imperial census in the time of Augustus, history otherwise knows nothing.

Apologetical: Huschke, Census zur Zeit des Geburt Jesu Christi, pp. 2-59; Wieseler, Chronological Synopsis of the Four Gospels, pp. 66-82; Rodbertus, Jahrbücher für Nationalökonomie und Statistik, v. 145 ff., 241 ff.; Zumpt, Geburtsjahr Christi, pp. 147-160; Marquardt, Römische Staatsverwaltung, ii. 204 ff. (2 Aufl. p. 211 ff.); Lecoultre, De censu Quiriniano, pp. 28-41.

Huschke especially has endeavoured by a series of facts to establish the position that such an imperial census actually did take place, but the want of demonstrative force in this attempt is now to some extent, at least, admitted even by the most decided upholders of the narrative of Luke. Thus Huschke refers (p. 11 ff.), and also even Wieseler, to the rationarium or breviarium totius imperii, a list of the sources of help or supply for the whole empire, which Augustus, as a good financier, drew up, so that he might be able to bring into order again the seriously disturbed financial arrangements of the empire (Suetonius, Augustus, 28, 101; Dio Cassius, liii. 30, lvi. 33; Tacitus, Annals, i. 11). But Zumpt rightly remarks that this, indeed, speaks for the orderly condition of the State administration, but does not prove an imperial census. — Still more unfortunate is Huschke’s reference (pp. 37-45) to Dio Cassius, liv. 35 and lv. 13; for in the former passage it is simply said that Augustus as a private man had undertaken a census of all his property (πάντα τὰ ὑπάρχοντά οἱ); and in the other, the reference is only to a census of Roman citizens. — Finally, the attempt of Huschke (pp. 45-53) to call the Monumentum Ancyranum (on which compare what is said in vol. i. p. 115) as a witness on behalf of the general imperial census completely breaks down; and for proof of this, it is enough to refer to Wieseler and Marquardt.

Of the numerous witnesses whom Huschke had called to prove the fact of the general imperial census, there remain, therefore, only Cassiodorus, Isidorus Hispalensis, and Suidas. They all do, undoubtedly, speak of a general imperial census in the time of Augustus. But their testimony loses very much of its value from the fact that they were all three Christians, and lived in a very late period, namely, in the sixth, seventh, and tenth centuries after Christ, which is calculated to produce an exceedingly strong suspicion that they simply drew their information from Luke. The confused rigmarole of the Spanish Isidore is not regarded even by Wieseler and Zumpt as an independent witness. As to Suidas, his dependence upon Luke is quite apparent. Finally, Cassiodorus has certainly used older sources, namely, the writings of the land measurers. But who can give us any guarantee that he did not derive his statement about the census from Luke? At any rate, it is hazardous, considering the silence of all older sources (the Monumentum Ancyranum, Dio Cassius, Suetonius), to accept as historical the isolated statement of Cassiodorus. — The "testimony" of Orosius, on which Riess again lays great stress, though it had long been given up by most, rests, undoubtedly, only upon the narrative of Luke.

Many think that they have found an indirect support for the idea of an imperial census in the times of Augustus in the so-called imperial survey of Augustus. But even this is very problematical. We know, indeed, that Agrippa, the friend of Augustus, collected material for a map of the world, and that this map of the world after his death was set up in marble in a corridor. These commentarii of Agrippa were specially valuable on account of their numerous and exact measurements. But it is very doubtful whether the measurements of Agrippa rest upon a general survey of the empire undertaken by Augustus. That such a survey was begun as early as the times of Caesar, and was completed under Augustus, is, indeed, affirmed by some late cosmographers, like Julius Honorius and Aethicus Ister. But it is questionable whether this statement is derived from ancient sources. And even if Augustus had undertaken a general imperial survey, this, evidently, had nothing to do with the census. It could only properly have to do, as all geographicalstatistical materials of the following period show, with geographical investigations, and, above all, with the measuring of roads, with a statement of distances from place to place.

But even although this much is established that, apart from Luke, there is no historical evidence of a general imperial census by Augustus, it may still certainly be regarded as a possibility that Luke alone has handed down to us information about that fact. But even this possibility again would require to be stated with very important limitations. For this reason chiefly we cannot entertain the idea of an imperial census, but at most only a census of the provinces, because in any case Italy would have to be excluded (compare p. 108). But even with respect to the provinces, there was this great difference among them, that some were administered by Augustus through his legates, others by the Senate. It is scarcely conceivable that the shrewd Augustus, careful to avoid all encroachments on the rights of the Senate, should have ordered by one and the same edict a census of the same sort for his provinces and for those of the Senate. Besides this, it is to be noted that we know definitely of some provinces that in the time of Angustus no Roman census had been made in them. The conclusion which we reach the# is simply this, that in the time of Augustus valuation censuses had been made in many provinces. And this is quite likely, since the need for such must have been keenly felt after the confusions of the civil war, and Augustus regarded it as his special task to restore matters to an orderly condition. Zumpt lays great stress also upon the fact that the juristic sources from the beginning of the third century after Christ (Digest. L. 15) already presuppose a great uniformity in reference to the matter of the valuation census. But there is nothing to justify us in carrying that unification back to Augustus.

But a further remark on the narrative of Luke is:

II. Under a Roman census, Joseph would not have been obliged to travel to Bethlehem, and Mary would not have required to accompany him thither.

Apologetical: Huschke, Census zur Zeit des Geburts Jesu Christi, pp. 116–125; Wieseler, Chronological Synopsis, pp. 92–95; Beiträge, pp. 65–69, 46–49; Zumpt, Geburtsjahr Christi, pp. 193–196, 203 f.

In a Roman census the landed property had to be registered for taxation in the commune in whose territory it lay (see above, p. 111). For the rest, the person to be taxed had to enrol his name in the census at his dwelling-place, or at the chief town of the taxation district within which he resided. When, on the other hand, Luke tells that Joseph travelled to Bethlehem, because he was of the house of David, it is assumed that the preparation of the taxation lists had been made according to tribes, generations, and families, which was by no means the Roman custom. It is therefore usually conjectured (as is done even by Wieseler and Zumpt) that in that census a concession had been made to the custom of the Jews. Now it is quite correct that the Romans in measures of that kind frequently conformed to existing institutions. But in this particular case such a concession as that referred to would have been very remarkable, since this method of conducting the census would be much more troublesome, and would lead to much greater inconvenience than the Roman plan. It is also extremely questionable whether a registration according to families and generations was any longer possible, since in regard to many it could not now be proved whether they belonged to this family or to that It is further remarkable that Luke makes it appear as if Mary had been obliged to travel with Joseph in order to be taxed (ver. 5: ἀπογράψασθαι σὺν Μαριάμ). No such requirement could have been made by a Roman census. For although women also were liable for the poll-tax (see above, p. 111), they were not accustomed to appear personally at a census, since the particulars required, as may be concluded from the analogy of the old Roman census, could have been supplied by the father of the family.

III. A Roman census could not have been made in Palestine during the time of King Herod.

Apologetical: Huschke, Census zur Zeit des Geburte Jeni Christi, pp. 99–116; Wieseler, Chronological Synopsis, pp. 82–92; Beiträge, pp. 79–94; Zumpt, Geburtsjahr Christi, pp. 178–186, 212 f.

When Quirinius in A.D. 7 undertook to make a census in Judea, this was quite in order; for Judea had then been converted into a Roman province. On the other hand, Luke would have us believe that a Roman census had been made in Palestine, at a time when Palestine, under Herod the Great, was still an independent kingdom, though under the suzerainty of Rome. After all that we have come to know about the position of the reges socii toward the Romans, and especially in regard to the position of Herod, this seems impossible. Pompey had indeed laid the land of Judea under tribute; and Caesar had rearranged the system of taxation by means of a series of edicts. Even Antony had imposed upon Herod a tribute when he appointed him king. But even granting that Herod had continued to pay this tribute under Augustus, it could not even then be supposed that a Roman valuation census should have been made in his country. Such an arrangement in regard to the internal administration might indeed have been ordered in Palestine after it had become a province, but not so long as it was the territory of a rex soeius.

In order to make the matter conceivable an attempt has been made to point out similar cases, in

which presumably in the domain of a rex socius a Roman census was made Thus reference is made to a passage in Tacitus about a census undertaken among the Clitae; Tacitus, Annals, vi. 41: “Per idem tempus Clitarum natio Cappadoci Archelao subiecta, quia nostrum in modum deferre census, pati tributa adigebatur, in iuga Tauri mentis abscessit locorumque ingenio sese contra imbelles regis copias tutabatur.” But it is not here said that in the domains of King Archelaus a Roman census had been made, but only that Archelaus had wished to make a census according to the Roman custom (nostrum in modum) among the Clitae who were subject to him. — Zumpt is of opinion that in the revolt of Judas of Galilee on the occasion of the census of Quirinius in A.D. 7, he has obtained a proof that this census extended not only over the territory of Archelaus (Judea and Samaria), then made into a province, but also over Galilee, since that revolutionary chief must have received his designation from the scene of his operations. But Josephus mentions expressly only the territory of Archelaus as that to which the census applied; and the designation of Judas as the Galilean is, on the contrary, to be explained by the fact that Judas, belonging to Gamala in Gaulanitis, which may readily be reckoned to Galilee in the wider sense, organized this revolt, not in Galilee but in Judea, and was now named by the inhabitants of Judea after his native country, “the Galilean.”

In order to prove the subject position of Herod and the consequent possibility of a Roman census in his domains, it has been pointed out that he was not allowed independently to declare war; that he besought permission of the emperor for the execution of his son; that his subjects also had to take the oath of allegiance to the emperor; that his will required the emperor’s confirmation; yea, even the wrestling games in honour of Augustus and the temples erected to the emperor are requisitioned to aid the proof of the possibility of a census. As if any one ever had supposed anything else but that the Jewish vassal kings were undoubtedly dependent upon the Roman emperor. Even from the Jewish coins Wieseler thinks that he can gather material for the-vindication of Luke. In regard to this it is eminently deserving of notice that there are Palestinian coins of Augustus with the year numbers 33, 36, 39, 40, 41, which, reckoning according to the Actian era of A.U.C. 723, would belong to the age of Archelaus, therefore to the time when Judea was still under native princes. But these numbers are probably to be reckoned according to the Augustan era of 1st January A.U.C. 727, according to which the year 33 would correspond to A.U.C. 759. — It is quite irrelevant when reference is made to the fact that Augustus enrolled Herod among “the procurators of Syria, and commanded that everything should be done in accordance with his judgment;” for from this it follows, not that Herod occupied the position of a subject, but, on the contrary, one of high trust on the part of his patrons and friends. A similar explanation may also be given of the threat once uttered by Augustus under extreme provocation when he said (Antiq. xvi. 9. 3) that “whereas of old he had used him as his friend, he should now use him as his subject,” ὅτι πάλαι χρώμενος αὐτῷ φίλῳ, νῦν ὑπηκόῳ χρήσεται. Wieseler, by a rare style of reasoning, seeks to twist this also into a support for his theory. An exact definition of the position of Herod in the sight of the civil law is certainly not easily given, since Josephus, where one would naturally look for an explanation, omits all reference to the question. In A.D. 30 Herod was by a decree of the Senate anew confirmed in the possession of his kingdom. But in regard to the contents of that decree Josephus gives us no details. Even the remark of Dio Cassius, that Augustus, when, in A.D. 20, he made definite arrangements for regulating affairs in Syria, “arranged the subject domain according to the Roman method, but allowed the confederate princes to rule according to the customs of their fathers,” is too general to permit any very definite conclusion to be drawn from it. It is at least not favourable to the idea of a Roman census in the domains of Herod. The same may be said of the expressions with which Josephus describes the conversion of Judea into a province. They prove satisfactorily that, in the opinion of Josephus, Judea was then for the first

time made into a Roman territory subject to the Romans.

Beyond the range of these general remarks we are carried by a consideration of the taxation system in the time of Herod, in so far as we are informed by Josephus. Here we find throughout that Herod acted independently with reference to the taxes, and there is no sign of his paying any of the dues to the Romans. Herod remits sometimes a third, sometimes a fourth of the taxes. He even frees the Jewish colony in Batanea from payment of all taxes of every kind. After his death the Jews obtain from Archelaus a reduction of the oppressive taxation, which was therefore at the disposal also of Archelaus; and the Jewish deputation at Rome complained of the burdensome taxes under Herod, in order to base upon this their request that Palastine should not again be put under the rule of a Herodian. But there is no mention of a Roman tax. We have seen then that Herod dealt quite unrestrictedly with the taxation system of Palestine. It will therefore in any case, even if Herod should have paid tribute to the Romans, be quite correct to affirm that a Roman census and a Roman system of taxation could not have been introduced in his country.

IV. Josephus knows nothing of a Roman census in Palestine in the time of Herod: speaks rather of the census of A.D. 7 as something new and previously unheard of.

Apologetical: Wieseler, Chronological Synopsis, pp. 86–92; Beiträge, pp. 94–104.

In the attempt to weaken the force of the argumentum e silentio drawn from Josephus, two different courses have been taken: some have endeavoured to discover even in Josephus traces of a Roman census in the time of Herod; others have denied that the silence of Josephus proves anything.

Wieseler is of opinion that he has found a trace of that sort in the revolt of Judas and Matthias shortly before the death of Herod, the cause of which is said to have been the taking of a census; whereas Josephus as clearly as possible assigns a cause of an altogether different kind. Another trace is supposed to be found in the detailed reports of the large amount of the revenues of Judea, Galilee, and Trachonitis, which are given by Josephus in his account of the partition of Palestine among Herod's three sons; as if in order to know the amount of these rents it would have been necessary to have a census of the purely Roman kind. It is a fact far more worthy of consideration that on the occasion of that partition Augustus laid down the condition that the rate of taxation of the Samaritans should be reduced one-fourth, since they had not taken part in the war against Varus. This is worthy of attention, because it is the only instance of an interference on the part of the emperor in the matter of the taxation of Judea prior to its being made into a Roman province. But certainly we cannot deduce from it the conclusion which Wieseler wishes to draw, that here we have to do with a Roman tax. On the contrary, the matter treated of throughout is only the revenues of the native princes, Archelaus, Antipas, and Philip; and the mere absence of any reference in this place to a Roman tax speaks strongly in favour of the idea that no such tax was then paid. — Finally, the argumentation is particularly acute, by means of which Zumpt has discovered in Josephus the sought for census, prior to the acknowledged one of A.D. 7. He says that from the account of Josephus with reference to the census of A.D. 7, it follows "that Quirinius then only taxed the property of the Jews, therefore those who were poor and without property were not taken into consideration." But now since the poll-tax existing in the time of Christ presupposes also a list of those without property, such a list must have been drawn up previously, even under Herod. In reference to this statement there are only three things that require to be proved: (1) that Quirinius taxed "only the property" of the Jews; (2) that in Palestine in the time of Christ a poll-tax, was in force even for those without

property; and (3) that this poll-tax had been introduced as early as in the time of Herod.

In reality, then, Josephus knows nothing of a Roman census in the time of Herod. We may not indeed be inclined ordinarily to lay any weight on argumenta e silentio; but in this case the argument is of some importance. In regard to no other period is Josephus so well informed, in regard to none is his narrative so full, as in regard to the last years of Herod. It is scarcely conceivable that a measure so calculated to cut into the very marrow of the people as a Roman census of that period should have been passed over by him, while he faithfully describes the census of A.D. 7, which occurred in a period of which Josephus knew practically nothing. It ought also to be remembered that a Roman census could not have passed off without leaving any trace behind, but must have occasioned a rebellion as well as that of A.D. 7, yea, much more, because in this case the latter would have been nothing new. The latter argument, indeed, Zumpt thinks to invalidate by making the census in the time of Herod into an innocent registration (ἀπογραφή) of the people for the purpose of the poll-tax, whereas the census of A.D. 7 was a property valuation (ἀποτίμησις), and just for that reason was so offensive. — The poll-tax had to be paid as tribute to the Romans, whereas the expenses of the internal government of the country had to be met by the property-tax. But it is in contradiction of all known facts that the tribute to be paid to the Romans should have consisted simply in a poll-tax of equal amount in the case of each caput. Appian says expressly that the Syrians paid a poll-tax of one per cent. of the sum of the valuation. If, therefore, a Roman tax had been imposed throughout Palestine, it would certainly not have been a mere poll-tax. And even were this granted, it would still be a Roman tax. There must then have been a numbering of the people, who would have made the imposition of this, just as much as a valuation census of the people, the occasion of a tumult. But, finally, that distinction between the ἀπογραφή referred to by Luke 2:2 and the ἀποτίμησις of A.D. 7 completely breaks down before the fact that the latter which occasioned the revolt of Judas of Galilee is referred to by Luke in the Acts of the Apostles v. 37 in the same words as the so-called numbering of the people in the time of Herod, and the ἀπογραφή is simply mentioned as an evident proof that he means in both passages to refer to the same fact.

The most decisive argument, however, against a census in the time of Herod is this, that Josephus characterizes the census of A.D. 7 as something entirely new and previously unheard of among the Jews. When we find Zumpt attempting to represent the novelty as consisting only in the property valuation (ἀποτίμησις), and Wieseler thinks that what was new and offensive lay merely in the form of the valuation, namely, the judicial examination (ἡ ἀκρόασις) and the obligation to confirm their depositions before a heathen tribunal by means of a definitely prescribed oath, these fine distinctions, which may possibly be spun out of the story in the Antiquities, are reduced to nothing when we turn to the parallel account in Wars of the Jews, ii. 8. 1, where Josephus expressed himself as follows: ἐπὶ τούτου (under Coponius) τις ἀνὴρ Γαλιλαῖος Ἰούδας ὄνομα εἰς ἀπόστασιν ἐνῆγε τοὺς ἐπιχωρίους, κακίζων εἰ φόρον τε Ῥωμαίοις τελεῖν ὑπομενοῦσι καὶ μετὰ τὸν θεὸν οἴσουσι θνητοὺς δεσπότας. The offensive thing, therefore, was not the taxing of property, or the form in which it was carried out, but the Roman taxation as such. This is also the assumption lying at the basis of accounts elsewhere given of the rebellion. Wars of the Jews, vii. 8. 1: Ἰούδα τοῦ πείσαντος Ἰουδαίων οὐκ ὀλίγους … μὴ ποιεῖσθαι τὰς ἀπογραφάς; ii. 17. 8: Ἰουδαίους ὀνειδίσας ὅτι Ῥωμαίοις ὑπετάσσοντο μετὰ τὸν θεόν. For the Romans at all to raise a tax in Judea was a novum et inauditum. Also from the words already quoted above, with which Josephus tells of the conversion of Judea into a province, Antiq. xvii. 13. 5: τῆς δὲ Ἀρχελάου χώρας ὑποτελοῦς προσνεμηθείσης τῇ Σύρων, if we take them exactly we shall be obliged to conclude that in the time of Herod and Archelaus

no taxes were paid to the Romans. For if it was only after the banishment of Archelaus that Judea was made tributary, it follows that it had not been so previously. The same conclusion may be drawn from other two passages. The tetrarchy of Philip was after his death added by Tiberius to the province of Syria, τοὺς μέντοι φόρους ἐκέλευσε συλλεγομένους ἐν τῇ τετραρχίᾳ τῇ ἐκείνου γενομένῃ κατατίθεσθαι (Antiq. xviii. 4. 6). If even after the death of Philip no taxes flowed from his tetrarchy into the Roman fiscus, much less would this have been the case during his lifetime. But of the Jewish colony at Batanea on which Herod conferred the privilege of being absolutely free from taxation Josephus reports as follows, Antiq. xvii. 2. 2: Ἐγένετο ἡ χώρα σφόδρα πολυάνθρωπος ἀδείᾳ τοῦ ἐπὶ πᾶσιν ἀτελοῦς. Ἃ παρέμεινεν αὐτοῖς Ἡρώδου ζῶντος• Φίλιππος δὲ δεύτερος ἐκείνου παραλαβὼν τὴν ἀρχὴν ὀλίγα τε καὶ ἐπ' ὀλίγον αὐτοὺς ἐπράξατο. Ἀγρίππας μέντοι γε ὁ μέγας καὶ ὁ παῖς αὐτοῦ καὶ ὁμώνυμος καὶ πάνυ ἐξετρύχωσαν αὐτούς, οὐ μέντοι τὰ τῆς ἐλευθερίας κινεῖν ἠθέλησαν. Παρ' ὧν Ῥωμαῖοι δεξάμενοι τὴν ἀρχὴν τοῦ μὲν ἐλευθέρου καὶ αὐτοὶ τηροῦσι τὴν ἀξίωσιν, ἐπιβολαῖς δὲ τῶν φόρων εἰς τὸ πάμπαν ἐπίεσαν αὐτούς. It is thus made quite evident that the raising of a Roman tax in that district began only when it was no longer ruled over by its own princes, whereas under Herod the Great, Philip, Agrippa I., and Agrippa II., these taxes were raised or not raised at the pleasure of the prince.

From all that we have learned, then, the conclusion is Roman taxes could not possibly have been raised in Palestine in the time of Herod, and with this result the Roman census as a matter of course falls to the ground.

But, finally, the main consideration that tells against the account of Luke is:

V. A census held under Quirinius could not have occurred in the time of Herod, for Quirinius was never governor of Syria during the lifetime of Herod.

Not only Matt. 2:1 ff., but also Luke 1:5, assumes that Jesus was born during the lifetime of Herod. He therefore undoubtedly places the census referred to by him in the period of Herod's reign. But he also says expressly that the census had been made ἡγεμονεύοντος τῆς Συρίας Κυρηνίου, which can mean nothing else than this, that it took place "while Quirinius had the supreme command in Syria," i.e. when he was governor of Syria. Now we know indeed that Quirinius arrived in Syria as governor in A.D. 6, and that he had been in possession of the same office even earlier, in B.C. 3–2. But in the time of Herod he cannot have been governor; for from B.C. 9–6 this office was held by Sentius Saturninus, from B.C. 6–4 by Quinctilius Varus. The latter had to suppress the revolt which broke out in Palestine after the death of Herod, and was, therefore, in Syria at least half a year after Herod's death. But the predecessor of Saturninus was Titius. Thus during the last five or six years of Herod, and it is only in regard to them that there can be any question here, there is absolutely no room for Quirinius.

This point has caused most trouble to the vindicators of Luke; and their opinions, which hitherto have been tolerably unanimous, now go very far apart from one another. We pass over the older attempts at solution, for the most part of a most arbitrary description (some even venturing upon the boldest alterations of the text), and restrict ourselves to a statement only of those which have their representatives in the present day.

1. Lutteroth, in order thoroughly to set aside the above stated exegetical facts, has devised the following original explanation. He says: When it is said of John the Baptist in Luke 1:80, that he was in the deserts ἕως ἡμέρας ἀναδείξεως αὐτοῦ πρὸς τὸν Ἰσραήλ, by ἀνάδειξις is to be understood, not his public appearance as a preacher of repentance, but his presentation before

the people as a child of twelve years, according to the custom of the law. At this point of time the following statement falls to be inserted, that ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις ἐκείναις was issued the emperor's edict about the taxing, which was carried out by Quirinius. It was this also that led to Joseph making his journey to Bethlehem. As a subject of Herod Antipas, he would indeed be under no obligation to do this, as the taxing applied only to Judea; but by his voluntary appearance there he would bring into view his Bethlehemite nativity. Luke, therefore, is perfectly correct in setting down the taxing of Quirinius at the time when John the Baptist was twelve years old. The conclusion of Luke 2:5 is to be translated: To be taxed with Mary, whom he had married when already she was great with child (therefore twelve years before the taxing). To this earlier time then ver. 6 again reverts: And just there, in Bethlehem, were they also when Mary (twelve years before the taxing) brought forth her first-born son, etc. The explanation belongs to the number of those which may excite admiration for their acuteness, but stand in no need of confutation.

2. Huschke, Wieseler, Ewald, Caspari assign to the superlative πρῶτος a practically or exclusively comparative significance, and translate: This taxing was made when first, or before, Quirinius was governor of Syria. Luke therefore expressly distinguishes the taxing made under Herod as an earlier one from the later one made under Quirinius. That this translation in case of need might be justifiable may be admitted (John 1:15, 30). But even then it is by no means proved that it is the correct translation. It is indeed absolutely inconceivable for what purpose Luke should have made the idle remark, that this taxing took place before Quirinius was governor of Syria. Why would he not rather name the governor under whom it did take place? It may indeed be said that he distinguishes the earlier census under Herod from the later under Quirinius. But Luke does not really even do this, according to that translation. He says not: "This taxing took place earlier than that made under Quirinius" (which would have required something like this: αὕτη ἡ ἀπογραφὴ πρώτη ἐγένετο τῆς Κυρηνίου Συρίας ἡγεμονεύοντος γενομένης); but: "This taxing took place before Quirinius was governor of Syria." So also Wieseler translates, and the analogy of all instances adduced by him (Chronological Synopsis, pp. 102, 103; Beiträge, pp. 30–32) admits of no other translation. But no unprejudiced person will find a suitable sense in these words. And to this it should be added, that Luke must here have expressed himself in a manner as involved and as likely to lead to misunderstanding as possible, whereas elsewhere his special characteristic is just intelligibility and lucidity of expression. No one who does not seek after hazardous explanations will be able to understand πρώτη otherwise than as superlative, and ἡγεμονεύοντος τῆς Συρίας Κυρηνίου otherwise then as genitivus absolutus: as, to name only some authorities, Winer, Buttmann, Zumpt, Bleek, Meyer, etc., have declared.

3. Gumpach. Lichtenstein, Kohler, Steinmeyer, J. Chr. K. von Hofmanu, emphasize ἐγένετο, and translate: This taxing "was carried into effect" (Gumpach), or "was completed" (Kohler, Steinmeyer, Hofmann), while Quirinius was governor of Syria. Luke distinguishes the issuing of the order for the taxing under Herod, and the execution of the decree, ten or twelve years later, under Quirinius. This hypothesis, apparently the most simple, in reality indeed the weakest, comes into conflict, as we shall immediately see, with the narrative of the journey of Joseph and Mary to Bethlehem, according to which it is not only the taxation decree, but also its execution, which took place in the time of Herod. That explanation at best could have a meaning only if one were bold enough to render the simple ἐγένετο by "came to a conclusion, was carried to a close," which, however, even the above-named expositors have not ventured to do.

Ebrard has advanced what he regards as an improved explanation when he accentuates αὐτὴ ἡ

ἀπογραφή and translates: The raising of the tax itself, however, took place only when Quirinius was governor of Syria. Luke therefore does not distinguish, as those critics before named supposed, the issuing of the order for a valuation of property and the execution of it, but the valuation of property (and that not only the order for it, but also the execution of it) on the one hand, and the levying of the tax based upon that valuation on the other hand. There is thus given to the subst. ἀπογραφή a completely different meaning from that given to the verb ἀπογράφεσθαι, which, in the close coherence of the passage, is absolutely impossible. The substantive and the verb alike can mean nothing else than: enrolment, to enrol, and in the strict sense are both specially used of the valuing and enrolment of property. The affirmation that just the census of Quirinius is ordinarily designated by the term ἀπογραφή, and that in consequence thereof this word has, for that particular definite case, the meaning of the levying of a tax (pp. 136 f., 140 f.), is a purely imaginary conception, and not once has the attempt been even made to establish it; for the reference to Acts 5:37, and Josephus, Antiq. xviii. 1 ff., cannot be regarded in this light. Instead of αὐτὴ ἡ ἀπογραφή it would be necessary to read something like this: ἡ δὲ τῶν φόρων ἐκλογή or εἴσπραξις. In conclusion, that view also is in contradiction to the history; for Quirinius, in A.D. 7, levied the taxes, not merely on the ground of an earlier valuation, but first of all, and chiefly, he was then engaged in making an ἀποτίμησις.

4. Seeing then that nothing can be gained by exegetical arts, the attempt has finally been made, even without any such, to vindicate the account of Luke as historical by having recourse to historical combinations. Indeed, Hengstenberg, since the discovery of the famous inscription which afforded evidence of the twice-repeated governorship of Quirinius is Syria, thinks that every difficulty has been wholly removed. That the inscription in reality proves nothing is quite selfevident after the description we have given of it above (see vol. i. p. 353). But also with the twice-repeated governorship of Quirinius in Syria, which is quite probable even apart from the inscription, nothing is gained toward the vindication of Luke; for even the first governorship of Quirinius cannot at the earliest have begun till at least half a year after the death of Herod (see above, p. 133), whereas, according to Luke, Quirinius must have been governor in the time of Herod. Zumpt and, after him, Pölzl, relying for support on a passage in Tertullian, seek assistance by assuming that the census was begun by Sentius Saturninus, B.C. 9–6, carried on by Quinctilius Varius, B.C. 6–4, and brought to an end by Quirinius during his first governorship. From Quirinius, as the completer of the work, it has received the name; wherefore also Luke says that it was made under him. So far then as Tertullian is concerned, Zumpt himself says in another part of his work that the Church Fathers “generally are wanting in all historical sense in the stating of the Gospel narrative.” On their statements, therefore, nothing can with safety be built. But in other respects Zumpt’s theory is only a falling back upon the theory of Gumpach and others, referred to under No. 3. The matter then stands so, in Zumpt’s opinion, that either in place of ἐγένετο we must put a verb like ἐτελέσθη, or instead of Quirinius must be put the name of that governor in whose term of office the fact recorded by Luke, the journey of Joseph and Mary to Bethlehem, took place; for Luke does indeed intend by mentioning the name simply to determine the time of which he speaks. Thus, as the words imply, the representation that the birth of Jesus Christ took place in the time of Quirinius is necessarily fundamental to the hypothesis, which, however, is impossible. Above all, it is inconceivable that the ἀπογραφή, in the way in which it is represented by Zumpt, namely, as a simple enrolment of the people without a property valuation, should have taken three or four years, whereas the much more difficult ἀποτίμησις of A.D. 7, which, besides, had to encounter the opposition of the people, was completed at farthest in the course of one year.

Both difficulties might indeed be overcome were we to assume, with Gerlach and Quandt, that

Quirinius had been sent to Syria along with Quinctilius Varus (B.C. 6–4) as extra-ordinary legate, and as such had undertaken the census. In its best and most precise form this theory was represented by Sanclemente, for he assumes that Quirinius had been despatched to Syria as legatus ad census accipiendos, and indeed with a higher authority than the ordinary legate of Syria of that time, Sentius Saturninus. But this expedient is absolutely inadmissible from the words of the evangelist, since ἡγεμονεύοντος τῆς Συρίας Κυρηνίου can mean nothing else than "when Cyrenius had the supreme command (or, what is the same thing, the office of governor) over Syria." Luke therefore undoubtedly considers Quirinius as the ordinary and regular legate of Syria. But this office, as is thoroughly well established on historical grounds, was occupied in the last years of Herod, not by Quirinius, but by Sentius Saturninus, B.C. 9–6, and then by Quinctilius Varus, B.C. 6–4. The statement of Luke then can be indicated historically only if it could be proved that Quirinius had been already in the times of Herod governor of Syria. But such a proof can never be produced, since, Aberle notwithstanding, the contrary is an established fact.

All ways of escape are closed, and there remains nothing else but to acknowledge that the evangelist has made his statement trusting to imperfect information, so that it is not in accordance with the facts of history. This is the conclusion reached by Höck, Mommsen, Hase, Winer, Bleek, De Wette, Meyer, Strauss, Hilgenfeld, Keim, Weizsäcker, Sevin, Lecoultre, and in all essential respects also by Sieffert The contradiction of history is twofold: (1) Luke ascribes to Augustus the order that a census should be made throughout the whole empire. Of such an imperial census history knows nothing. It is possible that Augustus may have held censuses in many, perhaps in most, of the provinces, and that Luke had some vague information about these. But these numerous provincial censuses, diverse in respect of time and form, could not be referred back to a single edict. Luke has therefore here generalized in a manner similar to that in which he deals with the famine in the days of Claudius. Just as out of the various famines, which, in quite an unusual manner, occurred in various parts of the empire during the reign of Claudius, he makes a famine extending ἐφ' ὅλην τὴν οἰκουμένην (Acts 11:28, see regarding it below under § 19); so also may the various provincial censuses of which he had heard have become combined in his representation into one imperial census. Should the statement about an imperial survey by Augustus be historical (see above, p. 117), even this might have contributed to the production of his mistake. (2) He knows further that a census in Judea under Quirinius had taken place somewhere about the time of the birth of Jesus Christ. By means of this census he explains the fact that the parents of Jesus travelled from Nazareth to Bethlehem, and places it therefore exactly in the time of the birth of Christ, under Herod, i.e. about ten or twelve years too soon. That Luke was indeed acquainted with this taxing, and was acquainted only with it, is established by the passage in the Acts of the Apostles (5:37), where he speaks expressly of it as "the taxing."

Whoever thinks that such errors should not have been expected from Luke, needs only to be reminded of the fact that Justin Martyr, who belonged to the educated class, regarded King Ptolemy, at whose instance the Bible was translated into Greek, as a contemporary of King Herod (Apol. i. c. 31). Even Luke himself cannot be pronounced free from other errors; for Theudas, to whom he ascribes the work and movement of Judas of Galilee (Acts 5:36 ff.), can scarcely be any other Theudas than the well-known bearer of that name, who actually lived somewhere about forty years later (see § 19).

EXCURSUS II – THE SO-CALLED TESTIMONY OF JOSEPHUS TO CHRIST, ANTIQ. XVIII. 3. 3

A list of the literature on this point is given by: Oberthür in Fabricius, Bibliotheca Graec. ed. Harles, t. v. pp. 49–56; Fürst, Bibliotheca Judaica, ii. pp. 127–132; Hase, Leben Jesu, § 9; Winer, Realwörterbuch, i. 558; Heinichen in his edition of Eusebii Scripta Historica, vol. iii. (1870) p. 623 sqq. — The older treatises are printed in Havercamp's edition of Josephus, ii. 2, pp. 186–286. — Some controversial tracts of the time of Richard Simon are enumerated by Bernus, Notice bibliographique sur Richard Simon (Bâle 1882), n. 110, 230, 238, 239.

From a vast number of treatises and pamphlets we select the following of more recent times: —

I. DEFENDING THE GENUINENESS

BRETSCHNEIDER, Capita theologiae Judaeorum dogmaticae e. Flavii Josephi scriptis collecta (1812), pp. 59–66.

BÖHMERT, Ueber des Flavius Josephus Zeugniss von Christo, 1823.

SCHÖDEL, Flavius Josephus de Jesu Christo testatus, 1840.

MAYAUD, Le témoignage de Joseph, Strasb. 1858.

LANGEN, Theologische Quartalschrift, 1865, p. 51 ff.

DANKO, Historia revelationis divinae Novi Testamenti (1867), pp. 308–314.

MENSINGA, Zeitschrift für wissenschaftliche Theologie, 1889, p. 388 (genuine apart from possible modifications of the text, which, however, have not yet been proved).

II. MAINTAINING THE THEORY OF INTERPOLATION

GIESELER, Ecclesiastical History (Edin. 1846, 5 vols.), vol. i. p. 63.

HASE, Leben Jesu, § 9 ("wholly or at least in part non-genuine").

EWALD, History of Israel, vi. 138–142.

PARET in Herzog's Real-Encyclopaedie, 1 Aufl. vii. 27–29.

HEINICHEN in his edition of Eusebii Scripta Historica, vol. iii. ed. 2, 1870, pp. 623–654.

WIESELER, Des Josephus Zeugnisse über Christus und Jakobus, den Bruder des Herrn (Jahrbücher für deutsche Theologie, 1878, p. 86 ff.).

VOLKMAR, Jesus Nazarenus, 1882, pp. 335–345.

RANKE, Weltgeschichte, 3 Thl. 2 Abthlg. (1883) p. 40 f.

SCHOLTEN, Theologisch Tijdschrift, 1882, pp. 428–451 (compare the review by Van Manen in Jahrbücher für protestantische Theologie, 1883, p. 608 f.).

MENSINGA, Theologisch Tijdschrift, 1883, pp. 145–152 (Van Manen, Jahrbücher für protestantische Theologie, 1883, p. 618).

GUST. AD. MÜLLER, Christus bei Josephus Flavius, Innsbruck 1890 (53 pp.).

EDERSHEIM in art. in Smith's Dictionary of Christian Biography "Josephus. 5. The Alleged Testimony of Josephus to Jesus Christ," vol. iii. pp. 458-460.

III. AGAINST THE GENUINENESS

EICHSTAEDT, Flaviani de Jesu Christo testimonii αὐθεντία quo jure nuper rursus defensa sit quaest. i.-vi., Jen. 1813-1841. Quaestionibus sex super Flaviano de Jesu Christo testimonio auctarium, i.-iv., Jen. 1841-1845.

LEWITZ, Quaestionum Flavianarum specimen, Regiomon. Pruss. 1835.

REUSS, Nouvelle Revue de Théologie, 1859, pp. 312-319.

ERNST GERLACH, Die Weissagungen des Alten Testamentes in den Schriften des Flavius Josephus und das angebliche Zeugniss von Christo, 1863.

KEIM, Jesus of Nazara, vol. i. pp. 16-21.

HÖHNE, Ueber das angebliche Zeugniss von Christo bei Josephus, Zwickau 1871, Gymnasial-programme.

D'AVIS, Die Zeugnisse nichtchristlicher Autoren ges ersten Jahrhunderts über Christus und das Christenthum, Sigmaringen 1873, Gymnasial-programme (p. 8: "Probably the whole passage is an interpolation, or rather, perhaps, is thoroughly corrupted by interpolations").

LOMAN, Theologisch Tijdschrift, 1882, pp. 593-601 (p. 596: a genuine basis is possible, but "scarcely probable." Compare the review by Van Manen, Jahrbücher für protestantische Theologie, 1883, pp. 593-595, 614).

In our manuscripts and editions of Josephus the following passage concerning Christ is found, Antiq. xviii. 3. 3: –

Τίνεται δὲ κατὰ τοῦτον τὸν χρόνον Ἰησοῦς, σοφὸς ἀνήρ, εἴ γε ἄνδρα αὐτὸν λέγειν χρή. Ἦν γὰρ παραδόξων ἔργων ποιητής, διδάσκαλος ἀνθρώπων τῶν ἡδονῇ τἀληθῆ δεχομένων• καὶ πολλοὺς μὲν Ἰουδαίους πολλοὺς δὲ καὶ τοῦ Ἑλληνικοῦ ἐπηγάγετο. Ὁ Χριστὸς οὗτος ἦν. Καὶ αὐτὸν ἐνδείξει τῶν πρώτων ἀνδρῶν παρ' ἡμῖν σταυρῷ ἐπιτετιμηκότος Πιλάτου, οὐκ ἐπαύσαντο οἱ τὸ πρῶτον αὐτὸν ἀγαπήσαντες• ἐφάνη γὰρ αὐτοῖς τρίτην ἔχων ἡμέραν πάλιν ζῶν, τῶν θείων προφητῶν ταῦτά τε καὶ ἄλλα μυρία θαυμάσια περὶ αὐτοῦ εἰρηκότων. Εἰσέτι τε νῦν τῶν Χριστιανῶν ἀπὸ τοῦδε ὠνομασμένων οὐκ ἐπέλιπε τὸ φῦλον.

"Now there was about this time, Jesus, a wise man, if it be lawful to call him a man, for he was a doer of wonderful works – a teacher of such men as receive the truth with pleasure. He drew over to him both many of the Jews and many of the Gentiles. He was the Christ; and when Pilate, At the suggestion of the principal men amongst us, had condemned him to the cross, those that loved him at the first did not forsake him, for he appeared to them alive again the third day, as the divine prophets had foretold these and ten thousand other wonderful things concerning him; and the tribe of Christians so named from him are not extinct at this day."

From the fourth century, when this passage was quoted by Eusebius and others (Eusebius,

Hist. Eccles. i. 11; Demonstratio Evangelica, iii. 3. 105-106, ed. Gaisford; Pseudo-Hegesippus, De bello Judaico, ii. 12), through the whole of the Middle Ages, the genuineness of this paragraph was never disputed. Indeed, it contributed not a little to exalt the reputation of Josephus in the Christian Church. It was eagerly seized upon as a proof of the truth of the evangelical history. It was only in the sixteenth century that criticism first moved in the matter, and since then to the present day the controversy, pro and con, has gone on uninterruptedly. We may surely be at least unanimous as to this, that the words, as we have them now, were not written by Josephus. Whatever may be advanced in their favour does not amount to much in comparison with the unquestionable indications of spuriousness. Our manuscripts, of which the oldest, the Ambrosianus F. 128 sup., do not go further back than the eleventh century (see above, vol. i. p. 103), without exception have this paragraph. But this proves only the great antiquity of the interpolation, which besides is vouched for by Eusebius. Over against the old citations since Eusebius stands the fact that it is extremely probable that Origen did not read this passage in his text of Josephus; for, just where one would have expected it, he betrays no knowledge of it. Even then, in respect of the external evidences, objections are not altogether wanting. But the objections on internal grounds are more decided. If reference be made to the genuinely Josephine style, we may for that only bestow upon the interpolator the praise of having very skilfully performed his task The similarity of style is not sufficient to outweigh the non-Josephine character of the contents. As concerns the contents then, it is clear that whoever wrote the words ὁ Χριστὸς οὗτος ἦν was distinctly a Christian; for that ἦν is not equivalent to ἐνομίζετο and cannot be rendered: He was the Christ in the popular belief. On this point it is not necessary to say more. But it is also equally certain that Josephus was not a Christian. Ergo: the passage, to say the least of it, has interpolations in it.

The point under discussion is simply this: whether there are interpolations in the passage or whether it is wholly spurious. Let us make the attempt to distinguish, and cast out what is suspicious. The words εἴ γε ἄνδρα αὐτὸν λέγειν χρή evidently presuppose belief in the divinity of Christ, and betray the Christian interpolator. The following, ἦν παραδόξων ἔργων ποιητής, might in a case of necessity have been said by Josephus, if it were not that they form the fundamental support of the non-genuine words preceding them. At any rate, the words διδάσκαλος ἀνθρώπων τῶν ἡδονῇ τἀληθῆ δεχομένων again must have come from a Christian pen. That ὁ Χριστὸς οὗτος ἦν was not written by Josephus has been already pointed out. And just as certainly he has not written: ἐφάνη αὐτοῖς τρίτην ἔχων ἡμέραν πάλιν ζῶν, τῶν θείων προφητῶν ταῦτά τε καὶ ἄλλα μυρία θαυμάσια περὶ αὐτοῦ εἰρηκότων. Finally, also, the concluding words want the necessary support so soon as the words ὁ Χριστὸς οὗτος ἦν removed from the text.

If, now, we examine the passage as thus reduced we shall find that as good as nothing remains: a couple of insignificant phrases which, in the form in which they stand after our operation has been performed, could not have been written by Josephus. If one therefore continues to maintain the theory of interpolation, it cannot at any rate be in the sense of a simple insertion of Christian additions, but, with Ewald, Paret, and others, in the sense of a complete working up in a new form of the original text of Josephus.

But if it is once admitted as an established fact, that of the present text scarcely a couple of words are from the hand of Josephus, is it not then more reasonable to recognise the utter spuriousness of the passage, and assume that Josephus has throughout been silent regarding Christ? That this hypothesis is impossible cannot be maintained. It is known that Josephus wished to represent his people in the most favourable light possible. Therefore he speaks as

little as he can of the Messianic Hope, since to his cultured readers it could only have appeared as foolishness, and, besides, would have been an unwelcome subject with the favourite of the Caesars; for in it lay the power of the opposition to Rome. Josephus might casually refer to John the Baptist without making mention of the Messianic Hope; but this would have been no longer possible had he introduced Christ. He could neither represent Christ as a teacher of virtue, like the Baptist, nor describe the Christian community as a school of philosophy, like those of the Pharisees and Sadducees. Therefore he will be silent throughout about this phenomenon.

If, for proof of the contrary, we should refer to the subsequent mention of James, the brother of Jesus Christ (Antiq. xx. 9. 1: τὸν ἀδελφὸν Ἰησοῦ τοῦ λεγομένου Χριστοῦ, Ἰάκωβος ὄνομα αὐτῷ), in order to draw from it the conclusion that some previous mention of Christ must have been made, it has to be answered, that the genuineness of this passage is also very seriously disputed. Indeed, on the contrary, one must say: the very statements which we have in reference to James prove that Josephus has been interpolated by Christian hands. For Origen, in his text of Josephus, read a passage about James which is to be found in none of our manuscripts, which therefore, without doubt, was a single instance of a Christian interpolation not carried over into the vulgar text of Josephus.

We therefore, although absolute certainty on such questions cannot be attained, are inclined to prefer the theory of the utter spuriousness as simpler than that of the merely partial spuriousness of the passage.

HEROD AGRIPPA I., A.D. 37, 40, 41-44

SOURCES

JOSEPHUS, Antiq. xviii. 6, xix. 5-9; Wars of the Jews, ii. 9. 1; Zonares, Annales, vi. 7-11 (an Abstract of Josephus).

In the New Testament: Acts 12.

Rabbinical Traditions in Derenbourg, pp. 205-219.

The coins are most completely given in Madden, Coins of the Jews (1881), pp. 129-139.

LITERATURE

EWALD, History of Israel, vii. 236-247, 257-270.

GRÄTZ, Geschichte der Juden, 4 Aufl. iii. pp. 318-361.

HITZIG, Geschichte des Volkes Israel, ii. 568-571.

SCHNECKENBURGER, Zeitgeschichte, pp. 211-215.

HAUSRATH, Zeitgeschichte, 2 Aufl. ii. 212-225, 266-283.

LEWIN, Fasti sacri (1865), ad ann. 31-44. See also the Index, p. 389 sq.

WINER, Realwörterbuch, i. 484 f.

KEIM, Jesus of Nazara, i. 272-275. In Schenkel's Bibellexikon, iii. 49-56.

HAMBURGER, Real-Encyclopaedie für Bibel und Talmud., Abthl. ii. art. "Agrippa."

DE SAULCY, Étude chronologique de la vie et des monnaies des rois juifs Agrippa I. et Agrippa II. 1869 (see above, vol. i. p. 27).

GERLACH, Zeitschrift für lutherische Theologie, 1869, pp. 53-62.

MENKE'S Bibelatlas, Bl. v., Special Map of "Judea and Neighbouring Countries in the last years of King Agrippa I."

I

WHEN Agrippa I. ascended the throne of Herod the Great, he had already passed through an eventful and adventurous career. He was born in B.C. 10, as the son of Aristobulus, who was executed in A.D. 7, and Berenice, a daughter of Salome and Costobar. Shortly before the death of his grandfather he was, while a boy of scarcely six years old, sent for his education to Rome. His mother Berenice was there treated in a friendly manner by Antonia, the widow of the elder Drusus, while the young Agrippa himself became attached to the younger Drusus, the son of

the Emperor Tiberius. The influence of the Roman society seems not to have been a favourable or healthy one. He was trained up to entertain ambitious projects and in habits of extravagance, which, especially after the death of his mother, knew no measure or bounds. He soon ran through his means. His debts accumulated upon him. And when by the death of Drusus, which took place in A.D. 23, he lost support and favour at court, he found himself obliged to leave Rome and go back again to Palestine. He betook himself to Malatha, a stronghold in Idumea, and meditated committing suicide. When these tidings reached his wife Cypros, she wrote to Agrippa's sister Herodias, who was by this time married to Antipas, and entreated her help. Herod Antipas was in this way induced to give to his distressed brother-in-law what would be at least sufficient for the support of his life, and gave him, in addition, the appointment of Agoranomos (overseer of markets) in the capital, Tiberias. This new position in life did not indeed continue long. At a banquet in tyre the two brothers-in-law once engaged in a dispute, which ended in Agrippa resigning his situation at Tiberias, and betaking himself to the Roman governor Flaccus in Antioch. But here, too, his stay was not of long duration. In a dispute which broke out on one occasion between the inhabitants of Sidon and those of Damascus, Agrippa took the side of the Damascenes, apparently in a thoroughly disinterested manner, but really in consequence of bribes which he had taken from them. When this came to the ears of Flaccus, he broke off friendly relations with him; and Agrippa found himself once again deprived of all means of subsistence. He then resolved to try his fortune again in Rome. After he had meanwhile raised a loan in Ptolemais by the assistance of a freedman of his mother Berenice, called Peter, and at Anthedon had only with difficulty escaped the hands of Capito, the procurator of Jamnia, who wished to apprehend him as a debtor of the emperor's, and had finally in Alexandria succeeded in raising large sums on the credit of his wife, he arrived in Italy in the spring of A.D. 36, and on the island of Capri presented himself before Tiberius. The emperor entrusted him with the oversight of his grandson Tiberius. He became particularly intimate with Caius Caligula, the grandson of his patroness Antonia, who afterwards became emperor. But even now he could not keep himself out of debt. Yea, in order to appease his old creditors he was obliged always to borrow new and even larger sums. It was not therefore to be wondered at that he eagerly desired an improvement in his circumstances; but there seemed at that time no prospect of accomplishing it until the aged Tiberius should be succeeded on the throne by Caligula, whom he had befriended. Unthinkingly he once expressed his wish aloud to Caligula in the presence of his coachman Eutychus. At a later period he happened to bring a charge of theft against this same Eutychus, and had him brought before the city prefect Piso. Eutychus now made a declaration that he had an important secret to communicate to the emperor. Tiberius at first gave no heed to the matter. But when, after some time, a hearing was granted, and Tiberius came to know what Agrippa had said, he had him immediately put in fetters and cast into prison. Agrippa now continued in confinement for six months, until the death of the emperor on 16th March A.D. 37.

With the death of Tiberius and the accession of Caligula began for Agrippa the period of his good fortune. Caligula scarcely waited till the solemnities of the funeral of Tiberius were over before he had delivered his friend from his imprisonment and conferred upon him what had been the tetrarchy of Philip, and that also of Lysanias, with the title of king. To this gift the Senate further added the honorary rank of a praetor. Instead of the iron chain which he had worn, Caligula gave him a golden chain of equal weight. But Agrippa still continued to stay in Rome for a year and a half. It was not before autumn of A.D. 38 that he went back by way of Alexandria to Palestine, that he might set in order the affairs of his kingdom.

Soon afterwards, through imperial favour, he obtained yet more important territorial additions. It

has been already told (above, at p. 36) how Herod Antipas in A.D. 39, by his own fault, had lost his tetrarchy, and now, probably not before A.D. 40, Caligula bestowed it also upon Agrippa.

In the autumn of that same year we find Agrippa once more at Rome or Puteoli, where he contrived by his personal intercession to prevent Caligula, at least for a long time, from persisting in his attempt to set up his statue in the temple of Jerusalem (see above, p. 102). He then remained in the company of Caligula, and was still present in Rome when his patron, on 24th January A.D. 41, was murdered by Chärea, and contributed not a little to secure the succession to the throne of the Caesars to the feeble Claudius. It may readily be supposed that he was not the man to perform such services without securing some personal advantage. The new emperor was obliged, in return, not only to confirm him in the possessions which he had previously, but also to add to these Judea and Samaria; so that Agrippa now united under his sway the whole territory of his grandfather. Besides this, he obtained consular rank. For the confirming of this grant, according to ancient custom, a solemn covenant was concluded in the Forum, but the documentary deed of gift was engraved on brazen tablets and placed in the Capitol.

II

The first act by which Agrippa celebrated his return to Palestine was significant of the spirit and disposition with which he was to conduct the government of his kingdom. It was an act of piety. The golden chain which Caligula had bestowed upon him on his liberation from imprisonment "he hung up within the limits of the temple, over the treasury, that it might be a memorial of the severe fate he had lain under, and a testimony of his change for the better; and that it might be a demonstration how the greatest prosperity may have a fall, and that God sometimes raises what is fallen down." At the same time he presented a thank-offering, "because he would not neglect any precept of the law;" and bore the expenses of a large number of Nazarites, in order that they might discharge the obligation of their vow."

With such acts the quondam adventurer began his new reign; and he maintained the same tone throughout the three years during which he was allowed to live and govern. There were again golden days for Pharisaism; a revival of the age of Alexandra. Hence Josephus and the Talmud are unanimous in sounding forth the praises of Agrippa. "He loved to live continually at Jerusalem, and was exactly careful in the observance of the laws of his country. He therefore kept himself entirely pure; nor did any day pass over his head without its appointed sacrifice." Thus runs the eulogistic strain of Josephus; and the Talmud relates how he as a simple Israelite with his own hand presented the first-fruits in the temple. And not only at home, but also abroad, he represented the interests and claims of Judaism. When on one occasion in the Phoenician city of Dora, a mob of young people erected a statue of the emperor in the Jewish synagogue, he used his influence with the governor of Syria, P. Petronius, so that not only for the future was any such outrage strictly forbidden, but also the guilty parties were called to account for their proceedings. And when he betrothed his daughter Drusilla to Epiphanes, son of King Antiochus of Commagene, he made him promise that he would submit to be circumcised. By such displays of piety he gave abundant satisfaction to the people who were under the guidance of the Pharisees. This was shown in a very striking manner when, at the Feast of Tabernacles in A.D. 41, according to the old custom, he read the Book of Deuteronomy, and in the passage, "Thou mayest not set a stranger over thee that is not thy brother" (Deut. 17:15), he burst forth in tears, because he felt himself referred to in it. Then cried out the people to him, "Be not grieved, Agrippa! Thou art our brother! Thou art our brother!"

The careful observance of Pharisaic traditions, however does not seem to have been the only ground of his popularity. We must also allow to him a certain natural amiability. Josephus, at least, ascribes to him an amiable disposition and unbounded benevolence. That he was grateful for service that had been rendered him is proved by his appointment of Silas, a faithful companion who had shared his adventures, to the supreme command of his troops. He must, indeed, have had many unpleasant experiences with this Silas, for he was frequently reminded by him in a rude, rough way of his earlier troubles, and the service which he had rendered him. In order to rid himself of this troublesome prattler, Agrippa was obliged to cast him into prison. But it was a new proof of his goodheartedness that on the next celebration of his birthday he caused the prisoner to be called, so that he might share in the enjoyments of the banquet. This kindly offer, however, had no effect, for Silas would take nothing as a matter of favour, and so was obliged to remain in prison. Agrippa on one occasion exhibited his clemency towards Simon the Pharisee, who in the king's absence had excited a popular tumult in Jerusalem, and had charged the king with transgression of the law. Agrippa obtained information of these proceedings at Caesarea, summoned Simon to his presence, caused him to be seated alongside of himself in the theatre, and said to him in a gentle and kindly tone: "Tell me now, what was done here contrary to the law?" Overcome with shame the learned scribe could give no answer, and was dismissed by the king with presents.

To a Pharisaic-national policy belonged also emancipation from a position of dependence upon Rome. And even in this direction Agrippa made, at least, two rather shy and timid attempts. In order to strengthen the fortifications of Jerusalem, the capital, he began to build on the north of the city a powerful new wall, which, according to Josephus' account, would, if it had been completed, have made the city impregnable. But, unfortunately, before the work could be carried out, the emperor, at the instigation of Marsus, the governor of Syria, issued an injunction against the continuance of it. Of yet greater significance for Rome was the conference of princes assembled by Agrippa soon after this at Tiberias. No fewer than five Roman vassal kings: Antiochus of Commagene, Sampsigeram of Emesa, Cotys of Lesser Armenia, Polemon of Pontus, and Herod of Chalcis, answered the invitation of Agrippa. But this enterprise also was broken up by Marsus. The Syrian governor himself put in an appearance at Tiberias, and ordered the other guests without delay to return home.

Finally, it was a further consequence of his Jewish policy that the otherwise good-natured king should become the persecutor of the young Christian community, especially of the apostles. James the elder, son of Zebedee, was put by him to a martyr's death; and Peter escaped his hand only by the intervention of a miracle. – Moreover, he was an enemy not of the Christians only. The heathen cities also within his territories hated him on account of his Jewish policy, as is proved by the unconcealed jubilation with which the news of his death was received by the Caesareans and Sebasteans.

That Agrippa's Pharisaic piety was a real conviction of the heart is, in view of his earlier life, not in the least probable. He who had spent fifteen years in gaiety and debauchery is not one of whom it could be expected that in the evening of his days he should from hearty conviction assume the Pharisaic yoke. Besides this, we have the most certain proofs that the king's Jewish piety was maintained only within the limits of the Holy Land. When he went abroad he was, like his grandfather, a liberal latitudinarian patron of Greek culture. Thus, for example, Berytus had much to tell of the pagan magnificence which he there cultivated. He had erected there at his own expense a beautiful theatre, an amphitheatre, baths, and piazzas. At the opening of the building, games and sports of all sorts were performed, and among the rest in the amphitheatre

there was a gladiatorial combat, at which 1400 malefactors were made to slaughter one another. Also at Caesarea he caused games to be performed. There also statues of his daughters were erected. So, too, the coins which were stamped during Agrippa's reign are in thorough agreement with the description of the state of matters now given. Only those stamped in Jerusalem had on them no image, while of those that were minted in other cities some had the image of Agrippa, others that of the emperor. The official title of Agrippa is the same as that of the other Roman vassal kings of that time. From an inscription we know that his family had been adopted into the gens Julia; and from another that he bore the title βασιλεὺς μέγας φιλόκαισαρ εὐσεβὴς καὶ φιλορώμαιος. From a survey of all the facts it is evident that his concessions to Pharisaism were purely matters of policy. Upon the whole he was a careful imitator of the old Herod, "only milder in disposition and somewhat more sly." Yet even the grandfather felt himself obliged to make concessions to the Pharisees. Agrippa was in this matter only consistently following out his general lines of policy, for he very well knew that the peace which he loved could be secured in no other way.

The country did not long enjoy his rule. After he had reigned little more than three years, if we reckon from A.D. 41, he died at Caesarea very suddenly in A.D. 44. The two accounts of his death which we have, in Acts 12:19-23, and Josephus, Antiq. xix. 8. 2, with many variations, are yet in thorough and detailed agreement on the principal points. The Acts of the Apostles relates that in Caesarea, sitting on the judgment-seat (βῆμα) dressed in his royal robes, he delivered an oration to the ambassadors representing the citizens of Tyre and Sidon, with whom, we know not why, he had been displeased. While he was speaking the people called out: It is the voice of a god, and not of a man. Immediately the angel of the Lord smote him, because he gave not God the glory; and he was eaten up of worms, and gave up the ghost. According to Josephus, he was present at Caesarea while games were being celebrated there in honour of the emperor. On the second day he appeared in the theatre in a robe which was made wholly of silver. When the robe sparkled in the sun, the flatterers cried out to him declaring that he was a god (θεὸν προσαγορεύοντες), and entreating that he would have mercy upon them. The king allowed himself to be carried away by their flattery. Soon thereafter he saw an owl sitting upon a rope, which at once he accepted as a presage of a speedy death. He then knew that his hour had come. Immediately a most severe pain arose in his bowels. He had to be carried into the house, and in five days was a corpse. — It thus appears that the principal points: Caeserea as the scene of the incident, the brilliant robe, the flattering shout, the sudden death — are common to both narratives, although the details have been somewhat diversified in the course of transmission.

Agrippa left, besides his three daughters (Berenice, Mariamme, and Drusilla), only one son, then in his seventeenth year, whose name also was Agrippa. The Emperor Claudius had been disposed to give over to him the kingdom of his father; but his advisers restrained him from carrying out his intentions. And so again the whole of Palestine, as formerly Judea and Samaria had been, was taken possession of as Roman territory, and its administration given over to a procurator under the supervision of the governor of Syria. The younger Agrippa continued meanwhile to live in retirement.

THE ROMAN PROCURATORS, A.D. 44-66

SOURCES

JOSEPHUS, Antiq. xx. 1 and 5-11; Wars of the Jews, ii. 11-14 ZONARAS, Annales, vi. 12-17 (summary from Josephus).

LITERATURE

EWALD, History of Israel, vii. 412-426, 479-485.

GRÄTZ, Geschichte der Juden, 4 Aufl. iii. pp. 361 ff., 426 ff., 724 ff.

HITZIG, Geschichte des Volkes Israel, ii. 588-594.

SCHNECKENBURGER, Zeitgeschichte, pp. 215-224.

HAUSRATH, Neutestamentliche Zeitgeschichte, 2 Aufl. ii. 362 ff., iii. 331-374, 423-426.

LEWIN, Fasti sacri, 1865, ad. ann. 44-46.

GERLACH, Die Römischen Statthalter in Syrien und Judäa, 1865, p. 67 ff.

GRÄTZ, "Chronologische Präcisirung der Reihenfolge der letzten römischen Landpfleger in Judäa," etc. (Monatsschrift für Geschichte und Wissenschaft des Judenthums), 1877, pp. 401 ff., 443 ff.). Compare, Geschichte der Juden, 4 Aufl. iii. p. 724 ff., where the treatise from the Monatsschrift is almost entirely reproduced.

ROHDEN, De Palaestina et Arabia provinciis Romanis quaestiones selectae, Berol. 1885, pp. 34-36.

KELLNER, "Die römischen Statthalter von Syrien und Judäa zur Zeit Christi und der Apostel." Zweiter Artikel. "Die kaiserlichen Procuratoren von Judäa" (Zeitschrift für katholischen Theologie, 1888, p. 630 ff.).

MENKE'S Bibelatlas, Bl. V. Special Map of "Judea and neighbouring countries in the time of Felix and Festus."

WHEN we glance over the history of the Roman procurators, to whom once more the government of Palestine was entrusted, we might readily suppose that all of them, as if by secret arrangement, so conducted themselves as most certainly to arouse the people to revolt. Even the best among them, to say nothing at all of the others who trampled right and law under foot, had no appreciation of the fact that a people like the Jews required, in a permanent degree, consideration for their prejudices and peculiarities. Instead of exercising mildness and toleration, they had only applied themselves with inexorable strictness to suppress any movement of the popular life. — As compared with those who followed, the words of Josephus are true regarding the first two procurators, that, "making no alterations of the ancient laws and customs, they kept the nation in tranquillity."

1. The first procurator whom Claudius sent to Palestine was Cuspius Fadus (A.D. 44–?).Immediately after he had entered upon his office he had an opportunity for affirming his determination to maintain order. When he arrived in Palestine the inhabitants of Perea were in a state of open war with the city of Philadelphia. The conflict had arisen over disputes about the boundaries of their respective territories. Inasmuch as the Pereans were the parties at fault, Fadus caused one of the three leaders of the party to be executed and the other two to be banished from the country. — But that Fadus with all his uprightness and love of justice had no appreciation of the peculiar characteristics of the Jewish people, is proved by his demand that the beautiful robe of the high priest, which in earlier times, A.D. 6–36, had laid under Roman keeping, and had been afterwards given up by Vitellius (see above, p. 88), should again be committed to the charge of the Romans. Thus, without any occasion whatever, by petty annoyances, the feelings of the people, which were most sensitive in matters of this sort, were outraged. Fortunately, Fadus and the governor of Syria, Cassius Longinus, who on account of this important affair had gone up to Jerusalem, were considerate enough as to at least allow a Jewish embassy to proceed to Rome, which by the mediation of the younger Agrippa obtained an order from Claudius that in the matter of the garments things should continue as they had been.

More serious than this conflict was one which occurred at a later period, and led to open war and shedding of blood. One who pretended to be a prophet, Theudas by name, gathered a large multitude of followers after him, with whom he marched down to the Jordan, giving them the assurance that he by his mere word would part the stream and lead them across on dry land. This, indeed, was only to be a proof of his divine mission, and what he had mainly in view, the contest with Rome, would follow. At any rate this was how the matter was regarded by Fadus. He sent a detachment of horsemen against Theudas, which completely defeated him and slew a portion of his followers or took them prisoners; and when Theudas himself had been apprehended, they struck off his head and carried it to Jerusalem as a sign of their victory.

2. The successor of Fadus was Tiberius Alexander, down to A.D. 48, descended from one of the most illustrious Jewish families of Alexandria, a son of the Alabarch Alexander, and nephew of the philosopher Philo. He had abandoned the religion of his fathers and taken service under the Romans. During the period of his government Palestine was visited by a sore famine. The one fact of any importance that is recorded about him is that he caused James and Simon, the sons of Judas of Galilee, to be crucified, ostensibly because they were entertaining schemes similar to those of their father.

Although even the days of those first procurators did not pass without troubles and upheaval, these came to be regarded as altogether insignificant in comparison with the excitement and turmoil that followed. Even under the governorship of the next procurator Cumanus popular tumults, not without faults on both sides, broke out in far more formidable proportions.

3. The first rebellion against which Ventidius Cumanus, A.D. 48–52, had to contend was occasioned by the coarse insolence of a Roman soldier. This man had the presumption at the feast of the Passover, when to maintain order and preserve the peace a detachment of soldiers was always situated in the court of the temple, to insult the festive gathering by assuming an indecent posture. The enraged multitude demanded satisfaction from the procurator. As Cumanus, however, attempted first of all to hush up the matter, he too was assailed with reproachful speeches, until at length he called for the intervention of the armed forces. The excited crowds were utterly routed; and their overthrow was so complete that, according to Josephus' estimate, in the crush which took place in the streets in consequence of their flight,

20,000 (!) men lost their lives.

The fault in this case lay with the Romans, but in the next upheaval the occasion was given by the Jewish people themselves. An imperial official called Stephanus was attacked on a public road not far from Jerusalem, and robbed of all his belongings. As a punishment for this the villages which lay in the neighbourhood of the spot where the deed was committed were subjected to a general pillage. It was through a pure mischance that out of this pillage further mischief was very nearly occasioned; for a soldier, before the eyes of all, amid contumelious and reproachful speeches tore up a Thorah roll which he had found. In order to obtain revenge and satisfaction for such profanity, a mass deputation visited Cumanus at Caesarea, demanding the punishment of the offender. This time the procurator saw it to be advisable to give way, and so sentenced the offender to be put to death.

Far more bitter and bloody was a third collision with the people under Cumanus, which though it did not indeed cost him his life, yet led to his loss of office. Certain Galilean Jews, who on their way to the feast at Jerusalem had to pass through Samaria, had been murdered in a Samaritan village. When Cumanus, who had been bribed by the Samaritans, took no steps to secure the punishment of the guilty, the Jewish people took upon themselves the duty of revenge. Under the leadership of two Zealots, Eleasar and Alexander, a great multitude of armed men made an attack upon Samaria, hewed down old men, women, and children, and laid waste the villages. But then Cumanus with a portion of his military force fell upon the Zealots; many were slain, others were taken prisoners. Meanwhile ambassadors from the Samaritans appeared before Ummidius Quadratus, governor of Syria, and lodged a complaint with him about the robber raid of the Jews. At the same time, however, a Jewish embassy also came to Quadratus, and accused the Samaritans and Cumanus, who had accepted bribe from them. Quadratus, therefore, went himself to Samaria and made a strict investigation. All the revolutionists taken prisoners by Cumanus were crucified; five Jews, who were proved to have taken a prominent part in the struggle, were beheaded; but the ringleaders both of the Jews and of the Samaritans were sent along with Cumanus to Rome in order to answer for their conduct there. The Jews were indebted to the intercession of the younger Agrippa, who happened then to be in Rome, for their success in their securing their rights. The decision of Claudius was to this effect, that the ringleaders of the Samaritans, who had been discovered by him to be the guilty parties, should be executed, while Cumanus was to be deprived of his office and sent into banishment.

4. At the request of the high priest Jonathan, one of the Jewish aristocracy whom Quadratus had sent to Rome, the Emperor Claudius transferred the administration of Palestine to one of his favourites, the brother of the influential Pallas, whose name was Felix (A.D. 52-60). This man's term of office constitutes probably the turning-point in the drama which had opened with A.D. 44 and reached its close in the bloody conflicts of A.D. 70. During the days of the first two procurators things had continued relatively quiet; under Cumanus, indeed, there were more serious uprisings of the people; yet even then they were only isolated and called forth by particular occurrences; under Felix rebellion became permanent.

He was, like his brother Pallas, a freedman of the imperial family, – a freedman probably of Antonia the mother of Claudius, and having therefore as his full name, Antonius Felix. The conferring of a procuratorship with military command upon a freedman was something unheard of, and is only to be accounted for by the influence which the freedmen had at the court of Claudius. As procurator of Palestine Felix proved worthy of his descent. "With all manner of cruelty and lust he exercised royal functions in the spirit of a slave;" in these words Tacitus sums up his estimate of the man.

Felix was three times married. All the three wives, of whom two are known to us, belonged to royal families. The one was a granddaughter of the triumvir Marc Antony and Cleopatra, and by this marriage Felix was brought into relationship with the Emperor Claudius. The other was the Jewish princess Drusilla, the daughter of Agrippa I. and sister of Agrippa II.; and the way in which the marriage with her was brought about serves to confirm the estimate of Tacitus quoted above. Drusilla at the time when Felix entered upon his office was fourteen years of age. Soon after this she was married by her brother Agrippa II. to Azizus, king of Emesa, after the marriage with the son of King Antiochus of Commagene, to whom she had been before betrothed, had been broken off because he refused to submit to circumcision. Soon after her marriage Felix saw the beautiful queen, became inflamed with passion, and determined to possess her. By the help of a magician of Cyprus called Simon, he prevailed on her to marry him. In defiance of the law, which strictly forbade the marriage of a Jewess with a pagan, Drusilla gave her hand to the Roman procurator.

The public career of Felix was no better than his private life. As brother of the powerful and highly favoured Pallas, "he believed that he might commit all sorts of enormities with impunity." – It can be easily understood how under such a government as this the bitter feeling against Rome grew rapidly, and the various stages of its development were plainly carried out to the utmost extent under Felix and by his fault.

First of all, on account of his misgovernment the Zealots, who entertained so fanatical a hatred of the Romans, won more and more sympathy among the ranks of the citizens. How far Josephus had grounds for styling them simply robbers may remain undetermined. In any case, as their following from among the people shows, they were not robbers of the common sort; and their pillaging was confined wholly to the property of their political opponents. Felix, who was not very scrupulous about the means he used, contrived to get Eleasar, the head of the party, into his hands by means of treachery, and sent him, together with those of his adherents whom he had already in prison, to Rome. "But the number of the robbers whom he caused to be crucified was incalculable, as also that of the citizens whom he arrested and punished as having been in league with them."

Such preposterous severity and cruelty only gave occasion to still further troubles. In the place of the robbers of whom Felix had rid the country, the Sicarii made their appearance, a still more fanatical faction of the patriots, who deliberately adopted as their special task the removal of their political opponents by assassination. Armed with short daggers (sicae), from which they received their name, they mixed among the crowds especially during the festival seasons, and unobserved in the press stabbed their opponents (τοὺς διαφόρους, i.e. the friends of the Romans), and feigning deep sorrow when the deed was done, succeeded in thereby drawing away suspicion from themselves. These political murders were so frequent that soon no one any longer felt safe in Jerusalem. Among others who fell victims to the daggers of the Sicarii was Jonathan the high priest, who, as a man of moderate sentiments, was hated by the Sicarii as well as by the procurator Felix, whom he often exhorted to act more worthily in the administration of his office, lest he (Jonathan) should be blamed by the people for having recommended the emperor to appoint him governor. Felix wished to have the troublesome exhorter put out of the way, and found that this could be most simply accomplished by means of assassination, to which the Sicarii, although otherwise the deadly foes of Felix, readily lent themselves.

With these political fanatics there were associated religious fanatics "not so impure in their

deeds, but still more wicked in their intentions." Advancing the claim of a divine mission, they roused the people to a wild enthusiasm, and led the credulous multitude in crowds out into the wilderness, in order that there they might show them "the tokens foreshadowing freedom" (σημεῖα ἐλευθερίας) – that freedom which consisted in casting off the Roman yoke and setting up the kingdom of God, or, to use the language of Josephus, in innovation and revolution. Since religious fanaticism is always the most powerful and the most persistent, Josephus is certainly right when he says that those fanatics and deceivers contributed no less than the "robbers" to the overthrow of the city. Felix also recognised clearly enough the dangerous tendency of the movement, and invariably broke in upon all such undertakings with the sword. – The most celebrated enterprise of this sort was the exploit of that Egyptian to whom Acts 21:38 refers. An Egyptian Jew who gave himself out for a prophet, gathered around him in the wilderness a great crowd of people, numbering, according to Acts, 4000, according to Josephus, 30,000, with whom he wished to ascend the Mount of Olives, because he promised that at his word the walls of Jerusalem would fall down and give them free entrance into the city. Then they would get the Roman garrison into their power and secure to themselves the government. Felix did not give the prophet time to perform his miracle, but attacked him with his troops, slew and scattered his followers or took them prisoners. But the Egyptian himself escaped from the slaughter and disappeared.

The result of this unfortunate undertaking was temporary strengthening of the anti-Roman party. The religious and the political fanatics (οἱ γόητες καὶ λῃστρικοί) united together for a common enterprise. "They persuaded the Jews to revolt, and exhorted them to assert their liberty, inflicting death on those that continued in obedience to the Roman government, and saying that such as willingly chose slavery ought to be forced from such their desired inclinations; for they parted themselves into different bodies, and lay in wait up and down the country, and plundered the houses of the great men, and slew the men themselves, and set the villages on fire; and this till all Judea was filled with their madness."

Thus did the misgovernment of Felix in the end bring about this result, that a large portion of the people from this time forth became thoroughly roused, under the constant strain of this wild reign of terror, to wage war against Rome, and rested not until at last the end was reached.

Besides these wild movements of the popular agitators, internal strifes and rivalries among the priests themselves led to the increase of confusion. The high priests were at feud with the other priests, and in consequence of the illegal arrangements which prevailed in Palestine under Felix' government, they could even go the length of sending their servants to the threshing-floor, and carrying away by force the tithes which belonged to the other priests, so that many of these unfortunate priests actually died for want.

In the last two years of Felix occurred also the imprisonment of the Apostle Paul at Caesarea, of which an account is given in Acts 23, 24. We are familiar with the story of the personal interview which the apostle had with the Roman procurator and his wife Drusilla, at which the apostle did not fail to speak to both of that which it was specially fit that they should hear: "of righteousness and of temperance, and of judgment to come."

While Paul lay a prisoner at Caesarea, a conflict arose there between the Jewish and Syrian inhabitants of the city over the question of equality in citizen rights (ἰσοπολιτεία), The Jews laid claim to the possession of certain advantages and privileges, since Herod was the founder of the city. The Syrians were naturally unwilling that any such preference should be given to the Jews. For a long tims both parties fought with one another in riots on the public streets. At last

on one occasion, when the Jews had obtained an advantage, Felix stepped in, reduced the Jews to order by military force, and gave up some of their houses to be plundered by the soldiers. But when, nevertheless, the disorders still continued, Felix sent the most prominent of both parties to Rome, in order that the question of law might be decided by the emperor. Before, however, the matter had been settled, Felix, probably in A.D. 60, was recalled by Nero.

5. As successor of Felix, Nero sent Porcius Festus, A.D. 60–62, a man who, though disposed to act righteously, found himself utterly unable to undo the mischief wrought by the misdeeds of his predecessor.

Soon after Festus' entrance upon office the dispute between the Jewish and Syrian inhabitants of Caesarea was decided in favour of the Syrians by means of an imperial rescript. The Jewish ambassadors at Rome had not been able to press their charges against Felix, because Pallas took the side of his brother. On the other hand, the two Syrian ambassadors succeeded by bribery in winning over to their interests a certain man called Beryllus, who was Nero's secretary for his Greek correspondence, and by this means obtained an imperial rescript, by which even that equality with the Syrians, with which before they had not been satisfied, was now taken away from the Jews, and the "Hellenes" declared to be the lords of the city. The embittered feelings excited by this decision among the Jews of Caesarea burst forth a few years later, in A.D. 66, in violent revolutionary movements, which Josephus regards as the beginning of the great war.

Festus, after repeated hearings, caused the Apostle Paul, whom Felix had left in prison (Acts 24:27), at the apostle's own demand as a Roman citizen to be judged before the emperor, to be sent to Rome (Acts 25, 26, 27:1, 2; compare also, in addition, pp. 59, 74 of the present work).

The trouble in connection with the Sicarii continued under Festus just as great as it had been under Felix. During his government also a deceiver, so at least Josephus designates him, led the people into the wilderness, promising redemption and emancipation from all evils to those who should follow him. Festus proceeded against him with the utmost severity, but was unable to secure any lasting success.

Details in regard to a conflict between the priests and King Agrippa II., in which Festus took the side of Agrippa, will be given under the section that treats of the history of that king.

After he had held office for a period of scarcely two years, Festus died while administering his procuratorship, and two men succeeded him, one after the other, who, like genuine successors of Felix, contributed, as far as it lay in their power to intensify the bitterness of the conflict, and hurry on its final bloody conclusion.

In the interval between the death of Festus and the arrival of his successor, in A.D. 62, utter anarchy prevailed in Jerusalem, which was turned to account by the high priest Ananus, a son of that elder Ananus or Annas who is well known in connection with the history of Christ's death, in order to secure in a tumultuous gathering the condemnation of his enemies, and to have them stoned. His arbitrary government was not indeed of long duration, for King Agrippa, even before the arrival of the new procurator, again deposed him after he had held office only for three months. James, the brother of Jesus Christ (ὁ ἀδελφὸς Ἰησοῦ τοῦ λεγομένου Χριστοῦ), is said to have been among those executed by Ananus. So at least the words run in our present text of Josephus; and the words had been read even by Eusebius in his copy of Josephus precisely as they occur in our manuscripts. There is considerable ground, however, for

suspicion of Christian interpolation, especially as Origen read in Josephus another passage regarding the death of James, in which the destruction of Jerusalem and the temple is described as a divine judgment in consequence of the execution of James. This passage occurs in some of our manuscripts of Josephus, and ought therefore certainly to be regarded as a Christian interpolation which has been excluded from our common text. Also in the account given by Hegesippus of the execution of James it is brought into close connection with the destruction of Jerusalem. The year 62 cannot by any means be accepted as the date of his death.

6. The testimony of Josephus in regard to the new procurator Albinus, A.D. 62–64, is to the effect that there was no sort of wickedness that could be mentioned which he had not a hand in. The leading principle of his procedure seems however, to have been: To get money from whomsoever he might obtain it. Public as well as private treasures were subjected to his plunderings, and the whole people had to suffer oppression under his exactions. But he also found it to his advantage to seek money as bribes for his favour from both political parties in the country, from the friends of the Romans, as well as from their opponents. From the high priest Ananias, inclined to favour the Romans, as well as from his enemies, the Sicarii, he accepted presents, and then allowed both of them without restraint to do as they liked. He made, indeed, a pretence of opposing the Sicarii; but for money any one who might be taken prisoner could secure his release. “Nobody remained in prison as a malefactor, but he who gave him nothing.” The Sicarii, indeed, found out another means for securing the liberation of those of their party who had been taken prisoners. They were in the habit of seizing upon adherents of the opposite party only. Then at the wish of the Roman party, by whom also he was bribed, Albinus would set free as many of the Sicarii as they would of their opponents. Once on a time the Sicarii seized the secretary of the ruler of the temple, Eleasar, a son of Ananias, and in return for the liberation of the secretary they secured the restoration of ten of their own comrades. Under such a government the anti-Roman party gained footing more and more, or, as Josephus puts it, “the boldness of those desirous of change became more and more obtrusive.” And seeing that, on the other hand, their opponents also had full scope, utter anarchy soon prevailed in Jerusalem. It was a war of all against all. Ananias, the high priest, behaved in the most outrageous manner. He allowed his servants quite openly to take away from the threshing-floors the tithes of the priests, and those who opposed them were beaten. Two noble relatives of King Agrippa, called Costobar and Saul, also tried their hand at the robber business, and with them was associated the man who had committed to him the maintaining of law and order, even the procurator Albinus himself. In such times it was indeed nothing calculated to excite surprise when on one occasion a high priest, Jesus, son of Damnäos, engaged in pitched battle in the streets with his successor, Jesus, son of Gamaliel, because he had no wish to give up to him the sacred office.

When Albinus was recalled, in order to do a pleasure to the inhabitants of the capital, and also to make the work of his successor as heavy as possible, he left all the prisons empty, having executed the ordinary malefactors, and set at liberty all the other prisoners. “Thus the prisons were left empty of prisoners, but the country full of robbers.”

7. The last procurator, Gessius Florus, A.D. 64–66, was at the same time also the worst. He belonged to Clazomenae, and had through the influence of his wife Cleopatra, who was a friend of the Empress Poppea, obtained the procuratorship of Judea. For the utter baseness which characterized his administration of his office, Josephus can scarcely find words sufficiently strong to express his feelings. In comparison with him, he thinks that even Albinus was extraordinarily law honouring (δικαιότατος). So unbounded was his tyranny, that in view of it the

Jews praised Albinus as a benefactor. Whereas Albinus wrought his wickednesses at least in secret, Florus was impudent enough to parade them openly. The robbing of individuals seemed to him quite too small. He plundered whole cities, and ruined whole communities. If only the robbers would share their spoil with him, they would be allowed to carry on their operations unchecked.

By such outrages the measure which the people could endure was at last filled up to the brim. The combustible materials which had been gathering for years had now grown into a vast heap. It needed only a spark, and an explosion would follow of fearful and most destructive force.

SUPPLEMENT. AGRIPPA II., A.D. 50-100

LITERATURE

EWALD, History of Israel, vii. 273, 421, 422, 432, and elsewhere; viii. 18.

LEWIN, Fasti sacri, ad ann. 44-69 (see in the same work, Index, p. 390).

WINER, Realwörterbuch, i. 485.

KEIM in SCHENKEL'S Bibellexikon, iii. 56-65.

DERENBOURG, Histoire de la Palestine, pp. 252-254.

HAMBURGER, Real-Encyclopaedie, Abth. ii. artikel "Agrippa."

DE SAULCY, Etude chronologique de la vie et des monnaies des rois juifs Agrippa I. et Agrippa II. 1869 (see vol. i. of the work, p. 27).

GERLACH, Zeitschrift für lutherischen Theologie, 1869, pp. 62-68.

BRANN, "Biographie Agrippa's II." (Monatsschrift für Geschichte und Wissenschaft des Judenthums, xix. 1870, pp. 433-444, 529-548; xx. 1871, pp. 13-28).

BAERWALD, Josephus in Galiläa, sein Verhältniss zu den Parteien insbesondere zu Justus von Tiberias und Agrippa II., Breslau 1877.

GRÄTZ, "Das Lebensende des Königs Agrippa II." u.s.w. (Monatsschrift, 1877, p. 337 ff.); "Agrippa II. und der Zustand Judäa's nach dem Untergange Jerusalems" (Monatsschrift, 1881, p. 481 ff.).

The inscriptions referring to Agrippa II. are collected from Waddington in the Zeitschrift für Wissenschaftliche Theologie, 1873, pp. 248-255. On an addition to this list see vol. i. of this work, p. 30.

Agrippa II, son of Agrippa I., whose full name, as given on coins and inscriptions, was Marcus Julius Agrippa, seems like almost all the members of the Herodian family, to have been educated and brought up in Rome. There, at least, we find him at the time of his father's death in A.D. 44, when Claudius wished to appoint him as successor to hif father. That the emperor, at the instigation of his counsellors on the plea of Agrippa's youth, did not carry out this purpose has been already narrated above. The youth remained for a while at Rome, and found there

abundant opportunities of being useful to his countrymen by making use of his influence and connections with the court. Notable instances of his successful intervention are those of the dispute about the high priest's robe and the conflict waged during the time of Cumanus. To him also it was mainly due that Cumanus did not escape the punishment he deserved. With this last-mentioned incident we are already brought down to A.D. 52. But even before this there had been bestowed upon him by Claudius, in compensation for the loss of his father's territories, another kingdom, though, indeed, a smaller one. After the death of his uncle, Herod of Chalcis, whose life and history are given in detail in Appendix I., he obtained, though not probably just at once, but only in A.D. 50, his kingdom in the Lebanon, and, at the same time, what that prince also had had, the oversight of the temple and the right to appoint the high priests. Of this latter right he frequently available himself by repeated depositions and nominations of high priests down to the outbreak of the war in A.D. 66. Probably after this gift had been bestowed upon him Agrippa continued still to reside for a while in Rome, where we meet with him in A.D. 52, and only after this date actually entered upon the government of his kingdom.

He can only seldom, or perhaps not even once, have revisited Palestine, when, in A.D. 53, in the thirteenth year of Claudius, in return for the relinquishment of the small kingdom of Chalcis, he received a larger territory, namely, the tetrarchy of Philip, including Batanea, Trachonitis, and Gaulanitis, and the tetrarchy of Lysanias, consisting of Abila and the domains of Varus. This territory, after the death of Claudius, was still further enlarged, through Nero'e favour for him, by the addition of important parts of Galilee and Perea, namely, the cities of Tiberias and Tarichea, together with the lands around belonging to them, and the city Julias, together with fourteen surrounding villages.

Of Agrippa's private life there is not much that is favourable to report. His sister Berenice, who, from the time of the death of Herod of Chalcis in A.D. 48, was a widow (see under Appendix I.), lived from that date in the house of her brother, and soon had the weak man completely caught in the meshes of her net, so that regarding her, the mother of two children, the vilest stories became current. When the scandal became public, Berenice, in order to cut away occasion for all evil reports, resolved to marry Polemon of Cilicia, who, for this purpose, was obliged to submit to be circumcised. She did not, however, continue long with him, but came back again to her brother, and seems to have resumed her old relations with him. At least this somewhat later came to be the common talk of Rome.

In the matter of public policy Agrippa was obliged to give up even the little measure of independence which his father sought to secure, and had unconditionally to subordinate himself to the Roman government. He provided auxiliary troops for the Parthian campaign of A.D. 54; and when, in A.D. 60, the new procurator Festus arrived in Palestine, he hastened, along with his sister Berenice, surrounded with great pomp (μετὰ πολλῆς φαντασίας), to offer him a welcome. His capital Caesarea Philippi was named by him Neronias in honour of the emperor, and the city of Berytus, which his father had adorned with magnificent specimens of pagan art, was still further indebted to his liberality. His coins, almost without exception, bear the names and images of the reigning emperor: of Nero, Vespasian, Titus, and Domitian. Like his father, he also caused himself to be styled βασιλεὺς μέγας φιλόκαισαρ εὐσεβὴς καὶ φιλορώμαιος.

That upon the whole he was attached to the Roman rather than to the Jewish side is made very evident from an incident which, in yet another direction, is characteristic of his indolence and general feebleness. When he paid a visit to Jerusalem, he was wont to occupy the house that had formerly been the palace of the Asmoneans. This building, lofty even in its original form, he caused to be considerably heightened by the addition of a tower, in order that from it he might

overlook the citadel and the temple, and to observe in his idle hours the sacred proceedings in the temple. This lazy onlooker was obnoxious to the priests, and they thwarted his scheme by building a high wall to shut off his view. Agrippa then applied for assistance to his friend, the procurator Festus, and he was very willing to give him any help he could. But a Jewish deputation, which went on its own authority about the business to Rome, managed by means of the mediation of the Empress Poppea to obtain permission to keep up the wall, so that Agrippa was obliged forthwith to abandon his favourite diversion.

Notwithstanding his unconditional submission to Rome, Agrippa yet sought also to keep on good terms with the friends of Judaism. His brothers-in-law, Azizus of Emesa and Polemon of Cilicia, were required on their marriage with his sisters to submit to circumcision. The rabbinical tradition tells of questions pertaining to the law which were put by Agrippa's minister or by the king himself to the famous scribe Rabbi Elieser. Yea on one occasion we find even Berenice, a bigot as well as a wanton, a Nazarite in Jerusalem. Judaism was indeed as little a matter of heart conviction with Agrippa as it had been with his father. The difference was only this, that as a matter of policy the father took up decidedly the side of the Pharisees, whereas the son with less disguise exhibited his utter indifference. When it is told in the Acts of the Apostles how Agrippa and Berenice desired out of curiosity to see and hear the Apostle Paul, while the king could make no other reply to the apostle's enthusiastic testimony on behalf of Christ than: "With little wouldest thou win me over to be a Christian," and therewith allows the matter to pass away from his mind, we can see not only that he was free from all fanaticism, but also that he had no interest whatever in the deeper religious questions of the time.

His interest in Judaism extended only to external matters, and, indeed, only to merely trifling and insignificant points. In order to support the temple when its foundations had begun to sink, and to raise the buildings twenty cubits higher, he caused, at great expense, wood of immense size and fine quality to be imported from the Lebanon. But the wood, owing to the outbreak of the war in the meantime, was never put to that use, and subsequently served for the manufacture of engines of war. He allowed the psalm-singing Levites, when they made the request of him, to wear the linen garments which previously had been a distinctive badge of the priests. For such an offence against the law, the war, as Josephus thinks, was a just punishment. When, in the time of Albinus, the building of the temple of Herod was completed, in order to secure employment for the multitudes of builders, Agrippa had the city paved with white marble. "And thus at least as costume maker, wood-cutter, pavier, and practical inspector of the temple, did he render his services to the sinking Jerusalem."

When, in the spring of A.D. 66, the revolution broke out, Agrippa was in Alexandria, where he had gone to pay his respects to the governor of that place, Tiberius Alexander, while his sister Berenice remained in Jerusalem in consequence of a Nazarite vow. Agrippa then immediately hasted back, and both brother and sister did all in their power to avert the threatening storm. But all in vain. Open hostilities were now begun in Jerusalem between the war and the peace parties, and the king's troops, which he had sent to help, fought on the side of the peace party. When this latter party had been defeated, and among other buildings, the palaces of Agrippa and Berenice had fallen victims to the popular fury, he became the decided choice of that party. Unhesitatingly throughout the whole war he stood on the side of the Romans. Even when Cestius Gallus undertook his unfortunate expedition against Jerusalem, King Agrippa was found in his following with a considerable number of auxiliary troops. As the further course of the revolt proved favourable to the Jews he lost a great part of his territory. The cities Tiberias, Tarichea, and Gamala joined the revolutionary party; but the king remained unflinchingly faithful to the

Roman cause. After the conquest of Jotapata, in the summer of A.D. 67, he entertained the commander-in-chief Vespasian in the most magnificent manner in his capital of Caesarea Philippi, and was able soon, after he had been slightly wounded at the siege of Gamala, to take possession again of his kingdom; for at the end of the year 67 the whole of the north of Palestine was again subject to the Romans.

When, after the death of Nero, which occurred on 9th June A.D. 68, Titus went to Rome to pay his respects to the new emperor Galba, he took Agrippa with him also for the same purpose. On the way they received tidings of Galba's murder, which took place on 15th January A.D. 69. While Titus now returned with as great speed as possible to his father, Agrippa continued his journey to Rome, where for a time he continued to reside. But after Vespasian had been, on 30th July A.D. 69, elected emperor by the Egyptian and Syrian legions, Berenice, who had been throughout a hearty supporter of the Flavian party, urged her brother to return without delay to Palestine to take the oath of allegiance to the new emperor. From this time forward Agrippa is to be found in the company of Titus, to whom Vespasian had entrusted the continued prosecution of the war. When Titus, after the conquest of Jerusalem, gave magnificent and costly games at Caesarea Philippi, King Agrippa was undoubtedly present, and as a Roman joined in the rejoicings over the destruction of his people.

After the war had been brought to an end Agrippa, as a faithful partizan of Vespasian, was not only confirmed in the possession of the kingdom which he had previously governed, but had also considerable additions made to his territories, though we have no more detailed account of the precise boundaries of his domains. Josephus mentions only incidentally that Arcaia (Arca, at the north end of the Lebanon, north-east of Tripolis) belonged to the kingdom of Agrippa. We are therefore obliged to conclude that his new possessions stretched very far to the north. The omission on the part of Josephus in Wars of the Jews, iii. 3. 5, to refer to these northern possessions, can be accounted for only by the hypothesis that at the time of the composition of that work this extension of territory had not yet taken place. As a matter of fact, Josephus does not refer to them there, because in that passage he does not propose to describe the whole kingdom of Agrippa, but only those districts which were inhabited more or less by Jews (compare Div. II. vol. i. p. 2). Of the southern possessions certain portions seem at a later period to have been taken away from Agrippa. At least, at the time when Josephus wrote his Antiquities, i.e. in A.D. 93–94, the Jewish colony of Bathyra in Batanea no longer belonged to the territory of Agrippa.

In A.D. 75 the brother and sister, Agrippa and Berenice, arrived in Rome, and there those intimate relations begun in Palestine between Berenice and Titus were resumed, which soon became a public scandal. The Jewish queen lived with Titus on the Palatine, while her brother was raised to the rank of a praetor. It was generally expected that there would soon be a formal marriage, which it is said that Titus had indeed promised her. But the dissatisfaction over the matter in Rome was so great that Titus found himself under the necessity of sending his beloved one away. After the death of Vespasian, on 23rd June A.D. 79, she returned once more to Rome; but Titus had come to see that love intrigues were not compatible with the dignity of an emperor, and so left her unnoticed. When she found herself thus deceived she returned again to Palestine.

Of her later life, as well as of that of Agrippa, we know practically nothing. We know indeed only this, that Agrippa corresponded with Josephus about his History of the Jewish War, praised it for its accuracy and reliability, and purchased a copy of it.

Numerous coins of Agrippa confirm the idea that his reign continued to the end of that of Domitian. The many inaccuracies which are found on these coins with reference to the imperial title have caused much trouble to numismatists. Yet, in reality, these inaccuracies are in various directions highly instructive.

According to the testimony of Justus of Tiberias, Agrippa died in the third year of Trajan, in A.D. 100; and there is no reason for doubting the correctness of this statement, as Tillemont and many modern writers have done. Agrippa, it would appear, left no children. His kingdom was undoubtedly incorporated in the province of Syria.

THE GREAT WAR WITH ROME, A.D. 66–73

SOURCES

JOSEPHUS, Wars of the Jews, ii. 14–vii.; Life, c. iv.–lxxiv. ZONARAS, Annales, vi. 18–29 (summary from Josephus). — On the so-called Hegesippus, see above, vol. i. pp. 100–102.

On the non-extant works of Vespasian, Antonius Julianus, and Justus of Tiberias, see above, vol. i. pp. 63–69.

Rabbinical traditions in DERENBOURG, pp. 255–295.

On the coins which possibly date from the period of this war, see Appendix IV.

LITERATURE

EWALD, History of Israel, vii. 486–616.

MILMAN, History of the Jews, books xiv., xv., xvi., xvii.

GRĀTZ, Geschichte der Juden, 4 Aufl. iii. pp. 448–557.

HITZIG, Geschichte des Volkes Israel, ii. 594–629.

HAUSRATH, Neutestamentliche Zeitgeschichte, 2 Aufl. iii. 421–477.

RENAN, Antichrist.

PRESSENSÉ, The Early Years of Christianity, vol. i. pp. 399–406. London 1879.

SCHILLER, Geschichte des römischen Kaiserreiches unter der Regierung des Nero (1872), pp. 205–261. — Geschichte der römischen Kaiserzeit, Bd. i. 1883, pp. 381–400.

MOMMSEN, Römische Geschichte, Bd. v. 1885, pp. 529–540.

LEWIN, The Siege of Jerusalem by Titus. With Journal of a recent Visit to the Holy City, and a general Sketch of the Topography of Jerusalem from the earliest Times down to the Siege. London 1863. — Compare Gött. gel. Anzeiger, 1864, p. 721 ff. — Also, Lewin, Fasti sacri, London 1865, pp. 338–362.

MORRISON, The Jews under the Romans. In “History of the Nations” series. London 1890.

CHAMPAGNT, Rome et la Judée au temps de la chute de Néron (ans 66–72 après Jésus-Christ), 2 éd. Paris 1865, t. i. pp. 195–254; t. ii. pp. 55–200.

DE SAULCY, Les derniers jours de Jérusalem. Paris 1886. Compare, Gött. gel. Anzeiger, 1868, p. 899 ff.

1. THE OUTBREAK AND TRIUMPH OF THE REVOLUTION, A.D. 66

THE ostensible occasion for the outbreak of the long threatened revolt was given by a deed of Floras which was not in itself any worse than many others committed by him, but to the people proved more intolerable because it was at the same time an outrage upon their religious sensibilities. Whereas before he had visited only the citizens with his plunderings, he now ventured to lay his hands upon the treasury of the temple, and to abstract from it seventeen talents. The people's patience was thus tried beyond endurance. They now rose in a great tumult; a couple of sarcastic wits hit upon a plan for throwing contempt upon the greedy procurator by sending round baskets and collecting gifts for the poor and unfortunate Florus. When the governor heard of this he immediately resolved to take bloody vengeance upon those who had thus insulted him. With a detachment of soldiers he marched to Jerusalem, and in spite of the weeping entreaties of the high priests and the principal inhabitantants, he gave over a portion of the city to be plundered by his soldiers. A large number of citizens, including among them even Roman knights of Jewish descent, were seized at random, put in fetters, and then crucified. Even the humble pleadings of Queen Berenice, who happened to be present in Jerusalem at that time, had no effect in moderating the fury of the procurator and his soldiers.

This outrage was committed on the 16th Artemisios (Ijjar, May) of the year 66.

On the day following Florus expressed the wish that the citizens should go out to give a formal greeting to the two cohorts which were to enter the city from Caesarea, in order thereby to give a public proof of their submissiveness and of their penitent disposition. Although the people were not by any means inclined to do so, the high priests persuaded them to submit to this indignity lest something worse should befall them. In solemn procession the people went out to meet the two cohorts, and gave them a friendly greeting. But the soldiers, evidently guided by the instructions of Florus, refused to return their greeting. Then began the people to murmur, and to utter reproaches against Florus. The soldiers then seized their swords, and drove the people back amid incessant slaughter into the city. Then in the streets a violent conflict raged, in which the people succeeded in securing possession of the temple mount, and in cutting off the connection between it and the castle of Antonia. Florus could easily see that he was not strong enough to subdue the multitude by violence. He therefore withdrew to Caesarea, leaving behind only one cohort in Jerusalem, and announcing that he would hold the chief men of the city responsible for the quiet and order of the people.

King Agrippa was at this time in Alexandria. When he heard of the disturbances he hastened to Jerusalem, summoned the people to an assembly on the Xystus, an open space in front of the palace of the Asmoneans, in which Agrippa resided, and from his palace addressed the people in a long and impressive speech, in order to urge them to abandon the utterly hopeless, and therefore unreasonable and disastrous struggle on which they were entering. The people declared themselves ready to return to their allegiance to the emperor They began again to build up the galleries between the temple mount and the Antonia, which they had torn down, and they collected the outstanding taxes. But when Agrippa insisted that they should again yield obedience to Florus, this was more than the people could endure. His proposals were rejected with contempt and scorn, and he was obliged to withdraw without accomplishing his purpose in his kingdom.

Meanwhile the rebels had succeeded in gaining possession of the fortress of Masada. At the instigation of Eleasar, son of the high priest Ananias, it was now also resolved to discontinue the daily offering for the emperor, and no longer to admit of any offering by those who were not Jews. The refusal to offer a sacrifice for the emperor was equivalent to an open declaration of revolt against the Romans. All attempts of the principal men, among the chief priests as well as

among the Pharisees, to induce the people to recall this foolhardy resolution were in vain. They firmly adhered to the decision to which they had come.

When the members of the peace party, to which, as might be expected, all discerning and judicious men belonged, – the high priests, the most distinguished of the Pharisees, those related to the house of Herod, – perceived that they were incapable of accomplishing any good, they resolved to have recourse to violent measures. They accordingly made application for assistance to King Agrippa. He sent a detachment of 3000 cavalry under the command of Darius and Philip, by whose help the peace party gained possession of the upper city, while the rebels continued to hold the temple mount and the lower city. A bitter strife now arose between the two parties; but the royal troops were not strong enough to withstand the violent rage of the multitude, and were obliged to evacuate the upper city. In order to take vengeance upon their opponents, the rebels set fire to the palaces of the high priest Ananias, of King Agrippa, and Berenice.

A few days after this, in the month Loos, that is, Ab or August, they also succeeded in storming the citadel of Antonia, and then they began to lay siege to the upper palace, that of Herod, in which the troops of the peace party had taken refuge. Here, too, it was impossible for the besieged to offer any effectual resistance. Consequently the troops of Agrippa were only too glad to submit on the condition of being allowed to pass out unhurt. The Roman cohorts had betaken themselves to the three strong towers of the palace, known respectively by the names Hippicus, Phasael, and Mariamme, while all the rest of the palace was, on 6th Gorpiaios, that is, Elul or September, set on fire by the rebels. On the following day the high priest Ananias, who had hitherto kept himself concealed, was apprehended in his hiding-place and put to death. The solitary feeble support which still remained to the peace party, was that of the Roman cohorts besieged in the three towers of the palace of Herod. These, too, were obliged at last to yield to the superior power of the people. Upon laying down their arms they were allowed to walk out uninjured. But the rebels, who were now masters of the whole city, celebrated their victory by general slaughter. The Roman soldiers were scarcely gone, leaving their weapons behind them, when they were treacherously fallen upon by the Jews, and were cut down to the last man.

While thus the triumph of the revolution in Jerusalem was decided, bloody conflicts took place also in many other cities, where Jews and Gentiles dwelt together, especially within the borders of Palestine. Wherever the Jews were in the majority, they cut down their Gentile fellow-townsmen; and where the Gentiles predominated, they fell upon the Jews. The influence of the revolt in the mother country spread even as far as Alexandria.

At last, after long delay and preparation, Cestius Gallus, the governor of Syria, entered upon negotiations for the quieting of the disturbances in Judea. With the twelfth legion, 2000 chosen men from other legions, six cohorts, and four alae of cavalry, besides numerous auxiliary troops which the friendly kings, including Agrippa, had been obliged to place at his disposal, he started from Antioch, marched through Ptolemais, Caesarea, Antipatris, Lydda, where he arrived at the time of the Feast of Tabernacles in the month Tizri or October, and finally through Beth-horon to Gabao or Gibeon, 50 stadia from Jerusalem, and there pitched his camp. A sally made by the Jews from Jerusalem put the Roman army into a position of great danger, but was at last driven back. Cestius then advanced nearer to the city, and laid siege to the so-called Scopus, 7 stadia from Jerusalem. Four days later, on the 30th Hyperberetaios, that is, Tizri or October, he took possession unopposed of the northern suburb Bezetha, and set it on fire. But when he ventured upon the bolder task of storming the temple mount his enterprise failed. He thereupon desisted from all further attempts, and began to withdraw without accomplishing his object. Josephus is

unable to explain the causes of this procedure. Probably Cestius perceived that his forces were insufficient for making an attack with any hope of success upon the well fortified and courageously defended city. With what determination and with what dauntless resolution the struggle was carried forward on the part of the Jews, was now to be proved to the Roman governor on his retreat In a ravine near Beth-horon, through which he was pursuing his journey, he found himself surrounded on every side by the Jews, and attacked with such force, that his homeward march was turned into a flight. Only by leaving behind him a great part of his baggage, including much valuable war material, which subsequently proved of great service to the Jews, did he succeed in reaching Antioch with a fragment of his army. Amid great rejoicings the returning conquerors entered Jerusalem on the 8th Dios, that is, Marchesvan or November.

In presence of the excitement caused by victory which now prevailed in Jerusalem all peace counsels were forcibly silenced. After such decisive successes no proposals of compromise would be listened to. Even those inclined to oppose were driven along by the course of events. Those who were inalienably attached to the Romans left the city. All the rest were drawn into their own ranks by the rebels, partly by force, partly by persuasion (τοὺς μὲν βίᾳ τοὺς δὲ πειθοῖ). They now set about organizing the rebellion in a regular methodical fashion, and made preparations for the expected onslaught of the Romans. It is distinctively characteristic of the later period of the war that the men who now had the power in their hands belonged exclusively to the higher ranks. The chief priests, the most distinguished of the Pharisees, were those who directed the organization of the land defences. An assembly of the people, which was held in the temple, made choice of commanders for the provinces. Two men, Joseph, son of Gorion, and the high priest Ananus, were entrusted with the defence of the capital. To Idumea they sent Jesus, son of Sapphias, and Eleasar, son of Ananias, both belonging to the high priestly family. Nearly all the eleven toparchies into which Judea was divided had their own commanders. Finally, to Galilee was sent Josephus, son of Matthias, the future historian.

There is no doubt but that the youthful Josephus had thus one of the most difficult and most responsible positions assigned to him, for it was just in Galilee that the first attack of the Romans might be expected. Great results could scarcely be looked for in the conducting of warlike operations from a young man only thirty years of age; and he owed his appointment certainly less to his military capacities than to his friendship with the most distinguished personages. It was indeed a strange proceeding to send a young man, who in addition to his natural ability could at most only point to his rabbinical learning, to enlist an army with all haste from among the peaceful inhabitants of Galilee, and with it to hold his ground against the attack of veteran legions and circumvent the tactics of experienced generals! If we are to believe his own account, he set himself at least with zeal to the solving of the insoluble problem. For the governing of Galilee he appointed, in imitation of the Sanhedrim of Jerusalem, a council of seventy men, which had to decide on difficult points of law; while for less important disputes he established in every city a council of seven men. He intended to prove his zeal for the law by destroying the palace of Tiberias, which, contrary to the law, was adorned with animal images; but in this he was anticipated by the revolutionary party. The military part of his task he endeavoured to carry out specially by strengthening the fortifications of the cities. All the more important cities of Galilee, Jotapata, Tarichea, Tiberias, Sepphoris, Gischala, Mount Tabor, also Gamala in Gaulanitis, and many smaller towns were put more or less in a condition of defence. But with special pride he boasts of his labours in organizing the army, He sought to bring together no less than 100,000 men, and to have them drilled after the Roman style.

While Josephus thus prepared for war with the Romans, a violent opposition arose against him

in his own province, which even went the length of openly drawing the sword upon him. The soul of this hostile movement was John of Gischala, a bold, reckless party leader, who was filled with glowing hatred toward the Romans, and had resolved to carry on the struggle against them to the uttermost. But while he had sworn death and destruction to the tyrants, he was himself no less of a tyrant within his own circle. It was intolerable to him to brook the idea of having others over him. Least of all could he yield obedience to Josephus, whose tame method of conducting the war seemed to him no better than friendship for the Romans. Hence he used every endeavour to get the man so hateful to him set aside, and to withdraw the allegiance of the people of Galilee from him. His suspicion of Josephus was indeed not altogether without foundation. Josephus knew the Romans too well to entertain the notion that the rebellion could be really and finally successful. He was therefore necessarily only half-hearted in the business which he had undertaken, and sometimes unwittingly allowed this to appear. On one occasion certain youths from the village of Dabaritta had robbed an official of King Agrippa, and taken rich spoil. Josephus caused them to hand back what they had taken, and intended, if we may believe his own account of the affair, to restore them to the king on the first favourable opportunity. When the people perceived that this was his intention, the suspicion which John of Gischala had insinuated against him was increased, and now broke out into open rebellion. In Tarichea, where Josephus had his residence, a great tumult was made. They threatened the life of the traitor. Only by the most miserable and degrading self-humiliation and the exercise of low cunning could Josephus ward off the threatened danger. Some time later at Tiberias, he escaped the assassins sent against him by John of Gischala only by precipitate flight. At last John carried matters so far that he was able to obtain in Jerusalem a resolution to recall Josephus. Four of the most distinguished men were sent for this purpose to Galilee, accompanied by a detachment of soldiers numbering 2500 men, in order to carry out this decision by force if necessary. But Josephus knew how to frustrate the execution of this decree, and the four ambassadors were again recalled. When they refused compliance with that summons, he had them apprehended and sent them back to Jerusalem. The inhabitants of Tiberias who continued in revolt were subjugated by force, and thus for the time peace was restored. When, a few days later, the inhabitants of Tiberias again rose in revolt, – now, indeed, in favour of Agrippa and the Romans, – they were overcome once more by craft.

Meanwhile in Jerusalem they were by no means inactive. There, too, they were making preparations for meeting the Romans. The walls were strengthened, war material of all sorts was collected, the youth were exercised in the use of arms.

Amid such preparations the spring of A.D. 67 came round, and with it the time when the attack of the Romans was expected, and the young republic would have to pass through its fiery ordeal.

2. THE WAR IN GALILEE, A.D. 67

The Emperor Nero had received in Achaia the news of the defeat of Cestius. Since the continuance of the war could not have been committed to the defeated general, – he seems indeed soon afterwards to have died, – the difficult task of putting down the Jewish rebellion was made over to the well-proved hands of Vespasian. During winter Vespasian still pushed forward the preparations for the campaign. While he himself went to Antioch and there marshalled his army, he sent his son Titus to Alexandria, in order that he might bring to him from thence the fifteenth legion. So soon as the season of the year allowed, he marched from Antioch and advanced to Ptolemais, where he meant to await the arrival of Titus. But before Titus reached that place, ambassadors from the Galilean city of Sepphoris appeared before

Vespasian and besought him to give them a Roman garrison. Vespasian hasted to comply with their request. A detachment of 6000 men under the leadership of Placidus was sent as a garrison to the city. Thus were the Romans, without drawing a sword, in possession of one of the most important and one of the strongest points in Galilee. Soon after this Titus arrived with his one legion. The army now at the disposal of Vespasian consisted of 3 distinct legions, the fifth, tenth, and fifteenth, 23 auxiliary cohorts, 6 alae of cavalry, besides the auxiliary troops of King Agrippa, of King Antiochus of Commagene, of Soemus of Emesa, and of Malchus of Arabia: in all comprising somewhere about 60,000 men.

When all arrangements had been made, Vespasian advanced from Ptolemais and pitched his camp on the borders of Galilee. Josephus had before this set his camp at the village of Garis, twenty stadia from Sepphoris (Life, lxxi.), in order that he might there wait the attack of the Romans. The warlike qualities of his army were soon shown in a very doubtful light. When it became known that Vespasian was approaching, the majority of the Jewish troops became utterly dispirited, even before they had so much as come face to face with the Romans; they fled hither and thither; and Josephus found himself obliged to hasten with the remnant to Tiberias. Without drawing a sword, Vespasian had thus obtained possession of the lowlands of Galilee. Only the strongholds now remained for him to take.

Josephus soon held communication with Jerusalem, and insisted that if they wished the war to be carried on they should send an army able to cope with the Romans, a petition which now indeed came too late. The most of the army of Josephus had taken refuge in the strong fortress of Jotapata. Even he himself entered that stronghold on the 21st (?) Artemisios, that is, Ijjar or May, so as to conduct the defence in his own person. On the evening of the immediately following day, Vespasian with his army appeared before the city; and then began the celebrated siege of the certainly not unimportant stronghold, described with a self-glorifying amplitude of details by Josephus. The first attack led to no result. It was found necessary to have recourse to a regular siege. An obstinate struggle made the issue for some time doubtful. What on the one side was accomplished by art and the experience of war, was accomplished on the other by the courage of despair and the skill of the commander-in-chief. For although Josephus was indeed no general in the proper sense of the word, he was a past master in little tricks and stratagem. With profound satisfaction the vain man tells how he deceived the Roman generals as to the scarcity of water in the city by making his soldiers hang their clothes dripping with water over the battlements. He also tells how he managed to procure supplies of food by sending his men out by night clothed in the skins of beasts, so that they might pass by the Roman sentinels. He further relates how he broke the force of the battering-ram upon the wall by throwing out bags filled with chaff; how he had boiling oil thrown upon the soldiers, or boiling fenugreek poured on the boards of the scaling ladders, so that those advancing on them slipped and fell back. But neither by such arts nor by the boldness of the sallies, in one of which Vespasian himself was wounded, could the fate of the city be averted. After the besieged had endured the utmost extremity of suffering, a deserter betrayed the secret, that in consequence of fatigue the very sentinels could no longer keep themselves awake till the morning. The Romans made use of this information. With perfect stillness, Titus one morning with a small detachment scaled the wall, cut down the sleeping watch, and pressed into the city. The legions followed in his track, and the outwitted garrison were aware of the entrance of the Romans only when they no longer had power to drive them back. All without exception who fell into the hands of the Romans, armed and unarmed, men and women, were ruthlessly slain or carried off as slaves; the city and its fortifications were levelled with the dust. It was on the 1st of the month Panemos, that is, Thamuz or July, A.D. 67, when this most important fortress of Galilee fell into the hands of the

Romans.

Josephus with forty companions had taken refuge in a well which discharged itself into a cave. When he was discovered there, he was willing to surrender to the Romans, but was prevented doing so by his companions. These only offered him the choice of dying along with them, either by their hand or by his own. By some sort of stratagem, having persuaded them that they should fall upon one another in the order determined by the lot, and having by the fortune of the lot been himself reserved to the last, Josephus managed to extricate himself from their hands, and having made his escape, surrendered himself to the Romans. When he was brought before Vespasian, he assumed the role of a prophet, and prophesied to the general his future elevation as emperor. This had for him at least this result, that although kept prisoner, he was dealt with in a generous manner.

On the fourth day of Panemos, Vespasian advanced from Jotapata and marched next past Ptolemais to Caesarea, where he allowed the troops some rest. While the soldiers were refreshing themselves after the exertions of the siege, the general paid a visit to the friendly King Agrippa at Caesarea Philippi, and took part there in extravagant festivities lasting for twenty days. He then sent the legions by Titus from Caesarea by the sea and marched against Tiberias, where, at the sight of the Roman army, the people of their own accord opened their gates, and for Agrippa's sake received honourable treatment. From this point Vespasian pursued his way onward to Tarichea. By a bold stroke of Titus, this city also fell into the hands of the Romans in the beginning of the month Gorpiaios, that is, Elul or September.

In Galilee there now remained in the hands of the rebels only Gischala and Mount Tabor (Itabyrion), and in Gaulanitis the important and strongly fortified Gamala. To the last-named place Vespasian next directed his attention. The siege appeared soon to be successful. The Romans succeeded in storming the walls and forcing an entrance into the city. But there they encountered such bitter resistance that they were forced to retire with very heavy loss. The repulse was so severe that it required all Vespasian's influence and reputation to restore again the courage of the soldiers. At last, on the 23rd Hyperberetaios, that is, Tizri or October, the Romans again forced their way into the city, and were this time successful in making themselves complete masters of the situation. During the siege of Gamala the Mount Tabor (Itabyrion) was also taken by a detachment sent thither.

Vespasian gave over the reducing of Gischala to Titus with a detachment of 1000 cavalry. He himself led the 5th and 15th legions into winter quarters at Caesarea, while he placed the 10th at Scythopolis. Titus made light work of Gischala. On the second day after his appearing before the walls of the city, the citizens of their own accord opened the gates to him, John having secretly, during the previous night, with his Zealot comrades quitted the city and fled to Jerusalem.

Thus by the end of A.D. 67 was the whole of the north of Palestine brought again into subjection to the Romans.

3. FROM THE SUBJUGATION OF GALILEE TO THE SIEGE OF JERUSALEM, A.D. 68-69

The unfortunate results of the first year of the war determined the fate of the leaders of the rebellion. On the part of the fanatical section of the people, and not without cause, the unfavourable turn that events had taken was attributed to the lack of energy in the mode of conducting the war hitherto. The men of the people therefore set themselves with all their might

to get the reins into their own hands, and to set aside those who had been in command. And since these would not of their own accord withdraw, a fearfully bloody civil war, accompanied by acts of horrid cruelty, broke out during the winter of A.D. 67-68 in Jerusalem, which in its atrocities can only be compared to the first French revolution.

The head of the fanatical popular party, or, as they called themselves, the Zealots, was John of Gischala. After he had escaped the hands of Titus by flight, he went with his followers, in the beginning of November A.D. 67, to Jerusalem, and sought to win over the people to himself and to rekindle in their breasts a determination to continue the war in a bolder and more resolute spirit. He readily succeeded in gaining over the youth to his side. And since now on all hands the war-loving rabble from the country poured into the city, the party of the Zealots was soon in the ascendency. They next proceeded to set aside those who were suspected of friendship for the Romans. Several of the most distinguished men, among them Antipas, who belonged to the family of Herod, were put under arrest, and were murdered in prison. Their next proceeding was to choose a new high priest by lot, for those who had held the office up to this time all belonged to the aristocratic party. The newly-elected high priest, Phannias of Aphtha, was not indeed in the least degree acquainted with the duties of the high priest's office. But he was a man of the people, and that was the main thing.

The men of order, Gorion, son of Joseph, the famous Pharisee Simon, son of Gamaliel, the two high priests, Ananus, son of Ananus, and Jesus, son of Gamaliel, sought on their part to resist the Zealots by force. They exhorted the people to put a stop to the wild schemes of that faction. A discourse which Ananus delivered with this end in view had indeed this result, that a section of the populace declared open hostilities against the Zealots. These enthusiasts were in the minority, and were obliged to retreat before the superior force of their opponents, and to take refuge in the inner court of the temple, where for a time they were carefully guarded, as the people would not violently attack the sacred gates.

In order to obtain support the Zealots secretly sent messengers to the war-loving Idumeans, and besought of them that they would form a confederacy on the pretext that the dominant party in Jerusalem had fallen away to Romans. The Idumeans appeared before the walls of the city, but were not admitted, for no one knew of their alliance with the Zealots. On the night after their arrival a terrible hurricane burst forth. The storm raged, and the rain fell in torrents. Under shelter of this storm the Zealots succeeded in secretly opening the gates to their confederates and letting them in unobserved. Scarcely had the Idumeans obtained a firm footing in the city, when they began the work of murder and robbery, in which the Zealots afforded them ready aid. The party of order was too weak to withstand the attack. The victory of the reign of terror in Jerusalem was complete. The rage of the Zealots and of the Idumeans in league with them was directly mainly against the distinguished, respectable, and well-to-do. All those who had previously been leaders of the revolution were now made away with as suspected friends of the Romans. Conspicuous above all the other victims of their murderous zeal were the high priests Ananus and Jesus. In order to lend to their wild scheme the semblance of legal sanction, the comedy of a formal process at law was on one occasion enacted. But when the court of justice convened for that purpose pronounced the accused, Zacharias, son of Baruch, innocent, he was cut down by a couple of Zealots with the scornful declaration: "Here hast thou also our voices."

When the Idumeans had been satiated with murder, and had, besides, observed that what had been styled threatened treason was only a calumnious charge trumped up against order-loving citizens, they would have no more partnership with the Zealots, and so took their departure. All

the more unrestrainedly did the Zealots now pursue their rule of terror. Gorion also now fell under their lash. The party of the well-doing and order-loving had been by this time so sadly thinned that there could no longer be any thought of resistance. John of Gischala was supreme potentate in the city.

At this period, if not even earlier than this, occurred the flight of the Christian community from Jerusalem. The Christians left the city "in consequence of a divine admonition," and migrated to the city of Pella in Perea, which is a heathen city was undisturbed by the war.

Vespasian's generals were of the opinion that they should take advantage of these circumstances, and that now was the time to begin the attack upon the capital. They thought that in consequence of the internal conflicts within the city the task before them would be easily accomplished. Not so Vespasian. He regarded it as more prudent to allow his enemies to waste their strength in the civil strife, and to consume one another. In order that the inhabitants of the capital might have time to carry out their work of self-destruction, he directed his attention meanwhile to Perea. Even before the favourable season had arrived, he marched from Caesarea on the 4th Dystros, that is, Adar or March, of A.D. 68, invested Gadara, in order to guard against the elements in the city hostile to the Romans, left there a garrison, and then turned back again to Caesarea. A detachment of 3000 infantry and 500 cavalry, which he left behind him under the command of Placidus, completed the subjugation of all Perea as far as Machärus. When the more suitable season came round, Vespasian advanced with the greater part of his army from Caesarea and invested Antipatris, took Lydda and Jamnia, drew up the 5th legion before Emmaus, made a successful raid through Idumea, then turned again northward upon Emmaus, pressed through Samaria to Neapolis (Shechem), and thence past Corea, where he arrived on 2 Daisios, that is Sivan or June, to Jericho. At Jericho and Adida he left Roman garrisons, while Gerasa(?) was taken and then destroyed by a detachment sent against it under Lucius Annius.

The country was now so far subdued that it only remained to begin the siege of the capital. Vespasian therefore turned back to Caesarea, and was actually busying himself with preparations for the siege of Jerusalem when the news reached him of the death of Nero, which had taken place on 9th June A.D. 68. By this event the whole situation was suddenly changed. The future of the empire as a whole was uncertain. Vespasian therefore suspended all warlike undertakings, and concluded to wait for the further development of affairs. When the news of Galba's elevation to the throne arrived, which was not till the middle of the winter of A.D, 68-69, he sent his son Titus to Rome in order to convey his greetings to the new emperor, and to receive from him his commands. But Titus had proceeded no farther than Corinth when he received tidings of the murder of Galba, which occurred on 15th January A.D. 69, whereupon he returned to Caesarea to his father. Vespasian was now inclined to wait without committing himself to see how things would go.

Circumstances, however, soon obliged him again to take decisive action. A certain Simon Bar-Giora, that is, son of the proselyte, a man of like spirit to John of Gischala, inspired by an equally wild enthusiasm for freedom, and just as little able to brook the presence of any one over himself, had taken advantage of the cessation of hostilities to gather around himself a crowd of supporters, with which he overran the southern parts of Palestine, robbing and plundering wherever he went. Everywhere the course which he and his horde had taken was marked by devastation. Among other successes he managed to surprise Hebron, and to carry off from it abundant spoil.

Vespasian therefore found it necessary to secure possession of Judea in a more thorough manner than had hitherto been accomplished. On the 5th Daisios, that is, Sivan or June, of the year 69, after a whole year had passed without armed interference, he again advanced from Caesarea, subdued the districts of Gophna and Acrabata, the cities of Bethel and Ephraim, and arrived in the neighbourhood of Jerusalem, while his tribune Cerealis conquered and destroyed the city of Hebron, which had offered opposition. With the exception of Jerusalem and the fortresses of Herodium, Masada, and Machärus, all Palestine was now subject to the Romans.

Even before Simon found himself prevented by this expedition of Vespasian from continuing his robber raids through Idumea, the gate of the capital had been flung open to receive him. Up to the spring of A.D. 69, John of Gischala had there played the part of the omnipotent tyrant. Of the ruinous confusion and lawlessness that prevailed in Jerusalem under his rule Josephus has given a thrilling and horrible description. The inhabitants, who had long desired to be rid of his supremacy, looked with favour upon the arrival of Simon Bar-Giora as a means of freeing them from him who now acted the tyrant over them. On the suggestion of the high priest Matthias, Simon was invited to come into the city. He most readily accepted the invitation, and made his public entrance into Jerusalem in the month Xanthicus, that is, Nisan or April, of the year 69. But, although the hope had been entertained that he would free them from the tyranny of John, it was now found that they rather had two tyrants in the city who fought against one another, both regarding the resident citizens as their common enemies.

Vespasian had scarcely returned back to Caesarea when the news came that Vitellius had been raised to the throne as emperor. The idea then took possession of the legions in Egypt, Palestine, and Syria that they had as much right to nominate the emperor as had their comrades in the West, and that Vespasian was more worthy of the throne than the glutton Vitellius. On 1st July A.D. 69, Vespasian was proclaimed emperor in Egypt. A few days afterwards the Palestinian and Syrian legions made the same proclamation. Before the middle of July, Vespasian was acknowledged as emperor throughout the whole East.

He had now something else to engage his attention than the prosecution of the war against the rebellious Jews. After he had received at Berytus the embassies from various Syrian and other cities, he marched on to Antioch, and from thence sent to Rome by road Mucianus with an army. He then went himself to Alexandria. During his residence there he obtained the intelligence that his interests had prevailed in Rome, and that Vitellius had been murdered on 20th December A.D. 69. He himself still remained in Alexandria till the beginning of the summer of A.D. 70; while his son Titus, to whom he had committed the continuing of the Jewish war, marched at the head of the army to Palestine.

In Jerusalem, by this time, the internal feuds had advanced one step further. Instead of the two parties of John and Simon there were now three, for from the party of John a new section had broken off under Eleasar, son of Simon. Simon had in his power the upper city and a great part of the lower city, John held the Temple Mount, and Eleasar the inner Court of the Temple. All three continued incessantly at war with one another, so that the city from day to day presented the aspect of a battlefield. In their mutual hatred of one another they became so foolish that they destroyed by fire the immense store of grain which had been gathered up in the city, lest their rivals should profit by it, without considering that thereby they robbed themselves of the means of sustaining a siege. While thus Jerusalem was tearing its own flesh, Titus was carrying on the preparations for his attack.

4. THE SIEGE AND CONQUEST OF JERUSALEM, A.D. 70

The army which Titus had at his disposal consisted of four legions. Besides the three legions of his father, the 5th, 10th, and 15th, he had also the 12th, which had already been in Syria under Cestius, and had so unfortunately begun the war. In addition to these, he had also the numerous auxiliary troops of the confederate kings. The commanders of the legions were – Sextus Cerealis over the 5th legion, Larcius Lepidus over the 10th, Tittius Frugi over the 15th. The commander of the 12th legion is not named. As principal adviser, we would call him Chief of the Staff, Tiberius Alexander, afterwards procurator of Judea, accompanied Titus. While a part of the army received orders to push on to meet him before Jerusalem, Titus himself advanced with the main body of his forces from Caesarea, and a few days before the Passover, 14th Nisan or April, of A.D. 70, arrived before the walls of the Holy City.

Titus had hurried on in advance of the legions with 600 cavalry in order to obtain information about the country by spies, and had in this got so far ahead of the main body, that he exposed himself most seriously to the danger of being fallen upon by the Jews, and, indeed, owed his safety wholly to his own personal bravery. The Romans, from the moment of their arrival, had painful experience of the daring spirit of their opponents. While the 10th legion, which had advanced from Jericho to Jerusalem, was still occupied with the strengthening of its camp on the Mount of Olives, it was attacked with such violence that it had well-nigh suffered an utter defeat. Only by the personal interference of Titus was the yielding legion brought again to a stand, and enabled to ward off the attack.

The conflict of parties within the city, however, was not even yet by any means abated. Even when the Romans were lying before the gates, during the Passover festival, a carnage of one party by the other was going on within the city. The faction of Eleasar had opened the gate of the temple court for those who had gone up to attend the feast. John of Gischala took advantage of this in order to smuggle in his people with concealed weapons, and to fall on Eleasar and his followers when least expected. Those who were thus taken by surprise were not strong enough to sustain the conflict, and were obliged to admit John's adherents into the court. From this time forward there were again two parties in Jerusalem, that of John and that of Simon.

In order to understand the siege operations that followed, it is necessary to form for oneself at least a general idea of the situation of the city, Jerusalem lay upon two hills, a higher one to the west and a smaller one to the east, which were separated by a deep ravine running from north to south, the so-called Tyropoeon. On the larger western hill lay the upper city, on the smaller eastern hill the lower city. The latter was also called Acra, because there in former days down to the times of the Maccabees the citadel or castle of Jerusalem had been placed. North of the Acra lay the site of the temple, the area of which had been considerably enlarged by Herod. Attached to the temple site on its northern side was the castle of Antonia. The temple site was surrounded on all its four sides by a strong wall, and thus even by itself n lone formed a little fortress. The upper and the lower cities were surrounded by a common wall which was attached to the western wall of the temple site; it then ran on to the west, stretched in a great curve southward over the upper and lower cities, and finally ended at the south-eastmost corner of the temple site. But, further, the upper city must have been separated from the lower city by a wall running from north to south reaching to the Tyropoeon. For Titus was obliged, after he had gained possession of the lower city, to direct an attack against the wall of the upper city. – On the west, south, and east, the walls stood upon the edge of lofty precipices; only on the north did the ground run down tolerably low. Thus was there with a northern curve a second wall which enclosed the older suburb; and then in a still wider curve to the north, a third wall, which

had been begun by Agrippa I., but was completed only when found urgently needed during the rebellion. This third wall enclosed the so-called new city or suburb of Bezetha.

As the very situation of the city demanded, Titus directed his attack against the north side, hence first of all against the third wall, or to speak from the standpoint of the besiegers, the first. It was only now, when the battering-ram began their work at three points, the civil war was stilled. Then the two factions, those of John of Gischala and of Simon Bar-Giora, banded together to make a common attack. In one of these onslaughts they fought with such success that the preservation of the engines of war were wholly due to the interference of Titus, who with his own hand cut down twelve of the enemy. After fifteen days' work one of the most powerful of the battering-rams had made a breach in the wall, the Romans pressed in, and on the 7th Artemisios, that is, Ijjar or May, were masters of the first wall.

The attack was now directed against the second wall. Five days after the taking of the first this one also had to yield before the blow of the Roman battering-rams. Titus pressed in with a chosen band, but was driven back again by the Jews. Four days afterwards, however, he once more secured his position, and this time succeeded in maintaining it permanently.

He now raised earthworks at one and the same time against the upper city and against the Antonia, two against the one, and two against the other; each of the four legions had to build one. Simon Bar-Giora conducted the defence of the upper city; John of Gischala that of the Antonia. While the works were in progress, Josephus, apparently without success, was made to summon the city to surrender. The want of the means of support was already beginning to be felt, and in consequence of this many of the poorer inhabitants went out of the city in search of victuals. Whenever any of them fell into the hands of the Romans, he was crucified in sight of the city, in order to strike terror into the heart of the besieged, or was sent back with his members mutilated.

On the 29th Artemisios, that is, Ijjar or May, the four ramparts were completed. Simon and John had only wished their completion, in order that they might direct all their energies to destroy again the works produced by incredible exertion and wearisome toil. Those over against the Antonia were destroyed by John of Gischala in this way: he dug a subterranean passage under them, supported it with pillars and then set fire to the supports, so that the ramparts fell in and were consumed in the fire. Two days later Simon Bar-Giora destroyed by fire those directed against the upper city.

Before Titus attempted the building of a new rampart, he made use of another device. He caused the whole city to be surrounded with a continuous stone wall (τεῖχος), in order to out off all escape and to reduce the city by famine. With marvellous smartness this work was finished in three days. Numerous armed watchmen guarded it so that no one could pass it. In consequence of this the famine reached a terrible height in the city; and if even but the half is true which the inventive imagination of Josephus has recorded, it must certainly have been horrible enough. That under such circumstances John of Gischala should have applied the sacred oil and the sacred wine to profane uses, can be regarded only by a Josephus as a reproach to him.

Meanwhile Titus caused ramparts again to be built, and this time four against the Antonia. The wood used in their construction, owing to the complete devastation of all the district around, had to be carried a distance of 90 stadia (four and a half days' journey). After twenty-one day' work they were completed. An attempt which John of Giechals made to destroy them on 1st

Panemos, that is, Thammuz or July, was unsuccessful, since it was not carried out with the earlier energy, while the Romans had redoubled their vigilance. Scarcely had the Jews retired back again, when the battering-rams began to beat against the walls. At first they had no considerable success. The walls, however, were so shattered by the blows, that soon they sank of themselves at the points where the wall-breakers had been at work. But even yet the storming of the city was a work of difficulty, since John of Gischala had already managed to erect a second behind it. After an encouraging speech of Titus on the 3rd Panemos, that is, Thammuz or July, a Syrian soldier named Sabinus, with eleven comrades, made the attempt to scale the walls, but fell in the struggle with three of his companions. Two days afterwards, on the 5th Panemos, some twenty or thirty others banded together to renew the attempt. They mounted the wall secretly by night and cut down the first sentinels. Titus pressed as quickly as possible after them, and drove the Jews back as far as the temple site. Thence the Romans were indeed beaten back again, but they held the Antonis, which was soon razed to the ground.

In spite of war and famine the daily morning and evening sacrifices had up to this time been regularly offered. On the 17th Panemos, that is, Thammuz or July, these had to be at last discontinued; but even then not so much on account of the famine, but rather "from the want of men." Seeing that a renewed summons to surrender by Josephus proved again unsuccessfnl, and an attack by night of a select detachment of the army on the temple site proved a failure, Titus now made preparations for a regular siege so as to take the temple by storm. The temple site formed a pretty regular square, which was completely surrounded by strong walls, along which on the inside ran a series of corridors. On the inside of this great space the inner court, surrounded on all sides by strong walls, formed a second position capable of being defended, which afforded to the besieged even after the loss of the outer space a place of safety. Titus was obliged first of all to make himself master of the outer wall. Again four ramparts were erected, for which he was now obliged to carry the material from a distance of 100 stadia (five hours' journey). While they were working at these, a number of Romans met with their death on the 27th Panemos in this way: they allowed themselves to be deceived by the withdrawal of the Jews from the heights of the western corridors into scaling those heights. But they had been beforehand filled by the Jews with inflammable materials. So soon then as the Romans had reached the top the Jews set fire to the vaults, and the fire spread with such rapidity that the soldiers could not escape, but were enveloped in the flames.

When the ramparts were completed on the 8th Loos, that is, Ab or August, the rams were again set to work, and the siege operations began. But on the immense walls they could make no impression. In order to obtain his end Titus caused fire to be placed at the gates, and so opened up the entrance to the outer temple space. On the next day, the 9th Ab, when the gates had been completely burnt down, Titus held a council of war, at which it was resolved that the temple should be spared. But when on the day following, the 10th Ab, the Jews made two onslaughts rapidly one after the other from the inner court, and on the second occasion were driven back by the soldiers who were occupied with the quenching of the flames in the corridors, a soldier cast a blazing brand into one of the chambers of the temple proper. When this was reported to Titus he hasted to the spot, followed by the generals and the legions. Titus gave orders to quench the fire; but in the wild conflict that now raged around the spot his commands were not heard, and the fire got ever a firmer hold upon the edifice. Even yet Titus hoped to save at least the inner court of the temple, and renewed his orders to quench the flames; but the soldiers in their excitement no longer listened to his commands. Instead of quenching the flames, they threw in new firebrands, and the whole noble work became a prey to the flames beyond redemption. Titus managed to inspect the inner court before the fire reached it.

While the Romans slaughtered indiscriminately all that fell into their hands, children and old men, priests and people, and intentionally fanned the terrible conflagration, so that nothing escaped the flames, John of Gischala succeeded, along with his Zealot following, to escape into the upper city. Even before the temple had been burnt down, the legions planted their standards in the temple court, and greeted their general as Imperator.

The work of the conqueror, however, was by no means completed with the overthrow of the temple. The upper city, the last refuge of the besieged, had yet to be taken. Titus once again called upon Simon and John to surrender. But the besieged wished to stipulate for liberty to go forth untouched, which would not be granted them. By order of Titus the parts of the city now in the possession of the Romans – the Ophla, the depository of the archives, the council house, the lower city down to Siloah – were set on fire, while at the same time the tyrants in the upper city continued their work of murder and plunder.

Seeing then that there was no hope of securing the voluntary surrender of the besieged, it was necessary once more to resort to the erection of ramparts. They were constructed partly at the north-western corner of the upper city near the palace of Herod, partly at the north-eastern corner, in the neighbourhood of the so-called Xystus. On the 20th Loos (Ab, August) the buildings were begun; on the 7th Gorpiaeus (Elul, September) they were finished. The battering-rams soon made a breach in the walls, through which the soldiers with little difficulty forced their way, because the besieged in their despondent condition could no longer offer a vigorous and determined opposition. One portion of them made the attempt to break away through the besiegers' lines and to force through the cordon which surrounded them at Siloah; but they were driven back, and rushed again into their subterranean hiding-places. Meanwhile the whole of the upper city was taken possession of by the Romans. The military standards were planted and the song of victory was sung. The soldiers passed through the city murdering, burning, and plundering. After a five months' siege, after having been obliged laboriously to press on step by step, gaining one position after another, the whole city at last, on 8th Gorpiaeus (Elul, September), fell into the hands of the conquerors.

Those of the inhabitants who had not already fallen victims to the famine or the sword were now put to death, or sent to labour in the mines, or reserved for the gladiatorial combats. The handsomest and most powerful of the men were spared to grace the triumph. Among the fugitives who were driven by hunger to go forth out of their subterranean hiding-places was John of Gischala. When he begged for mercy he was granted his life, but was sentenced to life-long confinement in prison. It was not, however, until a considerably later period that Simon Bar Giora was apprehended. He was reserved as a victim for the triumph. The city was then razed to the ground. Only the three gates of the palace of Herod – Hippicus, Phasael, and Mariamme – and a portion of the wall were left standing; the former as monuments of the original strength of the city, the latter as a protection for the garrison that was left in charge. The victory, won by hard fighting, and at the cost of many victims, was celebrated by Titus in an address of thanks to the army, the distribution of rewards to those who had distinguished themselves in battle, the presenting sacrifices of thanksgiving, and a festive banquet.

5. THE CONCLUSION OF THE WAR, A.D. 71-73

Leaving behind him the tenth legion as a garrison in Jerusalem, Titus proceeded with the rest of his army to Caesarea-on-the-Sea, where the spoil was deposited, and the prisoners consigned to safe keeping. Thence Titus marched to Caesarea Philippi, where a portion of the prisoners were forced to engage in combat with wild animals, and to take part in the gladiatorial shows. At

Caesarea-on-the-Sea, to which he returned, he celebrated the birthday of his brother Domitian, 24th October, with games on a magnificent scale. At Berytua also he celebrated in a similar manner the birthday of his father Vespasian, on 17th November. After a lengthened stay in Berytus, Titus proceeded to Antioch, giving public entertainments in the cities through which he passed, at which the Jewish prisoners were set to slay one another in gladiatorial contests. After a short stay in Antioch, he passed on to Zeugma on the Euphrates; and from thence he returned again to Antioch, and from thence proceeded to Egypt. At Alexandria he disbanded the legions. Of the prisoners there were 700 specially distinguished by their handsome appearance; and these, together with the rebel leaders John and Simon, were reserved for the triumph. Titus now sailed for Rome, was received by his father and by the people with joyful demonstrations, and in common with his father and brother celebrated, in A.D. 71, one triumph, though the Senate had assigned one separately to each of them. During the triumph Simon Bar Giora, the rebel leader, was in accordance with an old custom carried away from the festal procession to prison and executed there.

The conquest of the capital had certainly given to Titus the right to the celebration of the triumph. The whole of Palestine, however, was not yet by any means subdued. The strongholds of Herodium, Machärus, and Masada were still in the hands of the rebels. The reduction of these fortresses was the work of the governor of Palestine at that time, Lucilius Bassus. In regard to the Herodium, this seems to have been accomplished by him without difficulty. The siege of Machärus occupied a longer time. Yet even this strong hald, before it was taken by storm, yielded by a voluntary surrender. The decision to surrender was finally taken in consequence of the apprehension of a youth called Eleasar, who had particularly distinguished himself in the defence. Bassus threatened to crucify him in view of the city, and in order to prevent this the Jews gave over the fortress. In the meantime Lucilius Bassus died. To his successor, Flavius Silva, fell the task of taking Masada. In that fortress the Sicarii, under the leadership of Eleasar, the son of Jairi, and a descendant of Judas of Galilee, had established themselves at the commencement of the war, and had continued to maintain their position. The siege proved a very difficult business, since the rock upon which the fortress was built rose on all sides so high and steep that it was almost impossible to bring the engines of destruction near. Only at one point, and even there only by means of difficult and ingenious preparatory operations, was it possible to secure a place for a batteringram. But by the time that this machine had made a breach in the wall, the besieged had already erected behind that wall another bulwark of wood and earth, which, owing to its elasticity, could not be destroyed by the battering-ram. The enemy, however, by the use of fire succeeded in setting this obstacle also aside. When Eleasar saw that there was no longer any hope of resisting the attack, he held a council with the garrison, in which he urged that they should first of all slay the members of their own families, and then put one another to death. This, therefore, was done. When the Romans entered, they beheld with horror that no more work was left for them to do. Thus was the very last stronghold of the rebellion conquered in April A.D. 73.

After the fall of Masada disturbances were made by the Jews in Alexandria and in Cyrene, which in the former place resulted in the closing of the temple of Onias at Leontopolis. But these after-vibrations of the great revolution in the mother country are scarcely worthy of being mentioned along-side of the original movement, The fate of Palestine was sealed by the overthrow of Masada. Vespasian retained the country as a private possession, and the taxes levied went into his own purse. Only to 800 veterans did he distribute grants of land at Emmaus near Jerusalem. The former temple-tax of two drachmas was henceforth exacted of all Jews for the temple, Jupiter Capitolinns. The inhabitants of Palestine became impoverished, and by the

seven years' war their numbers had been terribly reduced. A Jewish magistracy, of the kind formerly possessed, no longer existed. The one gathering point which still remained for the people was the law. Around this they gathered now with anxious and scrupulous faithfulness, and with the indomitable hope that some day, under an established civil government, and even among the nations of the world, it would come again to have a recognised place and practical authority.

FROM THE DESTRUCTION OF JERUSALEM TO THE OVERTHROW OF BAR-COCHBA

1. THE STATE OF AFFAIRS IN PALESTINE FROM VESPASIAN TO HADRIAN

THE separation of Judea from the province of Syria, which had been resolved upon at the time when Vespasian was sent thither (see above, vol. i. p. 369), continued in force also after the conclusion of the war. Judea – and indeed under that very name – formed from this time forth an independent province. Since it had as a garrison only one legion, the legio X. Fretensis (see above, p. 248), alongside of which were only auxiliary troops (see above, p. 56), the commander of that legion was at the same time governor of the province. It appears that, as a rule, the position was held by men of praetorian rank. It was only at a later period that the province came to be administered by men of consular rank, probably after the time of Hadrian, since even then the legio VI. Ferrata was stationed in Judea, and the governor was not of an order superior to the commander of a legion.

From the series of governors only certain names are now known to us. The first of these who exercised their functions during the war of A.D. 70–73 have already been briefly referred to: –

1. Sex. Vettulenus Cerialis, who at the siege of Jerusalem commanded the fifth legion (see above, p. 236). He remained after the departure of Titus as commander of the garrison troops, that is, of the tenth legion and of the detachments joined with it, and gave them over to Lucilius Bassus (Wars of the Jews, vii. 6. 1). His full name is given in an inscription (Corpus Inscriptionum Latinorum, t. x. n. 4862).

2. Lucilius Bassus, who took the strongholds of Herodium and Machärus (Josephus, Wars of the Jews, vii. 6. 1–6). He died as governor (Wars of the Jews, vii. 8. 1). The procurator serving under him, L. Laberius (not Λιβέροις) Maximus (Wars of the Jews, vii. 6. 6), is also mentioned in the Acts of the Arval priesthood: Corpus Inscriptionum Latinorum, t. vi. n. 2059, and in the military diploma of A.D. 83 (Ephemeris epigraphica, v. p. 612 sq.). According to the latter authority, he was the governor of Egypt.

3. L. Flavius Silva, the conqueror of Masada (Josephus, Wars of the Jews, vii. 8–9). He was consul in A.D. 81. His full name is given as L. Flavius Silva Nonius Bassus in the Acta Arvalium, Corpus Inscriptionum Latinorum, t. vi. n. 2059. Compare Henzen, Acta Arvalium Index, p. 186.

4. M. Salvidenus, about A.D. 80, is witnessed to by a Palestinian coin of Titus, with the superscription ΕΠΙ Μ. ΣΑΛΟΥΙΔΗΝ(ΟΥ), Madden, Coins of the Jews, p. 218. He is certainly identical with the M. Salvidenus, who, according to a coin of Domitian, was proconsul of Bithynia (Mionnet, Supplement, v. p. 2).

5. Cn. Pompeius Longinus, A.D. 86. In a military diploma of Domitian of A.D. 86 the veterans of two alae and four cohorts are referred to “qui … sunt in Judaea sub Cn. Pompeio Longino” (Corpus Inscriptionum Latinorum, iii. p. 857, Dipl. xiv.). We have no other information with reference to these governors of Judea. – From some statements of the diploma Henzen thought himself justified in drawing the conclusion, that at that time warlike operations were being

carried on in Judea. The premises, however, do not by any means sustain such a conclusion.

6. Atticus, about A.D. 107. In two fragments of Hegesippus, which are quoted by Eusebius, it is reported that Simeon, said to be the second bishop of the Church of Jerusalem, died a martyr's death "under the Emperor Trajan and the governor Atticus" (Eusebius, Hist. eccl. iii. 32. 3: ἐπὶ Τραϊανοῦ Καίσαρος καὶ ὑπατικοῦ Ἀττικοῦ; iii. 32. 6: ἐπὶ Ἀττικοῦ τοῦ ὑπατικοῦ). In the Chronicle of Eusebius this event is placed in the tenth year of Trajan, A.D. 107 (Eusebius, Chronicon, ed. Schoene, ii. p. 162 sq.); in the Chronicon Paschale, ed. Dindorf, i. 471, in the consulship of Candidus and Quadratus, A.D. 105. Neither of these statements, indeed, has the value of traditional testimonies, least of all the statement in the Chronicon Paschale, which has only the authority of Eusebius. Our Atticus is supposed to be identical with the similarly named father of Herod Atticus. The designation of ὑπατικός is remarkable, since other governors of Judea had held this office before their consulship. — Compare generally: Waddington, Fastes des provinces asiatiques, p. 192 sq.; Dittenberger, Hermes, xiii. 1878, pp. 67–89.

7. Pompeius Falco, about A.D. 107 and onwards. The inscription in Corpus Inscriptionum Latinorum, t. x. n. 6321, gives the cursus honorum of this man, who is known from the letters of the younger Pliny. According to this document he was also "leg(atus) Aug(usti) pr(o) pr(aetore) provinc(iae) [Judaeae] et leg(ionis) X. Fret(ensis)." The supplied word Judaeae is warranted here by the fact that the command of the tenth legion was attached to the governorship. According to Pliny, Epist. vii. 22, this governorship dates probably from A.D. 107 to A.D. 110, for in the letter written about that time Pliny commends a friend to Falco for the place of a tribune. But this, according to the other date of the cursus honorum, could only have happened during the period of his governorship of Judea. — The epistles addressed by Pliny to Pompeius Falco are Pliny, Epist. i. 23, iv. 27, vii. 22, ix. 15. Compare generally: Mommsen, Hermes, iii. 1869, p. 51; Pliny, Epist. ed. Keil, p. 422 (Index by Mommsen); Waddington, Fastes des provinces asiatiques, pp. 202–204; Rohden, p. 39; Liebenam, Forschungen, i. 94 ff.; Petersen and Luschan, Reisen in Lykien (1889), p. 123.

8. Tiberianus, about A.D. 114. — In Joannes Malalas, ed. Dindorf, p. 273, the express language of a writing is quoted, which Tiberianus, the governor of Palaestina prima, addressed to Trajan during his stay in Antioch, A.D. 114 (ἐν τῷ δὲ διατρίβειν τὸν αὐτὸν Τραϊανὸν Βασιλέα ἐν Ἀντιοχείᾳ τῆς Συρίας βουλευόμενον τὰ περὶ τοῦ πολέμου ἐμήνυσεν αὐτὸν Τιβεριανός, ἡγεμὼν τοῦ Παλαιστίνων ἔθνους, ταῦτα). In it Tiberianus calls the attention of the emperor to the fact that the Christians in a foolish manner deliver themselves up to martyrdom, and desires directions as to how he should proceed. In reply Trajan commanded him and all other magistrates throughout the whole empire to suspend the persecutions. This same story is told in a somewhat different way by John of Antioch (in Müller, Fragmenta hist. graec. iv. 580, n. 111). The statement of the latter is literally reproduced by Suidas in his Lexicon, s.v. Τραϊανός. Both stories, which are in thorough agreement on all essential points, are in respect of contents highly suspicious. Even the partition of Palestine into Palaestina prima and secunda did not take place before the end of the fourth century. Against the historicity of the narrative, see Gieseler, Kirchengeschichte, i. 1, 4 Aufl. p. 129; Overbeck, Studien zur Geschichte der alten Kirche, i. 122; Görres, Zeitschrift für wissenschaftl. Theologie, 1878, p. 38 f.; Keim, Rom und das Christenthum, 1881, p. 526 f. In favour of it: Wieseler, Die Christenverfolgungen der Caesaren, 1878, p. 126 ff. The stories of Malalas and John of Antioch in this and in many other instances have so much that is common, that evidently the one must have borrowed from the other. Since both probably wrote about the beginning of the seventh century, it is a question to whom the priority belongs. The style of the particular passage before us speaks in favour of the

view now prevalent, that Malalas was the older, for Malalas communicates the letter of Tiberianus in the very words of the writer, whereas John of Antioch only describes its contents.

9. Lusius Quietus, about A.D. 117. — This distinguished general, after he had put down the outbreak of the Jews in Mesopotamia, was appointed governor of Judea (Eusebius, Hist. eccl. iv. 2. 5: Ἰουδαίας ἡγεμὼν ὑπὸ τοῦ αὐτοκράτορος ἀνεδείχθη. Eusebius, Chronicon, ed. Schoene, ii. 164; in Greek, in Syncellus, ed. Dindorf, i. 657, at the 18th year of Trajan [2131 Abr.]: ἡγεμὼν τῆς Ἰουδαίας διὰ τοῦτο καθίσταται). Dio Cassius merely says that he administered the government of Palestine after his consulship of A.D. 115 (Dio Cassius, lxviii. 32: ὑπατεῦσαι τῆς τε Παλαιστίνης ἄρξαι). That Trajan sent to Palestine a consular legate, not merely one of praetorian rank, was occasioned by the peculiarly difficult condition of affairs at that time. — By Hadrian, Lusius Quietus was recalled (Spartian. vita Hadriana, c. 5: "Lusium Quietum … exarmavit"), and soon thereafter put to death (ibid. c. 7; Dio Cassius, lxix. 2). — Compare generally: Borghesi, Oeuvres, i. 500 sq.

10. Tineius Rufus, A.D. 132. — When the revolution of Barcochba broke out, one Rufus was governor of Judea (Eusebius, Hist. eccl. iv. 6. 1: Ῥοῦφος ἐπάρχων τῆς Ἰουδαίας). In the Chronicle of Eusebius he is called Tineiua Rufus (Eusebius, Chronicon, ed. Schoene, ii. 166 sq. ad. ann. Abr. 2148; in Greek, in Syncellus, ed. Dindorf, i. 660: ἡγεῖτο δὲ τῆς Ἰουδαίας Τίννιος Ῥοῦφος; in Latin, in Jerome: "tenente provinciam Tinnio Rufo"). In Jerome on Daniel c. 9, s. fin. ed. Vallarsi, v. 695: Timo Rufo; on Zechariah viii. 16 sqq. ed. Vallarsi, vi. 852: T. Annio Rufo (so the earlier editions; the reading Turannio Rufo is only a conjecture of Vallarsi). Undoubtedly the correct form is Tineius Rufus, as is proved by Borghesi. For one Q. Tineius Rufus, who was consul under Commodus, is referred to on several inscriptions. He may have been son or grandson of one Rufus. See Borghesi, Oeuvres, iii. 62-64, viii. 189 sq.; Renan, L'église chrétienne, p. 192 sq.; and also Corpus Inscriptionum Latinorum, t. vi. n. 1978.

In order to suppress the rebellion, Publicius Marcellus, who up to that time had been governor of Syria, was also sent into Judea (Corpus Inscriptionum Graecorum, n. 4033=Archäolog.-epigr. Mittheilungen aus Oesterreich-Ungarn Jahrg. ix. 1885, p. 118: ἡνίκα Πουβλκιος Μάρκελλος διὰ τὴν κίνησιν τὴν Ἰουδαϊκὴν μεταβεβήκει ἀπὸ Συρίας; the same statement also is found in Corpus Inscript. Graec. n. 4034). This strengthening of the fighting forces in Judea is also referred to by Eusebius (Hist. eccl. iv. 6. 1: στρατιωτικῆς αὐτῷ συμμαχίας ὑπὸ βασιλέως πεμφθείσης. Compare Chronicon ad. ann. Abr. 2148).

11. Julius Severus, A.D. 135. — The suppression of the Jewish revolution was thoroughly completed only by Julius Severus, who was sent to Judea from Britain, where he had been up to that time governor (Dio Cassius, lxix. 13). The cursus honorum of this man is given in the inscription, Corpus Inscriptionum Latinorum, t. iii. n. 2830, where the higher offices are enumerated in the following order: "leg(ato) pr(o) pr(aetore) imp(eratoris) Traiani Hadriani Aug(usti) provinciae Daciae, cos. leg. pr. pr. provinciae Moesiae inferioris, leg. pr. pr. provinciae Brittaniae, leg. pr. pr. provinciae Judeae, leg. pr. pr. provinciae Suriae." This therefore confirms the statement of Dio Cassius that he came from Britain to Judea. On the other hand, the statement of Dio Cassius, or rather that of his unskilful epitomizer Xiphilinus, that after the conclusion of the Jewish revolt he was made governor of Bithynia (Dio Cassius, lxix. 14), is the result of a confusion between him and another Severus. Our Julius Severus, who was consul in A.D. 127, was called Sextus Julius Severus (Corpus Inscript. Lat. iii. p. 874, Dipl. xxxi.), but the governor of Bithynia was Τι. Σεουῆρος (Corpus Inscript. Graec. n. 4033 and 4034), or, according to a more recent copy of one of these inscriptions, Π. Σεουῆρος (Archäolog.-epigr. Mittheilungen aus Oesterreich-Ungarn, ix. 118=Corpus Inscript. Graec. n. 4033). Compare,

Marquardt, Romische Staatsverwaltung, Bd. i. 2 Aufl. 1881, p. 353; Rohden, p. 42.

The residence of the imperial governor, as in earlier times that of the procurators had also been, was not Jerusalem, but Caesarea, the important coast town built by Herod the Great. It was formed by Vespasian into a Roman colony, and bore the official name col(onia) prima Fl(avia) Aug(usta) Caesarensis or Caesarea. Jerusalem had been so completely razed to the ground "that there was left nothing to make those that came thither believe it had ever been inhabited." It was first of all only a Roman camp, in which, if not the whole of the tenth legion, yet at least the chief portion of it, had its headquarters, together with its baggage and followers.

In regard to the other changes made upon the organization of the Palestinian city communities we have only scattered notices. To what extent Vespasian held the country as a private possession cannot be very clearly understood from the indefinite statements of Josephus (see above, p. 253). His private possessions seem to have extended not merely to the town domains of Jerusalem, but to all Judea — that term being understood in its proper and more restricted sense (πᾶσαν γῆν τῶν Ἰουδαίων). The only new town which Vespasian here founded was the military colony of Emmaus (see above, p. 253). In Samaria, Flavia Neapolis, which rapidly grew and flourished, was then founded. For that its founding belongs to the time of Vespasian is proved not only by its name and by the reference in Pliny, but also by the era of the city, the starting-point of which is to be reckoned about A.D. 72. It lay upon the site of a place which was previously called Mabortha or Mamortha, in the immediate vicinity of Shechem, so that it soon came to be identified with Shechem. In the later days of the empire it was one of the most important cities of Palestine. The inhabitants were wholly or predominantly pagan, as their modes of worship witnessed to by coins prove. Upon not a few of these coins, later than the time of Hadrian, Gerizim is represented, and on its top a temple which was dedicated, according to Damascius, to Ζεὺς ὕψιστος. The festive games of Neapolis during the second century, and certainly even at a later date, were regarded as amongst the most important in Palestine. — The founding of Capitolias in Decapolis belongs to the time of Nerva or Trajan; its era begins in A.D. 97 or 98. Hadrian founded Aelia on the site of Jerusalem, the history of which is given below in the account of the war. Other new foundings of Palestinian cities belong to a period later than that of which we treat, such as that of Diocaesarea=Sepphoris (known under its new name from the time of Antonius Pius, see Div. II. vol. i. p. 136), Diospolis=Lydda, Eleutheropolis (both under Septimius Severus), Nicopolis=Emmaus (under Heliogabulus).

The destruction of Jerusalem brought about a violent revolution in the inner life of the Jewish people. No longer a Sanhedrim and no longer a sacrificial service, — the loss of those two great institutions was of itself sufficient to produce a profound change in the conditions of Jewish life. But it has first of all to be established that the sacrificial service actually did cease. Not only the Epistle to the Hebrews, the date of the composition of which is uncertain, but also Clement of Rome and the author of the Epistle to Diognetus, who undoubtedly wrote after the destruction of Jerusalem, speak as if in their time the Jewish sacrificial worship was still maintained. And Josephus also expresses himself quite to the same effect. Not only where he describes the Jewish sacrificial worship in accordance with the Old Testament, but also where he apparently speaks of the customs and practices of his own time, he employs the present tense. It is indeed the fact that when speaking of the sacrifices for the Roman people and for the Roman emperor he makes use of this mode of expression, although this was purely a later custom, and was not a prescription of the Old Testament. Besides this, we have also scattered allusions in the rabbinical literature, which seem to indicate the continuance of the sacrificial service after A.D. 70. It is not to be wondered at that many on the basis of such material should have maintained

the continuance of the sacrificial worship. In itself this was quite a possible thing. In an interesting passage in the Mishna, R. Joshua testifies: “I have heard that one ought to present sacrifice even if there be no temple; that one should eat that which is sanctified [on this see Division II. vol. i. p. 236], even though there be no wall around the court; that one may eat what is holy in a lower degree [see on this Division II. vol. i. p. 240] and the second tithe, even if there should be no wall around Jerusalem; for the first consecration has sanctified, not only for its own time, but for all future time.” It was not therefore in utter opposition to the views of the Rabbis that men should continue after the destruction of the temple to offer sacrifices in holy places. But as a matter of fact this was not done. In the enumeration of the unfortunate days of Israel it is distinctly said that on 17th Thammuz the daily sacrifice was abolished (בָּטַל הַתָּמִיד), while there is nowhere any reference made to its restoration, In the description of the Passover in the Mishna, the enumeration of the dishes that had to be set upon the table is concluded with the remark: “During the time that the temple was standing the Paseover offering also was served. This implies that after the destruction of the temple it was no longer offered. In speaking of the legal enactments for determining the new moon it is said: “So long as the temple remained standing those who had seen the new moon were allowed to violate the Sabbath by going to Jerusalem, in order to testify thereto, for the sake of the observance of the sacrifice on the festival of the new moon.” The harmonious testimony of those passages of the Mishna is confirmed by others in the Babylonian Talmud of a character yet more direct, if that were possible, which assume even in regard to the times of Rabban Jochanan ben Saccai, Rabban Gamaliel II. and R Ishmael, i.e. the first decade after the destruction of the temple, that the whole sacrificial worship had ceased. Finally, Justin also appears as a witness on behalf of this view. He says to his opponent Trypho: “God never appointed the Passover to be offered except in the place where His name was to be called upon, knowing that after the passion of Christ the days would come, when even Jerusalem would be given over to our enemies, and all sacrifices should cease.” And in another passage Trypho himself says in answer to Justin’s question as to whether it was not then still possible to observe all the commands of Moses: “By no means, for we know well that it is not allowable to slay the paschal lamb nor the goats for the Day of Atonement, nor generally to present any of the other offerings in any other place” — If, then, Christian writers and Josephus, even long after the destruction of the temple, still speak of the presenting of sacrifices in the present tense, they only describe thereby what is still allowable, but a right that was no longer actually exercised. Precisely the same view is presented in the Mishna from the first page to the last, for all institutions that are legally correct are described as existing customs, even although their observance owing to the circumstances of the time was impossible.

Two facts, therefore, of the highest importance and most widely influential are well established: the abolition of the Sanhedrim and the cessation of the sacrificial worship. In the Sanhedrim there had been embodied the last remnant of the political independence of Judaism, and consequently also the last remnant of the power of the Sadducean nobles. The influence of the Sadducean nobility even since the times of Alexandra had been waning before the advancing strength of the Pharisees. They still managed, however, to exert a very considerable influence so long as the Sanhedrim continued to exist. For the jurisdiction of that aristocratic senate of Judea was down to the time of the procurators pretty extensive, and at its head stood the Sadducean high priest. With the destruction of Jerusalem this Jewish council was immediately brought to an end; the Roman provincial constitution was enforced in a stricter form. With the disappearance of the Sanhedrim, Sadduceanism also disappears from history. — The overthrow of the city, however, led also to the suppression of the sacrificial worship, and therewith the gradual recession of the priesthood from public life. This was only carried out by degrees. It

could not for a long time be believed that the disastrous circumstances in which the people were placed were to continue. It seemed to be only a question of the time when the priests should be able again to resume their services. Naturally, all dues were exacted after as well as before the catastrophe. Only the taxes which had been contributed directly for the maintenance of the temple and of the public sacrifices were declared by the Rabbins to be suspended. The contribution devoted to the personal support of the priests continued after as Well as before a duty according to the law, and where there were priests, were given over directly to them. But notwithstanding all this, the priesthood, now that it could no longer perform its service, lost its importance. It was a memorial of a past age, which indeed, as time went on, sank more and more into obscurity and decay.

The Pharisees and the Rabbis now entered into the heritage of the Sadducees and priests. They had an admirable preparation for entering upon this heritage. During two centuries they had been making steady progress toward dominant power. And now for a time they entered upon the enjoyment of absolute sovereignty. The overthrow of Jerusalem means nothing more or less than the passing over of the people to Pharisaism and the Rabbis; for the factors which had hitherto stood in opposition to these had now sunk into utter insignificance.

After the overthrow of Jerusalem, Jamnia (Jabne) seems in a special way to have become a centre of literary activity. There, during the first decade after the destruction of the temple, wrought Rabban Jochanan ben Saccai, and, at the end of the first and beginning of the second century, Rabban Gamaliel II., gathering around them a whole band of scholars. The most celebrated of the contemporaries of Gamaliel were R. Josua ben Chananja and R. Elieser ben Hyrcanus, the latter of whom had his residence at Lydda. Younger contemporaries and pupils of these men were R. Ishmael, R. Akiba, and R. Tarphon. See in regard to all these scholars and their contemporaries, Div. II. vol. i. pp. 366–379.

By these men and by their numerous colleagues and scholars, the interpretation of the law was carried on with greater zeal than ever. It was as though, after the political overthrow, the whole strength of the nation had concentrated itself upon the care of the law as its own highest and proper task. Everything pertaining to it, the criminal and the civil law, and the manifold religious statutes and ordinances, were dealt with by these scholars with painful particularity, and drilled into the memories of the scholars by their teachers. It did not matter in the least whether the circumstances of the time allowed these ordinances to be put in practice or not. All the minutiae of the temple service, the entire ritual of the sacrificial worship, were discussed as diligently and as earnestly as the laws of purifying, the Sabbath commandment, and other religious duties, the observance of which was still possible. There is nothing so fitted to produce before us a lively picture of the faith of the people in their future as the conscientiousness with which the prescriptions about the temple service and the sacrificial worship were treated by the guardians of the law. The time of desolation might continue for a longer or shorter period, but once again the day of restoration would surely dawn. And hence, in the cataloguing by the scribes in the second century of the Jewish law in the corpus juris or Mishna, there are included a topography of the temple in the tract Middoth and a description of the distribution of the priests in the daily service in the tract Tamid. Their descendants, to whom was to be granted the privilege of a restored worship, were to be told how it had previously been conducted in the days of the fathers.

The scholars who after this fashion cared for the highest interests of Israel formed now even more exclusively and unrestrictedly than before the rank of the highest authorities among the people. The priests, who had previously been the most influential in the direction and practice of

religious duties, were now relegated to a condition of inactivity. All the energies of the pious had now to be restricted to the doing of that which the Rabbins prescribed to them. There was no need of any external compulsion. Whatever the most distinguished teachers had laid down was regarded by the pious without any further question as obligatory. Indeed, they were not only recognised as lawgivers in spiritual and temporal things, but in all matters of dispute they were appealed to as judges, even in questions of meum and tuum. During this period it was indeed no uncommon occurrence to see, e.g., R. Akiba, purely by means of his spiritual authority, condemning a man to pay 400 denarii compensation, because he had on the street uncovered his head to a woman.

The court of law at Jamnia enjoyed the highest reputation toward the end of the first and in the beginning of the second century after Christ, a college of learned men, which can scarcely have had any formal recognition from the Roman authorities, but yet actually stepped into the place of the old Sanhedrim of Jerusalem, as the supreme court of law for Israel. The enactments passed by Rabban Jochanan ben Saccai in Jamnia after the destruction of the temple, in order to adapt certain legal requirements to the altered circumstance of the times, were regarded as binding. Rabban Gamaliel II. and his court of justice watched over the correct reckoning of the contents of the calendar. To its decisions the elder R. Josua submitted, even if he considered them to be erroneous. As a rule the decisions on points of law issuing from Jamnia were treated as constituting the authoritative standard. Indeed, the succession of Jamnia to the privileges of Jerusalem was so generally acquiesced in, that where this was not the case, it was pointed to as an exception to the rule. Even in regard to the number of members, they seem to have copied the pattern of the Sanhedrim of Jerusalem. At least there occurs in one place a statement to the effect that “the seventy-two elders” appointed as president R. Eleasar ben Asariah. — We may assume that this court of justice at Jamnia was voluntarily accepted by the Jewish people as authoritative, not only in the domain of the ceremonial law, but also in the domain of the civil and criminal law. In reference to the civil law it may indeed have received actual authorization, in accordance with the, general procedure in legislation. For the Roman legislation, so far as we can understand it, recognised the authority of the Jewish communities in the Dispersion to administer the law in civil suits among their countrymen, wherever the contending parties chose to bring their disputes before their own communal court. But in criminal matters this jurisdiction bore the character of a usurped authority, rather than of one conferred by the emperor. Origen very vividly, and at the same time authentically, describes to us the state of matters which then prevailed. In vindicating the story of Susanna and Daniel, he endeavours to prove that the Jews might quite well have had their own judicatories during the Babylonian exile. In proof of this he refers to the state of matters in Palestine in his own days, of which he knew from his own observation. The power of the Jewish Ethnarch (so Origen designates him) is so great, that he is in no respect different from a king (ὡς μηδὲν διαφέρειν βασιλεύοντος τοῦ ἔθνους). “There are also secret legal proceedings in accordance with the law, and many are condemned to death without any general authority having been obtained for the exercise of such functions, and without any attempt to conceal such doings from the governor.” This was the state of matters during the third century, In the first decades after the destruction of Jerusalem, they would not have ventured to go so far. Yet this was the direction in which things were tending. — To this Jewish central court in Palestine, whose president subsequently received the title of Patriarch, were also paid the contributions of the Jews of the Dispersion, so far as these continued to be collected after the destruction of the temple. At least for the period of the later days of the empire this can be proved to demonstration. In this matter also the Rabbis take the place of the priests. For previously the contributions were cast into the central treasury of the priests at Jerusalem. It was now a rabbinical board which made the

collection by means of their apostoli, and superintended its proper distribution. See Div. II. vol. ii. pp. 269, 288.

All zeal for the law of their fathers in this later time, at least among the great majority of the pious, had its motive power in the belief in a glorious future for the nation. Such was the case even before the great catastrophe; and so it continued in a yet more exaggerated degree after that terrible event. If now, more zealously than ever, the people occupied themselves with the scrupulous fulfilment of the commandments of God, certainly the most powerful motive working in this direction was the wish to render themselves thereby worthy of the future glory in which they so confidently believed. In regard to this religious movement during the first decades after the overthrow of the holy city, the Apocalypses of Baruch and Ezra, which had their origin in that very period, afford us a lively as well as an authentic picture. On these Apocalypses see Div. II. vol. iii. pp. 83–114. The immediate consequence of the terrible slaughter was indeed a profound and paralyzing shook to the feelings. How could God permit this disaster to befall His own chosen people? But this grand mystery was only a particular instance of the universal mystery: How is the misfortune of the righteous generally and the good fortune of the unrighteous possible? Through the darkness of this latter problem the pious consciousness of Israel had long ago successfully struggled. So now also a satisfactory answer was soon found. It is a chastisement which God has inflicted upon His people because of their sin. It has its own appointed time. When the people by means of it shall have learned righteousness, the promised day of redemption will soon dawn for them. This is the fundamental idea of both of these apocalypses, and their purpose is to comfort the people in their distress, to inspire them with courage and with holy zeal by visions of the redemption that will come to them surely and soon. The confident belief in this future was therefore only intensified, confirmed, and inflamed by the sore sufferings and sad disasters of the time. Out of the grief for the overthrow of the sanctuary, the Messianic hope drew new nourishment, new strength. This was also, from a political point of view, important, and productive of serious consequences. For this Messianic hope was a wonderful blending of religious and political ideals. The political aspirations of the nation had never been abandoned, and the element of danger just lay in the combination of them with religious motives. The political freedom of the nation, which the people longed for, was now represented as the end of the ways of God. The more firmly this was believed, the more readily did the people set out of view the cool calculations of what is humanly possible, the bolder became their resolve to dare even the impossible. It was this feeling which even in the time of Nero had broken out in rebellion. In it there also still lay hidden elements that yet would lead to new and frightful catastrophes.

Under the emperors of the Flavian dynasty (Vespasian, Titus, Domitian, down to A.D. 96) there does not seem to have been any more serious development of these tendencies. Sufficient occasion, however, was presented for giving expression to those already present. For the command to contribute what had been the temple-tax to the Capitoline Jupiter at Rome (see above, p. 255), was an outrage upon the religious sensibilities of the Jews, which every year, on the levying of the tax, must afresh have roused the feeling of resentment. Under Domitian this tax was levied with great strictness, as generally this emperor posed as a decided enemy of the Jews, and conversion to Judaism was punished by the imposition of severe penalties.

Eusebius speaks of an actual persecution of the Jews after the destruction of Jerusalem, even during Vespasian's reign, referring to Hegesippus as his authority. Vespasian, as well as Domitian and Trajan, is said by Hegesippus to have hunted for and executed all Jews of the house of David with great rigour, in order that the royal family, on which the Jews rested their

hopes, should be rooted out. This order led to a great persecution of the Jews under Vespasian. We have no longer any means of determining how far this story is historical. It can scarcely be altogether without foundation, for that a Messiah descending from the house of David was expected is beyond dispute. The existence, therefore, of descendants of David might actually be looked upon as a source of political danger. This "persecution," however, cannot have been of great dimensions and importance, since it is not taken notice of by any other writer. — Whether political uprisings occurred in Judea under Domitian is certainly very questionable. From certain hints in a military diploma of A.D. 86, some have supposed that such disturbances must have taken place. Meanwhile, these conclusions have not by any means been satisfactorily proved. See above, p. 259. — On the other hand, the outbursts which occurred, first outside of Judea and afterwards in Judea itself, under Trajan and Hadrian, spread widely, and led to scenes of terrible violence.

2. THE WAR UNDER TRAJAN, A.D. 115–117

SOURCES

DIO CASSIUS, lxviii. 32.

EUSEBIUS, Hist. eccl. iv. 2; Chronicon, ed. Schoene, ii. 164 sq.

OROSIUS, vii. 12, almost wholly according to Jerome's Latin reproduction of the Chronicle of Eusebius.

LITERATURE

MÜNTER, Der jüdische Krieg unter den Kaisern Trajan und Hadrian (1821), pp. 10–29.

CASSEL in Ersch and Gruber's Encyclopaedie, sec. ii. Bd. xxvii. 1850, p. 12 f. (in art. "Juden").

GRÄTZ, Geschichte der Juden, Bd. iv. p. 123 ff.

DERENBOURG, Histoire de la Palestine, pp. 402–412.

NEUBÜRGER, Monatsschrift für Geschichte und Wissenschaft Judenthums, 1873, pp. 386–397.

EWALD, History of Israel, viii. pp. 271–276.

MORRISON, The Jews under the Roman Empire, pp. 189–194.

HAUSRATH, Neutestamentliche Zeitgeschichte, 2 Aufl. iv. 181–189.

RENAN, Les Évangiles (1877), pp. 503–512.

VOLKMAR, "Zur Chronologie des Trajanischen Partherkrieges mit Rücksicht auf die Ignatiustradition und eine neue Quelle"(Rhein. Museum, Neue Folge, Bd. xii. 1857, pp. 481–511).

VOLKMAR, "Der parthische und jüdische Kreig Trajans nach den Quellen" (Zeitschrift für die Alterthumswissenschaft. XV. Jahrg. 1857, Nr. 61–65).

VOLXXAR, Handbuch der Einleitung in dis Apokryphen, 1 Thl. Abth. 1, Judith. 1860.

DIERAUER in Büdinger's Untersuchungen zur röm. Kaisergeschichte, i. 1868, p. 182 f.

DE LA BERGE, Essai sur le règne de Trajan (1877), pp. 182–184.

SOHILLER, Geschichte der römischen Kaiserzeit, i. 2 (1883), p. 561 f.

MOMMSEN, Römischs Geschichte, Bd. v. (1885) pp. 542–544 Compare p. 397 ff.

Trajan, during the last years of his life, A.D. 114–117, was incessantly occupied in bold expeditions of conquest in the farthest eastern parts of the empire. While he was, in A.D. 115, engaged in the conquest of Mesopotamia, the Jews in Egypt and Cyrene, taking advantage of

the emperor's absence, "as if driven along by the wild spirit of revolution, began to make riots against the non-Jewish inhabitants of the land." The rebellion reached such dimensions in the following year, A.D. 116, that it assumed the character of a formal war. The Roman governor of Egypt, M. Rutilius Lupus, seems not to have been aware of the strength of the Jews. In an engagement the rebel Jews conquered the "Greeks," and compelled them to fly to Alexandria. There, in the capital, the Greeks had decidedly the upper hand, and the Jews residing there were seized and slain.

Still more furiously did the Jews in Cyrene conduct themselves. Of the cruelties which the Jews there perpetrated upon their non-Jewish fellow-inhabitants a dreadful picture is presented by Dio Cassius. They ate their flesh, besmeared themselves with their blood, sawed them through from above downward, or gave them for food to the wild beasts. The number of the murdered is said to have been as many as 220,000. Though here, certainly, the pen has been directed by the most extravagant fancy, the extent and importance of the revolt are beyond all dispute. The leader of the Jewish population of Cyrene, whom they proclaimed as their king, is called by Eusebius, Lukuas, by Dio Cassius, Andrew.

To suppress this revolt Trajan sent one of his best generals, Marcius Turbo. By means of long-continued and persistent fighting (πολλαῖς μάχαις ἐν οὐκ ὀλίγῳ τε χρόνῳ) he brought the war to an end, and slew many thousands of the Jews, not only of Cyrene, but also those of Egypt, who had attached themselves to their "king" Lukuas.

The outbreak had also spread to the island of Cyprus. Under the leadership of a certain Artemio, the Jews there imitated the example of their co-religionists of Cyrene, and murdered 24,000 non-Jewish inhabitants of the island. The very capital, Salamis, was laid waste by them. In regard to the suppression of the revolt we have no information. The consequence of it was that henceforth no Jew was allowed to appear upon the island; and if through stress of weather any Jew should happen to be cast upon its coasts, he was put to death.

Finally, when Trajan had pressed on as far as Ctesiphon, the capital of the Parthian empire, the Jews of Mesopotamia in his rear had become disturbed. Such a disturbance there upon the very frontier of the empire was a most serious affair. Trajan gave orders to the Moorish prince Lusius Quietus, who was at the same time a Roman general, to sweep the rebels out of the province (ἐκκαθᾶραι τῆς ἐπαρχίας αὐτούς). With barbarous cruelty Quietus executed his commission. Thousands of Jews were put to death. Thus was order restored, and Quietus, in recognition of his services, was appointed governor of Palestine.

The Jewish revolt was not, it would seem, finally suppressed until the beginning of Hadrian's reign in A.D. 117. At least Eusebius speaks of disturbances in Alexandria which Hadrian had to quell; and the biographer of Hadrian states that Palestine also had taken its share in the rebellion. In any case, however, perfect quiet seems to have been restored in the first year of Hadrian.

It is very doubtful indeed whether Palestine generally had any share in the rebellion. This is maintained by Volkmar and Grätz in the interest of their conception of the Book of Judith, which they place in this period; but it has been rightly contested by Lipsius and others. Rabbinical tradition makes mention distinctly of a "war of Quietus," פּוֹלְמוֹס שֶׁל קִיטוֹס; but there is nothing to oblige us to understand by this any other than the well-known war of Quietus in

Mesopotamia. In Megillath, Taanith § 29, the 12th Adar is designated the “day of Trajan,” יום טוריינוס, and the commentary upon this passage remarks that this day was celebrated in commemoration of the following incident: Two brothers, Julianus and Pappus, were arrested by Trajan at Laodicea, when the emperor called out to them in mockery: Let your God now save you as he saved Hananiah, Mishael, and Azariah. The two brothers replied that neither he nor they were worthy of having such a miracle wrought, but that God would indeed require their blood of him if he slew them. But before Trajan left that place, an order came from Rome, in consequence of which he was put to death. This fable, which deserves no attention whatever, as it proceeds on the assumption that Trajan was only a subordinate officer, is now forsooth offered as the principal evidence regarding the war of Trajan in Palestine! But it should be observed that even in it there is no mention either of a war or of Judea, but expressly of Laodicea. — The one thing that seems to favour Volkmar’s view is the statement of Spartian above referred to, according to which, in the beginning of Hadrian’s reign, Palestine rebelles animos efferebat. From this statement, indeed, it would seem to have been not altogether in a quiet condition. But it can hardly have gone the length of an actual war. Otherwise our original authorities would have given a more circumstantial account of it.

3. THE GREAT REBELLION UNDER HADRIAN, A.D. 132-135

SOURCES

DIO CASSIUS, lxix. 12-14.

EUSEBIUS, Hist. eccl. iv. 6; Chronicon, ed Schoene, ii. 166-169.

On Aristo of Pella, see vol. i. of this work, pp. 69-72.

Rabbinical traditions in Derenbourg, pp. 412-438. A collection of the rabbinical texts which refer to the history of Beth-ther is given in Lebrecht, Bether, pp. 43-50; comp, also p. 20 f.

On the coins, see Appendix IV.

LITERATURE

BASNAGE, Histoire des Juifs, t. vii. (according to another arrangement, t. xi.), 1716, pp. 328-378.

TILLEMONT, Histoire des empereurs, t. ii. (Venice 1732), pp. 285-296.

MÜNTER, Der jüdische Krieg unter den Kaisern Trajan und Hadrian, 1821; a most comprehensive monograph.

CASSEL in Ersch and Gruber’s Encyclopaedie, sec. ii. Bd. 27, 1850, pp. 13-16 (in article “Juden”).

HERZFELD, Zur Geschiehte des Barkochba (Monatsschrift für Geschichte und Wissenschaft des Judenthums, 1856, pp. 101-111).

GRÄTZ, Geschichte der Juden, Bd. iv. 2 Aufl. pp. 138-183.

JOST, Geschichte des Judenthums und seiner Sekten, ii. 75-83.

DERENBOURG, Histoire de la Palestine, pp. 412-438.

NEUBÜRGER, Monatsschrift für Geschichte und Wissenschaft des Judenthums, 1873, pp. 433-445, 529-536.

WILLIAMS, The Holy City, vol. i. pp. 209-213.

MORRISON, The Jews under the Roman Empire, pp. 198-206.

“The Jewish Wars under Hadrian and Trajan” (Journal of Sacred Literature, vol. vii. 1851, pp.

439-444).

EWALD, History of Israel, viii. 271-311

HAUSRATH, Neutestamentliche Zeitgesch. 2 Aufl. iv. 327-342.

RENAN, L'église, chrétienne (1879), pp. 186-228, 541-553. Revue historigue, t. ii. 1876, pp. 112-120.

SALZER, "Der Aufstand des Bar-Cochba" (Magazin für die Wissenschaft des Judenthums, iii. 1876, pp. 121-139, 173-190; iv. 1877, pp. 17-38).

HAMBURGER, Real-Encyclopaedie für Bibel und Talmud, Abth. ii., articles Akib, Barkochba, Bethar, Hadrian, Hadrianische Verfolgungsedikte.

DERENBOURG, "Quelques Notes sur la guerre de Bar Kozeba" (Mélanges publiés par l'école des hautes etudes, Paris 1878, pp. 167-173).

DARMESTETER, "Notes épigraphiques," etc. (Revue des études juives, t. i. 1880, pp. 42-55).

SCHILLER, Geschichte der römische Kaiserzeit, i. 2,1883, pp. 612-615.

MOMMSEN, Römische Geschichte, v. pp. 544-546.

GREGOROVIUS, Der Kaiser Hadrian (3 Aufl. 1884), pp. 38 f., 147-153, 188-216.

GREGOROVIUS, "Die Gründung der römischen Colonie Aelia Capitolina" (Sitzungsberichte der philos.-philol. und hist. Classe der Münchener Akademie, 1883, pp. 477-508).

SCHWARZ, Der Bar-Kochbaische Aufstand, Brünn 1885 (worthless; see Bursian's Jahresber. der class. Alterthumswissensch. pp. 48, 282 f.).

A late Jewish legend tells how in the days of Joshua ben Chananiah, that is, in the time of Hadrian, the pagan government had granted authority to proceed with the building of the temple. But the Samaritans had made representations against the enterprise. And in consequence of these the emperor had not indeed withdrawn the permission, but issued a decree that the new building should not be erected precisely on the site of the old temple, which came to the same thing as an actual prohibition. Then the Jews gathered together in factions in the valley of Beth-Rimmon. But R. Joshua, in order to quiet them, told them the story of the lion and the stork: as the stork ought to be glad to have got its head uninjured out of the jaws of the lion, so also ought they to be glad if they were allowed to live in peace under a heathen government. The historical value of this legend is simply nil, and yet it forms the chief ground for the view insisted upon by many modern scholars, that Hadrian had given permission for the rebuilding of the temple, and that the withdrawal of this permission was the real cause of the great Jewish rebellion. In confirmation of this view reference is made to statements by Christian writers. But even these are little calculated to support such a theory. Chrysostom, Cedrenus, and Nicephorus Callistus only say that the Jews in the time of Hadrian had rebelled and made an attempt to rebuild the temple, and that Hadrian put a stop to that undertaking. The Chronicon Paschale speaks of a destruction by Hadrian of the temple that had actually been built. Of a permission to build the temple that had first been given by Hadrian and afterwards withdrawn, there is no mention whatever. The attempt to rebuild the temple was really itself one of the acts of the rebellion. An apparent support for this theory is to be found only in one passage in the Epistle of Barnabas, of which, however, the explanation is uncertain. Barnabas seeks to show that it is not according to God's will that the Jews should continue to observe the law. Their Sabbath is not the true one. "And almost like the heathens have they honoured God in a

temple." In order to prove the heathenish character of the Jewish temple, Barnabas, in chap, xvi., quotes the prophecy of Isa. 49:17 (LXX.): "Behold, they who have cast down this temple, even they shall build it up again;" and then proceeds, in chap. xvi. 4: "It has so happened. For through their going to war it was destroyed by their enemies; and now they [together with] the servants of their enemies shall rebuild it" (γίνεται• διὰ γὰρ τὸ πολεμεῖν αὐτοὺς καθῃρέθη ὑπὸ τῶν ἐχθρῶν• νῦν καὶ αὐτοὶ [καὶ] οἱ τῶν ἐχθρῶν ὑπηρέται ἀνοικοδομήσουσιν αὐτόν). Only if the bracketed καί be retained, is the expectation there set forth that now the Jews and the heathens together were to build in common the Jewish temple. By striking out the καί the meaning of the sentence becomes this: the heathens themselves build the temple, that is, for heathenish purposes. But on external grounds also the latter reading deserves the preference. Barnabas seems therefore to allude to Hadrian's intention to erect a building for heathen worship. – Of the alleged permission given by Hadrian for the rebuilding of the Jewish temple, therefore, we do not meet with any trace when we investigate the causes of the rebellion. Such permission, at least in the form of active encouragement, is also improbable on internal grounds. For while Hadrian zealously patronized the Greek-Roman religious rites, he looked with contempt upon all foreign superstitions.

Only two accounts of the causes of the great rebellion are worthy of consideration. Spartian says: "moverunt ea tempestate et Judaei bellum, quod vetabautur mutilare genitalia." Dio Cassius, on the contrary, gives his account thus: "When Hadrian had founded at Jerusalem a city of his own in place of the one destroyed, which he called Aelia Capitolina, and on the site of the temple of their God erected another temple to Jupiter, the great and long-continued war broke out. For the Jews regarded it as a horrible outrage that foreigners should settle in their city, and that temples for strange gods should be built in it." Since Spartian mentions only the one and Dio Cassius only the other, it is doubtful whether without more ado we are entitled to combine the two. Gregorovius rejects the statement of Spartian, and regards that of Dio Cassius as alone worthy of credence. In fact, a prohibition of circumcision, without any special occasion, seems little in accordance with the mild character of Hadrian, although it might quite conceivably be used for the purpose of securing the extinction of the Jews after the suppression of the revolt. Nevertheless, the statement of Spartian is to be defended. For, according to all that we know, the prohibition of circumcision was not limited to the Jews, and was not immediately directed against them. When, under Antoninus Pius, the Jews were again allowed to circumcise their children, the prohibition still stood good against the non-Jewish peoples. It was therefore originally a general order. The special feature of this legislation was not that it aimed at the rooting out of Judaism, but that it placed circumcision on the same level with castration, and punished its practice accordingly. The prohibition was not, therefore, first of all directed against Judaism, but it is at the same time quite evident that Judaism would receive from it a deadly wound. In addition to this it was now made known that Hadrian designed the erection of a new heathen city upon the ruins of Jerusalem. In this also the ruling motive was not hostility to Judaism. The rearing of magnificent buildings and the founding of cities was the work to which Hadrian devoted the energies of his life. But this proposal must also have been regarded as a blow in the face to Judaism. So long as Jerusalem lay in ruins, the Jews could cherish the hope of its restoration. The founding of a heathen city, the erection of a heathen

temple on the holy place, put an end to these hopes in terrible manner. It was an outrage as great as that which Antiochus Epiphanea had fomerly committed, and was answered, as that had been, by a genenal uprising of the excited people. – Both reasons, therefore, are not in themselves improbable. A combination of the two is a suggestion which has much to commend it, if the two enactments of Hadrian were not too far separated in time from one another.

In regard to the date at which the building of the Aelia Capitolina was begun, various statements are given in the original authorities. Epiphanius had been informed that Hadrian, forty-seven years after the destruction of Jerusalem, when he arrived there on his second journey, gave orders to rebuild the city (not the temple), and commissioned Aquila to see the work done. This indication of date gives us A.D. 117, immediately after Hadrian's accession to the throne. He was then certainly in the East, but Epiphauius expressly refers to his later journey taken from Rome, and thus his statement regarding the time is deprived of all its value. The Chronicon Paschale places the founding of Aelia Capitolina in A.D. 119; but it does so only because it has also placed the great Jewish rebellion in that year, after the quelling of which Aelia was founded. With the date fixed for the Jewish rebellion, which is demonstrably false, falls also that fixed for the founding of Aelia. Eusebius also regards the founding of the city as a consequence of the rebellion. This is correct, inasmuch as only thereafter was the plan carried out. But, according to Dio Cassius, it is not to be doubted that the building had already been begun before the outbreak of the rebellion, and indeed not very long before, for he says that the Jews, who were irritated about the building, remained quiet so long as Hadrian stayed in Egypt and Syria, but that they broke out so soon as he had left those regions. In accordance with this, it must be assumed that the founding of the city took place during the period of Hadrian's visit to Syria, which occurred in A.D. 130.

Hadrian at that time – it was during his last great journey in the East – arrived in Syria from Greece, and thence went to Egypt, and then back again to Syria. It is made certain from inscriptions and coins that he was in Syria in A.D. 130, in Egypt in November A.D. 130, and so again in Syria in A.D. 131. Generally, wherever he went he furthered the interests of culture: artistic and useful buildings were erected: games were celebrated: he was a restitutor in all the provinces. In the cities of Palestine also we come upon traces of his presence. Tiberias had obtained an Ἀδριάνειον; Gaza, a πανήγυρις Ἀδριανή; Petra, in grateful remembrance of the benefactions of the emperor, took the name of Ἀδριανὴ Πέτρα. His residence in Judea was commemorated by coins bearing the inscription, adventui Aug(usti) Judaeae.

The founding of Aelia also, without doubt, belongs to the period of the emperor's activity. Pliny calls Jerusalem longe clarissima urbium orientis, non Judaeae modo. This celebrated city now lay in ruins, or was still merely a Roman camp. What then could be more attractive to the emperor than the restoring of such a city to its former magnificence? It was, however, manifestly intended that this new magnificence should be of a heathen character. A temple of the Capitoline Jupiter was to be erected on the spot where formerly the temple of the God of the Jews had stood. This was the fatal proposal. The Jews had been roused to a most violent degree by means of the order, issued probably not long before, against the practice of circumcision. And now to that was added a new outrage. By means of this proposed profanation of their city matters were brought to a crisis. The people remained quiet so long as the emperor

remained in Egypt, and during his second visit to Syria. But when he was no longer in the neighbourhood, that is, in A.D. 132, they broke out into revolt: an uprising that, in its extent and violence, and its unhappy consequences, was at least as serious as that of the time of Vespasian. If it does not bulk so largely in our records, it is only because of the meagreness of the original sources of information that have come down to us.

The leader of the revolt is called in the works of Christian writers Cochba or Bar-Cochba, and by the rabbinical authorities Barcosiba or Bencosiba. The one as well as the other is only a designation; the former distinguishes him as the star, or the son of the star, with reference to Num. 24:18, which passage R Akiba applied to him; the latter is a name derived either from his father (the son of Cosiba) or from his home (the man of Cosiba), and not until a comparatively late period, and only by a few individual writers, in view of his miserable collapse, was it taken to mean liar or deceiver. The designation Cochba or Bar-Cochba was apparently chosen on account of its similarity in sound to Barcosiba, but seems to have become pretty generally current, since the Christian authorities are acquainted with it alone. The coins have preserved for us the proper name of two men. For it is a fact scarcely admitting of question that the Simon-coins, some of which certainly, and others most probably, were stamped during the period of this outbreak, were issued by the leader of this outbreak, who was certainly Bar-Cochba. Those minted in the first year have the inscription, “Simon, Prince of Israel,” שמעון נשיא ישראל; those minted in the second year have only the name “Simon” שמעון. On some the figure of a star appears over that of a temple. Besides the Simoncoins there are also coins of the first year with the inscription, “Eleasar the Priest,” אלעזר הכהן. There thus seem to have been two men at the head of the rebellion, besides the Prince Simon, the Priest Eleasar. After the second year there are no more Eleasar-coins. Since in late rabbinical documents the R. Eleasar of Modein, who is also known from other sources, is described as the uncle of Barcosiba, some have ventured to conjecture that this man is the same as the one named “Eleasar the Priest” on the coins. But there is nothing anywhere to indicate that Eleasar of Modein was a priest.

The application of the designation of the “Star,” which should come out of Jacob, to Barcosiba, shows that he was regarded as the Messiah. R Akiba, the most celebrated doctor of the law in his time, is said to have distinctly announced him as such. And though, indeed, all the colleagues of Akiba did not recognise him, he had the mass of the people on his side. As in the days of Vespasian, so also at this time there was a widespread idea that the day had come when the old prophecy of the prophets would be fulfilled, and Israel would cast off the yoke of the Gentiles. The Christian legends also declare that Barcosiba bewitched the people by deceitful miracles. – Just by reason of the Messianic character of the movement it was quite impossible for Christians to take part in it. They could not deny their own Messiah by recognising the leader of the political revolution as such. Hence they were persecuted with peculiar violence by the new Messiah, as Justin Martyr and Eusebius testify.

The rebellion spread rapidly over all Palestine. Wherever strongholds, castles, caverns, subterranean passages afforded hiding-places, there were those who struggled for native customs and freedom gathered together. An open conflict they avoided; but from their dens in the mountains they made devastating raids upon the country, and fought with all who did not attach themselves to their party, Jerusalem also was certainly beset by the rebels. The doubt

which many, on the other hand, have raised is mainly supported by this, that in the more trustworthy sources (Dio Cassius and Eusebius' Church History) there is no mention of a war at Jerusalem. But how unspeakably meagre are these sources generally ! Even upon internal grounds it is probable that the rebels, who were at the beginning victorious, should have made themselves masters of Jerusalem, which was not then a strongly fortified city, but only a Roman camp. But this conjecture is confirmed by twofold testimony. In the first place by the coins. The coins that with the greatest confidence can be set down to this period, bear on the one side the name of Simon, שמעון, and on the other side the superscription, לחרות ירושלם, lechêruth Jeruschalem, "the freedom of Jerusalem." Therefore, the freeing of Jerusalem was commemorated by Simon on the coins. But there are among the coins belonging to this period also examples which, besides the date "First Year of the freeing of Israel" or "Second Year of the freedom of Israel," bear only the name Jerusalem, ירושלם. These, therefore, have been minted by the city itself in its own name, and hence we see that this city in the first year as well as in the second was in the hands of the rebels. In addition to this witness from the coins, we have the contemporary Appian, by whom, as will be told farther on, the fact of the reconquest of Jerusalem by the Romans is declared as a fact. – Whether during these troubled years of war the rebuilding of the Jewish temple may actually have been begun must be left undecided. Late Christians declare that this was so, and the intention to carry on this work was certainly entertained.

In regard to the progress of the war we know almost nothing. When it broke out Tineius Rufus was governor of Judea. When he was unable with his troops to crash the rebels, the revolt not only increased in dimension and importance throughout all Palestine, but also spread itself far out beyond the limits of that country. Unstable and restless elements indeed of another sort attached themselves to the Jewish rebellion, so that at last "the whole world, so to speak, was in commotion." The severest measures were necessary in order to put an end to the uproar. Large bodies of troops from other provinces were called in to strengthen the resident garrison. The best generals were commissioned for Palestine. Even the governor of Syria, Publicius Marcellus, hasted to the aid of his endangered colleague. But it seems that Rufus for the most of the time retained the supreme command; for Eusebius names no other Roman commander, and speaks as if the suppression of the revolt was accomplished by Rufus. In rabbinical authorities also, "Rufus the Tyrant," טורנס רופוס, appears the chief enemy of the Jews at that time. But from Dio Cassius, whose statements on this point are corroborated by the testimony of inscriptions, we know that during the last period of the war Julius Severus, one of the most distinguished of Hadrian's generals, had the supreme command, and that it was he who succeeded in bringing the rebellion to an end. He was summoned from Britain to conduct this war, and took a considerable time in crushing the revolt. In an open engagement no decisive result was gained. The rebels had to be hunted out of their hidingplaces one by one; and, where they kept concealed in mountain caverns, they were exhausted by having their supplies cut off. Only after long continued conflicts with individuals, in which there was great expenditure of life, did he at last succeed in harrying, exterminating, and rooting them out of the whole country (κατατρῖψαι καὶ ἐκτρυχῶσαι καὶ ἐκκόψαι).

Where Hadrian was residing during the war cannot be determined with certainty. Probably

during the critical year he was himself personally present at the seat of war. He had left Syria before the rebellion broke out. The evil tidings seem to have led him to return to Judea; for his presence at the seat of war is not only presupposed in the rabbinical legends, but is also made probable by some particulars derived from inscriptions. There is no reference to his presence in Rome again till May of A.D. 134. He would return so soon as he had been assured of a successful issue to the war, without waiting for the completion of the operations.

Dio Cassius as well as Eusebius is silent regarding the fate of Jerusalem. It certainly did not form the middle point of the conflict, as it had done in the Vespasian war. Its fortifications were quite unimportant. Even although the rebels had succeeded in driving out the Roman garrison, the recapture of the city would have been no very serious undertaking for a sufficiently strong Roman military force. But that it had been actually taken after a violent assault is plainly stated by Appian, a contemporary witness. When Appian speaks of a destruction (κατασκάπτειν), he is undoubtedly right, inasmuch as violent seizure is not conceivable without destruction to a certain extent. But after all, as following the thoroughgoing work of Titus, the object arrived at was comparatively limited. And, on the other hand, the Romans after once they had made themselves masters of the city, would not go further in the work of destruction. This was necessary in view of their purposed new building of Aelia. A siege of the city is assumed by Eusebius in his Demonstratio evangelica. Many Church Fathers (Chrysostom, Jerome, and others) maintain that Hadrian completely destroyed the remnants of the old city which were still left standing after the destruction by Titus. By this they really only mean that Hadrian made an utter end of the old Jewish city, and erected a new heathen city in its place. In the Mishna it is related that Jerusalem was run over on the 9th Ab by the plough. By this, as the context shows, the time of Hadrian is meant. In the Babylonian Talmud and by Jerome this deed is ascribed to Rufus; only they both speak, not of a ploughing of the city, but of the site of the temple. The short statement in the Mishna is specially deserving of notice. What this ceremony would signify, however, would be, not the destruction, but the new founding; and the incident must therefore be placed before the outbreak of the revolt. The story of the conquest of Jerusalem by Hadrian as told in the Samaritan chronicle is wholly fabulous.

The last hiding-place of Bar-Cochba and his followers was the strong mountain fastness of Beth-ther, according to Eusebius not very far from Jerusalem, probably on the site of the modern Bettir, three hours south-west of Jerusalem. After a long and stubborn defence this stronghold was also conquered in the eighteenth year of Hadrian=A.D. 134-135, according to rabbinical calculation on the 9th Ab. In the sack of the city they found Bar-Cochba, “the originator of all the mad fanaticism which had called down the punishment.” We have absolutely no information about the siege and conquest. The rabbinical legends tell all manner of stories about this struggle; but these productions of the wildest fancy do not deserve even once to be mentioned. This one point alone may perhaps deserve to be repeated, that before the fall of the city R. Eleasar, the uncle of Bar-Cochba, is said to have been slain by his nephew because he falsely suspected him of having come to an understanding with the Romans.

With the fall of Beth-ther the war was brought to a close, after having continued for somewhere about three years and a half, A.D. 132-135. During the course of it also many Rabbis died a martyr’s death. The later legends have glorified by poetic amplification and

exaggeration especially the death of ten such martyrs, among them that of R. Akiba.

In honour of the victory Hadrian was greeted for the Second time as Imperator. Julius Severus received the ornamenta triumphalia; to officers and men were given the customary rewards. The victory was won indeed at a very heavy cost. So great were the losses that Hadrian in his letter to the Senate omitted the usual introductory formula, that "he and the army were well." Still more grievous than this direct loss of men was the desolation of the fruitful and populous province. "All Judea was well-nigh a desert." Fifty fortresses, 985 villages were destroyed, 580,000 Jews (?) fell in battle, while the number of those who succumbed to their wounds and to famine was never reckoned. Innumerable was the multitude of those who were sold away as slaves. At the annual market at the Terebinth of Hebron they were offered for sale in such numbers that a Jewish slave was of no more value than a horse. What could not be disposed of there was brought to Gaza and there sold or sent to Egypt, on the way to which many died of hunger or by shipwreck.

With respect to the capital Jerusalem, that was now proceeded with which had been projected before the war: it was converted into a Roman colony with the name Aelia Capitolina. In order to make permanent the purely heathen character of the city, the Jews still residing there were driven out, and heathen colonists settled in their stead. No Jew was allowed thereafter to enter the territory of the city; if any one should be discovered there he was put to death. The official name of the newly-founded city is given on the coins as Col(onia) Aell(ia) Cap(itolina); writers designate it in their works, as a rule, only Aelia. Its constitution was that of a Roman colony, but it had not the jus Italicum. It may readily be supposed that it did not want beautiful and useful buildings. The Chronicon Paschale mentions: τὰ δύο δημόσια καὶ τὸ θέατρον καὶ τὸ τρικάμαρον καὶ τὸ τετράνυμφον καὶ τὸ δωδεκάπυλον τὸ πρὶν ὀνομαζόμενον ἀναβαθμοὶ καὶ τὴν κόδραν. At the south gate of the city toward Bethlehem the figure of a swine is said to have been engraved. The chief religious worship in the city was that of the Capitoline Jupiter, to whom a temple was erected on the site of the former Jewish temple. It would also seem that in it there was the statue of Hadrian of which Christian writers speak. On the coins, as deities of the city, besides Jupiter are mentioned: Bacchus, Serapis, Astarte, the Dioscuri. A sanctuary of Aphrodite (Astarte) stood on the place where, according to the Christian tradition, the sepulchre of Christ had been; or, according to another version, a sanctuary of Jupiter on the site of the sepulchre, and a sanctuary of Venus on the site of the cross of Christ.

The complete ethnicizing of Jerusalem was the actual accomplishment of a scheme which previously Antiochus Epiphanes had in vain attempted. In another respect also the enactments of Hadrian were similar to those of the former attempt. The prohibition of circumcision, which had been issued probably even before the war, and was directed not specially against the Jews (see above, p. 292), was now without doubt continued in force. It was only under Antoninus Pius that the Jews were again allowed to circumcise their children (see above, p. 292). The Jewish tradition, which certainly refers to this prohibition, affirms that even the observance of the Sabbath and the study of the law had been forbidden. Whether this statement be reliable or not, the prohibition of circumcision was, according to Jewish notions, equivalent to a prohibition of the Jewish religion generally. So long as this prohibition was maintained and acted on, there was no use speaking of a pacification of the Jewish people. In fact we hear again, even in the

time of Antoninus Pius, of an attempted rebellion which had to he put down by strong measures. To the Roman authorities there was here only the choice: either to tolerate the religious ceremonies, or to completely exterminate the people. We may indeed assume that the knowledge which the emperor Antoninus had of this alternative, led him to allow again and grant toleration to the practice of circumcision.

Under Hadrian's successor, therefore, essentially the same state of matters is seen still to exist as had existed since the time of Vespasian. He did not by any means answer the political ideals of the Jews. But in regard to religious matters they could be satisfied with him. The extinction of their political existence just led to this, that those tendencies obtained the supremacy which represented undiluted Judaism: Pharisaism and Rabbinism.

The development now proceeded forth upon those lines which became prominent in consequence of the great revolution of sentiment that followed the destruction of Jerusalem. Without a political home, grouped together into a unity only by the ideal power of the common law, the Jews continued all the more persistently to hold by and cherish this birth-right in which they all shared. In this way the separation between them and the rest of the world was more and more sharply defined. While, during the period in which Hellenistic Judaism flourished, the boundaries between the Jewish and Graeco-Roman view of the world threatened to melt away, the Jews and their opponents now gave attention with all their combined strength to deepen the cleft even more and more. Jewish Hellenism, which proclaimed the common brotherhood of man, disappeared, and Pharisaic Judaism, which sharply repudiated all communion with the Gentile world, won universal acceptance. But paganism also had become more intolerant: the rush of the masses to the worship of the Jewish God had ceased, partly because of other powerful spiritual forces, pre-eminently that of Chris tianity, which exercised a more potent influence, but partly also because of the civil legislation which, without abrogating the guaranteed toleration of the Jewish religion, imposed legal limitations to the further encroachments of Judaism.

And thus the Jews became more and more what they properly and essentially were: strangers in the pagan world. The restoration of a Jewish commonwealth in the Holy Land was, and continued even to be, a subject of religions hope, which they held by with unconquerable tenacity. The difference between the ideal and the actual, however, was at first, and even after centuries had passed, so marked and severe, that they could enter even their own capital only as strangers. Even in the fourth century it was permitted them only once in the year to enter the city on the 9th Ab, the day of the destruction of Jerusalem, in order that they might be able, on the site of the temple, to pour forth their lamentations. In graphic terms Jerome describes how the Jews on that day were wont to gather in mournful companies, to utter forth their grievous complaints, and by gold to purchase from the Roman watch permission to linger longer in the place of mourning: "Usque ad praesentem diem perfidi coloni post interfectionem servorum et ad extremum filii dei excepto planctu prohibentur ingredi Jerusalem, et ut ruinam suae eis flere liceat civitatis pretio redimunt, ut qui quondam emerant sanguinem Christi emant lacrymas suas et ne fletus quidem eis gratuitus sit. Videas in die, quo capta est a Romanis et diruta Jerusalem, venire populum lugubrem, confluere decrepitas mulierculas et senes pannis annisque obsitos, in corporibus et in habitu suo iram Domini demonstrantes. Congregatur turba miserorum; et

patibulo Domini coruscante ac radiante ἀναστάσει ejus, de oliveti monte quoque crucis fulgente vexillo, plangere ruinas templi sui populum miserum et tamen non esse miserabilem: adhuc fletus in genis et livida brachia et sparsi crines, et miles merceden postulat, ut illis flere plus liceat. Et dubitat aliquis, quum haec videat, de die tribulationis et angustiae, de die calamitatis et miseriae, de die tenebrarum et caliginis, de die nebulae et turbinis, de die tubae et clangoris? Habent enim et in luctu tubas, et juxta prophetiam vox sollennitatis versa est in planotum. Ululant super cineres sanctuarii et super altare destructum et super civitates quondam munitas et super excelsos angulos templi, de quibus quondam Jacobum fratrem Domini praecipitaverunt."

SECOND DIVISION

VOLUME I: THE INTERNAL CONDITION OF PALESTINE, AND OF THE JEWISH PEOPLE, IN THE TIME OF JESUS CHRIST

PREFACE

IT is a reconstruction of the Manual of the History of New Testament Times which here appears under another title. I believe that this new title expresses more plainly and correctly than the old title the actual contents of the book. For in fact, whether in its former or present state, it does not profess to be more than a History of the Jewish People in the Time of Jesus Christ, to the exclusion of the state of the heathen world. I could not decide on admitting the latter, because the selection to be made must have been an arbitrary one.

The external framework of the book has undergone but little alteration in this new revision. Most of the paragraphs remain the same. The only additions are the section on the Priesthood and the Temple worship (§ 24), and the two paragraphs on the Palestino-Jewish and the Graeco-Jewish literature (§ 32 and 33), which replace the former section on the Apocalypse. Thus the number of paragraphs is only increased by two. Within this former framework, however, the book has certainly become almost a new one. Renewed consultation of authorities and continued occupation with the subject furnished so much fresh material, that a considerable increase of extent was unavoidable. The matter of this Second Division is threefold that of the first edition, although I have earnestly striven not to expand the form beyond the limits then observed. It is only in verbal citations from documentary authorities that I have allowed myself somewhat more liberty than in the former edition.

An apology is needed on my part for issuing the second half of the book before the first. This inversion of the natural order was not at first contemplated. I merely began operations on this second half because there was more to be done here than in the first, my purpose being to print both parts in one volume as before. The work, however, so grew under my hands as to render a division necessary. At the same time, the completion of the whole was consequently so delayed, that it seemed desirable to publish what was ready at once. This was the more possible because this half also forms a comparatively independent whole. While thus issuing this Second Division first, I can at the same time express the hope, that the First Division, which will not expand in the same proportion, may, with the needful index, follow it within the space of one year.

E. SCHÜRER

THE STATE OF CULTURE IN GENERAL

I. MIXTURE OF POPULATION, LANGUAGE

THE Jewish population of Palestine experienced, during the Greek and Roman period, as well as in previous centuries, great fluctuations both in numbers and extension. From the beginning of the Hellenistic period to the rising of the Maccabees the Jewish element must be regarded as gradually receding, the Greek as triumphantly advancing. The rising of the Maccabees and its consequences produced however an important change, Judaism gaining ground thereby both intensively and extensively. It was internally consolidated and extended its boundaries in nearly every direction: to the west, by the Judaizing of the towns of Gazara, Joppa and Jamnia (see above, § 7, and below, § 23. I.); to the south, by the compulsory conversion of the Idumaeans under John Hyrcanus (see § 8); to the north, by the conversion of the Ituraeans under Aristobulus I. (see § 9); and in all directions by the conquests of Alexander Jannaeus. It is true that the Judaism of these Asmonean princes from John Hyrcanus onwards was not that of the scribes and Pharisees; still they represented, though in their own fashion, the Jewish religion and nationality, as the example of the "Hellenistic Aristobulus" especially proves. Then, under Alexandra even the Pharisaic tendency again prevailed. Under the Romans and Herodians indeed the pursuit of a Graeco-Roman culture was again favoured as much as possible. But Pharisaic Judaism was now so established, both externally and internally, by the development of the last two centuries, that its state of possession could not thus be essentially encroached upon, and not till the convulsions of the wars under Vespasian and Hadrian did it again incur great losses.

For the times of Josephus we have somewhat more accurate information concerning the extension of the Jewish population in Palestine in the description he has given of the country in his Bell. Jud. iii. 3. From this we learn – what is elsewhere confirmed – that of all the maritime towns, two only, viz. Joppa and Jamnia, which were Judaized in the Maccaibaean period, contained a chiefly Jewish population. In all the other coast towns the Gentile was the prevailing element (see also § 23. I.). In the interior, on the contrary, the countries of Judaea, Galilee and Peraea had an essentially Jewish population. To these were added the regions lying to the east of the Sea of Gennesareth, viz. Gamalitis, Gaulonitis, Batanaea and Trachonitis, which had a mixed Jewish and heathen population. Lastly the Samaritans also must in a wider sense be reckoned as belonging to the Jewish population.

The threefold division of the Jewish region into Judaea, Galilee and Peraea (יְהוּדָה, גָּלִיל, עֵבֶר הַיַּרְדֵּן) is also repeatedly assumed in the Mishna. The central country and nucleus of the whole was Judaea, which was bounded on the north by Samaria, on the east by the Jordan and the Dead Sea, on the west by the district of the Philistine-Hellenistic cities, on the south by Arabia Petraea. In Judaea was the centre of Jewish life; it was here that the new community had first reorganized itself after the Babylonian captivity, here that the rising of the Maccabees originated, and here that the learned and educational activity of the Pharisaic scribes had its chief seat. In the north, and separated from Judaea by Samaria, was Galilee, whose boundaries were to the north the district of Tyre; to the west, that of Ptolemais; to the east, Jordan and the Lake of Gennesareth. The population of Galilee also was mainly Jewish; for the inhabitants of this district had not joined the Samaritan schism, as might have been expected from the former common history of the kingdom of Ephraim. On the contrary, the

tendency adopted by Judaism in the post-exilian period had been — we no longer know how or when, but certainly during the Persian period — successfully brought to bear in this district also, and an enduring religious association thus established between the inhabitants of Judaea and Galilee. Peraea, the third of the Jewish lands, lay beyond the river Jordan, and was bounded on the north by the district of Pella, on the east by the districts of Gerasa, Philadelphia, and Heshbon, and on the south by the kingdom of Arabia Petraea. In this province also the population was an essentially Jewish one. Still, neither in Galilee nor Peraea must we conceive of the Jewish element as pure and unmixed. In the shifting course of history Jews and Gentiles had here been so often, and in such a variety of ways, thrown together, that the attainment of exclusive predominance by the Jewish element must be counted among the impossibilities. It was only in Judaea, that this was at least approximately arrived at by the energetic agency of the scribes during the course of centuries.

In spite of the common religion and nationality of the three provinces, many differences of manners and customs existed between their inhabitants, and these imparted a certain independence to their inner life, quite apart from the political separation repeatedly appearing. The Mishna mentions, e.g., slight differences in respect of the marriage laws between Judaea and Galilee, varying customs in the intercourse between espoused persons, differences of weights and coinage between Judaea and Galilee. The three provinces are therefore looked upon as in certain respects "different countries."

The districts east of the Lake of Gennesareth (Gamalitis, Gaulonitis, Batanaea and Trachonitis) formed a somewhat motley assemblage. The population was a mixed one of Jews and Syrians (Bell. Jud. iii. 5: οἰκοῦσι δὲ αὐτὴν μιγάδες Ἰουδαῖοί τε καὶ Σύροι). But besides the settled population, numerous nomadic hosts, from whom the former had much to suffer, were wandering about in these border lands of civilisation. Very favourable to them were the caves of this district, in which they could lay up stores of water and provisions, and in case of attack find refuge, together with their flocks and herds. Hence it was very difficult to subdue them. The powerful hand of Herod however succeeded in inducing among them a certain amount of order. With the view of keeping these turbulent elements permanently in check, he frequently settled foreign colonists in Trachonitis; at first, three thousand Idumaeans; then a colony of warlike Jews from Babylon, to whom he granted the privilege of immunity from taxation. His sons and grandsons continued this work. Nevertheless one of the two Agrippas had to complain in an edict of the brutish manner of life (θηριώδης κατάστασις) of the inhabitants and of their abode in the caves(ἐνφωλεύειν). Herod's exertions for the promotion of culture at last introduced the Greek element into these countries. In the neighbourhood of Kanatha (see § 23. I.) are still found the ruins of a temple, which according to its Greek inscriptions belongs to the period of Herod the Great. Greek inscriptions of the two Agrippas, especially of Agrippa II., are found in larger numbers in the neighbourhood of Hauran. In the Roman period the Greek element predominated, at least externally, in these districts (see hereon Nr. ii. 1).

The Samaritans also belonged in a wider sense to the Jewish population. For their character is not rightly viewed till it is regarded from the twofold point of sight — (1) of their being indeed, according to their natural composition, a mixed people arising from the intermingling of the former Israelitish population with Gentile elements, especially with the heathen colonists introduced by the Assyrians; and (2) of their having a religion essentially identical with that of Israel at an earlier stage of development. Among the colonists, whom the Assyrians had planted (2 Kings 17:24 sqq.) in Samaria from the provinces of Babylon, Cuthah, Ava, Hamath and Sepharvaim, those from Cuthah (2 Kings 17:24, 30) כּוּתָה, כּוּת, seem to have been

particularly numerous. The inhabitants of Samaria were hence subsequently called Cuthites by the Jews (Χουθαῖοι in Joseph. Antt. ix. 14. 3, xi. 4. 4, 7. 2, xiii. 9. 1; in Rabbinic literature כּוּתִים). We must not, however, confidently assume, that the ancient Israelitish population was entirely carried away, and the whole country peopled afresh by these heathen colonists. It is, on the contrary, certain, that a considerable percentage of the ancient population remained, and that the new population consisted of a mixture of these with the heathen immigrants. The religion of this mingled people was, according to the Bible (2 Kings 17:24–41), at first a mixed religion, — a combination of the heathen rites introduced by the colonists with the old Israelite worship of Jahveh upon the high places. Gradually however the Israelitish religion must have obtained a decided preponderance. For, from what we know with certainty of the religion of the Samaritans (of course leaving malicious reports out of question), it was a pure Israelitish monotheism. They acknowledged the unity of God and the authority of Moses as the greatest of the prophets; they observed the Jewish rite of circumcision on the eighth day, the sanctification of the Sabbath, and the Jewish annual festivals. Nay, they even relinquished the pre-Deuteronomic standpoint of the worship of Jahveh upon high places, accepted the whole Pentateuch as the law of Israel, and consequently acknowledged the unity of the Jewish worship. It is only in the circumstance of their transferring this worship not to Jerusalem but to Gerizim that we perceive the after effect of the older standpoint. Here, according to the somewhat suspicious account of Josephus, they built in the time of Alexander the Great a temple of their own; and even after its destruction by John Hyrcanus, Gerizim continued to be their sacred mountain and the seat of their worship. They did not indeed participate in the further development of Pharisaic Judaism, but rejected all that went beyond the injunctions of the Pentateuch. Nor did they accept any of the sacred writings of the Jewish canon except the Pentateuch. But for all this the right to call themselves "Israelites" cannot be denied them, so far, that is, as religion and not descent is in question.

The position of Judaism proper with regard to the Samaritans was always a hostile one: the ancient antagonism of the kingdoms of Israel and Judah was here carried on in a new form. When the Samaritans desired, in the time of Zerubbabel, to co-operate in the building of the temple at Jerusalem, they were rejected by the Jews (Ezra 4:1); and "the foolish people who dwell in Sichem" are as much hated by the Son of Sirach as the Edomites and Philistines (Ecclus. 50:25, 26). The Samaritans on their side requited this disposition with like hostility. The legal appointments, nevertheless, of Rabbinic Judaism with respect to the Samaritans, are, from the standpoint of Pharisaism, generally correct and just. The Samaritans are never absolutely treated as "foreigners," but as a mingled people, whose Israelitish descent was not indeed proved, but always to be regarded as possible. Hence their membership of "the congregation of Israel" is not denied, but only designated as doubtful. Their observance of the law, e.g. with regard to tithes and the Levitical laws of purification, did not indeed correspond with Pharisaic requirements, on which account they were in many respects placed on a level with Gentiles. They were never however treated as idolaters (עכ״ום), but, on the contrary, decidedly distinguished from them. Their observance of the Sabbath is occasionally mentioned, and it is assumed as at least possible, that they could say a genuine Israelitish grace at meals. In fact they stand, so far as their observance of the law is concerned, on the same level as the Sadducees.

The language of the Jewish population of all the districts here mentioned was, since the last centuries before Christ, no longer Hebrew, but Aramaic. How and when the change was effected, cannot now be ascertained. At any rate, it was not the exiles, who returned from Babylon, who brought the Aramaic thence, for the post-exilian literature of the Israelites is also chiefly Hebrew. Nor was the Aramaic dialect of Palestine the Eastern (Babylonian), but the

Western Aramaic. Hence it must have penetrated gradually to Palestine from the north. The period of the transition is marked by the canonical books of Ezra and Daniel (the latter about 167–165 B.C.), which are written partly in Hebrew, partly in Aramaic (Aramaic are Ezra 4:8–6, 18, 7:12–26; Dan. 2:4–7, 28). A saying of Joses ben Joeser, about the middle of the second century before Christ, is cited in Aramaic in the Mishna, also certain sayings of Hillel and other authorities. That Aramaic was in the time of Christ the sole popular language of Palestine, is evident from the words mentioned in the New Testament: ἀββᾶ (Mark 14:36), ἀκελδαμάχ (Acts 1:19), γαββαθᾶ (John 19:13), γολγοθᾶ (Matt. 27:33), ἐφφαθά (Mark 7:34), κορβανᾶς (Matt. 27:6), μαμωνᾶς (Matt. 6:24), μαρὰν ἀθα (1 Cor. 16:22), Μεσσίας = מָשִׁיחָא (John 1:41), πάσχα (Matt. 26:17), ῥακά (Matt. 5:22), σατανᾶς (Matt. 16:23), ταλιθὰ κούμι (Mark 5:41); to which may be added names of persons, such as Κηφᾶς, Μάρθα, Ταβιθά, and the numerous names compounded with בַּר (Barabbas, Bartholomew, Barjesus, Barjonas, Barnabas, Barsabas, Bartimæus). The words, too, of Christ upon the cross: Ἐλωΐ ἐλωΐ λαμὰ σαβαχθανεί (Mark 15:34), are Aramaic. Hebrew was so little current with the common people, that the lessons from the Bible read in public worship had to be translated verse by verse into the dialect of the country. Notwithstanding however this complete prevalence of Aramaic, Hebrew still remained in use as “the sacred language” (לְשׁוֹן הַקֹּדֶשׁ). The Holy Scriptures were read aloud in it before as afterwards; and in certain liturgical cases the use of Hebrew was absolutely required. Hebrew also continued to be the language of the learned, in which even the legal discussions of the scribes were carried on. Not until about the third century after Christ do we find Aramaic in use for the last-named purpose; and while the Mishna was still in Hebrew (second century), the Palestinian Talmud was (fourth century) in Aramaic. The latter is our most copious source for the knowledge of this language of Palestine. Some hints concerning dialectic differences of pronunciation between Judaea and Galilee are given in the Gospels and the Talmud.

II. DIFFUSION OF HELLENIC CULTURE

1. Hellenism in the Non-Jewish Regions

The Jewish region just described was, in ancient times as well as in the Graeco-Roman period, surrounded on all sides by heathen districts. Only at Jamnia and Joppa had the Jewish element advanced as far as the sea. Elsewhere, even to the west, it was not the sea, but the Gentile region of the Philistine and Phenician cities, that formed the boundary of the Jewish. These heathen lands were far more deeply penetrated by Hellenism, than the country of the Jews. No reaction like the rising of the Maccabees had here put a stop to it, besides which heathen polytheism was adapted in quite a different manner from Judaism for blending with Hellenism. While therefore the further advance of Hellenism was obstructed by religious barriers in the interior of Palestine, it had attained here, as in all other districts since its triumphant entry under Alexander the Great, its natural preponderance over Oriental culture. Hence, long before the commencement of the Roman period, the educated world, especially in the great cities in the west and east of Palestine, was, we may well say, completely Hellenized. It is only with the lower strata of the populations and the dwellers in rural districts, that this must not be equally assumed. Besides however the border lands, the Jewish districts in the interior of Palestine were occupied by Hellenism, especially Scythopolis (see § 23. I. Nr. 19) and the town of Samaria, where Macedonian colonists had already been planted by Alexander the Great (§ 23. I. Nr. 24), while the national Samaritans had their central point at Sichem.

The victorious penetration of Hellenistic culture is most plainly and comprehensively shown by the religious worship. The native religions, especially in the Philistine and Phenician cities, did indeed in many respects maintain themselves in their essential character; but still in such wise,

that they were transformed by and blended with Greek elements. But besides these the purely Greek worship also gained an entrance, and in many places entirely supplanted the former. Unfortunately our sources of information do not furnish us the means of separating the Greek period proper from the Roman, the best are afforded by coins, and these for the most part belong to the Roman. On the whole however the picture, which we obtain, holds good for the pre-Roman period also, nor are we entirely without direct notices of this age.

On the coins of Raphia of the times of the empire are seen especially Apollo and Artemis according to the purely Greek conception; upon those of Anthedon, on the contrary, the tutelary goddess of the city is conceived of as Astarte.

Of the worship at Gaza in the times of the Roman Empire complete information is given in the life of Porphyry, Bishop of Gaza, by Marcus Diaconus. According to this, there were in Gaza in the time of Porphyry (the end of the fourth century after Christ) eight δημόσιοι ναοί, viz. of Helios, Aphrodite, Apollo, Persephone (Kore), Hecate, Heroon, a temple of Tyche, and one of Marnas. From this it appears that the purely Greek worship was the prevailing one, and this is confirmed in general by the coins, upon which other Grecian deities also appear. A temple of Apollo in Gaza is already mentioned at the time of the destruction of the city by Alexander Jannaeus (Antt. xiii. 13. 3). In the Roman period only the chief deity of the city, Marnas, was, as his name (מר = Lord) implies, originally a Shemitic deity, who was however more or less disguised in a Greek garment.

A mixtur of native and Greek worship is also found at Ascalon. A chief worship here was that of Ἀφροδίτη οὐρανίη, i.c. of Astarte as Queen of Heaven. She is mentioned even by Herodotus as the deity of Ascalon, and is still represented on coins of the imperial epoch chiefly as the tutelary goddess of the town. With her is connected, nay probably at first identical, the Atargatis or Derceto, which was worshipped at Ascalon under a peculiar form (that of a woman with a fish's tail). Her Semitic name (עתרעתה, compounded of עתר = Astarte, and עתה) already points out that she is "merely the Syrian form of Astarte blended with another deity" (Baudissin). From this fish-form it is evident, that "the fertilizing power of water" was especially honoured in her. Asclepius λεοντοῦχος of Ascalon, to whom the Neo-Platonist Proclus composed a hymn, is, as well as these two, to be regarded as an originally Oriental deity. The genuinely Greek deities Zeus, Poseidon, Apollo, Helios, Athene, etc., appear also on the coins of Ascalon. A temple of Apollo in Ascalon is mentioned in pre-Herodian times, the grandfather of Herod having been, it is said, Hierodule there.

In Azotus, the ancient Ashdod, there was in the pre-Maccabaean period a temple of the Philistine Dagon, who was formerly also worshipped at Gaza and Ascalon. At the conquest of Ashdod by Jonathan Maccabaeus, this temple was destroyed, and the heathen worship in general extirpated (1 Macc. 10:84, 11:4). Of its re-establishment at the restoration by Gabinius no particulars are known. In any case Azotus also had in this later period a considerable number of Jewish inhabitants (see § 23. I. Nr. 5).

In the neighbouring towns of Jamnia and Joppa the Jewish element attained the preponderance after the Maccabæan age. Joppa is nevertheless of importance to Hellenism, as the scene of the myth of Perseus and Andromeda; it was here on the rock of Joppa, that Andromeda was exposed to the monster and delivered by Perseus. The myth retained its vitality even during the period of Jewish preponderance. In the year 58 B.C., at the splendid games given by M. Scaurus as aedile, the skeleton of the sea-monster brought to Rome from Joppa by Scaurus was exhibited. The permanence of the myth in this locality is testified by Strabo, Mela, Pliny,

Josephus, Pausanias, nay even by Jerome. The Hellenistic legend, according to which Joppa is said to have been founded by Cepheus, the father of Andromeda, also points to it. Pliny even speaks of a worship of the Ceto there, and Mela of altars with the name of Cepheus and his brother Phineus as existing at Joppa. After Joppa was destroyed as a Jewish town in the war of Vespasian, the heathen worship regained the ascendancy there.

In Caesarea, which was first raised to a considerable city by Herod the Great, we meet first of all with that worship of Augustus and of Rome, which characterized the Roman period. Provinces, towns and princes then vied with each other in the practice of this cult, which was indeed prudently declined by Augustus in Rome, but looked upon with approval and promoted in the provinces. It was self-evident that Herod also could not remain behind in this matter. If a general remark of Josephus is to be taken literally, he "founded Caesarea (Καισαρεῖα, i.e. temples of Cæsar) in many towns." Such are specially mentioned in Samaria, Panias (see below) and in Caesarea. The magnificent temple here lay upon a hill opposite the entrance of the harbour. Within it stood two large statues, one of Augustus after the model of the Olympic Zeus, and one of Rome after that of Hera of Argos, for Augustus only permitted his worship in combination with that of Rome. With respect to the other worships of Caesarea, the coins show a motley variety. In saying this we must certainly take into consideration, that these belong for the most part to the second and third centuries, which is of importance in the case of Caesarea, because after the time of Vespasian the Roman element, in opposition to the Greek, received a considerable reinforcement in the Roman colony introduced into Caesarea by that emperor. Hence it is to be ascribed to the influence of the Roman element, that the Egyptian Serapis, who was, as is well known, highly honoured in Rome, occurs so very frequently. In general, however, we may transpose to an earlier period also the deities mentioned on the coins. We here find again Zeus, Poseidon, Apollo, Herakles, Dionysos, Athene, Nike, and of female deities chiefly Astarte, according to the view of her prevailing in Palestine.

The coins of Dora, which are assignable to a period subsequent to Caligula, have most frequently the image of Zeus with the laurel. In a narrative of Apion, which is indeed a silly fiction, Apollo is designated the deus Dorensium. His worship, which was common in all these towns (comp. Raphia, Gaza, Ascalon, Caesarea), is to be traced to Seleucid influence. For Apollo was the ancestral God of the Seleucids, as Dionysos was that of the Ptolemies.

The ancient Ptolemais (Akko) was in the age of the Seleucids and Ptolemies one of the most flourishing of heathen cities (see § 23. I. Nr. 11). Hence we may here assume, even without more special information, an early penetration of the Greek worship. Upon the autonomie coins of the town, belonging probably to the last decades before Christ (soon after Caesar), is found. almost universally the image of Zeus. In the time of Claudius, Ptolemais became a Roman colony. Upon the very numerous subsequent coins is found chiefly Tyche (Fortuna); likewise Artemis, Pluto and Persephone, Perseus with Medusa, the Egyptian Serapis and the Phrygian Cybele. The Mishna gives an account of a meeting of the famous scribe Gamaliel II. with a heathen philosopher in the bath of Aphrodite.

Beside the towns on the coast, it was chiefly the districts in the east of Palestine which were the earliest and the most completely Hellenized. It is probable that Alexander the Great and the Diadochoi here founded a number of Greek towns, or Hellenized towns already existing. Hence arose in early times a series of centres of Greek culture in these parts. Their prosperity was interrupted for only a short time by the chaotic work of destruction of Alexander Jannaeus. For Pompey already made an independent development again possible to them by separating them from the Jewish realm and combining them probably under the name of Decapolis into a certain

sort of unity.

Damascus is reckoned by Pliny and Ptolemy as the chief among these cities of Decapolis. It was an important arsenal even in the time of Alexander the Great. Its Hellenistic character at that period is testified to by coins of Alexander, which were minted there (see § 23. I. Nr. 12). From that time onward it became increasingly a Hellenistic city. At the partition of the great empire of the Seleucids into several portions towards the end of the second century before Christ, it even became for a while the capital of one of these smaller kingdoms. As was consequently to be expected, the autonomic and mostly dated coins of Damascus reaching to the commencement of the Roman Empire, present us with the purely Greek deities: Artemis, Athene, Nike, Tyche, Helios, Dionysos. Upon imperial coins proper the emblems and images of stated divinities are, comparatively speaking, but seldom found. Silenus, the honoured companion of Dionysus and with him Dionysos himself here occur the most frequently; especially in the third century after Christ. The Hellenistic legend, which connects him with the foundation of Damascus, also points to the worship of this god. Perhaps his worship both here and in other cities of Eastern Palestine is to be traced to Arabian influence. For the principal deity of the Arabians was conceived of by the Greeks as Dionysos. Upon the Greek inscriptions, which have been preserved in Damascus and its neighbourhood, Zeus is more frequently mentioned.

In many of the towns of Decapolis, especially in Kanatha, Gerasa, and Philadelphia, the existing magnificent ruins of temples of the Roman period still bear witness to the former splendour of the Hellenistic worship in these towns. Of the special worships of the several towns, we have for the most part but deficient information. In Scythopolis, Dionysos must have been specially honoured. For the town was also called Nysa, and this is the mythological name of the place, in which Dionysos was brought up by the nymphs. The name Scythopolis was also referred mythologically to Dionysos (see § 23. I. Nr. 19). On the coins of Gadara Zeus is most frequently met with, also Herakles, Astarte and other individual deities. Artemis is depicted on the coins of Gerasa as the Τύχη Γεράσων. In Philadelphia Herakles appears to have been the principal divinity, Τύχη Φιλαδελφέων, other individual gods also occurring. The coins of the other cities of Decapolis are not numerous, and offer but insufficient material.

Apart from the coast towns and the cities of Decapolis, there are only two other cities in which especially Hellenism gained an early footing, viz. Samaria and Panias. Alexander the Great is said to have settled colonists in Samaria. In any case it was an important Hellenistic military post in the times of the Diadochoi (see § 23. I. Nr. 24). The town was indeed razed to the ground by John Hyrcanus, but the Hellenist rites must certainly have been re-established at its restoration by Gabinius, and have attained still greater ascendancy at the enlargement of the town by Herod the Great, who also here erected a magnificent temple to Augustus. On the other worships some further information is furnished by coins attributable to times subsequent to Nero. In Panias, the subsequent Caesarea Philippi, the Greek Fan must have been worshipped since the commencement of Hellenic times in the grotto there; for the locality is in the days of Antiochus the Great already mentioned by the name of τὸ Πάνειον (see § 23. I. Nr. 29). The continuance of his worship in later times is also abundantly testified by coins and inscriptions. Herod the Great built here as well as in Caesarea Stratonis and Samaria a temple of Augustus. Of other deities Zeus is most frequently found upon the coins, some appear singly; the image of Pan is, however, by far the most prevalent.

Subsequently to the second century after Christ, Hellenic worship may be proved to have existed in other towns of Palestine also, as Sepphoris, Tiberias, etc. It may however be

assumed with tolerable certainty, that it found no favour in them before the Vespasian war. For till then the cities in question were chiefly inhabited by Jews, who would hardly have tolerated the public exercise of heathen worship in their midst.

The case was different with the half-heathen districts of Trachonitis, Batanaea, and Auranitis, east of the Lake of Gennesareth. Here too the Hellenistic worships probably first penetrated to a wider extent subsequently to the second century after Christ. But the work of Hellenization. began with the appearance of Herod and his sons, who gained for culture these hitherto half-barbarous places (see above, p, 4). The worship of Hellenic deities was afterwards admitted. The inscriptions, of which a special abundance has been preserved in these regions, testify to its prevalence from the second to the fourth centuries. The same observation must however here be made as with respect to the Philistine towns, viz. that the native Arabian deities were still maintained beside the Greek gods.

Among these Dusares, compared by the Greeks to Dionysos, takes the first place. His worship in Roman times is testified chiefly by the games dedicated to him, the Ἄκτια Δουσάρια in Adraa and Bostra. Several other Arabian gods, the names of some of whom are all that is known to us, are also mentioned upon the inscriptions. The Greek deities have, however, the preponderance during this period. Among them by far the most frequently occurring is Zeus, and next to him Dionysos, Kronos, Herakles. Of female deities the most frequent are Athene and Tyche, then Aphrodite, Nike, Irene. Finally, the religious syncretism of the subsequent imperial period favoured other Oriental, as well as the ancient native deities. Among these the Syrian Sun-god, who is here adored, now under his Semitic name Αὔμου, now under his Greek name Ἥλιος, at another under both together, plays the chief part. His worship so flourished in Constantine's time also, that a considerable temple could even then be erected for it in Auranitis. Nay, the Christian preachers were only able to suppress it, by substituting for him the prophet Ἠλίας. Besides the Syrian Sun-god, the worship of Marnas of Gaza and the Egyptian deities Ammon and Isis, may also be shown to have been practised.

Periodical games were often closely connected with the religious rites. In this department also the predominance of Hellenic customs may be proved by numerous examples. But even here authorities for the Greek period, properly so called, are extremely few. We know, that Alexander the Great celebrated splendid games at Tyre. The πενταετηρικὸς ἀγών held there is incidentally mentioned in the prefatory narrative of the Maccabean rising (2 Macc. 4:18-20). On the same occasion we learn also that Antiochus Epiphanes desired to introduce the Διονύσια into Jerusalem (2 Macc. 6:7). But it is just is the Hellenic towns of Palestine that the celebration of such solemnities during the pre-Eoman period cannot be proved in detail, though from the general character of the age it must evidently be assumed. Not till we come to the Roman period are authorities again abundant. The great importance of public games in imperial times is well known; not a provincial town of any consequence was without them. This was especially the case with those in connection with the cult of the Imperator, the games in honour of the emperor, which were everywhere in vogue, even in the time of Augustus. In Palestine also they were introduced by Herod into Caesarea and Jerusalem. Other games of various kinds also existed beside them. Their prevalence in the chief towns of Palestine in the second century after Christ is proved by an inscription at Aphrodisias in Caria, upon which the council and people of the Aphrodisians record the victories gained by one Aelius Aurelius Menander in several contests. Among the games here enumerated are some also which took place in Palestinian towns. In a similar inscription at Laodicaea in Syria, of the beginning of the third century after Christ, the victor himself transmits to posterity the victories he obtained. Here too many towns of

Palestine are mentioned as the theatres of these victories. Lastly, in an anonymous Descriptio totius orbis of the middle of the 4th century after Christ, are enumerated the kinds of games and contests, for which the most important towns of Syria were then distinguished. From these and other sources the following materials have been compiled.

In Gaza a πανήγυρις Ἀδριανή was celebrated from the time of Hadrian. A παγκράτιον is mentioned as held there in the inscription of Aphrodisias. The pammacarii (= παμμάχοι or παγκρατιασταί) of Gaza were in the fourth century the most famous in Syria. Jerome in his Life of Hilarion mentions the Circensian games there. A ταλαντιαῖος ἀγών is testified for Ascalon in the inscription of Laodicaen. Its wrestlers (athlelue luctatores, were particularly famous. In Caesarea a stone theatre and a large amphitheatre, the latter with a view of the sea, were built by Herod the Great; a στάδιον is mentioned of the time of Pilate; the town must also have had a circus from its commencement, since a ἵππων δρόμος was held (see below) so early as at the dedication by Herod. Even now traces and remains of a theatre are discernible. All the four species of games having thus been from the first provided for, it follows that all four were in fact celebrated at the dedication by Herod the Great. From that time onwards they were repeated every four years in honour of the emperor. These were however of course not the only games held at Caesarea. All the four kinds may also be pointed out singly in later times. 1. The ludi circenses of Caesarea were in the fourth century after Christ as famous as those of Antioch. Laodicaea, Tyre and Berytus. 2. Titus instituted after the termination of the Jewish war gladiatorial contests and fights of wild beasts, in which hundreds of Jewish prisoners were sacrificed. The Emperor Maximinus exhibited at the celebration of his birthday animals brought from India and Ethiopia. 3. Games in the theatre are mentioned in the time of King Agrippa I. The pantomimi of Caesarea were in the fourth century the most famous in Syria. We must understand indeed of pantomimic games also, what Eusebius says of the games of Maximinus. 4. A παγκράτιον is mentioned in the inscription of Aphrodisias, a boxing-match in that of Laodicaea. In Ptolemais a gymnasium was built by Herod the Great.

In Damascus also a gymnasium and theatre were built by Herod the Great (see Josephus as before). The existence of a παγκράτιον there is testified to by the inscription of Aphrodisias, and σεβάσμια (games in honour of the emperor) are mentioned upon the coins since Macrinus. Ruins of two theatres are still standing at Gadara. A ναυμαχία there occurs on the coins of Marcus Aurelius. Kanatha has besides ruins of its temple those of a small theatre, hewn out in the rock and designated on an inscription as θεατροειδὲς ᾠδεῖον. In Scythopolis traces of a hippodrome are found, and ruins of a theatre are still standing. A παγκράτιον is mentioned in the inscription of Aphrodisias, and a ταλαντιαῖος ἀγών in that of Laodicaea. Among the magnificent ruins of Gerasa are found those of two theatres and traces of a Naumachia (an amphitheatre erected for battles of ships). Philadelphia too possesses the ruins of a theatre and of an Odeum (a small roofed theatre), and a παγκράτιον is mentioned in the inscription of Aphrodisias. In Caesarea Panias “various spectacles” (παντοίας θεωρίας), especially gladiatorial contests and wild beast fights, in which Jewish prisoners were used, were given by Titus after the termination of the Jewish war. A παγκράτιον held there is mentioned in the inscription of Aphrodisias. On games in the Jewish towns (Jerusalem, Jericho, Tarichea, Tiberias), see the next section.

Besides the religious rites and games, there is finally a third point which shows how deeply Hellenism had penetrated in many of these towns, viz. that they produced men, who gained a name in Greek literature. Among the coast towns Ascalon is especially prominent in this respect. In Stephanus of Byzantium (s.v. Ἀσκάλων) are enumerated four Stoic philosophers:

Antiochus, Sosus, Antibius, Eubius, who were natives of Ascalon. Of these only Antiochus is elsewhere known. He was a contemporary of Lucullus and a teacher of Cicero, and therefore belongs to the first century before Christ. His system is moreover not exactly stoic but eclectic. As grammarians of Ascalon, Ptolemaeus and Dorotheas, as historians Apollonius and Artemidorus are named by Steph. Byz. The two latter are unknown. Dorotheas is elsewhere quoted, but his date cannot be decided. Next to the philosopher Antiochus, the grammarian Ptolemaeus is best known. If he was, as stated by Stephen, Ἀριστάρχου γνώριμος, he would belong to the second century before Christ. He is probably however of a considerably later date (about the beginning of the Christian era). Among the towns of Decapolis Gadara and Gerasa are especially to be mentioned as the birthplaces of distinguished men. Of Gadara was the Epicurean Philodemus, the contemporary of Cicero, numerous fragments of whose writings have become known through the rolls discovered in Herculaneum; also the epigrammatic poet Meleager and the cynic Menippus, both probably belonging to the first century before Christ. The Greek anthology contains more than a hundred epigrams of Meleager, nay he was himself the founder of this collection. Lastly the rhetorician Theodorus, the tutor of the Emperor Tiberius, was also a Gadarene. All the four are already mentioned in combination by Strabo. Of Gerasa were, according to Steph. Byz. (s.v. Γέρασα): Ariston (ῥήτωρ ἀστεῖος), Kerykos (σοφιστής) and Plato (νομικὸς ῥήτωρ), all three not otherwise known.

2. Hellenism in the Jewish Region

In the Jewish region proper Hellenism was in its religious aspect triumphantly repulsed by the rising of the Maccabees; it was not till after the overthrow of Jewish nationality in the wars of Vespasian and Hadrian, that an entrance for heathen rites was forcibly obtained by the Romans. In saying this however we do not assert, that the Jewish people of those early times remained altogether unaffected by Hellenism. For the latter was a civilising power, which extended itself to every department of life. It fashioned in a peculiar manner the organization of the state, legislation, the administration of justice, public arrangements, art and science, trade and industry, and the customs of daily life down to fashion and ornaments; and thus impressed upon every department of life, wherever its influence reached, the stamp of the Greek mind. It is true that Hellenistic is not identical with Hellenic culture. The importance of the former on the contrary lay in the fact, that by its reception of the available elements of all foreign cultures within its reach, it became a world-culture. But this very world-culture became in its turn a peculiar whole, in which the preponderant Greek element was the ruling keynote. Into the stream of this Hellenistic culture the Jewish people was also drawn; slowly indeed and with reluctance, but yet irresistibly, for though religious zeal was able to banish heathen worship and all connected therewith from Israel, it could not for any length of time restrain the tide of Hellenistic culture in other departments of life. Its several stages cannot indeed be any longer traced. But when we reflect that the small Jewish country was enclosed on almost every side by Hellenistic regions, with which it was compelled, even for the sake of trade, to hold continual intercourse, and when we remember, that even the rising of the Maccabees was in the main directed not against Hellenism in general, but only against the heathen religion, that the later Asmonaeans bore in every respect a Hellenistic stamp – employed foreign mercenaries, minted foreign coins, took Greek names, etc., and that some of them, e.g. Aristobulus I., were direct favourers of Hellenism, – when all this is considered, it may safely be assumed, that Hellenism had, notwithstanding the rising of the Maccabees, gained access in no inconsiderable measure into Palestine even before the commencement of the Roman period. Its further diffusion was not to any considerable amount promoted by the rule of the Romans and Herodians, who added to it that Latin element, which makes itself so very apparent especially after the first century of the

Christian era. For this later age (the first half of the second century after Christ), the Mishna affords us copious material, plainly showing the influence of Hellenism upon every sphere of life. A multitude of Greek and also of Latin words in the Hebrew of the Mishna shows, how it was just Hellenistic culture which had gained an ascendancy in Palestine also. A series of examples may serve to substantiate this in detail also.

It is chiefly of course in the department of civil government and military matters that, together with foreign arrangements, we find foreign terms also current. A provincial governor is called הגמין (ἡγεμών), a province הגמוניא (ἡγεμονία), the municipal authorities of a town ארכי (ἀρχή). For soldiers in general the Latin לגיונות (legiones) is used; an army is called אסטרטיא (στρατία), war פולמום(πόλεμος), pay אפסניא (ὀψώνιον), a helmet קסדא (cassida), a shield תרים (θυρεός). In matters of jurisprudence, Jewish traditions were in general strictly adhered to. The law, given to His people by God through Moses, extended not only to sacred transactions, but also to matters of civil law and the organization of the administration of justice. Here too then the Old Testament was in essential points the standard. We nevertheless meet with Greek terms and arrangements in some particulars in these departments also. The court of justice is indeed generally called בית דין, but sometimes also סנהדרין (συνέδριον), the assessors פרהדרין(πάρεδροι), the accuser קטיגור (κατήγορος), the advocate פרקליט (παράκλητος), a deposit אפותיקי (ὑποθήκη), a testament דיתיקי(διαθήκη), a guardian or steward אפיטרופוס (ἐπίτροπος). Nay even for a specifically Jewish legal institution, introduced in the time of Hillel, viz. the declaration before a court of justice, that the right to call in a given loan at any time was reserved notwithstanding the Sabbatic year, the Greek expression פרוזבול (προσβολή) was used.

Of other public institutions, games again come first into notice. Pharisaic Judaism has always repudiated the heathen kind of games. Philo indeed says in his work, Quod omnis probus liber, that he was once present at an ἀγὼν παγκρατιαστῶν, and another time at the performance of a tragedy of Euripides. But what the cultured Alexandrian allowed himself was no standard for the strict legal Palestinians. Even in the period of the Maccabees the building of a gymnasium in Jerusalem and the visiting of the same on the part of the Jews is mentioned as a chief abomination of the prevailing Hellenism (1 Macc. 1:14, 15; 2 Macc. 4:9–17). And this continued to be the standpoint of legal Judaism. Even Josephus designates the theatre and amphitheatre as “foreign to Jewish customs.” Judaism however was unable, in spite of this theoretic repudiation, to prevent the pageantry of heathen games from developing in the midst of the Holy Land during and after the Herodian period; and we cannot assume that the mass of the Jewish population denied themselves from visiting them. A theatre and amphitheatre were built in Jerusalem by Herod, who instituted there as well as at Caesarea games every four years in honour of the emperor. The games imply the existence also of a stadium and hippodrome, the latter indeed is once expressly mentioned. In Jericho where Herod seems to have frequently resided were a theatre, amphitheatre and hippodrome. In Tiberias a stadium is incidentally mentioned. Even so unimportant a town as Tarichea had a hippodrome.

The public baths and public inns were further arrangements showing the influence of Hellenism. The bath indeed was designated by a purely Hebrew expression מֶרְחָץ. But the name for the director of the bath, בַּלָּן (βαλανεύς), points to its Greek origin. In the case of the public inns their Greek name, פונדקי (πανδοκεῖον or πανδοχεῖον), already showed them to be a product of the Hellenistic period.

Architecture in general and especially in public buildings must be regarded as emphatically a Hellenizing element. In the Hellenistic towns in the neighbourhood of Palestine this is of course

self-evident. They all had their ναούς, θέατρα, γυμνάσια, ἐξέδρας, στοάς, ἀγοράς, ὑδάτων εἰσαγωγάς, βαλανεῖα, κρήνας and περίστυλα in Greek fashion. But also in Palestine proper, the prevalence of the Greek style – especially since the time of Herod – may be safely assumed. When Herod built himself a splendid palace, there can be no doubt that he adopted for it the Graeco-Roman style. The same remark applies also to the other contemporary palaces and monuments of Jerusalem. In any case not only were Stadia known in Palestine, – as must be assumed from what has been remarked about the games, – but also Basilica, porticoes, porches, Tribunes, banqueting-halls and other buildings after the Graeco-Roman manner. Even in the temple at Jerusalem the Grecian style of architecture was copiously adopted. It is true that in the temple proper (the ναός) Herod could not venture to forsake the old traditional forms. But in the building of the inner fore-court we see the influence of Greek models. Its gates had fore-courts (ἐξέδραι) within, between which colonnades (στοαί) ran along the inside of the walls. The gate at the eastern side of the outer court had folding doors of Corinthian brass, which were more costly than those covered with gold and silver. Quite in the Grecian style were the colonnades (στοαί), which surrounded the outer court on all four sides. Most of them were double (διπλαῖ), but the most magnificent were those found on the south side. They were in the form of a basilikon (βασίλειος στοά); four rows of large Corinthian columns, together 162 in number, formed a three-aisled hall, the middle aisle of which was broader by a half than the two side aisles and as high again. All this does not indeed prove, that the Grecian was the prevailing style for ordinary private houses, nor may this be assumed. Occasionally we see also that Phoenician and Egyptian architecture was also found in Palestine.

Plastic art could, by reason of the Jewish repudiation of all images of men and beasts, find no entrance into Palestine; and it was only in isolated cases, as e.g. when Herod the Great had a golden eagle brought into the temple, or Herod Antipas placed images of animals on his palace at Tiberias, that the Herodians allowed themselves to defy Jewish views, Grecian music was undoubtedly represented at the feasts at Jerusalem and elsewhere. The musical instruments of the Greeks, κίθαρις, ψαλτήριον and συμφωνία, are, as is well known, mentioned in the Book of Daniel and also in the Mishna. Of games of amusement dice, קוביא (κυβεία), were, as the name shows, introduced into Palestine by the Greeks. They also were repudiated by the stricter Jews. In the matter of writing the influence of the Greek and Roman periods is shown in the words used for pen, קלמוס, (κάλαμος), and writer, לבלר(librarius).

But it was in the department of trade, of industry, and all connected therewith, and in that of the necessaries of daily life, that the influence of Hellenism made itself the most forcibly noticeable. By their ancient commerce with the Phoenicians the coast lands of the Mediterranean had already entered into active intercourse with each other. While, however, in ancient times the Phoenicians had the preponderance as givers, the Orientals now more occupied the position of receivers. At least it was the Graeco-Roman element which was now the intermediary and influential factor in the general commerce of the world. This is plainly shown in the trade and commerce of Judaeo-Palestine. Already are the technical designations of the commercial class partly Greek. A corn-dealer is called סיטון (σιτώνης), a sole dealer, מנפול (μονοπώλης), a retail dealer, פלטר (πρατήρ), a merchant's account-book is called פנקס (πίναξ). The whole coinage system of Palestine was partly the Phoenician-Hellenistic, partly the entirely Greek or Roman. Reckonings were made in Palestine in the time of the Maccabees by drachmas and talents. During the period of independence the Asmonean princes certainly issued money of their own, coined according to a native (Phoenician) standard, and with Hebrew inscriptions. But the later Asmoneans already added Greek inscriptions also. Of the Herodians only coins of Roman values with Greek inscriptions are known. In the period of Roman supremacy the Roman

system of coins was fully carried out, nay even the Roman names of coins were then more current than the Hebrew and Greek ones, which were used simultaneously. This is seen by the following comparison of the material afforded by the Mishna and the New Testament. (1) The Palestinian gold coin is the Roman aureus of 25 denarii, often mentioned in the Mishna under the name of the "gold denarius" (2) .(דינר זהב) The current silver coin was the denarius (δηνάριον), which is the most frequently named of all coins in the New Testament (Matt. 18:28, 20:2 sqq., 22:19; Mark 6:37, 12:15, 14:5; Luke 7:41, 10:35, 20:24; John 6:7, 12:5; Rev. 6:6). That this Latin designation is familiar to the Mishna is very evident, for it is here almost more frequently mentioned by the expression דינר than by its Semitic equivalent זוז. The denarius being esteemed equal in value to an Attic drachma, calculations were still made by drachmas. Still this mode of computation was no longer frequent. (3) Of copper coins, the two as piece, or dupondius (Hebr. פונדיון), is chiefly mentioned. Such a dupondius is also meant in the saying of Christ, Luke 12:6, where the Vulgate rightly translates ἀσσαρίων δύο by dipondio. (4) The most common copper coin was the as, Greek ἀσσάριον (Matt. 10:29; Luke 12:6), Hebr. אסר, sometimes expressly designated as the Italian as, אסר איטלקי. It amounted originally to one tenth, but after the second Punic war (B.C. 217), to only one-sixteenth of a denarius. (5) The smallest copper coin was the פְּרוּטָה, amounting to only the eighth of an as. It was unknown to the Roman system of coinage, its name too is Semitic. The λεπτόν however which occurs in the New Testament (Mark 12:42; Luke 12:59, 21:2), and is, according to Mark 12:42, the half of a quadrans, is identical with it. Coins of this size are in fact found in the period of the later Asmoneans and single ones in the Herodian-Romish period. It is however striking, that both in the Mishna and the New Testament reckonings are made by this smallest portion of the as, and not by the semis (half as) and quadrans (quarter as), while the latter were then coined in Palestine also, and indeed more frequently than the λεπτόν. The mode of reckoning seems, according to the latter, to have come down from pre-Roman times, but to have remained in use even after the introduction of the Roman valuation. The coins issued in the Phoenician towns, especially in Tyre, which were in circulation in Palestine even when no more were made according to this standard, differed in value from the Roman coins.

That which applies to money, the medium of commerce, applies also to its objects. Here too we everywhere come upon the track of Greek and Roman names and matters. At the same time we must not overlook the fact, that Palestine with her abundance of natural products made on her part large contributions to the commerce of the world; the produce of her soil and her industrial commodities went into all lands and were some of them world-famed. But whether the commodities were produced in the land or introduced from abroad, they equally bore in large proportion the impress of the prevalent Hellenistic culture; the produce of the interior was regulated by its requirements, while just the objects which were the fashion in all the world were those which were imported into Palestine.

A series of examples from the three departments of (1) provisions (2), clothing and (3) furniture may serve as a further illustration. Of foreign provisions, e.g., there were known in Palestine Babylonian sauce (כּוּתַח), Median beer (שֵׁכָר), Edomite vinegar (חוֹמֶץ) and Egyptian zythos (זִיתוֹס). Also other Egyptian products, viz. fish, mustard, pumpkins, beans, lentils. Likewise Cilician groats, Bithynian cheese, Greek pumpkins, Greek and Roman hyssop, and Spanish kolias. From abroad came also, as their foreign names show, e.g. asparagus, lupines and Persian nuts. Very widely diffused in Palestine was the custom of salting fish or pickling them in brine, as the name of the town Ταριχέαι on the Lake of Gennesareth and the frequent mention of brine (muries) in the Mishna prove. The foreign origin of this custom also is evident from its foreign name.

Of materials for dress and garments of foreign origin the following are mentioned: Pelusian and Indian linen and cotton fabrics, Cilician haircloth, the sagum (סגום), the dalmatica (דלמטיקיון), the paragaudion (פרגוד), the stola (אצטלית), the handkerchief (סודרין, σουδάριον), the felt hat (פליון, πιλίον), the felt socks (אמפליא, ἐμπίλια), the sandals (סנדל), of which the Laodicean (סנדלדיקי) are mentioned as a special kind. A series too of technical expressions in the department of manufactured articles testifies to the influence of Greek models. The spun thread is called נימא (νῆμα), a certain arrangement of the loom קירוס (καῖρος), the tanner בורסי (βυρσεύς). Of raw materials, hemp (e.g. קנבוס, κάνναβος, κάνναβις) was first introduced into Palestine by the Greeks.

Domestic utensils of foreign, especially of Greek and Roman origin, are everywhere plentiful. Of Egyptian utensils, a basket, a ladder, and a rope are mentioned, also a Tyrian ladder, Sidonian dishes or bowls. Of Greek and Roman utensils we find the bench (ספסל, subsellium), the armchair (קתדרא, καθέδρα), the curtain (וילון, velum), the mirror (אספקלריא, specularia), the Corinthian candlestick. For eating and drinking, e.g. the plate (אסקוטלא, scutella), the bowl (פילי, φιάλη), the table-cloth (מפה, mappa). For cases of all kinds the most common designation is תיק, θήκη. Special kinds of wooden vessels are the cask or box (קופה, cupa), the wine-barrel (פיטם, πίθος), the chest (גלוסקמא, γλωσσόκομον), the small chest (קמטרא, κάμπτρα), the casket (קפסא, capsa), the sack (מרצוף, μαρσύπιον).

The stock of Greek and Latin words in the Mishna is far from being exhausted by the specimens quoted. They suffice however to give a vivid impression of the full adoption of Western manners and customs even in Palestine in the second century after Christ. The influence of the Greek language reached still farther. For even in cases where the introduction of Western productions and notions is not treated of, we meet with the use of Greek words in the Mishna. The air is called אויר (ἀήρ), the form טופס (τύπος), the sample or pattern דוגמא (δεῖγμα), an ignorant, a non-professional, or a private individual הדיוט (ἰδιώτης), a dwarf ננס (νάννος), a robber לסטים (λῃστής). For the notion “weak” or “ill” the Greek expression אסטנים (ἀσθενής) for steep קטפדס (καταφερής) is used. The employment also of Greek and Latin proper names is pretty frequent even among the lower classes and the Pharisaic scribes. Not only were the aristocratic high priests, who were on friendly terms with the Greeks, called Jason and Menelaus (in the Maccabean period), Boethus and Theophilus (in the Herodian period), not only did the Asmonean and Herodian princes bear the names of Alexander, Aristobulus, Antigonus, Herod, Archelaus, Philip, Antipas, Agrippa, but among men of the common people also, as the apostles of Christ, names such as Andrew and Philip appear. And in the circles of the Rabbinical scribes we find an Antigonus of Socho, a R. Dosthai (= Dositheus), a R. Dosaben Archinos (for such and not Harkinas was the Greek name of his father), R. Chananiah ben Antigonus, R. Tarphon (= Tryphon), R. Papias, Symmachus. Latin names also were early naturalized. The John Mark mentioned in the New Testament was, according to Acts 12:12, a Palestinian; so too was Joseph Barsabas, whose surname was Justus (Acts 1:23). Josephus mentions besides the well-known Justus of Tiberius, also e.g. a Niger of Peræa.

But all that has been said does not prove that the Greek language also was familiar to the common people of Palestine. However large the number of Greek words which had penetrated into the Hebrew and Aramaic, an acquaintance with Greek by the mass of the people is not thereby proved. In fact, it must be assumed, that the lower classes in Palestine possessed either no knowledge, or only an insufficient one of Greek. When the Apostle Paul wanted to speak to the people in Jerusalem, he made use of the Hebrew (Aramaic?) tongue (Acts 21:40, 22:2). When Titus during the siege of Jerusalem repeatedly summoned the besieged to

surrender, this was always done in Aramaic, whether Titus commissioned Josephus to speak, or spoke in his own name by the help of an interpreter. Thus the incidental knowledge of Greek on the part of the people was in any case by no means an adequate one. On the other hand it is probable, that a slight acquaintance with Greek was pretty widely diffused, and that the more educated classes used it without difficulty. Hellenistic districts not only surrounded Palestine on almost every side, but also pushed far into the interior (Samaria, Scythopolis). Constant contact with them was inevitable. And it is not conceivable, that this should continue without the diffusion of a certain amount of knowledge of the Greek language in Palestine also. To this must be added, that the country, both before and after the Asmonean period, was under rulers, whose education was a Greek one: first under the Ptolemies and Seleucidæ, then under the Herodians and Romans; nay some even of the Asmoneans promoted Greek civilisation. The foreign rulers too brought with them into the country a certain amount of elements moulded by Greek training. We know of Herod especially, that he surrounded himself with Greek literati (see § 15). There were foreign troops in the land; Herod had even Thracian, German and Gallic mercenaries. The games given by Herod at Jerusalem brought not only foreign artists, but spectators from abroad into the holy city. But the most numerous concourse of strangers took place at the great annual Jewish festivals. The thousands of Jews, who came on these occasions from all parts of the world to Jerusalem, were for the most part both in language and education Hellenists. And not only Greek Jews, but actual Greeks, i.e. proselytes, came at the Jewish feasts to Jerusalem to sacrifice and worship in the temple (comp. John 12:20 sqq.). We must conceive of the number of such proselytes, who made annual pilgrimages to Jerusalem, as something considerable. Again many Jews, who had received a Greek education abroad, took up their permanent abode at Jerusalem, and even formed there a synagogue of their own. Hence we find at Jerusalem in the times of the apostles a synagogue of the Libertines, Cyrenians, Alexandrians, Cilicians, and Asiatics (Acts 6:9; comp. 9:20), in which it is uncertain whether one congregation or five are spoken of. In Galilee the larger towns had probably a fraction of Greek inhabitants. We know this for certain of Tiberias, not to speak of the mainly non-Jewish Caesarea Philippi. Together with this strong penetration of the interior of Palestine by Greek elements, there must have been not infrequently the necessary acquaintance with the Greek tongue. And single traces actually point to this. For while the Asmoneans had their coins stamped with both Greek and Hebrew inscriptions, the Herodians and Romans coined even the money intended for the Jewish region proper with merely Greek inscriptions; and it is known from the gospel history that the (undoubtedly Greek) inscription upon the coins of Caesar could be read without difficulty at Jerusalem (Matt. 20:20 sq.; Mark 12:16; Luke 20:24). The statement of the Mishna, that even in the temple certain vessels were marked with Greek letters, is certainly supported there by only one authority (R. Ismael), while according to the prevailing tradition the letters were Hebrew. When further it is determined in the Mishna that the writing of divorcement might be in the Greek language also, and that the Holy Scriptures might be used in the Greek translation, both these permissions may refer to the Jewish Dispersion beyond Palestine. The notice on the contrary, that at the time of the war of Titus (or more correctly Quietus) it was forbidden to any one to have his son instructed in Greek, presupposes, that hitherto that which was now prohibited had taken place in the sphere of Rabbinic Judaism. Nor can the circumstance be otherwise explained, than by a certain familiarity with Greek, that in the Mishna the names of Greek letters are often used for the explanation of certain figures, e.g. כִּי for the explananation of the figure X, or גַּמָּא for the explanation of the figure Γ.

From the commencement of the Roman supremacy the Latin was added to the Greek language and culture. But Latin, as in all the eastern provinces, so also in Palestine, attained no wide diffusion till the later imperial period. In the first centuries the Roman officials in their intercourse

with provincials exclusively employed the Greek language. It was only in official documents, inscriptions, and the like, that Latin was, from the time of Caesar, also adopted. Thus e.g. Caesar commanded the Sidonians to set up in Sidon upon a brazen tablet his decree for the appointment of the Jewish high priest Hyrcanus II. in the Greek and Roman languages (Antt. xiv. 10. 2). Another official decree of the same period was in like manner to be set up in the Roman and Greek tongues in the temples of Sidon, Tyre, and Ascalon (Antt. xiv. 10. 3). Mark Antony commanded the Tyrians to set up in a public place a decree issued by him in Greek and Latin (Antt. xiv. 12. 5). In the temple at Jerusalem there were placed at intervals on the enclosure (δρύφακτος), beyond which a nearer approach to the sanctuary was forbidden to Gentiles, tablets (στῆλαι) with inscriptions, which announced this prohibition partly in the Greek and partly in the Latin language (Bell. Jud. v. 5. 2, vi. 2. 4). The superscription also over the cross of Christ was written in Hebrew, Greek, and Latin (John 19:20). Beyond such official use Latin had not advanced in Palestine, in the early times of the Roman supremacy.

3. Position of Judaism with Respect to Heathenism

The more vigorously and perseveringly heathenism continued to penetrate into Palestine, the more energetically did legal Judaism feel called upon to oppose it. On the whole indeed the advance of heathen culture could not, as has been shown, be prevented. But for that very reason the lines of defence against all illegality were only the more strictly and carefully drawn by the vigilance of the scribes. Extreme vigilance in this direction was indeed a vital question for Judaism. For, if it was not to succumb in the struggle for existence, in which it was engaged, it must defend itself with the utmost energy against its adversary. But the anxiety with which the struggle was carried on infinitely increased the danger which was to be guarded against, and which was in fact victoriously encountered. For the greater the subtilty with which casuistry determined the cases, which were to be regarded as a direct or indirect pollution through heathen customs, the more frequent was the danger of incurring it. Hence the course of events placed the pious Israelite in an all but unendurable position. He was in almost daily contact with heathenism, whether with persons or with goods and matters which sought and found entrance into Palestine in the way of trade and commerce. And the zeal of the scribes was continually increasing the number of snares, by which an Israelite who was a strict adherent to the law might incur uncleanness through heathen practices.

Two points especially were not to be lost sight of in guarding against heathen practices — (1) heathen idolatry and (2) heathen non-observance of the Levitical law of uncleanness. With respect to both the Pharisaism of the scribes proceeded with extreme minuteness. (1) For the sake of avoiding even an only apparent approximation to idolatry, the Mosaic prohibition of images (Ex. 20:4 sq.; Deut. 4:16 sq., 27:15) was applied with the most relentless consistency. To suffer anything rather than the setting up of the statue of Caligula in the temple was indeed quite right. But pictorial representations in general, such as the trophies in the theatre in the time of Herod, or the eagle at the gate of the temple, were also repudiated. When Pilate marched his troops into Jerusalem with the eagles of the legions, a regular tumult took place. Vitellius took his troops by an indirect course from Antioch to Petra for the sole reason of not polluting the sacred soil of Judah by the Roman eagles. And at the outbreak of the war, the first thing to be done in Tiberias was to destroy the palace of Antipas, because it was adorned with images of animals. It seems indeed, that coins with the image of the emperor were circulated in Judaea (Matt. 22:20, and parallel passages); but the coins issued there were not, from considerate forbearance, so stamped. When the famous scribe Gamaliel II. justified his visit to the baths of Aphrodite at Akko (Ptolemais) by saying, that the image of Aphrodite was there

because of the baths, and not the baths because of the image of Aphrodite, this was a kind of consideration by no means generally recognised as valid in the sphere of legalistic Judaism. To obviate the danger of a direct or indirect encouragement of idolatry, or any kind of contact therewith, an Israelite was forbidden to transact business with Gentiles, to lend to, or borrow anything from them, to make them payments, or receive payments from them during the three days preceding, and, according to R. Ismael, also the three days following any heathen festival, while on the festival itself an Israelite was to hold no kind of intercourse in the town. All objects, which might even possibly be connected with idolatrous worship, were forbidden. Thus heathen wine must not only be made no use of, because it might possibly have been offered as a libation, but it was also forbidden to derive any profit from it. If wood had been taken from an idol grove all use of it was prohibited. If the stove had been heated by it, the stove must be broken to pieces, if it were still new; but if it were old, it must be let to cool. If bread had been baked with it, not only the eating, but every use of it was forbidden. If such bread were mixed with other bread, no use of it was allowed. If a weaver's shuttle were made of such wood, its use was forbidden. If a garment had been made of the stuff woven therewith, all use of the garment was forbidden. If this garment had been mixed among others, and these again among others, the use of all was forbidden.

If all this sufficiently provided for the separation of Judaism from heathenism, it was still further inculcated by the notion, that a Gentile – as a non-observer of the laws of purification – was unclean, and that consequently all intercourse with him was defiling; that further, for the same reason, even the houses of the heathen, nay all objects touched by them, – so far as these were receptive of Levitical uncleanness, – were to be regarded as unclean. When it is said (Acts 10:28), that a Jew might have no intercourse with a heathen (ἀθέμιτόν ἐστιν ἀνδρὶ Ἰουδαίῳ κολλᾶσθαι ἢ προσέρχεσθαι ἀλλοφύλῳ), this must not indeed be misunderstood to the extent of supposing that there was an absolute prohibition of all intercourse, yet it does mean that ceremonial uncleanness was incurred by such intercourse. All Gentile houses were as such unclean. Merely to enter them was to become unclean (John 18:28). All articles belonging to Gentiles and of a kind susceptible of Levitical uncleanness, were unclean, and needed before using some kind of purification. "If any one buys kitchen utensils of a Gentile, he must dip what is to be purified by dipping; boil what is to be boiled and heat in the fire what is to be heated; spits and gridirons are to be made red-hot; knives need only be sharpened and they are clean." Apart from this uncleanness, which so many objects might contract by use on the part of Gentiles, there were lastly many heathen products, which could not be used by Jews, because in their production the Jewish laws, especially those relating to the distinction between clean and unclean, had not been observed. Partly for the former, partly for the latter reason, the most ordinary provisions, if coming from the heathen, were not to be eaten by Jews, who were only allowed to use them by buying and selling. This was especially the case with milk milked by a heathen without an Israelite seeing it, also with the bread and oil of the heathen. Neither could a strictly legal Israelite at any time sit at meat at a Gentile table (Acts 11:3; Gal. 2:12). Hence Israelites travelling in foreign countries were in very evil case, and, if they wanted to be exact in their observance of the law, had to restrict themselves to vegetable raw materials, as e.g. certain priests, friends of Josephus, who having been brought as prisoners to Rome lived there upon nuts and figs.

To all the reasons here stated, which made intercourse with the heathen and their abode in the Holy Land a heavy burden to an Israelite, who was faithful to the law, was added an entirely opposite and doctrinal view, which caused the rule of strangers in the land of Israel to be felt as a glaring contrast between the ideal and reality. For the land was the property of the chosen

people. None but Israelites could be landowners therein. Even the letting of houses and fields to the heathen was, according to the theory of the scribes, forbidden. And what with such views must have been their feelings at finding the heathen really in possession – if not privately yet politically – of the whole land? Under such circumstances we can understand, that the question, whether it were lawful for a faithful Israelite to pay tribute to Caesar at all, would be one of serious consideration (Matt. 22:15-22; Mark 12:13-17; Luke 20:20-26).

Thus circumstances present us with a peculiar double picture: a yielding to the influence of heathen customs together with the erection of the strongest wall of partition against them. So far as the actual purpose of the latter was a defence against heathenism in its religious aspect, its aim was certainly attained. In other respects, however, heathen culture was not restrained by it, but only made a burdensome oppression to Israelites.

CONSTITUTION. SANHEDRIM. HIGH PRIEST

I. THE HELLENISTIC TOWNS

THE LITERATURE

Noris, Annus et epochae Syromacedonum in vetustis urbium Syriae nummis praesertim Mediceis expositae (Florence 1689). I cite from the Leipsic edit. 1696.

Belley, Suppléments aux Dissertations du Cardinal Noris sur les époques des Syro-Macédoniens, in the Mémoires de l'Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres, ancient series, vols. xxvi. xxviii. xxx. xxxii. xxxv. Paris 1759–1770.

Eckhel, Doctrina numorum veterum. Vol. iii. Vindob. 1794.

Mionnet, Description de médailles antiques. Vol. v. Paris 1811. Supplément. Vol. viii. Paris 1837. Recueil des planches. Paris 1808.

De Saulcy, Numismatique de la Terre Sainte, Description des monnaies autonomes et impériales de la Palestine et de l'Arabie Pétrée. Paris 1874.

Droysen, Geschichte des Hellenismus. 2nd ed. 3 parts in 6 half vols. Gotha 1877–1878.

Stark, Gaza und die philistäische Küste. Jena 1852.

Kuhn, Die städtische und bürgerliche Verfassung des römischen Reichs bis auf die Zeiten Justinians. 2 parts. Leipzig 1864–1865.

Kuhn, Ueber die Entstehung der Städte der Alten. Komenverfassung und Synoikismos. Leipzig 1878 (especially pp. 422–434).

Marquardt, Römische Staatsverwaltung. Vol. i. (also under the title of Handb. der röm. Alterthümer von Marquardt u. Mommsen, vol. iv.). 2nd ed. Leipzig 1881.

Pauly's Real-Encyclopädie der classischen Alterthumswissenschaft, unter den betr. Artikeln.

Winer's and Schenkel's Biblische Realwörterbucher, unter den betr. Artikeln.

The geographical works of Reland, Raumer, Robinson, Ritter, Guérin, and others (for the titles see above, § 2).

Menke's Bibelatlas, maps iv. and v.

OF fundamental importance in the political life of Palestine during the Hellenic era was the independent organization of large municipal communities. This was indeed no novelty in Palestine, where from of old the large towns of the Philistine and Phoenician coasts had formed centres of political life. The entrance of Hellenism marks however a turning-point in this respect also. For, on the one hand it essentially transformed the existing communities, while on the

other it founded numerous new ones and made the municipal communities in general the basis of the political organization of the country in a far more thorough manner than before. Wherever Hellenism penetrated – especially on the Philistine coasts and the eastern boundaries of Palestine beyond the Jordan – the country districts were grouped around single large towns as their political centres. Each of such communities formed a comparatively independent whole managing its own internal affairs, and its dependence upon the rulers of Syria consisted only in the recognition of their military supremacy, the payment of taxes, and certain other performances. At the head of such a Hellenistically organized community was a democratic senate of several hundred members, which we may probably conceive of as resembling the Athenian βουλή, i.e. as one changed annually, chosen from the Phylae, or as a committee chosen by lot from the people (Marquardt). It formed the ruling power, not for the town only, but also for all the smaller towns and villages, which belonged to the often extensive district of the town. The entire Philistinian and Phoenician coast was in this way divided into a number of municipal communities, some of which were of considerable importance. We have then briefly to consider as such the Hellenistic towns in the east and north-east of Palestine, the Hellenized towns in the interior of Palestine, such as Samaria and Scythopolis, and the towns founded by Herod and his sons, of which a considerable portion of the population was non-Jewish.

With all their independence these towns of course participated on the whole in the political fate of the rest of Palestine. In the time of the Diadochoi the government changed very frequently. Ptolemy I. three times took possession of Phoenicia and Palestine, and three times had to surrender them. It was not till about 280 B.C. that Ptolemy (II.) Philadelphus succeeded in establishing the rule of the Ptolemies over these countries for a lengthened period. After that date not only Palestine proper, but also the whole of Phoenicia, as far as Eleutherus, south of Aradus, was under their dominion. Their power, however, did not extend beyond Lebanon. Damascus already belonged to the Seleucidae. In the years 219-217 B.C. Antiochus assumed a transitory possession of Palestine, but was obliged to give it up in consequence of the unsuccessful battle at Raphia. After the death of Ptolemy (IV.) Philopator, he however invaded Palestine a second time, and his victory at Panias (198 B.C.) was decisive in favour of the Seleucidae. From this time onward Palestine and the whole Philistinian-Phoenician coast belonged to the Syrian kingdom. The supremacy of the Ptolemies, like that of the Seleucidae, found its expression chiefly in two points: in the appointment of military governors (στρατηγοί) in the regions subject to their sway, and in the imposition of regular taxes. Josephus in his account of Josephus, the farmer of taxes, and his son Hyrcanus (Antt. xii. 4), gives us a very vivid picture of the manner in which the system of taxation was organized in the later period of their rule, a picture which, notwithstanding its fictitious colouring, certainly gives a faithful reflection of the institutions. It shows that the imposts were not collected by the authorities, but leased to great contractors, to whom their collection in the several towns was given up.

Towards the end of the second century before Christ, the kingdom of the Seleucidae increasingly exhibits an image of dissolution. The central authority was so weakened by continual revolutions, that a multitude of independent communities were founded in the border lands of the empire. During this period therefore not only did the Jews obtain and maintain their full freedom, but a number also of the larger towns, which had already in the wars between Syria and Egypt often played a part of their own, declared themselves independent, and as a sign of their independence began a new computation of time. Thus Tyre had an era dating from the year 126 B.C.; Sidon a similar one from the year 111; Ascalon from 104. In other towns individual “Tyrants” would seize upon the sovereignty. Thus we find towards the end of the second, and in the beginning of the first century before Christ, a tyrant, Zeno Kotylas in

Philadelphia, his son Theodorus in Amathus on the Jordan, Zoilus in Straton's Tower and Dora, Demetrius in Gamala. And there is no lack of evidence that the Romans at their entry into Syria found there a number of independent petty princes.

The strengthening of the Jewish power was in those times fatal for the towns in the neighbourhood of Palestine. Even the earlier Maccabees, and subsequently John Hyrcanus, subjected several towns. But it was especially Alexander Jannaeus who made conquests on a large scale. At the end of his rule all the coast towns from Raphia to Carmel, with the sole exception of Ascalon, almost all the towns of the country east of Jordan, and of course those also which were situated in the interior, such as Samaria and Scythopolis, as far north as the Lake of Merom, were subject to the Jews.

The conquest of Syria by Pompey put an end again at a stroke to the independence of all the small towns, which had separated themselves from the empire of the Seleucidae. The only consequence to the autonomic towns was, that they now entered into the same relations of voluntary dependence towards the Romans, in which they had hitherto stood towards the Seleucidae. To those towns however, which had been subjected by the Jews, the Roman invasion had even the character of a deliverance from a hated rule. For Pompey again separated from the Jewish region all those towns which had been subjected to the Jews since the time of the Maccabees and restored to them their freedom. Josephus enumerates as such "liberated" towns, which had of course to acknowledge the Roman supremacy, the following: Gaza, Azotus, Jamnia, Joppa, Straton's Tower, Dora, Samaria, Scythopolis, Hippus, Gadara, Pella, Dium. The list is, however, incomplete. For besides the above-named, others also used the Pompeian era, i.e. the computation since the liberation by Pompey, and many of these towns retained it till far into the imperial period. Those lying in the region east of the Jordan, together with Scythopolis, then united with each other in the "ten cities alliance," the so-called Decapolis. The proconsul Gabinius was another benefactor to many of these towns. In the years 57-55 B.C. he rebuilt the towns of Raphia, Gaza, Anthedon, Azotus, Jamnia, Apollonia, Dora, Samaria and Scythopolis, some of which had been entirely destroyed by the Jews. The Roman civil wars however, with their exhaustion of the provinces and the arbitrary rule of Antony in the East, brought bad times to these towns. He bestowed upon Cleopatra the entire Philistinian and Phoenician coast, from the borders of Egypt to Eleutherus, with the sole exception of Tyre and Sidon. Even when, after the fall of Antony and Cleopatra, whose authority had ceased of itself, a more quiet era had been established by Augustus, many of these towns again changed masters. Augustus bestowed upon Herod all the coast towns from Gaza to Straton's Tower, with the exception of Ascalon, together with the towns of Samaria, Hippus and Gadara in the interior. After the death of Herod these towns again experienced different fates. Gaza, Hippus and Gadara were placed under the immediate government of the Roman legate of Syria (on Anthedon, see below the section respecting it); Azotus and Jamnia with Phasaelis, which was built by Herod, were given to his sister Salome, while Joppa, Straton's Tower and Samaria fell with the rest of Judaea to Archelaus. The towns belonging to Salome came after her death to the Empress Livia. After the death of Livia, they seem to have been transferred to the private possession of her son Tiberius, on which account we find an imperial ἐπίτροπος in his time in Jamnia. The towns bestowed upon Archelaus, together with the rest of his district, came after his deposition under the oversight of a Roman procurator, then in the years 41-44 A.D. to King Agrippa I., and were again after his death under Roman procurators. This frequent change of masters was however of little more consequence to these towns, than that the taxes had to be paid now to one now to another governor. For they had, on the whole, the independent management of their own affairs, even though the supremacy of their different

masters made itself sometimes more and sometimes less noticed. Finally, it was of importance to the development of their communal life that Herod and his sons refounded a great number of towns, so especially Caesarea (= Straton's Tower), Sebaste (= Samaria), Antipatris, Phasaelis, Caesarea Philippi, Julias, Sepphoris, Livias, Tiberias.

The kind of dependence of these towns upon the Roman power both in name and in fact differed considerably. There were in the Roman Empire both free and subject communities. The former (civitates liberae, ἐλεύθεροι) had not only their own judicature and administration of finance, but were also free from taxation proper and only bound to certain definitely appointed contributions; they were αὐτόνομοι καὶ φόρων ἀτελεῖς (Appian. Civ. i. 102). Again there was among these a privileged class, the civitates foederatae or such as had their freedom guaranteed by a foedus. All these free cities were indeed dependent upon Rome, but were not regarded as belonging in the strict sense to the province. From them must then be distinguished the subject towns (ὑπήκοοι) properly belonging to the province, the specific difference of which from the former consisted in their liability to taxation. For αὐτονομία, or the privilege suis legibus uti, was often conceded to them, though under the control of the Roman proconsul. All the varieties of civic position here alluded to were represented among the Syrian towns. Tyre e.g. was one of the privileged civitates foederatae. Ascalon was an oppidum liberum. But just because this is mentioned of Ascalon as something special, the greater number are not to be regarded as free communities in the technical sense of the word. Nor is it, according to what has just been said, opposed to this that many of them are designated as αὐτόνομοι. And still less does it signify, when Josephus says that Pompey made these towns free (ἐλευθέρας). For this means only their liberation from Jewish sway. Their political condition is correctly pointed out by Josephus by the expressions προσένειμε τῇ ἐπαρχίᾳ and κατέταξεν εἰς τὴν Συριακὴν ἐπαρχίαν. These slight political distinctions were not indeed of much practical importance. For the most privileged towns were taxed for certain requirements, and on the other hand many of the subject towns, at least in Syria, had a jurisdiction and administration of their own. Least of all were these distinctions paid respect to with regard to military affairs. It would be a great mistake to suppose, that in war all or most of these towns were released from the obligation of furnishing auxiliaries. At least Josephus speaks quite generally of the auxiliaries, which had been furnished by "the towns" at the campaign of Cestius Gallus against Jerusalem. When in the year 4 B.C. Berytus with its district furnished 1500 auxiliaries to the army of Varus, this certainly is not a case in point, inasmuch as Berytus was then already a Roman colony and was therefore under different legal regulations from the other towns. But we also know e.g. that from A.D. 44–67 there was in Caesarea a garrison of five cohorts and a wing of cavalry, which was formed for the most part of Caesareans and Sebastenians (inhabitants of the towns of Caesarea and Sebaste and their respective districts). Nay we find towards the end of the first century after Christ a cohors I. Tyriorum already in Moesia. So too in occupying the towns with garrisons regard was certainly had less to political distinctions than to military requirements. "Free" Antioch became the chief seat of the Roman military force in Syria, and we know of Ascalon, that though an oppidum liberum, it received a Roman garrison, though but a small one.

The Roman colonies occupied among the towns of the Roman Empire an exempt position from taxes. There had been such both in Palestine and Phoenicia since the time of Augustus. The oldest were Berytus, founded by Augustus, Ptolemais by Claudius, Caesarea by Vespasian. All the colonies of the imperial period were military colonies, i.e. they consisted of superannuated soldiers, to whom possession of lands was awarded as payment for their services, and indeed in such wise, that this was always done to a large number at one place contemporaneously, thereby founding the colony. The lands required for the purpose were in earlier times simply

taken from their possessors. Afterwards (i.e. after Augustus) it was customary to compensate the owners or to give the veterans such land as was already state property. The colonists either formed a new community beside the older one, or themselves entered into the older community, in which case the latter received in its entirety the Roman municipal constitution. Thus the plantation of a colony, which had formerly been an act of cruel plunder, gradually became an actual favour to a town. The rights of colonies also differed. Those were in the most favoured position, which had received the full jus Italicum and with it exemption from poll taxes and land taxes. Herod imitated Augustus in his system of establishing military colonies.

The position of those towns, which were temporarily under the Herodian princes, did not essentially differ from that of those directly under Roman governors. It is certainly possible, that the Herodian princes made their power more directly felt, but this cannot be proved. For the security of their sovereignty, they appointed governors of their own in the towns; thus Herod the Great placed an ἄρχων in Idumaea and Gaza, Agrippa I. a στρατηγός in Caesarea and an ἔπαρχος in Tiberias, Agrippa II. a viceroy in Caesarea Philippi and an ἔπαρχος in Gamala. Such a viceroy was also the ἐθνάρχης of King Aretas in Damascus, 2 Cor. 11:32.

The great independence of these towns involves the fact, that each had its special history. In following this in each separate case, we shall begin with the towns of the Philistinian and Phoenician coast, advancing from south to north. Many of these had at the commencement of the Hellenistic period a brilliant past behind them and continued to be of prominent importance during the whole Graeco-Roman period.

1. Raphia, Ῥαφία (so is it written on the coin), may still be pointed out in the ruins of Kirbeth bir Refah, situated according to Guérin about half a league from the sea, but upon a flat harbourless shore, and therefore regarded by Pliny and Ptolemy as an inland town. It was the first Syrian town after leaving Egypt. Apart from the cuneiform inscriptions, it is first mentioned in history in the campaign of Antigonus against Egypt, B.C. 306, when the fleet of Antigonus, under the command of his son Demetrius, was here destroyed by a storm. It then became famous chiefly through the victory, which was here gained by the unwarlike Ptolemy Philopater over Antiochus the Great, and which resulted in the loss of Palestine and Phoenicia by the latter. In the year 193 the marriage of Ptolemy Philopater with Cleopatra, daughter of Antiochus the Great, was celebrated here. In the beginning of the first century before Christ Raphia was conquered by Alexander Jannaeus (Joseph. Antt. xiii. 13. 3; Bell. Jud. i. 4. 2; comp. Antt. xiii. 15. 4), was afterwards, like the neighbouring towns, separated by Pompey from the Jewish district and was rebuilt by Gabinius (Antt. xiv. 5. 3; Bell. Jud. i. 8. 4). Hence the coins of Raphia, of the imperial age (from Commodus to Philip the Arabian), have an era commencing with the refoundation by Gabinius (57 B.C.). It seems never to have been in the possession of the Herodian princes.

2. Gaza, Γάζα, Hebr. עַזָּה, the ancient and important city of the Philstines, so often mentioned in the Old Testament. Herodotus knows it by the name of Κάδυτις, and remarks, that it is not much smaller than Sardis. Already in the times of Persian supremacy it must – as the coins testify – have been in active intercourse with Greece. In the time of Alexander the Great it was next to Tyre the most important fortress on the Philistinian-Phoenician coast. Alexander did not take it till after a three months' troublesome siege (332 B.C.). After that time it became more and more a Greek town. The contests of Ptolemy Lagos with the other Diadochoi for the possession of Coelesyria of course affected Gaza in the highest degree. In 315 B.C. it was conquered by Antigonus. In 312 it again fell into the hands of Ptolemy in consequence of his victory gained at Gaza over Demetrius the son of Antigonus. In the same year however he

renounced the possession of Coelesyria, and on his retreat had the most important fortresses, Gaza among them, demolished. The sovereignty over these districts changed several times during the decades next following, till at length they were for a longer period in the possession of the Ptolemies about 240 B.C. In the years 218–217 Gaza, like the rest of Syria, was temporarily in the possession of Antiochus the Great. Twenty years later Coelesyria came permanently under the dominion of the Seleucidae through the victory of Antiochus the Great at Panias (198 B.C.). Gaza also must then have been conquered after a difficult siege, to which indeed we have only allusions in Polybius. The sway of the Seleucidae is evidenced among other things by a coin of Demetrius I. (Soter) minted at Gaza. During the contests in the Syrian kingdom between Demetrius II. (Nicator) and Antiochus VI. respecting Trypho (145–143 B.C.), Gaza refusing to join the party of Antiochus, was besieged by Jonathan the Maccabee in concert with him, and its environs laid waste, whereupon it gave up its opposition and delivered hostages to Jonathan as a pledge of its adherence to Antiochus. With respect to the constitution of Gaza at this time we learn incidentally, that it had a council of 500 members. About the year 96 B.C. Gaza as well as the neighbouring cities of Raphia and Anthedon fell into the hands of Alexander Jannaeus. Alexander conquered it after a siege of one year, though at last only through treachery, and abandoned the city and its inhabitants to destruction (Joseph. Antt. xiii. 13. 3; Bell. Jud. i. 4. 2; comp. Antt. xiii. 15. 4. Stark, p. 499 sqq.). When Pompey conquered Syria, Gaza also – so far as its existence can be then spoken of – obtained its freedom (Antt. xiv. 4. 4; Bell. Jud. i. 7. 7). The newly built town consequently began a new era from the time of Pompey (52 B.C.). The rebuilding itself did not take place till the time of Gabinius (Antt. xv. 5. 3). Probably the ancient Gaza was then forsaken and the new town built somewhat farther southwards. In the year 30 B.C. Gaza came under the authority of Herod the Great (Antt. xv. 7. 3; Bell. Jud. i. 20. 3). After his death it was again added to the province of Syria (Antt. xvii. 11. 4; Bell. Jud. ii. 6. 3). With this agrees the fact, that the imperial coins of Gaza do not begin till after the death of Herod the Great. The oldest known are two coins of Augustus of the years 63 and 66 aer. Gaz. In the time of Claudius, Gaza is spoken of as an important city by the geographer Mela. In A.D. 66 it was attacked and destroyed by the rebellious Jews (Joseph. Bell. Jud. ii. 18. 1). This must however have been a very partial destruction. For so strong a fortress could not have been actually destroyed by a band of insurrectionary Jews. Coins too of the years 130, 132, 135 aer. Gaza. (= A.D. 68/69, 70/71, 73/74) testify to the lasting prosperity of the city. Special tokens of favour seem to have been bestowed upon it by Hadrian. It is called on an inscription of the time of Gordian (A.D. 238–244) ἱερὰ καὶ ἄσυλος καὶ αὐτόνομος. It must have subsequently become a Roman colony. Eusebius speaks of it as a πόλις ἐπίσημος. And this too it remained for a considerable period. The independence of these great cities is shown in perhaps the most striking manner by the fact, that Gaza as well as Ascalon, Tyre and Sidon had each its own calendar.

3. Anthedon, Ἀνθηδών, situate on the sea, erroneously called an inland town by Pliny, was according to Sozomen only twenty stadia from Gaza, probably in a northerly (northwesterly) direction. Its very name shows it to have been founded in the Greek period. It is first mentioned in the time of Alexander Jannaeus, who conquered it about the same time as Raphia (Joseph. Antt. xiii. 13. 3; Bell. Jud. i. 4. 2; comp. Antt. xiii. 15. 4). Like the other coast towns it was undoubtedly retaken from the Jews by Pompey. Gabinius rebuilt it (Antt. xiv. 5. 3; Bell. Jud. i. 8. 4). Augustus bestowed it on Herod (Antt. xv. 7. 3; Bell. Jud. i. 20. 3), who again restored it and gave it the name of Agrippias or Agrippeion in honour of Agrippa (Antt. xiii. 13. 3; Bell. Jud. i. 4. 2, 21. 8). It is not expressly mentioned in the partition of Herod's inheritance. Hence it is uncertain whether, like its neighbour Gaza, it was united to the province of Syria, or passed like Joppa and Caesarea to Archelaus (see Stark, p. 542 sq.). In the latter case it would have

shared the fate of the rest of Judaea and therefore have come, after the deposition of Archelaus, under Roman procurators and have been from A.D. 41–44 under the rule of King Agrippa. The existence of a coin of Anthedon with the name of Agrippa would give evidence of the latter, if its reading were certain. At the beginning of the Jewish war Anthedon was attacked and partially devastated by the revolted Jews (Bell. Jud. ii. 18. 1). The name Agrippias was never naturalized; Josephus already and all subsequent authors call it Anthedon again. On coins too only this name occurs.

4. Ascalon, Ἀσκάλον, Hebr. אַשְׁקְלוֹן, was like Gaza an important town of the Philistines, repeatedly mentioned in the Old Testament and also already known to Herodotus. The present Ascalon lies close to the sea, and Ptolemy also mentions Ascalon as a coast town. But the old town must have lain inland, if ever so little, since even in the sixth century after Christ Ascalon and Majuma Ascalonis (the port of Ascalon) are distinguished. In the Persian period Ascalon belonged to the Tyrians. Coins of Alexander the Great coined at Ascalon mark the commencement of the Hellenistic period. Like all Palestine and Phoenicia it was in the third century before Christ under the dominion of the Ptolemies, and had consequently to pay them yearly tribute. With Antiochus III. began its subjection to the Seleucidae, which is also evidenced by Ascalonian Seleucid coins from Antiochus III. to Antiochus IX. Ascalon was able by prudent concessions to protect itself against the increasing power of the Jews. The Maccabaean Jonathan did indeed march twice against the town, but was on both occasions pacified by a respectful welcome on the part of the inhabitants. Ascalon was also the only coast town, which remained unmolested by Alexander Jannaeus. It was able in the year 104 B.C. to attain to independence and thenceforth began a computation of time of its own, which it made use of even in the times of the Roman Empire. The Romans acknowledged its independence at least formally. Besides the usual era of the year 104 B.C. another of 57 B.C. occurs in several instances, which proves that Ascalon was favoured by Gabinius. On some of the coins of Ascalon the heads have been taken for those of Cleopatra and a Ptolemy, which would point to their sovereignty or claims to sovereignty over this region. Ascalon was never in the possession of Herod and his successors, although it was indeed adorned with public buildings by Herod, who seems also to have had a palace there, which after his death passed into the possession of his sister Salome. The ancient enmity of the Jews and Ascalonians made the breaking out of the Jewish war in A.D. 66 fatal for both. At first Ascalon was devastated by the Jews; then the Ascalonians put to death all the Jews dwelling in their city, 2500 in number; finally, the Jews made a second attack upon the town, which was indeed easily repelled by the Roman garrison stationed there. Ascalon long remained a flourishing Hellenistic city with celebrated religious rites and games. Many individuals famous in Greek literature were natives of this town.

5. Azotus, Ἄζωτος, or Ashdod, Hebr. אַשְׁדּוֹד, like Gaza and Ascalon, an old Philistine town frequently mentioned in the Old Testament and already known to Herodotus. Ptolemy speaks of it as a coast town; Josephus at one time as a coast, at another as an inland town. The latter is more accurate, for it lay, as the present Asdud does, more than a league inland, on which account Ἄζωτος παράλιος is in Christian times distinguished from Ἄζωτος μεσόγειος. The district of Azotus is frequently mentioned in the Books of the Maccabees; but no certain conclusions can be drawn therefrom as to its extent. Nor are any further details of its fate under the Ptolemies and Seleucidae known. At the time of the rising of the Maccabees Azotus was unable to maintain itself against Jewish supremacy. Judas already destroyed its altars and images (1 Macc. 5:68). Jonathan, however, devastated the city, together with its temple of Dagon, by fire. (1 Macc. 10:84, 11:4). At the time of Alexander Jannaeus the city, or rather its ruins, belonged to the Jewish region (Joseph. Antt. viii. 15. 4). Pompey again separated it from

this latter, and made it a free town (Antt. xiv. 4. 4; Bell. Jud. i. 7. 7). But the ruined city was not restored till Gabinius (Antt. xiv. 5. 3; Bell. Jud. i. 8. 4). It possibly came, together with the other maritime towns, under the dominion of Herod (B.C. 30), from whom it passed after his death to his sister Salome (Antt. xvii. 8. 1, 11. 5; Bell. Jud. ii. 6. 3). Whether, like Jamnia, it fell after her death to the Empress Livia is not quite certain, since Azotus is not expressly named (Antt. xviii. 2. 2; Bell. Jud. ii. 9. 1). It is probable that a considerable portion of its population was Jewish, on which account Vespasian was obliged, during the Jewish war, to place a garrison in it (Bell. Jud. iv. 3. 2). Coins of Azotus during the Roman period seem not to have been preserved.

6. Jamnia, Ἰάμνεια, in the Old Testament Jabneh, 2) יַבְנֶה Chron. 26:6), under which name it frequently occurs in Rabbinic literature. Jamnia, like Azotus, is sometimes called a maritime, sometimes an inland town, for it lay considerably inland, but had a port. Both are correctly distinguished by Pliny and Ptolemy. There is express testimony that Jamnia had a district. According to Strabo, it was so densely populated that Jamnia and its neighbourhood were able to furnish 40,000 fighting men. In the Maccabaean period Jamnia was – at least according to the second Book of the Maccabees – attacked by Judas, and its port together with the fleet burnt. The town itself however did not come into the possession of the Jews either then, or, as Josephus asserts, under Simon. It was not till Alexander Jannaeus that it formed a portion of the Jewish territory (Antt. xiii. 15. 4). Pompey again separated it from the latter (Antt. xiv. 4. 4; Bell. Jud. i. 7. 7), Gabinius restored it. Like Azotus, Jamnia must also have come into the possession of Herod, since it was left by him to his sister Salome (Antt. xvii. 8. 1, 11. 5; Bell. Jud. ii. 6. 3). The Empress Livia received it from the latter (Antt. xviii. 2. 2; Bell. Jud. ii. 9. 1), and after her death it seems to have become a private possession of Tiberius (Antt. xviii. 6. 3; see above, p. 55). The population was then a mixed one of Jews and heathen, but with a preponderance of the Jewish element. This explains the fact, that Vespasian twice found himself obliged to garrison the city, and that Jamnia, after the destruction of Jerusalem, soon became a headquarter of Jewish learning.

7. Joppa, Ἰόπη or Ἰόππη, Hebr. יָפוֹ, the present Jaffa. The special importance of Joppa is found in the fact that it was comparatively the best harbour on the coast of Palestine. It was therefore at almost all periods the chief place of debarkation for the interior of Judaea, and its possession, especially on the greater development of trade and commerce in later times, was almost a vital question for the Jews. In the Persian period, and indeed in the time of the Sidonian King Eschmunazar, Joppa was granted to the Sidonians by the "Lord of Kings," i.e. by the Persian monarch. To the Greeks it was chiefly known as the scene of the myth of Perseus and Andromeda, and is mentioned as such even before the time of Alexander the Great by Scylax (see above, p. 15). In the Diadochian period it seems to have been an important arsenal. When Antigonus wrested Coelesyria from Ptolemy Lagos, he was obliged to take Joppa as well as other places by force. And when, three years later (312 B.C.), Ptolemy Lagos found he could not hold the reconquered region against Antigonus, he had Joppa razed on his retreat as one of the more important fortresses. In the time of the Maccabees the efforts of the Jews were especially directed to obtain possession of this important place. It is true that Judas Maccabaeus – if the account is quite trustworthy – only destroyed the port and fleet of Joppa during a nocturnal attack (2 Macc. 12:3-7). Jonathan however, in the year 147 or 146 B.C., made a serious assault of the town, in consequence of which the inhabitants opened the gates to him and forced the Syrian garrison to depart (1 Macc. 10:75, 76). Thenceforward the Jews remained with but slight intermission in possession of the town till the time of Pompey. From the same period also must be dated the Judaizing of the city. For when, a few years after its conquest by Jonathan, the inhabitants showed signs of again surrendering the town to the

Syrians, Simon, the brother of Jonathan, stationed a Jewish garrison in it (1 Macc. 12:33, 34) and compelled the heathen inhabitants to leave the town (1 Macc. 13:11: ἐξέβαλε τοὺς ὄντας ἐν αὐτῇ). Simon afterwards enlarged and improved the harbour and fortified the town (1 Macc. 14:5, 34). When the energetic Antiochus VII. (Sidetes) endeavoured again to retrench the power of the Jews, the possession of Joppa was a main point of dispute. Even while Antiochus was contending with Trypho, he demanded from Simon the surrender of Joppa (1 Macc. 15:28–30). The latter however declared himself only ready to pay a sum of money instead (1 Macc. 15:35). When, some years later, in the beginning of the reign of John Hyrcanus, all Palestine was conquered and even Jerusalem besieged by Antiochus, it is probable that Joppa had already been taken by him. He was nevertheless satisfied at the conclusion of a peace with the payment of a tribute for Joppa (Joseph. Antt. xiii. 8. 3). Thus the town continued in the possession of the Jews, and in later times even the payment of the tribute ceased. There is express testimony that Alexander Jannaeus possessed Joppa (Antt. xiii. 15. 4). This maritime city was however taken by Pompey from the Jews, who were thus entirely cut off from the sea (Antt. xiv. 4. 4; Bell. Jud. i. 7. 7). Among the favours bestowed by Caesar on the Jews one of the most valuable was the restoration of Joppa (Antt. xiv. 10. 6). It is not quite certain whether Herod held Joppa from the first. At any rate, like the other coast towns, it belonged, during the years 34–30 B.C., to Cleopatra (see above, § 15), and thenceforth to Herod (Antt. xv. 7. 3; Bell. Jud. i. 20. 3). From this time it was always united with Judaea proper, and hence passed after Herod's death to Archelaus (Antt. xvii. 11. 4; Bell. Jud. ii. 6. 3), and was after his deposition under Roman procurators. At the beginning of the Jewish war, Joppa was, by reason of its mainly Jewish population, a central seat of rebellion. It was destroyed at the very beginning of the war by Cestius Gallus (Bell. Jud. ii. 18. 10), but soon fortified again and conquered a second time by Vespasian (Bell. Jud. iii. 9. 2–4). From that time it probably again became a chiefly heathen town. It is shown by a coin recently discovered, that it was also called Flavia, which leads to the inference of its refoundation in the time of Vespasian. Notwithstanding its close connection with Judaea, Joppa formed an independent political community after the manner of Hellenistic towns. Of its coins few specimens have been preserved.

8. Apollonia, Ἀπολλωνία. An Apollonia between Joppa and Caesarea is mentioned by geographers down to the later imperial period. It occurs only twice in history: at the time of Alexander Jannaeus, when it belonged to the Jewish region (Joseph. Antt. xiii. 15. 4), and at the time of Gabinius, who restored it (Joseph. Bell. Jud. i. 8. 4). According to the statement of distance in the Peutinger table (22 m. p. from Caesarea) it must have been situate where the present Arsuf is. Stark's supposition, that it is identical with Σώζουσα, is commended by the circumstance, that in Cyrenaica also an Apollonia and a Sozusa appear, which are probably identical. Sozusa would thus be the town of Apollo Σωτήρ. The name Apollonia makes it probable, that it was founded by Seleucus I. in the time of the definitive occupation of Coelesyria by the Ptolemies.

9. Straton's Tower, Στράτωνος πύργος, afterwards Caesarea. Like Apollonia, Straton's Tower may have been a foundation of the Hellenistic period, perhaps at first a castle, so called, after a general of the Ptolemies. It is however possible, that it was founded towards the end of the Persian period by a Sidonian king of the name of Straton. Artemidorus, about 100 B.C., is the first geographical author by whom it is mentioned. At that period too it first occurs in history, being mentioned in the time of Aristobulus I., 104 B.C. (Antt. xiii. 11. 2). In the beginning of the reign of Alexander Jannaeus, a "tyrant," Zoilus was master of Straton's Tower and Dora (Joseph. Antt. xiii. 12. 2). He was soon overthrown by Alexander Jannaeus (Antt. xiii. 12. 4), and hence Straton's Tower is named among the towns belonging to Alexander (Antt. xiii. 15. 4). It

obtained its freedom from Pompey (Antt. xiv. 4. 4; Bell. Jud. i. 7. 7). It was bestowed upon Herod by Augustus (Antt. xv. 7. 3; Bell. Jud. i. 20. 3), and from this period dates the special importance of the town. For it was rebuilt on the most magnificent scale by Herod, and provided with artificial embankments and an excellent harbour (Antt. xv. 9. 6, xvi. 5. 1; Bell. Jud. i. 21. 5–8). He called the town Καισάρεια in honour of the emperor, and the harbour Σεβαστὸς λιμήν. Hence on Nero's coins we meet with Καισαρια ἡ προς Σεβαστω λιμενι. The designation Καισάρεια Σεβαστή occurs only once. Elsewhere the town is called in distinction from others Καισάρεια Στράτωνος, and in later times Καισάρεια τῆς Παλαιστίνης. It quickly attained to great prosperity, and remained for a long period one of the most important towns of Palestine. After the death of Herod it passed with the rest of Judaea to Archelaus (Antt. xvii. 11. 4; Bell. Jud. ii. 6. 3). It afterwards continued on all occasions united with Judaea, and hence came after the deposition of Archelaus under Roman procurators, then under Agrippa I., and then again under procurators. Coins of Agrippa I., which were coined in Caesarea, are still in existence. His στρατηγός in Caesarea is incidentally mentioned (Antt. xix. 7. 4). It is well known that he himself died there (see above, § 18). He was hated by the Caesareans for his Judaizing tendencies (Antt. xix. 9. 1). The Roman procurators, both before and after the reign of Agrippa, took up their abode at Caesarea (see above, § 17). Hence the town is called in Tacitus, Judaeae caput (Tac. Hist. ii. 78). It was also the chief garrison for the troops under the command of the procurators, who were for the most part composed of natives (see above, p. 65). The population being chiefly a heathen one (Bell. Jud. iii. 9. 1), though mingled with a considerable Jewish fraction, disputes easily occurred, and the more so that both had equal civil rights, and had therefore to conduct the affairs of the town in common. Neither the Jews nor the heathen were satisfied with this state of things. Each of these parties claimed the exclusive government of the town. Already towards the close of the official career of Felix there were sanguinary contests on the subject, in consequence of which Nero, whose adviser had been bribed by the heathen party, deprived the Jews of their equality of right, and declared the heathen sole governors of the town. The exasperation which ensued gave the first inducement to the great rising of the Jews in A.D. 66 (Antt. xx. 8. 7 and 9; Bell. Jud. ii. 13. 7, 14. 4, 5). After the breaking out of the war, the Jews, as the minority, fell victims to the fury of the heathen populace. It is said that all the Jewish inhabitants, 20,000 in number, were then assassinated in an hour (Bell. Jud. ii. 18. 1 vii. 8. 7, ed. Bekker, p. 161). Caesarea was changed by Vespasian into a Roman colony, though without the full jus Italicum. On coins it bears the title col(onia) prima Fl(avia) Aug(usta) Caesarensis or Caesarea. To this was added after the time of Alexander Severus the title metropolis, or as it is more completely given on coins after Decius, metropolis, pr. S. Pal. (= provinciae Syriae Palaestinae.

10. Dora, Δῶρα, in Polybius Δοῦρα, elsewhere also Δῶρος, in Pliny, Dorum, Hebr. דּוֹר or דֹּאר, an old Phoenician settlement 8 or 9 miles north of Caesarea. It was known from ancient times to the Greeks, being already mentioned by Hecataeus of Miletus, who lived 500 years before Christ, in his description of the earth. Nay, it is possible that it may, during the hegemony of Athens in the Mediterranean in the 5th century B.C., have been tributary to the Athenians. In the time of the Sidonian King Eshmunazar it was granted to the Sidonians by the "Lord of Kings," i.e. by the Persian monarch. Hence Scylax, whose description refers to the Persian period, rightly calls Dora a town of the Sidonians. Although Dora was no large city, it was on account of its favourable position a strong fortress. When Antiochus the Great made (219 B.C.) his first attack upon Coelesyria, he besieged Dora, but in vain. Eighty years afterwards (139–138 B.C.) Trypho was here besieged by Antiochus Sidetes with a large army, but equally without result. The siege ended with the flight of Trypho. On a coin of Trypho's stamped at Dora the town is called ἰε(ρὰ) κ(αὶ) ἄ(συλος). Some decades afterwards we find it in the possession of the tyrant

Zoilus (Joseph. Antt. xiii. 12. 2), who was afterwards overthrown by Alexander Jannaeus (Antt. xiii. 12. 4). It must therefore have subsequently belonged to the Jewish region, but was again separated from it by Pompey (Antt. xiv. 4. 4; Bell. Jud. i. 7. 7). Like many other towns, Dora also then began a new era, which it continued to use on coins of the imperial age. It was restored by Gabinius (Antt. xiv. 5. 3). After Pompey it was under direct Roman government, and therefore never belonged to Herod (whose dominions on the coast extended no farther northward than Caesarea). It is called on coins of the imperial period ἱερὰ ἄσυλος αὐτόνομος ναυαρχίς. The existence of a Jewish community in Dora is evidenced by an occurrence of the time of King Agrippa I.: a number of young people once placed a statue of the emperor in the Jewish synagogue, and it needed energetic intervention on the part of Petronius the governor, in a letter addressed to the authorities of Dora (Δωριτῶν τοῖς πρώτοις), to secure to the Jews that free exercise of their religion, which had been pledged to them (Antt. xix. 6. 3). In the later imperial period, Dora seems to have fallen into decay. Christian bishops of Dora are however mentioned down to the 7th century.

11. Ptolemais, Πτολεμαΐς. The original name of the town was Akko, עַכּוֹ (Richter 1. 31), or, as it reads in Greek, Ἄκη. By this name it was already known to the Greeks in pre-Hellenistic times. It was here that in the year 374 B.C. the army of Artaxerxes Mnemnon assembled for the campaign against Egypt. Ake must have been an important town in the time of Alexander the Great. For among the coins of Alexander stamped in Phoenicia those of Ake especially are very numerous. They have the name of Alexander in Greek, that of the town in Phoenician characters (Ἀλεξάνδρου, עכ, sometimes עכא), and the year of an era beginning with Alexander the Great. As elsewhere so too in Ake these coins were still issued long after the death of Alexander. Ake was levelled to the ground in the year 312 by Ptolemy Lagos, when he again evacuated before Antigonus the district of Coelesyria, which he had just conquered. It probably received from Ptolemy II. the name of Πτολεμαΐς, which was henceforth the prevailing one. Still its original name Akko was uninterruptedly maintained beside the Greek one, which it subsequently supplanted. In the Seleucid period also Ptolemais figures as one of the most important cities of the Phoenician-Philistine coast. The conquest of this region by Antiochus the Great in the year 219 was much facilitated by the surrender to him of the towns of Tyre and Ptolemais by the Phoenician general Theodotus. Antiochus wintered in Ptolemais in 218/219. The Seleucidae after their definitive occupation of Phoenicia specially favoured Ptolemais. On coins, especially those of the times of Antiochus IV. and VIII., the inhabitants are called Ἀντιοχεῖς οἱ ἐν Πτολεμαΐδι, sometimes with the addition ἱερὰ ἄσυλος, sometimes ἱερὰ αὐτόνομος. The bestowal of the title “Antiochians,” and with it perhaps certain privileges, is to be regarded as a mark of favour, which was aspired after by many other towns, e.g. Jerusalem, during the predominance of the Hellenistic party. Seleucid coins of Antiochus V., Demetrius I., Alexander Balas, and Trypho, minted at Ptolemais, are in existence. The town was used as a residence by the kings during their temporary abode in these regions (1 Macc. 10:56-60, 11:22, 24). It always showed itself hostile to the Jews. Even at the beginning of the Maccabaean rising, it was especially the towns of Ptolemais, Tyre and Sidon, which fought against the Jews, who had revolted from Syrian sovereignty (1 Macc. 5:15 sqq.). Jonathan was here treacherously taken prisoner by Trypho (1 Macc. 12:45 sqq.). After the accession of Alexander Jannaeus, B.C. 104, when the Seleucidae had already lost all authority in the southern parts of their dominions, three neighbouring powers contended for the possession of Ptolemais. At first Alexander Jannaeus entertained the purpose of conquering it, but was prevented from carrying out his design by Ptolemy Lathurus, the ruler of Cyprus, who himself took possession of the town by force (Joseph. Antt. xiii. 12. 2-6). He was however soon deprived of it by his mother Cleopatra, queen of Egypt (Antt. xiii. 13. 1-2). Ptolemais seems never again to have come under

the authority of the Selucidae, nay even the still more northward towns of Tyre and Sidon had meantime made themselves independent. On the contrary, we still find there, about 70 B.C., an Egyptian princess, Selene, daughter of this Cleopatra, and widow of Antiochus Grypus, to whom she had been given in marriage by her mother, when the latter entered into alliance with him against Antiochus Kyzikenos, who ruled in Coelesyria. At the instance of this Selene Ptolemais closed its gates against Tigranes, king of Armenia, the conqueror of the Seleucid kingdom; was thereupon conquered by Tigranes, but again liberated when Tigranes found himself obliged to retreat by reason of the attacks of the Romans upon his own kingdom (Joseph. Antt. xiii. 16. 4). Ptolemais seems to have experienced special favour from Caesar, when in the year 47 he was over the affairs of Syria. For there are in existence some of its coins of the imperial period with an era reaching back to Caesar. Probably the coins with the legend Πτολεμαι. ἱερας καὶ ἀσυλον (or the like) belong also to this time (shortly after Caesar). The Emperor Claudius settled a colony of veterans in Ptolemais. Hence the town was henceforth called colonia Ptolemais, though it did not possess the actual privileges of a colony. At the breaking out of the Jewish war, the Jews in Ptolemais, 2000 in number, were slaughtered by the inhabitants (Bell. Jud. ii. 18. 5). The district of Ptolemais is mentioned by Josephus as the western boundary of Galilee (Bell. Jud. iii. 3. 1; comp. Vita, 24). The formula: Πτολεμαΐδα καὶ τὴν προσκυροῦσαν αὐτῇ, scil. χώραν (1 Macc. 10:39), is characteristic.

Next to the great maritime towns, the towns of the so-called Decapolis belong to the class of independent Hellenistic communities. The organization alluded to in this word was probably the work of Pompey. For we first meet with the term (ἡ Δεκάπολις) during the Roman period; and most of the towns of Decapolis owe their independent political existence to Pompey. These were the Hellenistic towns of the country east of Jordan, which, having been subjected by Alexander Jannaeus, were again liberated from Jewish authority by Pompey. It is probable that they then formed a kind of confederacy, which originally consisted of ten towns, and was therefore called ἡ Δεκάπολις, but retained the name after the number was enlarged by the accession of other towns. For the number did not always remain the same, as Pliny, our chief authority, remarks, H. N. v. 18. 74: Decapolitana regio a numero oppidorum, in quo non omnes eadem observant, plurimum tamen Damascum, Philadelphiam, Rhaphanam, Scythopolim, Gadara, Hippon, Dion, Pellam, Galasam (read: Gerasam), Canatham. Besides Pliny, only Ptolemy v. 15. 22-23 gives an enumeration of the several towns. It contains all the towns mentioned by Pliny, with the exception of Raphana; and besides these, nine others (situated chiefly in the north of Palestine in the neighbourhood of Damascus), so that the number given by him amounts to eighteen. Hence we must keep to Pliny for the original number. To those named by him, we add only Abila and Kanata (another town than Kanatha), both which have also the Pompeian era. All the towns except Scythopolis lie in the region east of the Jordan. The inclusion of Damascus, lying so far to the north, is striking. Since however it is mentioned by both Pliny and Ptolemy, it must be retained. In any case Decapolis, as such, continued in existence in the second century after Christ (the time of the geographer Ptolemy). Its dissolution took place in the course of the third century, in consequence of the transference of some of its most important towns (as Kanatha, Gerasa, Philadelphia) to the province of Arabia (constituted a province A.D. 105). The mention of Decapolis by later authors, as Eusebius, Epiphanius, Steph. Byz., rests therefore only on historical information. The following enumeration is in geographical order from north to south.

12. Damascus, Δαμασκός, Hebr. דַּמֶּשֶׂק. From the varied history of this town, we can here bring forward only such particulars as are important with respect to its constitution during the Hellenistic and Roman periods. The dominion of Alexander the Great over Damascus is

evidenced not only by the narratives of authors, but by coins of Alexander issued there. In the third century before Christ, Damascus seems to have belonged not, like Phoenicia and Palestine, to the Ptolemies, but to the Seleucidae. It is true, that when Ptolemy II. seized Phoenicia and Palestine, B.C. 280, he must also have taken possession of Damascus. It was however reconquered by Antiochus I. (280–262). At the great invasion of the realm of the Seleucidae by Ptolemy III., B.C. 246, in which all Syria was for some time lost to Seleucus II., Damascus seems to have been not once conquered, but only besieged. Seleucus relieved it, when in the year 242/241 he again victoriously pressed southwards. The fact, that Damascus anciently formed part of the Seleucid dominions, is indirectly confirmed by the circumstance, that Polybius, when fully relating the particulars of the conquest of Phoenicia and Palestine by Antiochus the Great (v. 61–71), mentions indeed the taking of the most important Phoenician and Palestinian towns, but nowhere speaks of Damascus. When in 111 B.C. the Syrian kingdom was, in consequence of the strife between the brothers Antiochus VIII. (Grypos) and Antiochus IX. (Kyzikenos), divided, and Antiochus Kyzikenos established himself in the southern part, Damascus probably became the capital of his small kingdom. At all events it was about 95–85 B.C. repeatedly the capital of a kingdom of Coelesyria separated from the kingdom of Syria, first under Demetrius Eukaerus a son of Antiochus Grypos (Joseph. Antt. xiii. 13. 4), then under Antiochus XII. also a son of Grypos (Antt. xiii. 15. 1). Antiochus XII. fell in battle against the Arabian king Aretas; and Damascus continued henceforth under his authority (Antt. xiv. 15. 1, 2; Bell. Jud. i. 4. 7, 8). When Pompey penetrated into Asia, Damascus was first of all occupied by his legates (Antt. xiv. 2. 3; Bell. Jud. i. 6. 2). Apparently it was not restored to the Arabian king, but united to the province of Syria. In the time of Cassius (44–42 B.C.) we find a Roman commander, Fabius, in Damascus (Antt. xiv. 11. 7, 12. 1; Bell. Jud. i. 12. 1, 2). Already in the times of Augustus and Tiberius there were Roman imperial coins of Damascus, but at the same time, as in the case of Ascalon, autonomic ones also. The Seleucid era is used on both, and this continued to be the prevailing one at Damascus. There are no coins of the times of Caligula and Claudius, though there are coins from Nero onwards. With this circumstance must be combined the fact, that Damascus, when St. Paul fled from it (probably in the time of Caligula), was under a viceroy (ἐθνάρχης) of the Arabian king Aretas (2 Cor. 11:32). Hence it then belonged temporarily to the Arabian king, whether he seized it by violence or obtained it by imperial favour. That there was a Jewish community in Damascus is already evident from the New Testament (Acts 9:2; 2 Cor. 11:32). That it was numerous may be inferred from the number of Jews slain at Damascus at the breaking out of the great war. This amounted to 10,000, or according to another statement 18,000 (the former, Bell. Jud. ii. 20. 2; the latter, Bell. Jud. vii. 8. 7). After Hadrian the town bore the title μητρόπολις, after Alexander Severus it was a colony (not first after Philip the Arabian, as even Eckhel supposes), both facts being witnessed to by the coins. We are informed (Antt. xviii. 6. 3) of a dispute concerning boundaries between the Damascenes and Sidonians in the time of Tiberius, which is chiefly of interest as showing, how extensive the district pertaining to this town must have been, since it bordered upon that of Sidon.

13. Hippus, Ἵππος, is properly the name of a mountain or hill, on which stood the town of the same name. Identical with it is probably the Hebrew Susitha (סוסיתא), which is frequently mentioned in Rabbinical authorities as a Gentile town of Palestine, and Susije, which frequently occurs in Arabic geographers. The following statements serve to determine the locality. According to Pliny, it stood on the eastern shore of the Lake of Gennesareth; according to Josephus, only 30 stadia from Tiberias; according to Eusebius and Jerome, near a certain city and castle of Afeka. According to these data the ruins of el-Hösn on a hill on the eastern shore of the Lake of Gennesareth are probably to be regarded as marking the position of the ancient

Hippus; a village of the name of Fik, which must be identical with the ancient Afeka, is three-quarters of a league off. The supposed identity of the name Hippos with el-Hösn (the horse) is certainly questionable. But little is known of the history of Hippus. It received its freedom from Pompey (Joseph. Antt. xiv. 4. 4; Bell. Jud. i. 7. 7). It was bestowed by Augustus upon Herod (Antt. xv. 7. 3; Bell. Jud. i. 20. 3), after whose death it was again separated from the Jewish region (Antt. xvii. 11. 4; Bell. Jud. ii. 6. 3). On this occasion it is expressly called a Greek city (l.c.). At the outbreak of the Jewish revolt the district of Hippus as well as that of Gadara was devastated by the Jews under the leadership of Justus of Tiberias (Bell. Jud. ii. 18. 1; Vita, 9). The inhabitants of Hippus retaliated by slaying or casting into prison all the Jews dwelling in the city (Bell. Jud. ii. 18. 5). In Christian times Hippus was the see of a bishop. The name of the town has as yet been only once shown to exist upon coins (viz. on one of Nero's time). But coins with the legend Ἀντιοχέων τῶν πρὸς Ἵπ(πον) τῆς ἱερ(ᾶς) κ(αὶ) ἀσύλου have been rightly referred by numismatists to Hippus. They have as might be expected the Pompeian era, and on most is the image of a horse. – The district of Hippus is mentioned Vita, 9, 31; Bell. Jud. iii. 3. 1. Vita, 9: Ἐμπίπρησι τάς τε Γαδαρηνῶν καὶ Ἱππηνῶν κώμας, αἳ δὴ μεθόριοι τῆς Τιβεριάδος καὶ τῆς τῶν Σκυθοπολιτῶν γῆς ἐτίγχανον κείμεναι, is most instructive as showing, that the districts of these four towns were so extensive as to form a connected whole.

14. Gadara, Γαδαρά. The position of Gadara on the site of the present ruins of Om-Keis (Mkês), to the south-east of the Lake of Gennesareth, was recognised by Seetzen so early as 1806, and may now be regarded as settled. The main point of connection is furnished by the warm springs for which Gadara was famous, and which are still found in this region. They lie on the northern bank of the Scheriat el-Mandur; on the southern bank, at about a league's distance from the springs, are found on the lofty ridge of the hill the ruins of the town. Hence the Scheriat el-Mandur is identical with the Hieromices, which according to Pliny flowed past the town. Gadara was in the time of Antiochus the Great already an important fortress. It was conquered by Antiochus both at his first invasion (B.C. 218), and when he finally took possession of Palestine after his victory at Panias, B.C. 198. It was taken by Alexander Jannaeus after a ten months' siege (Antt. xiii. 13. 3; Bell. Jud. i. 4. 2). It consequently belonged under him and his successors to the Jewish region (Antt. xiii. 15. 4), but was separated from it by Pompey (Antt. xiv. 4. 4; Bell. Jud. i. 7. 7). On this occasion Pompey, out of regard for his freedman Demetrius of Gadara, rebuilt the city, which had been destroyed by the Jews (Alexander Jannaeus?). Hence upon the numerous coins of the town extending from Augustus to Gordian, the Pompeian era is used. It begins in the year 690 A.U.C., so that 1 aer. Gadar. = 64/63 B.C. The memory of its rebuilding by Pompey is also perpetuated upon coins from Antoninus Pius to Gordianus by the legend Πομπηιέων Γαδαρέων. The notion that Gadara was the seat of one of the five Jewish Sanhedrin established by Gabinius is incorrect (see above, § 13). In the year 30 B.C., Gadara was bestowed upon Herod by Augustus (Antt. xv. 7. 3; Bell. Jud. i. 20. 3). The town was however very discontented with his government. So early as the year 23-31 B.C., when M. Agrippa was staying at Mytilene, certain Gadarenes there brought complaint against Herod (Antt. xv. 10. 2). Complaints were repeated when Augustus in the year 20 personally visited Syria (Antt. xv. 10. 3). In both cases those who made them were dismissed. It is quite in accordance with this, that we find Gadarene coins of just the year 20 B.C. (44 aer. Gadar.) with the image of Augustus and the inscription Σεβαστός – Herod being desirous, by stamping such coins at Gadara, to show his gratitude to the emperor. After the death of Herod, Gadara regained its independence under Roman supremacy (Antt. xvii. 11. 4; Bell. Jud. ii. 6. 3). At the beginning of the Jewish revolt the district of Gadara, like that of the neighbouring Hippus, was devastated by the Jews under the leadership of Justus of Tiberias (Bell. Jud. ii. 18. 1; Vita, 9). The Gadarenes, like their neighbours of Hippus, avenged themselves by slaying or imprisoning the Jews dwelling in their

town (Bell. Jud. ii. 18. 5). Such of the inhabitants however as were friendly to the Romans, not feeling themselves secure against the turbulent elements in their own city, requested and received a Roman garrison from Vespasian in the later period of the war (Bell. Jud. iv. 7. 3, 4). In what sense Josephus can designate Gadara as the μητρόπολις τῆς Περαίας (Bell. Jud. iv. 7. 3) cannot be further ascertained. On coins, especially of the time of the Antonines, it is called ἱε(ρὰ) ἄσ(υλος) α(ὐτόνομος) γ(…?) Κοί(λης) Συρ(ίας). According to an inscription discovered by Renan, it was during the later imperial period a Roman colony. The information of Stephanus Byz. (s.v.), that it was also called Ἀντιόχεια and Σελεύκεια, stands quite alone, and certainly refers only to temporary official designations, not to such as had come into common use. There is abundant evidence that it was already in pre-Christian times a flourishing Hellenistic town. Josephus calls it at the death of Herod a πόλις Ἑλληνίς (Antt. xvii. 11. 4; Bell. Jud. ii. 6. 3); Strabo mentions as renowned natives of Gadara, Philodemus the Epicurean, the poet Meleager, and Menippus the Cynic, who on account of his witty style was often called ὁ σπουδογελοῖος, and Theodorus the orator. Of later times must also be added Oenomaus, the cynic and the orator Apsines. Meleager says of himself that he came of “an Attic race, dwelling in Assyrian Gadara.” The district of Gadara formed the eastern boundary of Galilee (Bell. Jud. iii. 3. 1). On its extent, comp. Vita, 9, and above, p. 100. That it reached to the Lake of Gennesareth may not only be inferred from Matt. 8:28 (where the reading is uncertain), but also from the coins, on which a ship is often portrayed, nay once (on a coin of Marc. Aurel.) a ναυμα(χία) mentioned.

15. Abila, Ἄβιλα. The local name Abel (אָבֵל) or Abila is very frequent in Palestine. Eusebius knows of three places of this name celebrated for the cultivation of the vine: (1) A village in South Peraea, 6 mil. pass. from Philadelphia; (2) A πόλις ἐπίσημος, 12 mil. pass. from Gadara; (3) A place between Damascus and Paneas. Of these the second town on the east of Gadara is the one with which we are here concerned. Its situation, on the south bank of the Scheriat el-Mandur, was discovered, as well as that of Gadara, by Seetzen. Pliny does not mention this Abila among the cities of Decapolis. Its inclusion among them is however evidenced by an inscription of the time of Hadrian. An Ἄβιδα by which our Ἄβιλα is certainly intended is also placed by Ptolemy among the cities of Decapolis. It first appears in history in the time of Antiochus the Great, who occupied Abila as well as its neighbour Gadara at both his first and his second conquest of Palestine, 219 and 198 B.C. On the whole it seems to have frequently shared the lot of Gadara. Like the latter, Abila received its liberty through Pompey. For the coins of Abila with the Pompeian era are rightly ascribed to this town. Its titles also are the same as those of Gadara: ἱ(ερὰ) ἄ(συλος) α(ὐτόνομος) γ(…?) Κοί(λης) Συ(ρίας). The coins show that the town was also called Σελεύκεια, the inhabitants were called Σελευκ(εῖς) Ἀβιληνοί. In Nero’s time Abila was given to Agrippa II., unless the notice of Josephus to that effect rests upon an error. In the sixth century after Christ Christian bishops of Abila, who may with tolerable certainty be referred to our Abila, are mentioned.

16. Raphana, not to be confounded with the Syrian Ῥαφάνεια in Cassiotis, is mentioned only by Pliny (v. 18. 74). The Ῥαφών however of the first Book of the Maccabees (5:37 = Joseph. Antt. xii. 8. 4), which, according to the context of the narrative (comp. 5:43) lay in the neighbourhood of Astaroth-Karnaim, and therefore in Batanaea, is probably identical with it. Since Ptolemy has not the name of Raphana among the towns of Decapolis, it is probable that he mentions the town by another name; and it is at least possible, though only possible, that Raphana is, as Quandt supposes, identical with the Capitolias mentioned by Ptolemy (v. 15. 22), and so frequently elsewhere since the second century after Christ.

17. Kanata. The existence of this town, as distinct from Kanatha, has but recently been ascertained on the ground of inscriptions by Waddington. Upon an inscription at el-Afine (on the south-western declivity of the Hauran, to the west of Hebran) is mentioned an ἀγωγὸς ὑδάτων εἰσφερομένων εἰς Κάνατα built by Cornelius Palma, governor of Syria in the time of Trajan. This Kanata cannot be identical with Kanatha = Kanawat, for the latter, lying higher than el-Afine, and being itself abundantly supplied with water, an aqueduct from el-Afine thither is inconceivable. The situation of Kanata is however also determined by an inscription discovered by Wetzstein at Kerak (in the plain west-south-west of Kanawat): Διΐ μεγίστ[ῳ] Κανατηνῶν ὁ [δῆμος]. According to this Kanata is identical with the present Kerak, to whose former Greek culture other inscriptions also bear testimony. The few coins of Kanata, which were by former numismatists wrongly attributed to the better known Kanatha, prove at least that Kanata had the Pompeian era, and therefore very probably belonged to Decapolis. The coins belong to the times of Claudius and Domitian. That Kerak was once a town is confirmed by the mention of a βουλευτής upon an inscription. On the other hand, another inscription of the middle of the third century after Christ calls it a κώμη. It had thus already lost the rights of a town. The date on this inscription is according to the era of the province of Arabia, hence we may conclude, that at the establishment of this province (105 B.C.) it was allotted to it.

18. Kanatha. On the western declivity of the Hauran range is the place now called Kanawat, whose ruins are among the most important of the country east of the Jordan. Numerous inscriptions, well preserved remains of temples and other public buildings, prove that an important town once stood here; and both ruins and inscriptions point to the first centuries of the Roman imperial period. The ruins have, since Seetzen's first hasty visit, been frequently described. The inscriptions have been most completely collected by Waddington. It is rightly and almost universally admitted, that the Kanatha so often mentioned by ancient authors, and with which the Old Testament קְנָת (Num. 32:42; 1 Chron. 2:23) is probably identical, is to be sought for here. The form of the name fluctuates between Κάναθα and Κάνωθα; Κεναθηνός also occurs upon an inscription. Apart from the Old Testament passages, the history of Kanatha cannot be traced farther back than the time of Pompey; its coins have the Pompeian era, and it is reckoned by both Pliny (v. 18. 74) and Ptolemy (v. 15. 23) among the towns of Decapolis. On the coins of Commodus given by Reichardt the inhabitants are called Γαβειν(ιεῖς) Καναθ(ηνοί); the town therefore seems to have been restored by Gabinius. Herod experienced a mortifying defeat at Kanatha in a battle against the Arabians. On the civic constitution of Kanatha in imperial times we get some information from inscriptions, βουλευταί being frequently mentioned, and once an ἀγορανόμος. A Graeco-Latin epitaph of a Syrian merchant, discovered in 1862 in the neighbourhood of Trevoux in France, is of special interest. He is designated in the Greek text as βουλευτὴς πολίτης τε Κανωθαί[ω]ν ἐ[…] Συρίης, in the Latin as decurio Septimianus Canotha. What the latter title denotes is indeed very doubtful. If the Συρία of the Greek text is to be understood in the strict sense of the province of Syria, it follows from the combination of the two texts, that Kanatha belonged to the province of Syria down to the time of Septimius Severus. In the time of Eusebius it belonged to the province of Arabia. It is striking that Eusebius calls it a κώμη. Could it in his time have no longer had a civic constitution? A Christian bishop of Kanotha was present at the Councils of Ephesus (A.D. 449), Chalcedon (A.D. 451) and Constantinople (A.D. 459).

19. Scythopolis, Σκυθόπολις, one of the most important Hellenistic towns of Palestine, the only one among the towns of Decapolis which lay westward of the Jordan. The ancient name of the town was Beth-sean, בֵּית שְׁאָן or בֵּית שָׁן, in the Septuagint and in the first Book of Maccabees (v. 52, 12:40 sq.), Βαιθσάν. The ancient name was always maintained beside the Greek one, nay

at last supplanted it. To this very day the desolate ruins of Beisan in the valley of the Jordan south of the Lake of Gennesareth mark the position of the ancient city. The name Σκυθόπολις is undoubtedly equal to Σκυθῶν πόλις, as indeed it is frequently written. The reason for this name is very obscure, probably it must be explained as by Syncellus, by the fact that a number of Scythians settled here on the occasion of their great invasion of Palestine in the seventh century before Christ. On the name Nysa, which Scythopolis also bore according to Pliny, Stephanus Byz., and which is found upon coins, see above, p. 20. The town was perhaps already known by its Greek name Scythopolis in the time of Alexander the Great, or at any rate in the third century before Christ, when it was tributary to the Ptolemies. When in 218 B.C. Antiochus the Great invaded Palestine, the town willingly (καθ' ὁμολογίαν) surrendered to him. Like the rest of Palestine however it did not come permanently under Syrian dominion till twenty years later (198 B.C.). In the time of the Maccabees Scythopolis is mentioned as a heathen town, but not as one hostile to the Jews (2 Macc. 12:29-31). Towards the end of the second century (about 107 B.C.) it came under Jewish rule, the weak Antiochus IX. (Kyzikenos) being unable to offer effectual resistance to the advance of John Hyrcanus, nay his general Epicrates treacherously surrendering Scythopolis to the Jews (Joseph. Antt. xiii. 10. 3; Bell. Jud. i. 2. 7 speaks otherwise). Hence we find it also in the possession of Alexander Jannaeus (Antt. xiii. 15. 4). It was again separated from the Jewish region by Pompey (Antt. xiv. 5. 3, xiv. 4. 4; Bell. Jud. i. 7. 7), and restored by Gabinius (Antt. xiv. 5. 3; Bell. Jud. i. 8. 4). It afterwards continued to be an independent town under Roman supremacy. Nor did either Herod or his successors ever possess the town. Its membership among the cities of Decapolis is testified by Josephus, who calls it "one of the largest towns of Decapolis" (Bell. Jud. iii. 9. 7: ἣ δέ ἐστι μεγίστη τῆς Δεκαπόλεως). It is not quite certain what era it made use of. The Pompeian era is evidently used on a coin of Gordianus; while upon others a later one seems adopted. The titles of the town, especially upon the coins of Gordianus, are ἱερὰ ἄσυλος. At the beginning of the Jewish war, A.D. 66, the revolted Jews attacked the district of Scythopolis (Bell. Jud. ii. 18. 1). The Jewish inhabitants found themselves obliged, for the sake of safety, to fight on the side of the heathen against their fellow-countrymen, who were attacking the town. The heathen inhabitants however afterwards requited this alliance by faithless treachery, luring them into the sacred grove, and then surprising them by night and massacring them to the number, as it is said, of 13,000 (Bell. Jud. ii. 18. 3, 4, vii. 8. 7; Vita, 6). When Josephus says with respect to the period of the Jewish war, that Scythopolis was then obedient to King Agrippa (Vita, 65, ed. Bekker, p. 341, 20: τῆς ὑπηκόου βασιλεῖ), this is certainly not to be understood in the sense of actual subjection, but only means, that Scythopolis was on the side of Agrippa and the Romans. The district of Scythopolis must be regarded as very extensive. At the taking of Scythopolis and Philoteria (a town of that name on the Lake of Gennesareth of which we know nothing else) by Antiochus the Great, in the year 218, Polybius remarks, that the district subject to these two towns could easily furnish abundant support for the whole army. We have also similar testimony at a later date, viz. that of Josephus (Vita, 9), that the district of Scythopolis bordered on that of Gadara (see above, p. 88). The district of this town is also mentioned Bell. Jud. iv. 8. 2. The subsequent history of Scythopolis, which remained for centuries an important and flourishing town, cannot be further pursued here. On its religious rites, games and industry, compare above, pp. 19, 27, 41.

20. Pella, Πέλλα. The district of Pella is designated by Josephus as the northern boundary of Peraea. According to Eusebius, the Jabesh of Scripture was only 6 m. p. from Pella, on the road from this latter to Gerasa. Now as Gerasa lies south of the present Wadi Jabis, Pella must have lain a little to the north of it, and hence it is almost certain, that the important ruins at Fahil, on a terrace over the Jordan valley opposite Scythopolis in a south-easterly direction, mark the

position of the ancient Pella. That it stood here is further borne out by the fact that Pliny describes Pella as aquis divitem. Whether the original Semitic name was Fahil (פחלא ?), and the name Pella chosen by the Greeks on account of its similarity of sound, may be left uncertain. In any case the name Pella was borrowed from the famous Macedonian town of the same name. The latter being the birthplace of Alexander the Great, it is not improbable that our Pella as well as the neighbouring Dium was founded by Alexander the Great himself, as indeed the somewhat corrupt text of Stephanus Byz. declares. According to another passage of Stephanus Byz. our Pella was also called Βοῦτις. Pella is first mentioned in history at the conquest of Palestine by Antiochus the Great, B.C. 218, when after taking Atabyrion (Tabor) he turned towards the country east of the Jordan and seized Pella, Kamus, and Gephrus. Alexander Jannaeus conquered and destroyed the town, because its inhabitants would not adopt "Jewish customs" (Bell. Jud. i. 4. 8; Antt. xiii. 15. 4). It was again separated from the Jewish region by Pompey (Antt. xiv. 4. 4; Bell. Jud. i. 7. 7). The fact of its having belonged to Decapolis is attested by Eusebius and Epiphanius as well as by Pliny and Ptolemy. The few coins which have been preserved bear, as might be expected, the Pompeian era. When Pella is named in Josephus (Bell. Jud. iii. 3. 5) among the chief places of the eleven toparchies of Judaea, this must be ascribed either to a mistake on the part of Josephus himself or to an error in the text. At the commencement of the Jewish war Pella was attacked by the insurgent Jews (Bell. Jud. ii. 18. 1). During the war the Christian Church fled thither from Jerusalem. Christian bishops of Pella are mentioned in the fifth and sixth centuries after Christ.

21. Dium, Δῖον. Among the towns of this name, of which Steph. Byz. enumerates seven, that in Macedonia at the foot of Olympus is the best known. Hence it is very credible, that our Dion in Coelesyria was a foundation of Alexander the Great. According to the astronomical definitions of Ptolemy (v. 15. 23), Dium lay under the same degree of latitude as Pella, but 1/6 of a degree farther eastward. With this agree the statements of Josephus concerning Pompey's route, that the Jewish king Aristobulus accompanied Pompey on his march from Damascus against the Nabataeans as far as Dium, that here he suddenly separated from Pompey, who therefore now turned suddenly westward and came by Pella and Scythopolis to Judaea. Little is known of the history of Dium. It was conquered by Alexander Jannaeus (Antt. xiii. 15. 3), liberated by Pompey (Antt. xiv. 4. 4), and then belonged to Decapolis (Plin. v. 18. 74; Ptolem. v. 15. 23). The coins of Dium, with the legend Δειηνων, have the Pompeian era. Some of those belonging to the time of Caracalla and Geta are still in existence. The Δία mentioned by Hierocles is certainly identical with this Dium.

22. Gerasa, Γέρασα. The ruins of the present Dscharásch are the most important in the region east of the Jordan, and are indeed (with those of Palmyra, Baalbec and Petra) among the most important in Syria. There are still in existence considerable remains of temples, theatres and other public buildings. About one hundred columns of a long colonnade, which ran through the middle of the town, are still standing. The buildings seem from their style to belong to the second or third century after Christ. Few inscriptions have as yet been published. There can be no doubt that here was the ancient Gerasa. The derivation of the name from γέροντες (veterans) of Alexander the Great, who settled here, is based only upon etymological trifling. It is certainly possible, that the foundation of Gerasa as a Hellenistic town may reach as far back as Alexander the Great. It is first mentioned in the time of Alexander Jannaeus, when it was in the power of a certain Theodorus (a son of the tyrant Zeno Kotylas of Philadelphia). It was conquered after an arduous siege by Alexander Jannaeus towards the end of his reign. It was while still defending the fortress Ragaba "in the district of Gerasa (ἐν τοῖς Γερασηνῶν ὅροις)" that he died. Gerasa was undoubtedly liberated by Pompey, for it belonged to Decapolis. At the

outbreak of the Jewish war it was attacked by the Jews (Bell. Jud. ii. 18. 1); yet the Jews dwelling in the town were spared by the inhabitants (Bell. Jud. ii. 18. 5). The Gerasa conquered and destroyed by Lucius Annius at the command of Vespasian (Bell. Jud. iv. 9. 1) cannot be this Gerasa, which as a Hellenistic town was certainly friendly to the Romans. The few coins of Gerasa (from Hadrian to Alexander Severus) have no era and contain no epithet of the city, They almost all have the superscription Ἄρτεμις τύχη Γεράσων. On an inscription of the time of Trajan the inhabitants are called Ἀντιοχεῖς πρὸς τῷ Χρυσορόᾳ. Upon another inscription, also of the Roman period, the town is called Γέρασα Ἀντιόχεια. In an ethnographic sense Gerasa must be reckoned part of Arabia, but seems even in the second century after Christ to have belonged to the province of Syria and only subsequently to have been incorporated in that of Arabia. In the fourth century after Christ it was one of the most important towns of this province. Its district was so large, that Jerome could say, that what was formerly Gilead was now called Gerasa. Famous men of Gerasa are mentioned by Steph. Byz. The names too of certain Christian bishops are well known.

23. Philadelphia, Φιλαδέλφεια, the ancient capital of the Ammonites called in the O. T. “Rabbah of the Ammonites” (רַבַּת בְּנֵי עַמּוֹן), i.e. the chief city of the Ammonites, or more shortly “Rabbah” (רַבָּה). In Polybius it is called Rabbat-Amana, in Eusebius and Steph. Byz. Amman and Ammana. The situation of the town is certainly evidenced by the ruins south of Gerasa, which to this day bear the name of Ammana. The ruins belong, like those of Kanatha, to the Roman period. The town received the name of Philadelphia from Ptolemy II. (Philadelphus), to whom consequently its Hellenization is to be referred. In the time of Antiochus the Great it was a strong fortress, which in the year 218 B.C. he vainly endeavoured to take by storm, and of which he vainly unable to get possession, till a prisoner showed him the subterranean path, by which the inhabitants came out to draw water. This being stopped up by Antiochus, the town was forced to surrender for want of water. About 135 B.C. (at the death of Simon Maccabaeus) Philadelphia was in the power of a certain Zenos Kotylas (Antt. xiii. 8. 1; Bell. Jud. i. 2. 4). It was not conquered by Alexander Jannaeus, though he had possession of Gerasa to the north and Esbon to the south of it. Hence Philadelphia is not named among the towns which were separated by Pompey from the Jewish region. It was however joined by him to the confederacy of Decapolis and had therefore the Pompeian era. It was in its neighbourhood that Herod fought against the Arabians. In A.D. 44 sanguinary contests took place between the Jews of Peraea and the Philadelphians concerning the boundaries of a village called Mia in our present text of Josephus, but for which Zia is probably the correct reading (Antt. xx. 1. 1). At the outbreak of the Jewish war, Philadelphia was attacked by the insurgent Jews (Bell. Jud. ii. 18. 1). Upon an inscription of the second century after Christ our Philadelphia is called Φιλαδέλφεια τῆς Ἀραβίας. This is however meant only in an ethnographical sense. For coins down to Alexander Severus have the superscription Φιλαδελφέων, Κοίλης Συρίας. The town therefore still belonged to the province of Syria and was probably allotted to the province of Arabia towards the close of the third century. In the fourth century it was one of the most important towns of this province. Josephus mentions the district of Philadelphia (Φιλαδελφηνή) as the eastern boundary of Peraea (Bell. Jud. iii. 3. 3). If the supposition be warranted, that Zia is the correct reading in Joseph. Antt. xx. 1. 1, the district of Philadelphia must have extended to about 15 m. p. westward of the town, in other words, full half of the land lying between the Jordan and the town must have belonged to the Philadelphian district.

It is an undoubted fact, that all the cities hitherto described formed independent political communities, which – at least after the time of Pompey – were never internally blended into an organic unity with the Jewish region, but were at most externally united with it under the same

ruler. Almost all of them had a chiefly heathen population, which after the third century before Christ became more and more Hellenistic in its character. It was only in Joppa and Jamnia and perhaps Azotus, that the Jewish element obtained during and after the Maccabean period the ascendancy. But even these towns with their respective districts formed both before and after that time independent political units. — To the same category belonged also, as Kuhn correctly admits, the towns which were refounded by Herod and his sons. It is true, that in many of these the population was mainly Jewish. But even where this was the case, the constitution was of Hellenistic organization, as is shown especially in the case of Tiberias. In most of them however the heathen population preponderated. Hence we must not assume, that they were organically incorporated with the Jewish realm, but that they occupied within it au independent position similar to that of the older Hellenistic towns. Nay in Galilee, where it was indeed impregnated with heathen elements, the Jewish country seems, on the contrary, to have been subordinate to the newly built capitals — first to Sepphoris, then to Tiberias, then again to Sepphoris (see the articles concerning them), Among the towns built by Herod certainly the two most important were Sebaste, i.e. Samaria, and Caesarea, the latter of which has been already spoken of (No. 9). Of less importance were Gaba in Galilee and Esbon in Peraea (Antt. xv. 8. 5), which must also be regarded as chiefly heathen towns, for at the outbreak of the Jewish war they, like Ptolemais and Caesarea, Gerasa and Philadelphia, were attacked by the insurgent Jews (Bell. Jud. ii. 18. 1). Lastly, we have to mention as towns founded by Herod, Antipatris and Phasaelis, Kypros named together with the latter being a mere castle near Jericho and not a πόλις (Bell. Jud. i. 21. 9; Antt. xvi. 5. 2), which also applies to the fortresses of Alexandreion, Herodeion, Hyrcania, Masada and Machaerus. Among the sons of Herod, Archelaus founded only the village (κώμη) of Archelais. Philip, on the other hand, built Caesarea = Panias and Julias = Bethsaida, and Herod Antipas the cities of Sepphoris, Julias = Livias and Tiberias. These ten cities still remain to be treated of:

24. Sebaste = Samaria. The Hellenization of the town of Samaria (Hebr. שֹׁמְרוֹן) was the work of Alexander the Great. The Samaritans had during his stay in Egypt, B.C. 332-331, assassinated Andromachus his governor in Coelesyria. Consequently when Alexander returned from Egypt (B.C. 331), he executed strict justice upon the offenders and planted Macedonian colonists in Samaria. The Chronicle of Eusebius speaks also of a refoundation by Perdiccas, which could only have taken place during his campaign against Egypt (B.C. 321); this is however very improbable so soon after the colonization by Alexander the Great. As in old times so now also Samaria was an important fortress. Hence it was levelled by Ptolemy Lagos, when in the year B.C. 312 he again surrendered to Antigonus the land of Coelesyria, which he had shortly before conquered. Some fifteen years later (about 296 B.C.) Samaria, which had meanwhile been restored, was again destroyed by Demetrius Poliorcetes in his contact with Ptolemy Lagos. Thenceforward we are for a long time without special data for the history of the town. Polybius indeed mentions, that Antiochus the Great in both his first and second conquest of Palestine 218 and 198 B.C. occupied the country of Samaria, but the fate of the town is not further indicated. It is of interest to find, that the country of Samaria, under the Ptolemies as well as under the Seleucidae, formed like Judaea a single province, which again was subdivided into separate νομοί. Towards the end of the second century before Christ, when the Seleucidian Epigonoi were no longer able to prevent the encroachments of the Jews, the town fell a victim to their policy of conquest; and Samaria — then a πόλις ὀχυρωτάτη — was again conquered in the reign of John Hyrcanus (B.C. 107) by his sons Antigonus and Aristobulus after a siege of a year, and entirely given up to destruction (Antt. xiii. 10. 2, 3; Bell. Jud. i. 2. 7). Alexander Jannaeus had possession of the town or its ruins (Antt. xiii. 15. 4). It was separated from the Jewish region by Pompey and never henceforth organically combined with it (Antt. xiv. 4. 4;

Bell. Jud. i. 7. 7). Its rebuilding was the work of Gabinius (Antt. xv. 14. 3; Bell. Jud. i. 8. 4), on which account its inhabitants were for a while called Γαβινιεῖς. The town was bestowed upon Herod by Augustus (Antt. xv. 7. 3; Bell. Jud. i. 20. 3); and by his means it first regained prosperity. For while it had hitherto been a comparatively small though strong town, its extent was so greatly increased by Herod, that it was now twenty stadia in circumference and not inferior to the most important towns. In the city thus enlarged Herod settled six thousand colonists, composed partly of disbanded soldiers, partly of people from the neighbourhood. The colonists received excellent estates. The fortifications too were rebuilt and extended, and finally the town obtained also, by the erection of a temple to Augustus and other magnificent edifices, the splendour of modern culture. Herod gave to the newly-rebuilt town the name of Σεβαστή (Antt. xv. 8. 5; Bell. Jud. i. 21. 2. Strabo, xvi. p. 860) in honour of the emperor, who had recently assumed the title of Augustus. The coins of the town bear the inscription Σεβαστηνῶν or Σεβαστηνῶν Συρ(ίας) and a special era commencing with the year of the rebuilding of the city, i.e. according to the usual view 25 or perhaps more correctly 27 B.C. The town is also mentioned in Rabbinical literature by its new name of Sebaste (סבסטי). When Josephus says, that Herod granted it "an excellent constitution," ἐξαίρετον εὐνομίαν (Bell. Jud. i. 21. 2), he makes indeed no great addition to our knowledge. It is however probable from other reasons, that the country of Samaria was subordinated to the town of Sebaste precisely as Galilee was to the capitals Sepphoris and Tiberias respectively and Judaea was to Jerusalem. For on the occasion of the tumults of the Samaritans under Pilate a "council of Samaritans," Σαμαρέων ἡ βουλή, is mentioned, which seems to point to a United organization of the country (Antt. xviii. 4. 2). Sebastenian soldiers served in the army of Herod and embraced the party of the Romans against the Jews in the conflicts which broke out at Jerusalem after his death (Bell. Jud. ii 3. 4, 4. 2, 3; comp. Antt. xvii. 10. 3). At the partition of Palestine after the decease of Herod, Sebaste with the rest of Samaria fell to Archelaus (Antt. xvii. 11. 4; Bell. Jud. ii. 6. 3), after whose banishment it remained for a time under Roman procurators, was then temporarily under Agrippa, and then again under procurators. During this last period Sebastenian soldiers formed a main element in the Roman troops stationed in Judaea (see above, p. 65). At the outbreak of the Jewish war Sebaste was attacked by the insurgent Jews (Bell. Jud. ii 18. 1). The town of Sebaste, with its chiefly heathen population, then remained as during the disturbances that followed the death of Herod (Antt. xvii. 10. 9; Bell Jud. ii. 5. 1) undoubtedly on the side of the Romans, while the native Samaritans in the district of Sichem certainly occupied a difficult position (Bell. Jud. iii. 7. 32). Sebaste became a Roman colony under Septimius Severus. But its importance henceforth declined before the prosperity of Neapolis = Sichem. Eusebius and Stephanus Byz. still call Sebaste only "a small town." Its district was nevertheless so large, that it comprised e.g. Dothaim, which lay 12 m. p. northward of the town.

25. Gaba, Γάβα or Γαβά. The name corresponds to the Hebrew גֶּבַע or גִּבְעָה, a hill, and is a frequent local name in Palestine. We are here concerned only with a Gaba, which according to the decided statements of Josephus stood on Carmel, and indeed in the great plain near the district of Ptolemais and the borders of Galilee, and therefore on the north-eastern declivity of Carmel (see especially, Bell. Jud. iii. 3. 1, and Vita, 24). Herod here settled a colony of retired knights, on which account the city was also called πόλις ἱππέων (Bell. Jud. iii. 3. 1; Antt. xv. 8. 5). From the manner in which the town is mentioned in the two passages, Bell. Jud. iii. 3. 1; Vita, 24, it is evident that it did not belong to the district of Galilee. Its population being chiefly heathen, it was attacked by the Jews at the beginning of the Jewish insurrection (Bell. Jud. ii. 18. 1), while on the other hand it took an active part in the struggle against the Jews (Vita, 24). This town is probably the Geba on Carmel mentioned by Pliny. Whatever other material has been adduced to the contrary by scholars with respect to Gaba, has served to complicate rather

than throw light upon the questions concerning its situation and history. A Gabe 16 m. p. from Caesarea is mentioned by Eusebius, but the distance stated is too short to suit the situation north-east of Carmel. Still more improbable is it, that the coins with the superscription Κλαυδι(έων) Φιλιπ(πέων) Γαβηνῶν belong to our Gaba. These titles point rather to a Gaba, which had belonged to the Tetrarch Philip; and the Gabe, mentioned by Pliny as near Caesarea Panias, may be identical with it. Lastly, which Gaba the Γάβαι in Palaestina secunda, mentioned by Hierocles, may be, must be left uncertain. Guérin thinks he has discovered our Gaba in the village of Sheikh Abreik upon a hill near Carmel, with the situation of which the statements of Josephus certainly agree.

26. Esbon or Hesbon, Hebr. חֶשְׁבּוֹן, in the LXX. and Eusebius Ἐσεβών, Josephus Ἐσσεβών, later Ἐσβοῦς. The town lay, according to Josephus, 20 m. p. east of the Jordan, opposite Jericho. With this agrees exactly the situation of the present Hesbân, east of Jordan, under the same degree of latitude as the northern point of the Dead Sea, where ruins are also found. Hesbon is frequently mentioned as the capital of an Amorite kingdom. In Isaiah and Jeremiah, on the other hand, it appears as a Moabite town. And as such it is also mentioned by Josephus even in the time of Alexander Jannaeus, by whose victories it was incorporated in the Jewish region (Antt. xiii. 15. 4). Its further history cannot be accurately followed. At all events it was in the possession of Herod, when he refortified it for the control of Peraea, and placed in it a military colony (Antt. xv. 8. 5). The district of Esbon is mentioned as the eastern boundary of Peraea by Josephus, hence it did not in a political sense belong to Peraea. At the outbreak of the Jewish war, it was attacked by the insurgent Jews (Bell. Jud. ii. 18. 1). At the creation of the province of Arabia, A.D. 105, Esbon, or as it was now called Esbus, was probably forthwith awarded to it, for Ptolemy already speaks of it as belonging to Arabia. The few coins as yet known are those of either Caracalla or Elagabalus. It was an important town in the time of Eusebius, and Christian bishops of Esbus (Esbundorum, Ἐσβουντίων) are mentioned in the fourth and fifth centuries.

27. Antipatris, Ἀντιπατρίς. The original name of this town was Καφαρσαβά, or Καβαρσαβά, sometimes Καπερσαβίνη, Hebrew כפרסבא, under which name it also occurs in Rabbinical literature. Its situation is evidenced by the present Kefr-Saba, north-eastward of Joppa, the position of which agrees with the statements of ancient writers concerning Antipatris, that it was 150 stadia from Joppa, at the entrance of the mountainous district, and 26 m. p. south of Caesarea, on the road thence to Lydia. Herod here founded in a well-watered and well-wooded plain a new city, which he called Antipatris in honour of his father Antipater (Antt. xvi. 5. 2; Bell. Jud. i. 21. 9). The town is also mentioned in Rabbinical literature under this name, אנטיפטרס; also by Ptolemy, Eusebius, and Stephanus Byzantinus. It was much reduced in the fourth century after Christ, being spoken of in the Itinerar. Burdig., not as a civitas, but only as a mutatio (stopping place), and designated by Jerome as a semirutum opidulum. Yet a Bishop of Antipatris still occurs in the Acts of the Council of Chalcedon, A.D. 451. Its existence in these later times is also elsewhere evidenced. Nay, so late as the eighth century after Christ it is still spoken of as a town inhabited by Christians.

28. Phasaelis, Φασαηλίς. It was in honour of his brother Phasael that Herod founded in the Jordan valley, in a hitherto untilled but fertile region, which was thus gained for cultivation, the city of Phasaelis (Antt. xvi. 5. 2; Bell. Jud. i. 21. 9). After his death the town, with its valuable palm plantations, came into the possession of his sister Salome (Antt. xviii. 8. 1, 11. 5; Bell. Jud. ii. 6. 3); and after her death into that of the Empress Livia (Antt. xviii. 2. 2; Bell. Jud. ii. 9. 1). Pliny speaks of the excellent dates obtained from the palm trees growing there. The town is also

mentioned by Ptolemy, Stephanus Byz., and the geographers of Ravenna. Its name has been preserved in the present Karbet Fasail on the edge of the plain of the Jordan, in a fertile district. The stream flowing thence to the Jordan is called Wadi Fasail.

29. Caesarea Panias. Τὸ Πάνειον properly means the grotto dedicated to Pan at the source of the Jordan. It is first mentioned under this name by Polybius in the time of Antiochus the Great, who there gained (198 B.C.) over the Egyptian general Scopas the decisive victory, in consequence of which all Palestine fell into his hands. Even this early mention would lead us to infer a Hellenization of the place in the third century before Christ. In any case the population of the surrounding district, as its farther history also shows, was chiefly non-Jewish. In the early times of Herod the country of Πανιάς (as it was called from the Pan-Grotto there) belonged to a certain Zenodorus, after whose death, in the year 20 B.C., it was given by Augustus to Herod (see above, § 15), who built a splendid temple to Augustus in the neighbourhood of the Pan-Grotto (Antt. xv. 10. 3; Bell. Jud. i. 21. 3). The place, which lay there, was originally called like the country, Πανιάς or Πανεάς. It was first, however, transformed into a considerable town by Philip the Tetrarch, the son of Herod, who rebuilt it and called it Καισάρεια, in honour of Augustus (Antt. xviii. 2. 1; Bell. Jud. ii. 9. 1). This refoundation belongs to the early times of Philip; for the coins of the town have an era, the commencement of which probably dates from the year 3 B.C. (751 A.U.C.), or at latest 2 B.C. (752 A.U.C.). After the death of Philip, his realm was for a few years under Roman administration, then under Agrippa I., then again under Roman procurators, and at last, in A.D. 53, under Agrippa II., who enlarged Caesarea and called it Νερωνιάς in honour of Nero (Antt. xv. 9. 4), which name is occasionally found on coins. That the town was then also chiefly a heathen one appears from Joseph. Vita, 13. Hence both Titus and Vespasian passed their times of repose during the Jewish war amidst games and other festivities at this place. The name Neronias seems never to have been naturalized. In the first century after Christ this Caesarea was, to distinguish it from others, usually called Καισάρεια ἡ Φιλίππου; its official designation upon coins, especially of the second century, is Καισ(άρεια) Σεβ(αστὴ) ἱερ(ὰ) καὶ ἄσυ(λος) ὑπὸ Πανείῳ. Elsewhere it has generally been called since the second century Καισάρεια Πανιάς, which name also predominates on coins of the third. Since the fourth the name of Caesarea has been wholly lost, and the town called only Panias. This seems besides to have always remained its prevailing name among the native population, as it is also that chiefly used (in the form פנייס) in Rabbinic literature. When the "villages of Caesarea Philippi" (αἱ κῶμαι Καισαρείας τῆς Φιλίππου) are mentioned in the New Testament, Mark 8:27, of course the genitive here expresses not a merely "local reference" of the villages to the town, but shows that they belong and are subject to it, — in other words, that Caesarea had, like each of these towns, a district of its own which it governed.

30. Julias, formerly Bethsaida. In the place of a village called Bethsaida, lying to the north of the Lake of Gennesareth, a new town was built by Philip, who called it Ἰουλιάς, in honour of Julia the daughter of Augustus (Antt. xviii. 2. 1; Bell. Jud. ii. 9. 1). Its situation eastward of the Jordan, just before the latter flows into the Lake of Gennesareth, is placed beyond doubt by the repeated and concurrent statements of Josephus. The foundation of this city also must have taken place in the earlier times of Philip. For in the year 2 B.C. (752 A.U.C.) Julia had already been banished by Augustus to the island of Pandateria, and it is not conceivable, that Philip should, after that date, have named a town after her. Of its subsequent history, nothing is known but that it was given by Nero to Agrippa II. (Antt. xx. 8. 4; Bell. Jud. ii. 13. 2). It is mentioned in Pliny, Ptolemy and the geographers of Ravenna. From the manner in which Josephus speaks of it (Antt. xviii. 2. 1), it might appear as though Philip had only altered the name of the village of Bethsaida into Julias, and thus, that the new place too was only a κώμη.

In another passage however he explicitly distinguishes Julias from the surrounding villages as a πόλις, hence the former was properly speaking a πόλις from the time of its rebuilding. The question as to whether the Bethsaida of the New Testament was identical with this – a question recently again decided in the affirmative – must here be left undiscussed.

31. Sepphoris, Σεπφώρις. The Semitic form of this name fluctuates between צִפּוֹרִין and צִפּוֹרִי. Perhaps the former is the older, the latter the abbreviated form. With the former correspond the Greek and Latin Σεπφουρίν, Saphorim, Safforine; with the latter Σαπφουρεί, Sapori. Josephus constantly uses the Graecized form Σεπφώρις. On coins the inhabitants are called Σεπφωρηνοί. The earliest mention is found in Josephus in the beginning of the reign of Alexander Jannaeus, when Ptolemy Lathurus made an unsuccessful attempt to take Sepphoris by force (Antt. xiii. 12. 5). When Gabinius, about 57-55 B.C., divided the Jewish region into five "Synedria," he transferred the Synedrium for Galilee to Sepphoris (Antt. xiv. 5. 4; Bell. Jud. i. 8. 5); which shows that this town must then have been the most important town of Galilee. It is also mentioned as a place of arms at the conquest of Palestine by Herod the Great, who was only able to take it without difficulty, because the garrison of Antigonus had evacuated the place (Antt. xiv. 15. 4; Bell. Jud. i. 16. 2). At the insurrection, after the death of Herod, Sepphoris seems to have been a main seat of the rebellion. Varus despatched thither a division of his army, burnt the town and sold its inhabitants as slaves (Antt. xvii. 10. 9; Bell. Jud. ii. 5. 1). This makes a turning-point in its history; from a Jewish town adhering to the national party it now became a town friendly to the Romans, with probably a mixed population. For Herod Antipas, to whose possession it was transferred, rebuilt it and made it "the ornament of all Galilee" (Antt. xviii 2. 1): πρόσχημα τοῦ Γαλιλαίου παντός. But its population was – as was shown by its attitude during the great war, A.D. 66-70 – no longer anti-Roman and hence no longer purely Jewish. It is perhaps this change, which is referred to in a passage of the Mishna, in which the "ancient government of Sepphoris" is assumed to have been a purely Jewish one. At its rebuilding by Herod Antipas, Sepphoris seems to have been also raised to the rank of capital of Galilee.

This rank was however afterwards bestowed by the same prince upon the newly built city of Tiberias, to which Sepphoris was subordinate. It so continued until Tiberias was, in the reign of Nero, separated from Galilee and bestowed upon Agrippa II., when Sepphoris consequently again occupied the position of capital of Galilee. Thus these two towns alternately assumed the same position with respect to Galilee, that Jerusalem did with respect to Judaea (see below, § 2). Sepphoris was at that time the most important fortress in Galilee, and, after Tiberias, the largest town in the province. Hence, at the outbreak of the Jewish war, it was of the greatest consequence, that just this town did not participate in the insurrection, but remained from the beginning on the side of the Romans. So early as the time when Cestius Gallus marched against insurgent Jerusalem, Sepphoris took up a friendly position towards him. It remained also faithful to its Romish tendencies during the winter of A.D. 66/67, when Josephus was organizing the insurrection in Galilee. Josephus therefore took possession of it by force, in doing which he was unable to prevent its being plundered by his Galilaean troops. Cestius Gallus consequently sent a garrison to the oppressed town, by which Josephus was repulsed, when he for the second time entered it by force. Vespasian soon after arrived in Galilee with his army, and Sepphoris entreated and again received from him a Roman garrison. We have but fragmentary information of the further history of the town. Its inhabitants are, on coins of Trajan, still called Σεπφωρηνοί. Soon after however it received the name of Diocaesarea, which appears on coins since Antoninus Pius. Its official designation upon coins is: Διοκαι(σάρεια) ἱερὰ ἄσ(υλος) καὶ αὐτό(νομος). The name of Diocaesarea remained the prevailing one in Greek

authors, though its original appellation continued to exist, and at last banished the new one. The district of Diocaesarea was so extensive, that it included e.g. the village of Dabira on Mount Tabor.

32. Julias or Livias. In the Old Testament, a place called Beth-haram (בֵּית הָרָם or בֵּית הָרָן), in the country east of the Jordan, in the realm of the Amorite kings of Hesbon, is mentioned (Josh. 13:27; Num. 32:36). In the Jerusalemite Talmud בית רמתה is stated to be the more modern name of this Beth-haram; and both Eusebius and Jerome identify the scriptural Beth-haram with the Βηθραμφθά or Bethrhamtha, which was known to them. The Βηθαράμαθος, where Herod the Great had a palace, which was destroyed during the insurrection after his death, is at any rate identical with the latter. It was this very Bethramphtha, which was rebuilt and fortified by Herod Antipas, and called Julias in honour of the wife of Augustus (Joseph. Antt. xviii. 2. 1; Bell. Jud. ii. 9. 1). Eusebius and others give the name as Livias instead of Julias, and the town is elsewhere frequently mentioned by this name. Since the wife of Augustus was called by her own name Livia during his lifetime, and did not bear the name of Julia till she was admitted into the gens Julia by his testament, we must conclude that Livias was the older name of the town, and that this was after the death of Augustus altered into that of Julias; but that this new official appellation was, as in the case of Caesarea Philippi and Neronias, unable to banish the older and already nationalized name. Only Josephus uses the official designation Julias. He still mentions the town by this name at the time of the Jewish war, when it was occupied by Placidus, a general of Vespasian. The situation of the town is most accurately described by Theodosius, the Palestinian pilgrim (sixth century), and after him by Gregory of Tours: it lay beyond Jordan, opposite Jericho, 12 m. p. from that town, in the neighbourhood of the warm springs. With this Eusebius, who places it opposite Jericho on the road to Hesbon, coincides. Its cultivation of dates is as much celebrated by Theodosius as by Pliny.

33. Tiberias, Τιβεριάς. The most important work of Herod the Great was the building of a new capital on the western shore of the Lake of Gennesareth, which he called Τιβεριάς in honour of the Emperor Tiberius. It was situated in a beautiful and fertile district in the neighbourhood of celebrated warm springs (Antt. xviii. 2. 3; Bell. Jud. ii. 9. 1; compare above, § 17). Its building took place considerably after that of Sepphoris and Livias. For while Josephus mentions the building of these two cities at the very beginning of the reign of Herod Antipas, he does not speak of the building of Tiberias till the entrance of Pilate upon his office (A.D. 26); see Antt. xviii. 2. 1–3. This makes it probable, that Tiberias was not built till A.D. 26 or later. Eusebius in his Chronicle decidedly places the building in the 14th year of Tiberius; but this statement is quite without chronological value. Unfortunately the era of the town occurring upon the coins of Trajan and Hadrian cannot be calculated with certainty. It appears however, that the dates of the coins do not contradict the conjecture arrived at from Josephus. The population of Tiberias was a very mixed one. To obtain inhabitants for his new town Herod Antipas was obliged to settle there, partly by compulsion, a real colluvies hominum (see above, § 17). Its attitude however during the Jewish war shows them to have been chiefly Jewish. The constitution however was one of Hellenistic organization. The town had a council (βουλή) of 600 members, at the head of which was an ἄρχων and a committee of the δέκα πρῶτοι, also Hyparchoi and an Agoranomos. It was also promoted to be the capital of Galilee, Sepphoris itself being subordinated to it (see above, p. 139), The coins of Tiberias issued in the time of Herod have simply the superscription Τιβεριάς. After the deposition of Herod Antipas Tiberias was transferred to the possession of Agrippa I. A coin of his time also, with the superscription Τιβεριέων is known. After the death of Agrippa the town came under the authority of the Roman procurators of Judaea. It must at the same time have received new political privileges or

experienced some kind of favour from the Emperor Claudius; for the inhabitants are constantly called Τιβεριεῖς Κλαυδιεῖς on the coins of Trajan and Hadrian. It continued to maintain its position as capital of Galilee till the time of Nero (Joseph. Vita, 9). By him, probably in A.D. 61, it was bestowed upon Agrippa II., and thus separated from Galilee (Antt. xx. 8. 4; Bell. Jud. ii. 13. 2; Vita, 9). Hence it formed part of the realm of Agrippa, when the Jewish insurrection broke out in A.D. 66. The attitude of the population with respect to it was a very varying one. Some desired to remain on the side of Agrippa and the Romans; others – and indeed the mass of those without property – wished to join the cause of the revolution; others again took up a position of reserve (Vita, 9; comp. also Vita, 12, where the revolutionary party is called ἡ τῶν ναυτῶν καὶ τῶν ἀπόρων στάσις). This party had decidedly the upper hand, and the rest had consequently to submit. A chief leader of this party was Jesus the son of Sapphias, then archon of the town. Still even after the triumph of the revolutionary torrent, a part of the population maintained their relations to Agrippa, and repeatedly entreated, though in vain, his support. When Vespasian had subjected the greater part of Galilee and penetrated as far as Tiberias, the town ventured no resistance, but voluntarily opened its gates and begged for pardon, which was granted out of regard for Agrippa. Vespasian indeed allowed his soldiers to march into Tiberias, but spared the town and restored it to Agrippa. It remained in his possession probably till his death, A.D. 100, till which period it did not again come under direct Roman rule, to which circumstance extant coins of the time of Trajan and Hadrian bear testimony. Eusebius designates it as a πόλις ἐπίσημος. It was in the third and fourth centuries after Christ a chief seat of Rabbinical scholarship, and is hence frequently mentioned in Talmudic. literature.

Of some of the last-named towns, as Antipatris, Phasaelis, Julias and Livias it cannot certainly be determined whether they really belonged to the class of independent towns with Hellenistic constitutions, since it is just as likely that, like other second-rate towns, they were incorporated in the general organization of the country. They had however to be named here, because in any case a certain proportion of the towns built by Herod and his sons belonged to the above category. On the other hand, it is also possible, that the number of the independent communities is not exhausted by the towns here enumerated. Hence we cannot look upon the list we have given as a strictly defined one. For the times of Roman imperialism a further number of independent civic communities would have to be named, which are here designedly passed over, because it was not till later (at the earliest A.D. 70) that they attained this position. This was the case especially with Nicopolis (= Emmaus), Neapolis (= Sichem), Diospolis (= Lydda), Eleutheropolis and the communities belonging to the province of Arabia, as Bostra, Adraa and others. Aelia Capitolina (= Jerusalem) too would have to be mentioned as a heathen town for the period after Hadrian. On Capitolias, comp. above, p. 106.

Concerning the position of the Jews in these mainly heathen communities no further material exists than what has been already communicated on the places in question. The history of Caesarea (No. 9) is the most instructive. Here heathens and Jews possessed down to Nero's time equal civic rights (ἰσοπολιτεία, Antt. xx. 8. 7 and 9) and hence equal eligibility to the town senate. As this of necessity entailed manifold dissensions, both parties strove to bring about an alteration of this state of things, each desiring to have the supremacy. Thus a threefold possibility existed: 1. equality, 2. exclusion of the Jews, and 3. exclusion of the heathen, from civic privileges. All three cases actually occurred. In the old Philistinian and Phoenician towns the Jews hardly possessed the privilege of citizenship. They dwelt in them indeed by thousands; but were only tolerated as inhabitants; and how strained were the relations between them and the heathen citizens, is best shown by the sanguinary persecution of the Jews in many of these towns at the outbreak of Jewish revolution, as e.g. in Ascalon, Ptolemais and

Tyre. In other towns heathen and Jews may have been on an equality; this was especially the case in those towns, which subsequently to the Maccabaean period were mainly inhabited by Jews, as Jamnia and Joppa. Whether heathens were excluded from civic rights in any of the hitherto named towns is very doubtful; and not probable even in Sepphoris and Tiberias. The third possibility is at all events represented by Jerusalem and in general by the towns of the strictly Jewish territory. Particulars cannot be further entered into from lack of material It must suffice to have established the general point of sight On the organization of the Jewish communities in these towns, see below, § 27. II. and § 31. II.-III.

II. THE STRICTLY JEWISH TERRITORY

THE LITERATURE

Selden, De synedriis et praefecturis juridicis reterum Ebraeorum, lib. i. Londini 1650, lib. ii. Londini 1653, lib. iii. Londini 1655 (reprint of the whole work, Amstelodami 1679). The first book treats of the judicial institutions of the Jews ante legis in Sinai dationem, the second of these same institutions subsequent to the giving of the law at Sinai, while the third is specially devoted to the consideration of the prerogatives of the supreme court (the Sanhedrim). In spite of all its critical shortcomings this learned work is still valuable on account of the rich fund of material it contains.

Saalschütz, Das mosaische Recht, vol. i. 1853, pp. 53-64.

Winer, Realwörterb., arts. Alter, Aelteste; Gericht; Städte.

Schenkel's Bibellexicon, arts. Aelteste (by Schenkel); Gerichte (by Wittichen); Städte (by Furrer).

Riehm's Handwörterb. des bibl Altertums, arts. Aelteste; Gerichtswesen; Dorf; Stadt.

Arnold in Herzog's Real-Enc., 1st ed. vol. xiv. p. 721 (art. Städte).

Leyrer in Herzog's Real-Enc., 1st ed. vol. xv. p. 324 f. (art. Synedrium).

Kuhn, Die städtische und bürgerl. Verfassung des römischen Reichs, vol. ii. pp. 336-346.

Köhler, Lehrbuch der biblischen Geschichte Alten Testaments, vol. i. 1875, p. 350 f.

Reuss, Gesch. der heiligen Schriften A. T.'s, sec. cxiv.

The strictly Jewish territory — leaving Samaria out of view — consisted of the three provinces of Judaea, Galilee and Peraea, and was enclosed within such boundaries as would naturally be formed by the contiguous portions of the districts belonging to the surrounding Hellenistic towns (comp. above, § 23. I.). The Gentile element in those provinces never formed more at the very outside than a minority of the population, while we may venture to assume that, in the towns, the municipal councils were composed exclusively of Jews. For there cannot be a doubt that, in Jewish towns as well, there were civic representative bodies to whom the management of the public affairs of the community was entrusted. So far back even as the earliest period in the history of Israel we find frequent mention of "the elders of the city" (זִקְנֵי הָעִיר) in the capacity of local authorities (see in general, Deut. 19:12, 21:2 ff., 22:15 ff., 25:7 ff.; Josh. 20:4; Judg. 8:14; Ruth 4:2 ff.; 1 Sam. 11:3, 16:4, 30:26 ff.; 1 Kings 21:8, 11). Of how many members this body was composed we are hardly ever told, but their number must have been something considerable. In Succoth, for example, there were as many as seventy-seven (Judg. 8:14). Those officials represented the community in every department of its affairs and accordingly they were also called upon to act in the capacity of judges (see, for example, Deut. 22:15). But,

besides these, “judges” (שֹׁפְטִים) and “officers” (שֹׁטְרִים) are also specially mentioned (both classes in Deut. 16:18; while in 2 Chron. 19:5 ff. the instituting of “judges” is ascribed to Jehoshaphat). Now seeing that the judges are expressly mentioned along with the elders (Deut. 21:2; Ezra 10:14), the two orders of officials are in any case to be regarded as distinct, but probably only to this extent, that the judges were those among the elders to whom the administration of justice was specially entrusted. Similarly the “officers” are also to be regarded as belonging to the number of the “elders,” their special function again being to take charge of the executive department. The organization then that existed in later times is to be assumed as having been substantially identical with the one here in question. We further find that the “elders” of the city are also frequently mentioned during the Persian and Geeek era (Ezra 10:14; Judith 6:16, 21, 7:23 8:10, 10:6, 13:12). As regards the Roman period again, we have evidence of the existence of local tribunals at that time in such a statement, for example, as that of Josephus, where he mentions that Albinus, actuated by greed, liberated for a money consideration certain individuals who, for the crime of robbery, had been sentenced to imprisonment by their respective local courts (βουλή). From what is here stated we can further gather that it was the βουλή itself that discharged the judicial functions. Still it is quite possible that in the larger towns especially there may have been, besides the βουλή, certain other courts of a special kind. Again it is the local Sanhedrims that are to be understood as referred to when, in Matt. 10:17 = Mark 13:9, it is stated that the believers would be delivered εἰς συνέδρια; we may also regard as belonging to the same category those courts that, in Matt. 5:22, are assumed to be inferior in point of jurisdiction to the high court of the Sanhedrim; and similarly with regard to the πρεσβύτεροι of Capernaum (Luke 7:3). But it is in the Mishna above all that the existence of local courts throughout the country of the Jews is presupposed from beginning to end. As regards the number of members of which such courts were composed, some have been disposed to infer from the Mishna that the most inferior ones consisted of not more than three persons. This however is based upon a pure misapprehension. For the passages appealed to in support of this view do nothing more than simply enumerate the various questions for the deciding of which and the various causes for the trying of which three persons were deemed sufficient. Thus three, for example, were considered sufficient to decide an action involving money, or to pronounce judgment in cases of robbery and assault, or to award damages and such like; this number was also sufficient to sentence any one to be scourged, to determine the date of the new moon, and decide as to the intercalary year; also for the laying on of the hands (upon a sin-offering offered in the name of the congregation), and for breaking the heifer’s neck (on the occasion of any person being found murdered). Further cases for the disposal of which only three judges were necessary were those connected with the Chaliza and the refusal of a man to marry the wife of his deceased brother (Deut. 25:7-9), the redemption of the produce of fruit trees during the first four years of their growth, the redemption of the second tithe the value of which had not been previously determined, the purchasing back of certain things that were holy to the Lord, and so on. But nowhere is it said, that there were distinct local courts consisting of only three persons. In what sense we are to understand the statements of the Mishna above referred to may be readily seen from another passage which runs thus: “Actions involving money are decided by three persons. That is to say, each of the two parties in

the case chooses a judge and then both the parties or, according to another view, both the judges, choose a third to act along with them." As matter of fact the most subordinate of the local courts consisted of seven persons. For one can scarcely be far wrong in assuming that the statement of Josephus to the effect that Moses ordained that "seven men were to bear rule in every city, and that two men of the tribe of Levi were to be appointed to act as officers in every court," was intended to be regarded as a description of the state of things that existed in Josephus' own time, for there is no mention of anything of this kind in the Pentateuch. This is corroborated by the fact that Josephus himself, when on one occasion he wanted to introduce a model Jewish constitution into Galilee, established a court with seven judges in every town. No doubt from this latter circumstance one might rather infer that this organization had had no existence in Galilee previous to the revolution. But the boast of Josephus, that he was the first to create this the ideal of a Jewish constitution, may be said to be true only to this extent, that he took steps to have it more rigidly put in force. In the Talmud too we find "the seven leading men of the city" (שבעה טובי העיר) referred to on one occasion as forming a public board which, among other things, was entrusted with the management of the financial affairs of the community. What Josephus has stated with regard to two Levites being always appointed to act as ὑπηρέται to the local courts (see above note 41 is not without its analogies at least in the Old Testament. According to the Mishna there were certain special cases in which it was necessary to have priests as judges. In the more populous places the local courts would appear to have been composed of twenty-three members. At least we find a statement in the Mishna to the effect that an inferior Sanhedrim (סַנְהֶדְרִין קְטַנָּה) consisted of twenty-three persons, and that one of this sort was assigned to every town with a population of at least 120 or, according to R. Nehemiah's view, of at least 230, in order that there might thus be a judge for every ten of the inhabitants. It must be confessed however that here too, as in so many other instances, we have no guarantee that the actual state of things quite corresponded with these regulations. Those courts of twenty-three members were likewise empowered to deal with criminal cases of a serious nature (דִּינֵי נְפָשׁוֹת), for we can also see from Matt. 5:21, 22, that the trying and sentencing of murderers did not belong exclusively to the jurisdiction of the supreme court of the Sanhedrim.

As in the case of the Hellenistic communes, so too within the Jewish domain the villages were subordinate to the towns, and the smaller towns again to the larger ones. The distinction between a town (עִיר) and a village (חָצֵר, seldom כָּפָר) is presupposed from beginning to end of the Old Testament itself; the former, as a rule, being an inhabited place surrounded by a wall, and the latter one that is not so enclosed (see in particular, Lev. 25:29–31); at the same time, towns themselves are also sometimes distinguished as walled and unwalled (Deut. 3:5; Esth. 9:19). Moreover, Josephus and the New Testament uniformly distinguish between the two notions πόλις and κώμη. On one occasion the New Testament speaks of κωμοπόλεις of Palestine (Mark 1:38), i.e. towns which, as regards their constitution, only enjoyed the rank of a κώμη. In the Mishna there are three conceptions of this matter, and these are uniformly distinguished from each other: that of a large city (כָּרָךְ), then that of a city (עִיר), and lastly that of a village (כָּפָר). The distinguishing characteristic in the case of the first two would seem to have been merely the difference in size; for even an ordinary town (עִיר) might be enclosed by a wall,

and indeed it usually was so. In the Old Testament there is already frequent allusion to the subordination of the villages to the towns. In the lists of towns given in the Book of Joshua, and above all in the fifteenth and nineteenth chapters, we often meet with the expression, the “cities with their villages” (הָעָרִים וְחַצְרֵיהֶן). Elsewhere we frequently read of a city and its daughter (בְּנוֹתֶיהָ), Num. 21:25, 32, 32:42; Josh. 15:45–47, 17:11; Judg. 11:26; Neh. 11:25 ff.; 1 Chron. 2:23, 5:16, 7:28 f., 8:12, 18:1; 2 Chron. 13:19, 28:18; Ezek. 16:46 ff., 26:6, 30:18; 1 Macc. 5:8, 65. And in keeping with the idea of the daughter, we also find the term “mother” employed to designate the chief town of a district (2 Sam. 20:19). From all this it is, in any case, clear that the villages were everywhere dependent upon the cities. But it is also highly probable that this was no less true of the smaller towns in relation to the larger ones. For frequently it is not only to villages, but also to smaller dependent towns that the designation “mother” is applied; at least in several instances is this most undoubtedly the case (Num. 21:25; Josh. 15:45–47; 1 Chron. 2:23). And what we thus gather from the Old Testament may be assumed to be no less applicable to later times as well (comp. especially, 1 Macc. 5:8: τὴν Ἰαζὴρ καὶ τὰς θυγατέρας αὐτῆς; ibid. 5:65: τὴν Χεβρὼν καὶ τὰς θυγατέρας αὐτῆς). But it is in the country on the east of the Jordan above all, and in the district of Trachonitis in particular, that capital villages (μητροκωμίαι), i.e. villages holding a position corresponding to that of a capital town, were most frequently to be met with. Thus Phaena, the modern Mismie, is called μητροκωμία τοῦ Τράχωνος. We have another example of a μητροκωμία in the case of Borechath, the modern Breike, which is also situated within the district of Trachonitis. Epiphanius mentions τὴν Βάκαθον μητροκωμίαν τῆς Ἀραβίας τῆς Φιλαδελφίας. Of course those testimonies only date from somewhere between the second and the fourth centuries of our era; moreover, the population of those districts, though of a mixed character, was composed chiefly of Gentiles.

Any notices of a more special kind that we have regarding the subordination of certain provinces to some of the larger cities apply exclusively to Galilee and Judaea, and only date from the Roman period. In Galilee, Sepphoris was the place which Gabinius fixed upon as the seat of one of the five συνέδρια or σύνοδοι; and as the one which sat here was the only one in the province (Antt. xiv. 5. 4; Bell Jud. i. 8. 5), Sepphoris became, in consequence, the centre of an organization that embraced the whole of Galilee. It is true the arrangement of Gabinius here referred to was of but short duration. But in later times as well, and particularly under the Idumaean dynasty, the whole of Galilee was always subordinate to some one capital city, whether Sepphoris on the one hand or Tiberias on the other (see above, notes 3 and 3 Here then we have an instance of a Jewish province being placed in subordination to a capital city that was not of a purely Jewish character.

In Judaea again it is to the division of the province into eleven or ten toparchies, vouched for both by Josephus and Pliny, that a special interest attaches. According to Josephus, Judaea was divided into the following eleven κληρουχίαι or τοπαρχίαι: – (1) Jerusalem, (2) Gophna, (3) Akrabatta, (4) Thamna, (5) Lydda, (6) Ammaus, (7) Pella, (8) Idumaea, (9) Engaddi, (10) Herodeion, (11) Jericho. Of these, the seven printed in italics are also mentioned by Pliny, who, by adding to them the following three: Jopica, Betholeptephene, Orine, brings up the total number of toparchies to ten. The mention of Orine instead of Jerusalem cannot be said to make any material difference. But the mention of Joppa in this instance is quite as erroneous as that

of Pella by Josephus, for both of these were independent towns and did not belong to Judaea proper. Bethleptepha, on the other hand, is mentioned by Josephus in another passage, and that as being the capital of a toparchy. We may therefore obtain a correct list if we adopt that of Josephus and substitute Bethleptepha for Pella. In that case the toparchies would be grouped as follows: in the centre, Jerusalem; to the north of it, Gophna and Akrabatta; to the north-west, Thamna and Lydda; to the west, Emmaus; to the south-west, Bethleptepha; to the south, Idumaea; to the south-east, east, Engaddi and Herodeion; to the east, Jericho. It may be assumed as self-evident that this division was made chiefly for administrative reasons and, above all, with a view to greater convenience in the collecting of the revenue. Whether those districts were at the same time districts for judicial purposes as well, it is impossible to say. In any case it is probable that the whole organization does not date farther back than the Roman period, for no trace of it is to be met with previous to that time. The authorities from whom our information is derived exhibit a singular indecision in their conceptions of the political character of the capitals of those districts, inasmuch as at one time they are described as ̓πόλεις, at another as κῶμαι. It is true that here nothing is to be made of the circumstance that Eusebius treats the places in question for the most part as κῶμαι, for by his time matters had undergone an essential change. But Josephus himself is also somewhat undecided. For example, he speaks of Emmaus as being the μητρόπολις of the district in which it stood, and obviously therefore as that of the toparchy; whereas, in speaking of Lydda, on the other hand, he calls it merely a κώμη, thus employing what would appear to be the more correct designation (see above, note 43 We are therefore bound to assume, that from the Romano-Hellenistic point of view none of the places in question were πόλεις in the strict sense of the word, that is to say, they were not civic communities with a Hellenistic constitution; while it was only in deference to Jewish and popular usage that they were spoken of as “cities.” Strictly speaking, they ought rather to be called κωμοπόλεις (see above, note 42 or, viewed in their relation to their respective toparchies, μητροκωμίαι (see above, notes 42

There was only one town in Judaea proper that, according to Romano-Hellenistic ideas, enjoyed at the same time the rank of a πόλις, and that was Jerusalem. To this latter all the rest of Judaea was subordinate, so that it ruled over it (Judaea) ὡς βασίλειον (see note 43 Consequently its relation to Judaea was similar to that in which the Hellenistic cities stood to their respective districts. This among other things is implied in the style of address that is made use of in the imperial edicts issued to the Jews and which run thus: Ἰεροσολυμιτῶν ἄρχουσι βουλῇ δήμῳ, Ἰουδαίων παντὶ ἔθνει, terms precisely similar to those employed in the edicts addressed to the Hellenistic communes where, in like manner, the city with its council ruled over, and therefore was regarded as representing the whole district to which it belonged. It is further probable that the council (the Sanhedrim) of Jerusalem was also responsible for the collection of the taxes throughout the whole of Judaea. Again there is a reminiscence of the circumstance of the “elders” exercising authority over the whole of Judaea still preserved to us in the Mishna. But since the death of Herod the Great at least, the civil jurisdiction of the Sanhedrim of Jerusalem was entirely restricted to Judaea proper. Ever since then, Galilee and Peraea were, as regards their political relations, entirely severed from Judaea, or at all events formed independent spheres of administration, as has been pointed out above with special

reference to Galilee. And least of all can we venture to make use of the circumstance that the rebellion in Galilee was directed from Jerusalem as an argument to show, that in times of peace as well, Galilee was under the jurisdiction of the supreme court of the Sanhedrim. For the circumstances here in question are obviously of an exceptional character. It was only in earlier days, and particularly during the Asmonaean period, that the whole land of Judaea could be said to have been really one in a political sense as well (comp. below, chap. iii.). As the council of Jerusalem could scarcely have been able to attend to the administration of justice in all its details, it is antecedently probable that, besides the supreme Sanhedrim, there would be one or more inferior tribunals in Jerusalem. Of this too the Mishna has preserved a reminiscence, though it happens to be a somewhat confused one.

III. THE SUPREME SANHEDRIM IN JERUSALEM

THE LITERATURE

Selden, De synedriis et praefecturis juridicis veterum Ebraeorum, lib. i.-iii., Londini 1650-1655 (comp. above, p. 132).

Meuschen, Novum Testamentum ex Talmudé et antiquitatibus Hebraeorum illustratum (Lips. 1736), pp. 1184-1199: Diatribe de נשיא seu directore Synedrii M. Hebraeorum.

Carpzov, Apparatus historico-criticus antiquilatum sacri codisis (1748), pp 550-600.

Hartmann, Die enge Verbindung des Alten Testaments mit dem Neuen (1831), pp. 166-225.

Winer, Realwörterb. ii. 551-554, art. "Synedrium."

Sachs, Uber die Zeit der Entstehung des Synhedrin's (Frankel's Zetischr.für die religiösen Interessen des Judenth., 1845, pp. 301-312).

Saalschütz, Das mosaische Rechte, 2nd ed. 1853, i. 49 ff., ii. 598 ff. Also his Archäologie der Hebräer, vol. ii. 1856, pp. 249 ff., 271 ff., 429-458.

Levy, Die Präsidentur im Synedrium (Frankel's Monatsschr. f. Gesch. und Wissenseh. des Judenth. 1855, pp. 266-274, 301-307, 339-358).

Herzfeld, Geschichte des Volkes Israel, vol. ii. (1855) pp. 380-396.

Jost, Geschichte des Judenthums und seiner Secten, vol. i. (1857) pp. 120-128, 270-281. Comp. also pp. 403 ff., vol. ii. (1858) pp. 13 ff., 25 ff.

Geiger, Urschrift und Uebersetzungen der Bibel (1857), p. 114 ff.

Keil, Handbuch der bibischen Archäologie (2nd ed. 1875), pp. 714-717.

Leyrer, art. "Synedrium," in Herzog's Real-Encycl., 1st ed. vol. xv. (1862) pp. 315-325.

Langen, Das jüdische Synedrium und die römische Procuratur in Judäa (Tüb. Theol. Quartalschr. 1862, pp. 411-463).

Grätz, Geschichte der Juden, vol. iii. (3rd ed. 1878) pp. 110 ff., 683-685.

De Wette, Lehrbuch der hebräisch-jüdischen Archäologie (4th ed. 1864), pp. 204-206.

Ewald, Geschichte des Volkes Israel (3rd ed. 1864-1868), iv. 217 ff., v. 56, vi. 097 ff.

Kueuen, Over de samenstelling van het Sanhedrin (Verslagen en Mededeelingen der koninkl. Academie van Wetenschappen, Afdeeling Letterkunde, Deel x., Amsterdam 1866, pp. 131-168). Comp. also, De Godsdienst van Israël, ii. (1870) pp. 512-515.

Derenbourg, Histoire de la Palestine (1867), pp. 83-94, 465-468.

Giusburg, art. "Sanhedrim," in Kitto's Cyclopaedia of Biblical Literature.

Hausrath, Neutestamentuche Zeitgeschichte, vol. i. (2nd ed. 1873) pp. 63-72.

Wieseler, Beiträge zur richtigen Würdigung der Evangelien (1869), pp. 205-230.

Keim, Geschichte Jesu, iii. pp. 321 ff., 345 ff.

Wellhausen, Die Pharisäer und die Sadducäer (1874), pp. 26-43.

Holtzmann, art. "Synedrium," in Schenkel's Bibellexicon, v. 446-451.

Hoffmann (D.), Der oberste Gerichtshof in der Stadt des Heiligthums (Progr. des Rabbiner-Seminares zu Berlin für 1877-1878). Also his Die Prüsidentur im Synedrium (Magazin für die Wissensch. des Judenth. v. Jahrg. 1878, pp. 94-99).

Reuss, Geschichte der heil. Schriften Alten Testaments (1881), secs, ccclxxvl., ccccxcv.

Hamburger, Real-Encyclopädie für Bibel und Talmud, part 2, 1883, art. "Synhedrion;" also the articles "Nassi" and "Abbethdin."

Stapfer, Le Sanhédrin de Jérusalem au premier siècle (Revue de théologie et de philosophie [Lausanne], 1884, pp. 105-119).

1. Its history. There is no evidence to show that, previous to the Greek period, there existed at Jerusalem an aristocratic council claiming to exercise either supreme, or what was substantially supreme, authority and jurisdiction over the whole Jewish nation. It is true no doubt that Rabbinical exegesis has sought to identify the Sanhedrim of later times with the council of seventy elders that, at his own request, had once been granted to Moses to assist him with its advice (Num. 11:16), and has, in consequence, assumed that this same council continued without interruption from the days of Moses down to Talmudic times. But during the first thousand years of this period we find practically no trace whatever of its existence. For the "elders" that are sometimes mentioned as being the representatives of the people (for example in 1 Kings 8:1, 20:7; 2 Kings 23:1; Ezek. 14:1, 20:1) did not constitute a regularly organized court like the future Sanhedrim. Then again, the supreme court at Jerusalem, the existence of which is presupposed in the Deuteronomic legislation (Deut. 17:8 ff., 19:16 ff.), and the institution of which the author of Chronicles ascribes to Jehoshaphat (2 Chron. 19:8), was merely a court of justice with functions of an exclusively judicial character, and not a council governing, or at all events substantially governing, the country as was the Sanhedrim of the Graeco-Roman age. But further, it is, to say the least of it, uncertain whether any such court as that of the Sanhedrim existed even in the Persian era. No doubt, at that time, the municipal Council of Jerusalem formed the centre of the small Jewish commonwealth very much as it did at a subsequent period. And thus far we might be justified in understanding the "elders" of the Book of Ezra (Ezra 5:5, 9, 6:7, 14, 10:8), and the חוֹרִים and סְגָנִים of the Book of Nehemiah (Neh. 2:16, 4:8, 13, 5:7, 7:5), as corresponding somewhat to the future Sanhedrim. But judging from the whole way in which they are mentioned, it is more probable that the various order referred to are regarded in their individual capacity and not as con stituting an organized body. In any case the existence of a Jewish γερουσία earlier than the Greek period cannot be proved with any degree of certainty. The first occasion on which it is mentioned, and that under this designation, is in the time of Antiochus the Great (223-187 B.C.), so that it must, of course, have been in existence as early as the time of the Ptolemies. Now seeing that, in its desire for reform everywhere and in everything, Hellenism had set itself to reorganize political institutions as well, we are bound to assume that, in all probability, it was just the new Greek rulers who would give to the Jewish γερουσία the form in which it was met with at the period now in question, whether

that form were entirely an original one or whether it were simply a reorganization of a similar court that was already in existence under the Persian rule. From the circumstance of the designation γερουσία being applied to it, it is clear that, unlike the majority of Greek councils, this was not a democratic, but an aristocratic body. This same circumstance would seem further to show that, so far as its original institution is concerned, this court dates back to an earlier period, and therefore to the time of the Persian rule. As we may well conceive, its powers would be of a tolerably large and extensive character. For the Hellenistic kings had conceded a great amount of internal freedom to municipal communities, and were on the whole satisfied if the taxes were duly paid and their own supremacy duly recognised. At the head of the Jewish commonwealth, and therefore of the γερουσία as well, stood the hereditary high priest. It was this latter, in conjunction with the γερουσία over which lie presided, that practically regulated the whole internal affairs of the nation.

After the Maccabaean insurrection the old high-priestly dynasty was superseded, its place being now supplied by the new Asmonaean line of high priests, which began with Simon, and which was likewise a hereditary one. Then again the old γερουσια must have been essentially revolutionized through its being purged of every element in it suspected of Greek sympathies and leanings. But the court itself still continued to exist and exercise its functions along with and under the Asmonaean princes and high priests; for even these latter could not venture to go so far as entirely to discard the old nobility of Jerusalem. Hence we find the γερουσία mentioned in the time of Judas (2 Macc. 1:10, 4:44, 11:27; the πρεσβύτεροι τοῦ λαοῦ of 1 Macc. 7:33 being also identically the same thing), of Jonathan (1 Macc. 12:6: ἡ γερουσία τοῦ ἔθνους; ibid. 11:23: οἱ πρεσβύτεροι Ἰσραήλ; ibid. 12:35: οἱ πρεσβύτεροι τοῦ λαοῦ) and of Simon (1 Macc. 13:36, 14:20, 28). Its existence is likewise presupposed in the Book of Judith, which probably belongs to the period now in question (Judith 4:8, 11:14, 15:8). The assumption of the title of king on the part of the Asmonaean princes, and above all the autocratic rule of an Alexander Jannaeus, indicated no doubt an advance in the direction of a pure monarchy. But, for all that, the old γερουσία still continued to assert itself as much as ever. At least in the reign of Alexandra we find τῶν Ἰουδαίων οἱ πρεσβύτεροι expressly mentioned (Antt. xiii. 16. 5).

It is true that, when a new order of things was introduced by Pompey, the monarchy was abolished. But the high priest still retained the προστασία τοῦ ἔθνους (Antt. xx. 10), and therefore it may be presumed that meanwhile the position of the γερουσία would remain essentially the same as before. The existing arrangements however were rather more seriously disturbed by Gabinius (57-55 B.C.), when he divided the whole of the Jewish territory into five σύνοδοι (Bell. Jud. i. 8. 5) or συνέδρια (Antt. xiv. 5. 4). Now, seeing that of those five synedria three were allotted to Judaea proper (viz. those of Jerusalem, Gazara and Jericho) it follows that the jurisdiction of the council of Jerusalem, if it really retained anything of its previous character at all, would extend only to something like a third part of the province. But probably that measure meant rather more than a mere limiting of jurisdiction. For the five συνέδρια established by Gabinius were not municipal councils, but – as indeed we might have supposed from the fact that Josephus uses the term σύνοδοι as a synonymous expression – genuine Roman conventus juridici, “districts for judicial purposes,” into which the Romans were in the habit of dividing every province. And, that being the case, the measure in question must have

been neither more nor less than a stricter application to Judaea of the Roman system of provincial government. As things now stood the council of Jerusalem no longer exercised sole jurisdiction within the circuit to which it belonged, but only in conjunction with the other communities within this same district. The arrangements of Gabinius however continued to subsist only somewhere about ten years. For they were in turn superseded by the new system of things introduced by Caesar (47 B.C.). This latter reappointed Hyrcanus II. to his former office of ἐθνάρχης of the Jews (see above, § 13); while it is distinctly evident from a circumstance that occurred about that time, that the jurisdiction of the council of Jerusalem once more extended to Galilee as well. The circumstance in question was the occasion on which Herod when a youth was required to appear before the συνέδριον at Jerusalem to answer for his doings in Galilee (Antt. xiv. 9. 3-5). Here for the first time, as frequently afterwards, the council of Jerusalem was designated by the term συνέδριον. As it is unusual elsewhere to find this expression applied to civic councils, such a use, in this instance, is somewhat strange, but probably it is to be explained by the fact that the council of Jerusalem was conceived of as being above all a court of justice (בֵּית דִּין). For it is in this sense that συνέδριον is specially used in later Greek.

Herod the Great inaugurated his reign by ordering the whole of the members of the Sanhedrim to be put to death (Antt. xiv. 9. 4: πάντας ἀπέκτεινε τοὺς ἐν τῷ συνεδρίῳ). Whether the πάντας here is to be understood quite literally may be left an open question. For, acoording to another passage, Herod is represented as as having ordered the forty-five most prominent personages belonging to the party of Antigonus to be put to death (Antt. xv. 1. 2: ἀπέκτεινε δὲ τεσσαράκοντα πέντε τοὺς πρώτους ἐκ τῆς αἱρέσεως Ἀντιγόνου). In any case the object of this proceeding was either to get rid entirely of the old nobility, who had been somewhat hostile to his claims, or at all events so to intimidate them as to ensure their acquiescence in the rule of the new sovereign. It was of those then that were disposed to be tractable – among whom also were a good many Pharisees, who saw in Herod's despotic sway a well-merited judgment of heaven – that the new Sanhedrim was now composed. For there is express evidence that such an institution existed in the time of Herod also, inasmuch as one can hardly understand that the "assembly" (συνέδριον) before which this monarch successfully prosecuted his charge against the aged Hyrcanus could be taken as referring to any other court than our Sanhedrim (Antt. xv. 6. 2, fin.).

After Herod's death Arclielaus obtained only a portion of his father's kingdom, viz. the provinces of Judaea and Samaria. Nor can there be any doubt that, in consequence of this, the jurisdiction of the Sanhedrim was at the same time restricted to Judaea proper (comp. above, p. 142). This continued to be the state of matters in the time of the procurators as well. But, under their administration, the internal government of the country was to a greater extent in the hands of the Sanhedrim than it had been during the reign of Herod and Archelaus. Josephus distinctly intimates as much when he informs us that, ever since the death of Herod and Archelaus, the form of government was that of an aristocracy under the supreme direction of the high priests. And accordingly he regards the aristocratic council of Jerusalem as being now the true governing body in contradistinction to the previous monarchical rule of the Idumaean princes. So too in the time of Christ and the apostles the συνέδριον at Jerusalem is frequently mentioned as being the supreme Jewish court, above all, as being the supreme Jewish court of

justice (Matt. 5:22, 26:59; Mark 14:55, 15:1; Luke 22:66; John 11:47; Acts 4:15, 5:21 ff., 6:12 ff., 22:30, 23:1 ff., 24:20). Sometimes again the terms πρεσβυτέριον (Luke 22:66; Acts 22:5) and γερουσία (Acts 5:21) are substituted for συνέδριον. A member of this court, viz. Joseph of Arimathea, is described in Mark 15:43, Luke 23:50, as a βουλευτής. Josephus calls the supreme court of Jerusalem a συνέδριον or a βουλή, or he comprehends the court and people under the common designation of τὸ κοινόν. While in the Mishna again the supreme court of justice is called בֵּית דִּין הַגָּדוֹל or סַנְהֶדְרִין גְּדוֹלָה, likewise סַנְהֶדְרִין שֶׁל שִׁבעִים יְאחד, or merely סַנְהֶדְרִין. There can be no question that, after the destruction of Jerusalem in the year 70 A.D., the Sanhedrim was abolished, so far at least as its existing form was concerned. The comparatively large amount of self-government that had hitherto been granted to the Jewish people could no longer be conceded to them after such a serious rebellion as had taken place. Hitherto, apart from the short episode in the time of Gabinius, the Roman system of provincial government had not been strictly carried out in Judaea (see above, § 17), but now that Palestine was reduced to the position of a dependent Roman province, it was no longer exempted from the ordinary system of Roman provincial administration. From all this it followed, as matter of course, that a Jewish council, invested with such extensive powers as this one had hitherto exercised, could not possibly continue any longer. It is true, no doubt, that the Jewish people lost no time in again creating for themselves a new centre in the so-called court of justice (בֵּית דִּין) at Jabne. But this court was something essentially different from the old Sanhedrim, inasmuch as it was not a legislative body, but a judicial tribunal, the decisions of which had at first nothing more than a merely theoretical importance. And although this court also came ere long to acquire great power over the Jewish people through exercising over them a real jurisdiction that was partly conceded and partly usurped, still Rabbinical Judaism has evidently never been able to get rid of the feeling that the old “Sanhedrim” had now become a thing of the past.

2. Its composition. In accordance with the analogy of the later Rabbinical courts of justice, Jewish tradition conceives of the supreme Sanhedrim as having been merely a collegiate body composed of scribes. This is what, down to the time of the destruction of Jerusalem, it certainly never was. On the contrary, it is certain, from the concurrent testimony of Josephus and the New Testament, that, till the very last, the head of the sacerdotal aristocracy continued to preside over the Sanhedrim. And so we see that all the vicissitudes of time had not been able to efface that original fundamental character of this court in virtue of which it was to be regarded not as an association of learned men, but as a body representative of the nobility. But, of course, it was not to be expected that the power of Pharisaism should continue to grow as it did without ultimately exerting some influence upon the composition of the Sanhedrim. The more the Pharisees grew in importance the more did the priestly aristocracy become convinced that they too would have to be allowed to have their representatives in the Sanhedrim. The first step in this direction would probably be taken some time during the reign of Alexandra, and the matter would doubtless receive no inconsiderable impetus in the time of Herod. For this monarch’s high-handed treatment of the old nobility could not possibly have failed to promote the interests of Pharisaism. The Sanhedrim of the Roman period then would thus seem to have been made up of two factors: that of the priestly nobility, with its Sadducaean sympathies on the

one hand, and that of the Pharisaic doctors on the other. It is moreover in the light of this fact that the various matters recorded in the traditions will require to be viewed. According to the Mishna the number of members amounted to seventy-one, clearly taking as its model the council of elders in the time of Moses (Num. 11:16). From the two statements of Josephus, the one in Antt. xiv. 9. 4 (where we are told that Herod, on his accession to the throne, put to death all the members of the Sanhedrim), and the other in Antt. xv. 1. 2 (where again we are informed that he put to death the forty-five most prominent members of the party of Antigonus), one might be disposed to infer that the number of members was forty-five. But the πάντας in the first of those statements is assuredly not intended to be taken literally. On the other hand, we have a great deal that tends to bear out the view that the number of members amounted to seventy-one. When Josephus was planning the rising in Galilee he appointed seventy elders to take charge of the administration of this province. In like manner the zealots in Jerusalem, after suppressing the existing authorities, established a tribunal composed of seventy members. This then would seem to have been regarded as the normal number of members required to constitute a supreme court of justice among the Jews. Consequently the traditions of the Mishna too are in themselves perfectly probable. As to the mode in which vacancies were filled up we know in reality absolutely nothing. But, judging from the aristocratic character of this body, we may venture to presume that there was not a new set of members every year, and those elected by the voice of the people, as in the case of the democratic councils in the Hellenistic communes, but that they held office for a longer period, nay perhaps for life, and that new members were appointed either by the existing members themselves or by the supreme political authorities (Herod and the Romans). The supplying of vacancies through co-optation is also presupposed in the Mishna, in so far as, after its own peculiar way no doubt, it regards the amount of Rabbinical learning possessed by the candidate as the sole test of his eligibility. In any case we may well believe that the one requirement of legal Judaism, that none but Israelites of pure blood should be eligible for the office of judge in a criminal court, would also be insisted on in the case of the supreme Sanhedrim. New members were formally admitted to take their seats through the ceremony of the laying on of hands (סְמִיכָה). With regard to the different orders to which the members of the Sanhedrim belonged we have trustworthy information on that point in the concurrent testimony of the New Testament and Josephus. Both authorities are agreed in this, that the ἀρχιερεῖς in the literal sense of the word were the leading personages among them. In almost every instance in which the New Testament enumerates the different orders we find that the ἀρχιερεῖς are mentioned first. Sometimes οἱ ἄρχοντες is substituted for this latter as being an inter-changeable expression. This is also the case in Josephus, above all, who designates the supreme authorities in Jerusalem either by conjoining the ἀρχιερεῖς with the δυνατοῖς, the γνωρίμοις and the βουλῇ, or by substituting ἄρχοντες for ἀρχιερεῖς, but never by coupling the two together at the same time. On the other hand, the ἀρχιερεῖς often stand alone as being the leading personages in the Sanhedrim. And however difficult it may now be further to determine the exact significance of this term (on this see below, under No. iv.), there can, at all events, be no doubt whatever that it is the most prominent representatives of the priesthood that are here in view. We are therefore to understand that it was always this class that played a leading part in the conduct of affairs. But it is certain that,

along with them, the γραμματεῖς, the professional lawyers, also exercised considerable influence in the Sanhedrim. Such other members as did not belong to one or other of the two special classes just referred to were known simply as πρεσβύτεροι, under which general designation both priests and laymen alike might be included (for the two categories in question, see the passages in the New Testament quoted in note 48 Now, as the ἀρχιερεῖς belonged chiefly if not exclusively to the party of the Sadducees, while the γραμματεῖς, on the other hand, adhered not less strongly to the sect of the Pharisees, it follows from all that we have just been saying that Sadducees and Pharisees alike had seats in the Sanhedrim (especially during the Romano-Herodian period with regard to which alone can we be said to have any precise information). This is further corroborated by the express testimony of the New Testament and Josephus. During the period in question the greatest amount of influence was already practically in the hands of the Pharisees, with whose demands the Sadducees were obliged, however reluctantly, to comply, "as otherwise the people would not have tolerated them." This remark of Josephus gives us a deep insight into the actual position of matters, from which it would seem, that though formally under the leadership of the Sadducaean high priests, the Sanhedrim was by this time practically under the predominant influence of Pharisaism.

There is a casual notice in Josephus which may perhaps be taken as pointing to the existence of an arrangement peculiar to the Hellenistico-Roman period. On one occasion when certain differences had arisen between the Jewish authorities and Festus the procurator about some alteration in the temple buildings, it appears that, with the concurrence of Festus, the Jews sent "the ten foremost persons among them and the high priest Ismael and the treasurer Helkias" as a deputation to Nero (Antt. xx. 8. 11: τοὺς πρώτους δέκα καὶ Ἰσμάηλον τὸν ἀρχιερέα καὶ Ἑλκίαν τὸν γαζοφύλακα). Now, if by the πρῶτοι δέκα here we are to understand not merely the ten most distinguished persons generally, but men holding a specific official position, then we are bound to assume that they were no other than the committee consisting of the δέκα πρῶτοι so often to be met with in the Hellenistic communes, and which can also be clearly shown to have had a place for example in the constitution established by Tiberias (see above, note 39 We are thus furnished with characteristic evidence of the extent to which Jewish and Hellenistico-Roman influences had become intertwined with each other in the organization of the Sanhedrim at the period in question.

As to who it was that acted as president of the Sanhedrim, this is a question in regard to which even Christian scholars down to most recent times and founding upon Jewish tradition, have entertained the most erroneous views conceivable. The later Jewish tradition, which as a rule regards the Sanhedrim in the light of a mere college of scribes, expressly presupposes that the heads of the Pharisaic schools were also the regular presidents of the Sanhedrim as well. Those heads of the schools are enumerated in the Mishna tractate Aboth c. i., and that with reference to earlier times, say from the middle of the second century B.C. till about the time of Christ, and are mentioned in pairs (see below, § 25); and it is asserted, though not in the tractate Aboth, yet in another passage in the Mishna, that the first of every pair had been Nasi (נָשִׂיא), while the second had been Ab-beth-din (אַב בֵּית דִּין), i.e. according to later usage in regard to those titles: president and vice-president of the Sanhedrim. Further, the heads of the schools that come after the "pairs" just referred to, especially Gamaliel I. and his son Simon,

are represented by the later traditions as having been presidents of the Sanhedrim. In all this however there is, of course, nothing that is of any historical value. On the contrary, according to the unanimous testimony of Josephus and the New Testament, it was always the high priest that acted as the head and president of the Sanhedrim. Speaking generally, we may say that this is only what was to be expected from the nature of the case itself. Ever since the commencement of the Greek period the high priest had uniformly acted as head of the nation as well. In like manner the Asmonaeans had also been high priests and princes, nay even kings at one and the same time. With regard to the Roman period, we have the express testimony of Josephus to the effect that the high priests were also the political heads of the nation (Antt. xx. 10, fin.: τὴν προστασίαν τοῦ ἔθνους οἱ ἀρχιερεῖς ἐπεπίστευντο). In his theoretical descriptions of the Jewish constitution this historian invariably speaks of the high priest as having been the supreme judge (Apion, ii. 23: the high priest φυλάξει τοὺς νόμους, δικάσει περὶ τῶν ἀμφισβητουμένων, κολάσει τοὺς ἐλεγχθέντας ἐπ' ἀδίκῳ; Antt. iv. 8. 14: Moses is said to have ordained that, if the local courts were unable to decide a case, the parties were to go to Jerusalem, καὶ συνελθόντες ὅ τε ἀρχιερεὺς καὶ ὁ προφήτης καὶ ἡ γερουσία τὸ δοκοῦν ἀποφαινέσθωσαν). Even from what is here stated we are required to assume that the high priest acted the part of president in the Sanhedrim. But, besides this, we have testimony of the most explicit kind to the same effect. In a document of so early a date as the national decree declaring the combined office of high priest and sovereign to be vested by right of inheritance in the family of Simon the Maccabaean, it was ordained that nobody was to be allowed "to contradict his (Simon's) orders, or to convene an assembly in any part of the country without his knowledge or consent." In the few instances in which Josephus mentions the sittings of the Sanhedrim at all, we invariably find that the high priest occupied the position of president. Thus in the year 47 B.C. it was Hyrcanus II., and in the year 62 A.D. it was Ananos the younger. Similarly in the New Testament, it is always the ἀρχιερεύς that appears as the presiding personage (Acts 5:17 ff., 7:1, 9:1, 2, 22:5, 23:2, 4, 24:1). Wherever names are mentioned we find that it is the high priest for the time being that officiates as president. Thus we have Caiaphas in the time of Christ (Matt. 26:3, 57), and Ananias in the time of the Apostle Paul (Acts 23:2, 24:1), both of whom, as we learn from Josephus, were the high priests actually in office at the dates in question. The trial of Jesus before Annas (John 18.) cannot be regarded as in any way disproving this view. For there it was merely a question of private examination. As little can we lay any stress on the fact that Ananos (or Annas) the younger is represented as being at the head of affairs in the time of the war, and that long after he had been deposed. For the circumstance of his occupying that position then was due to the fact of a special decree of the people having been issued at the time at which the revolution broke out. The only passage that might be urged in opposition to our view is Acts 4:6, where Annas (who was only an ex-high priest) is represented as being the president of the Sanhedrim. But this passage is very much in the same position as the parallel one, Luke 3:2. In both Annas is mentioned before Caiaphas in such a way as might lead one to suppose that the former was the high priest actually in office, though in point of fact this was certainly not the case. If therefore we are not at liberty to infer from Luke 3:2 that Annas was still in office as high priest, as little can we conclude from Acts 4:6 that he was president of the Sanhedrim, which would be incompatible with Matt. 26:57-66. We

should prefer to explain the matter by saying that, in both cases, there is some inaccuracy about the narrative. That the persons who are mentioned in the Rabbinical traditions were not presidents of the Sanhedrim is further evident from the fact that, wherever those same individuals happen to be mentioned in the New Testament or by Josephus, they always appear merely as ordinary members of the court. Thus Shemaiah (Sameas) in the time of Hyrcanus II., Gamaliel I. in the time of the apostles (Acts 5:34, comp. ver. 27), and Simon ben Gamaliel in the time of the Jewish war.

The Jewish tradition in question is therefore at variance with the whole of the undoubted historical facts. Not only so, but it is itself only of a very late origin, and probably does not belong to so early a period as the age of the Mishna. The one solitary passage in the Mishna in which it occurs (Chagiga ii. 2) stands there in perfect isolation. Everywhere else in this work the heads of the schools above mentioned are spoken of simply as heads of schools and nothing more. Consequently it is extremely probable that the passage in question did not find its way into the text of the Mishna till some subsequent period. Then again, it may be affirmed, unless we have been deceived on all hands, that the titles Nasi and Ab-beth-din as applied to the president and vice-president of the Sanhedrim are foreign as yet to the age of the Mishna. It is true both those terms are to be met with in this work. But by Nasi it is always the actual prince of the nation, specially the king, that is meant, as indeed, is on one occasion expressly affirmed, while the Ab-beth-din again, if we may judge from its literal import, can hardly have been intended to mean anything else than the president of the supreme court of justice (and therefore of the Sanhedrim). Besides this latter title, we sometimes meet with that of Rosh-beth-din, and with precisely the same meaning. It was not till the post-Mishnic age that the titles Nasi and Ab-beth-din were, so to speak, reduced a step by being transferred to the president and vice-president respectively. Finally, the so-called מוּפְלָא, who, on the strength of a few passages in the Talmud is also frequently mentioned by Jewish and Christian scholars as having been a special functionary of the court, was not so at all, but simply the most “prominent” of its ordinary members, i.e. the one who was most learned in the law.

As regards the time of Christ it may be held as certain, from all that has just been said, that the office of president was always occupied by the high priest for the time being, and that too in virtue of his being such.

3. Its jurisdiction. As regards the area over which the jurisdiction of the supreme Sanhedrim extended, it has been already remarked above (p. 142) that its civil authority was restricted, in the time of Christ, to the eleven toparchies of Judaea proper. And accordingly, for this reason, it had no judicial authority over Jesus Christ so long as He remained in Galilee. It was only as soon as He entered Judaea that He came directly under its jurisdiction. In a certain sense, no doubt, the Sanhedrim exercised such jurisdiction over every Jewish community in the world, and in that sense over Galilee as well. Its orders were regarded as binding throughout the entire domain of orthodox Judaism. It had power, for example, to issue warrants to the congregations (synagogues) in Damascus for the apprehension of the Christians in that quarter (Acts 9:2, 22:5, 26:12). At the same time however the extent to which the Jewish communities were willing to yield obedience to the orders of the Sanhedrim always depended on how far they were favourably disposed toward it. It was only within the limits of Judaea proper that it exercised any

direct authority. There could not possibly be a more erroneous way of defining the extent of its jurisdiction as regards the kind of causes with which it was competent to deal than to say that it was the spiritual or theological tribunal in contradistinction to the civil judicatories of the Romans. On the contrary, it would be more correct to say that it formed, in contrast to the foreign authority of Rome, that supreme native court which here, as almost everywhere else, the Romans had allowed to continue as before, only imposing certain restrictions with regard to competency. To this tribunal then belonged all those judicial matters and all those measures of an administrative character which either could not be competently dealt with by the inferior local courts or which the Roman procurator had not specially reserved for himself. The Sanhedrim was, above all, the final court of appeal for questions connected with the Mosaic law, but not in the sense that it was open to any one to appeal to it against the decisions of the inferior courts, but ather in so far as it was called upon to intervene in every case in which the lower courts could not agree as to their judgment. And when once it had given a decision in any case the judges of the local courts were, on pain of death, bound to acquiesce in it. In the theoretical speculations of the scribes we find the following specially laid down as cases which are to belong to the jurisdiction of the supreme court of justice: "A tribe (charged with idolatry), or a false prophet, or a high priest is only to be tried before the court of the seventy-one. A voluntary war is only to be commenced after the decision of the court of the seventy-one has been given regarding it. There is to be no enlargement of the city (Jerusalem or the courts of the temple) till after the court of the seventy-one has decided the matter. Superior courts for the tribes are only to be instituted when sanctioned by the court of the seventy-one. A town that has been seduced into idolatry is only to be dealt with by the court of the seventy-one." Accordingly the high priest might be tried by the Sanhedrim, though the king, on the other hand, was as little amenable to its authority as he was at liberty to become one of its members. At the same time it is not difficult to perceive that all the regulations just referred to have the air of being of a purely theoretical character, that they do not represent the actual state of things, but merely the devout imaginations of the Mishnic doctors. The facts to be gleaned from the pages of the New Testament are of a somewhat more valuable character. We know, as matter of fact, that Jesus appeared before the Sanhedrim charged with blasphemy (Matt. 26:65; John 19:7), and that, before this same tribunal, Peter and John were brought up charged with being false prophets and deceivers of the people (Acts 4 and 5), Stephen with being a blasphemer (Acts 6:13 ff.), and Paul with being guilty of transgressing the Mosaic law (Acts 23).

There is a special interest attaching to the question as to how far the jurisdiction of the Sanhedrim was limited by the authority of the Roman procurator. We accordingly proceed to observe that, inasmuch as the Roman system of provincial government was not strictly carried out in the case of Judaea (see above, § 17), as the simple fact of its being administered by means of a procurator plainly shows, the Sanhedrim was still left in the enjoyment of a comparatively high degree of independence. Not only did it exercise civil jurisdiction, and that according to Jewish law (which was only a matter of course, as otherwise a Jewish court of justice would have been simply inconceivable), but it also enjoyed a considerable amount of criminal jurisdiction as well. It had an independent authority in regard to police affairs, and consequently possessed the right of ordering arrests to be made by its own officers (Matt.

26:47; Mark 14:43; Acts 4:3, 5:17, 18). It had also the power of finally disposing, on its own authority, of such cases as did not involve sentence of death (Acts 4:5–23, 5:21–40). It was only in cases in which such sentence of death was pronounced that the judgment required to be ratified by the authority of the procurator. Not only is this expressly affirmed with regard to the Jews in the Gospel of John (18:31 ἡμῖν οὐκ ἔξεστιν ἀποκτεῖναι οὐδένα), but it follows as matter of certainty, from the account of the condemnation of Jesus as given by the Synoptists. Besides, a reminiscence of this fact has survived in the Jewish traditions. But it is at the same time a fact worthy of note, that the procurator regulated his judgment in accordance with Jewish law; only on this assumption could Pilate have pronounced sentence of death in the case of Jesus. It is true the procurator was not compelled to have any regard to Jewish law in the matter at all, but still he was at liberty to do so, and as a rule he actually did so. There was one special offence in regard to which the Jews had been accorded the singular privilege of proceeding even against Roman citizens according to Jewish law. For if on any occasion one who was not a Jew happened to pass the barrier at the temple in Jerusalem, beyond which only Jews could go, and thus intrude into the inner court, he was punished with death, and that even though he were a Roman. Of course, even in this latter case, it was necessary that the sentence of the Jewish court should be confirmed by the Roman procurator. For we can hardly venture to infer, from the terms used by Josephus in speaking of this matter, that in this special instance, though in this alone, the Jews had an absolute right to carry out the capital sentence on their own authority. Nor would we be justified in drawing any such inference from the stoning of Stephen (Acts 7:5 ff.). This latter is rather to be regarded either as a case of excess of jurisdiction, or as an act of irregular mob-justice. Still, on the other hand, it would be a mistake to assume, as a statement in Josephus might seem to warrant us in doing, that the Sanhedrim was not at liberty to meet at all without the consent of the procurator. But all that is meant by the statement in question is that the high priest had no right to hold a court of supreme jurisdiction in the absence and without the consent of the procurator. As little are we to assume that the Jewish authorities were required to hand over every offender in the first instance to the procurator. This they no doubt did if at any time it seemed to them to be expedient to do so, but that does not necessarily imply that they were bound to do it. We see then that the Sanhedrim had been left in the enjoyment of a tolerably extensive jurisdiction, the most serious restriction to it being, of course, the fact that the Roman authorities could at any time take the initiative themselves, and proceed independently of the Jewish court, as they actually did in not a few instances, as, for example, when Paul was arrested. Further, it was in the power, not only of the procurator, but even of the tribune of the cohorts stationed in Jerusalem, to call the Sanhedrim together for the purpose of submitting to it any matter requiring to be investigated from the standpoint of Jewish law (Acts 20:30; comp. 23:15, 20, 28).

4. The time and place of meeting. The local courts usually sat on the second and fifth days of the week (Monday and Thursday). Whether this was also the practice in the case of the supreme Sanhedrim we have no means of knowing. There were no courts held on festival days (יום טוב), much less on the Sabbath. As in criminal cases a capital sentence could not be pronounced till the day following the trial, it was necessary to take care not to allow cases of this nature to be concluded on the evening preceding the Sabbath or any festival day. Of course all

those regulations were, in the first instance, of a purely theoretical character, and, as we know from what took place in the case of Jesus, were by no means strictly adhered to. The place in which the supreme Sanhedrim was in the habit of meeting (the βουλή) was situated, according to Josephus, Bell. Jud. v. 4. 2, close to the so-called Xystos, and that on the east side of it, in the direction of the temple mount. Now, seeing that, according to Bell. Jud. ii. 16. 3, there was nothing but a bridge between the Xystos and this latter, it is probable that the βουλή was to be found upon the temple mount itself, on the western side of the enclosing wall. In any case, it must have stood outside the upper part of the city, for, according to Bell. Jud. vi. 6. 3, we find that the Romans had destroyed the βουλευτήριον (= βουλή) before they had as yet got possession of the upper part of the city. The Mishna repeatedly mentions the לִשְׁכַּת הַנָּוִית as the place where the supreme Sanhedrim held its sittings. Now, seeing that its statements cannot possibly refer to any other period than that of Josephus, and considering, more-over, that by the βουλή of this historian we are undoubtedly to understand the meeting-place of the supreme Sanhedrim, we must necessarily identify the לִשְׁכַּת הַגָּזִית with the βουλή of Josephus. It may be presumed therefore that the designation לשכת הגדית was not meant to imply (as has been commonly supposed) that the hall in question was built of hewn stones (גָּזִית = hewn stones), – which could hardly be regarded as a characteristic feature, – but that it stood beside the Xystos (גָּזִית = ξυστός, as in the Sept. 1 Chron. 22:2; Amos 5:11). To distinguish it from the other לְשָׁכוֹת on the temple esplanade it was called, from its situation, “the hall beside the Xystos.” It is true that the Mishna represents it as having been within the inner court. But, considering how untrustworthy and sometimes inaccurate are its statements elsewhere regarding the topography of the temple, the testimony of the Mishna cannot be supposed to invalidate the result arrived at above, especially as it happens to be corroborated by other circumstances besides. We may regard as utterly useless here the later Talmudic statement, to the effect that, forty years before the destruction of the temple, the Sanhedrim had either removed or had been ejected (גלתה) from the lischkath hagasith, and that after that it held its sittings in the chanujoth (חנויות) or in a chanuth (חנות), a merchant’s shop. This view must be completely dismissed, for the simple reason that no trace of it is as yet to be met with in the pages of the Mishna, which, on the contrary, obviously presupposes that the Sanhedrim still held its sittings in the lischkath hagasith on the very eve of the destruction of the temple. As it so happens that the forty years immediately preceding the destruction of the temple are also regarded as the period during which the Sanhedrim had ceased to have the right to pronounce a capital sentence (see above, note 51 it is probable that what the Talmudic statement in question means, is that during the period just referred to the Sanhedrim was no longer at liberty, or was no longer inclined, to hold its sittings in the usual official courthouse, but met in some obscure place, i.e. in “the merchant’s shops,” or, as the reading with the singular chanuth is perhaps to be preferred, in a “merchant’s shop.” For חָנוּת is the ordinary word for a shop with an arched roof, a merchant’s shop. As in one instance it is stated that the Sanhedrim subsequently removed from the chanuth into Jerusalem, probably we are to conceive of that building as having been outside the city proper. But all further conjectures on the part of scholars as to where it stood are superfluous, for the thing itself is in the main unhistorical. Although on the occasion on which Jesus was condemned to death (Mark 14:53 ff.; Matt. 26:57 ff.) the Sanhedrim happened to meet in the

palace of the high priest, we must regard this as an exception to the rule, rendered necessary by the simple fact of its having met during the night. For at night the gates of the temple mount were shut.

5. Judicial procedure. This, according to the account of it given in the Mishna, was as follows. The members of the court sat in a semicircle (כַּחֲצִי גּוֹרֶן עֲגוּלָה, literally, like the half of a circular threshing-floor), in order that they might be able to see each other. In front of them stood the two clerks of the court, one on the right hand and the other on the left, whose duty it was to record the votes of those who were in favour of acquittal on the one hand, and of those who were in favour of a sentence of condemnation on the other. There also sat in front of them three rows of the disciples of the learned men, each of whom had his own special seat assigned him. The prisoner at the bar was always required to appear in a humble attitude and dressed in mourning. In cases involving a capital sentence, special forms were prescribed for conducting the trial and pronouncing the sentence. On such occasions it was the practice always to hear the reasons in favour of acquittal in the first place, which being done, those in favour of a conviction might next be stated. When any one had once spoken in favour of the accused he was not at liberty afterwards to say anything unfavourable to him, though the converse was permissible. Those of the student disciples who happened to be present were also allowed to speak, though only in favour of and not against the prisoner, while on other occasions not involving a capital sentence they could do either the one or the other as they thought proper. A sentence of acquittal might be pronounced on the same day as that of the trial, whereas a sentence of condemnation could not be pronounced till the following day. The voting, in the course of which each individual stood up in his turn, began "at the side," מִן הַצַּד, i.e. with the youngest member of the court, whereas on other occasions it was the practice to commence with the most distinguished member. For a sentence of acquittal a simple majority was sufficient, while for one of condemnation again a majority of two was required. If therefore twelve of the twenty-three judges necessary to form a quorum voted for acquittal and eleven for a conviction, then the prisoner was discharged; but if, on the other hand, twelve were for a conviction and eleven for acquittal, then in that case the number of the judges had to be increased by the addition of two to their number, which was repeated if necessary until either an acquittal was secured or the majority requisite for a conviction was obtained. But, of course, they had to restrict themselves to the maximum number of seventy-one.

IV. THE HIGH PRIESTS

THE LITERATURE

Selden, De successions in pontificatum Ebraeorum, lib. i. cap. 11-12 (frequently printed along with Selden's other works; for example, in the edition of the Uxor Ebraica, Francof. ad Od. 1673; also in Ugolini's Thesaurus, vol. xii.).

Lightfoot, Ministerium templi Hierosolymitani, c. iv. 3 (Opp. ed. Roterodam. i. 684 ff.).

Reland, Antiquitates sacrae, par. ii. c. 2 (ed. Lips. 1724, p. 146 f.).

Anger, De temporum in actis apostolorum ratione (1833), p. 93 f.

Ewald, Geschichte des Volkes Israel, vol. vi. 3rd ed. 1868, p. 634.

Schürer, Die ἀρχιερεῖς im Neuen Testamente (Stud. u. Krit. 1872, pp. 593-657).

Grätz, Monatsschr.für Geschichte und Wissensch. des Judenthums, Jahrg. 1877, pp. 450-

464, and Jahrg. 1881, pp. 49-64, 97-112.

The most distinctive feature of the Jewish constitution as it existed during the period subsequent to the exile is this, that the high priest was the political head of the nation as well. That he was so at least from the commencement of the Greek era down to the days of the Romano-Herodian rule is regarded as entirely beyond dispute. The high priests of the pre-Maccabaean age as well as those of the Asmonaean line were not only priests, but also princes at one and the same time. And although their authority was restricted on the one hand by the Greek suzerains, and on the other by the gerousia, still it was very greatly strengthened by the fact that their high office was hereditary and tenable for life. The combination of priesthood and royalty as seen in the case of the later Asmonaeans represented the very acme of sacerdotal power and authority. After the Romans came upon the scene, and still more under the Herodian princes, they of course lost much of their power. The Asmonaean dynasty was overthrown, nay was extirpated altogether. The principle of inheritance and life-tenure was done away with. High priests were appointed and deposed at pleasure by Herod and the Romans alike. In addition to this, there was the steady increase of the power of Pharisaism and the Rabbinical school. But even in spite of the combined influence of all the factors we have mentioned, the high-priesthood contrived to retain a considerable share of its original power down to the time of the destruction of the temple. And even after that the high priests continued to act as presidents of the Sanhedrim, and consequently to have the chief direction of the civil affairs of the community as well. Even then there still remained a few privileged families from which the high priests continued to be almost always selected. And accordingly, although under the supreme rule of the Romans and the Herodian princes they no longer formed, it may be, a monarchical dynasty, they yet continued to exist as an influential aristocracy. As we are familiar, from political history, with the series of high priests down to the overthrow of the Asmonaeans, it will be sufficient at present merely to subjoin a list of those belonging to the Romano-Herodian period. Josephus tells us that they numbered twenty-eight in all. Accordingly on collating his different notices with regard to them, we get the following twenty-eight names: —

(a) Appointed by Herod (37-4 B.C.): —

1. Ananel (37-36 B.C.), a native of Babylon, and belonging to an obscure priestly family, Antt. xv. 2. 4, 3. 1. The Rabbinical traditions represent him as having been an Egyptian.

2. Aristobulus, the last of the Asmonaeans (35 B.C.), Antt. xv. 3. 1, 3.

Ananel for the second time (34 ff. B.C.), Antt. xv. 3. 3.

3. 3. Jesus the son of Phabes, Antt. xv. 9. 3.

4. 4. Simon the son of Boethos, or according to other accounts, Boethos himself, in any case the father-in-law of Herod, he having been the father of Mariamne II. (some time between 24 and 25 B.C.), Antt. xv. 9. 3, xvii. 4. 2. Comp. xviii. 5. 1, xix. 6. 2. The family belonged originally to Alexandria, Antt. xv. 9. 3.

5. Matthias the son of Theophilos (5-4 B.C.), Antt. xvii. 4. 2, 6. 4.

6. Joseph the son of Ellem, Antt. xvii. 6. 4.

7. Joasar the son of Boethos (4 B.C.), Antt. xvii. 6. 4.

(b) Appointed by Archelaus (4 B.C.-6 A.D.): —

8. Eleasar the son of Boethos (4 ff.), Antt. xvii. 13. 1.

9. Jesus the son of Σεέ, Antt. xvii. 13. 1.

Joasar for the second time, Antt. xviii. 1. 1, 2. 1.

(c) Appointed by Quirinus (A.D. 6): —

10. Ananos or Hannas the son of Seth (6–15 A.D.), Antt. xviii. 2. 1, 2. Comp. xx. 9. 1; Bell. Jud. v. 12. 2. This is the high priest so well known in the New Testament, Luke 3:2; John 18:13–24; Acts 4:6.

(d) Appointed by Valerius Gratus (A.D. 15–26): —

11. Ismael the son of Phabi (some time between 15 and 16 A.D.), Antt. xviii. 2. 2.

12. Eleasar the son of Ananos (some time between 16 and 17 A.D.), Antt. xviii. 2. 2.

13. Simon the son of Kamithos (somewhere about 17–18 A.D.), Antt. xviii. 2. 2.

14. Joseph called Caiaphas (somewhere between 18 and 36 A.D.), Antt. xviii. 2. 2, 4. 3. Comp. Matt. 26:3, 57; Luke 3:2; John 11:49, 18:13, 14, 24, 28; Acts 4:6. According to John 18:13, he was the father-in-law of Hannas = Ananos.

(e) Appointed by Vitellius (35–39 A.D.): —

15. Jonathan the son of Ananos (36–37 A.D.), Antt. xviii. 4. 3, 5. 3. Comp. xix. 6. 4. He was found still playing a prominent part in public life in the time of Cumanus, 50–52 A.D. (Bell. Jud. ii. 12. 5–6), and was ultimately assassinated at the instigation of Felix the procurator (Bell. Jud. ii. 13. 3; Antt. xx. 8. 5).

16. Theophilos the son of Ananos (37 ff. A.D.), Antt. xviii. 5. 3.

(f) Appointed by Agrippa I. (41–44 A.D.): —

17. Simon Kantheras the son of Boethos (41 ff. A.D.), Antt. xix. 6. 2.

18. Matthias the son of Ananos, Antt. xix. 6. 4.

19. Elionaios the son of Kantheros, Antt. xix. 8. 1.

(g) Appointed by Herod of Chalkis (44–48 A.D.).

20. Joseph the son of Kami or Kamedes (= Kamithos), Antt. xx. 1. 3, 5. 2.

21. Ananias the son of Nedebaios (somewhere between 47 and 59 A.D.), Antt. xx. 5. 2; comp. xx. 6. 2; Bell. Jud. ii. 12. 6; Acts 23:2, 24:1. In consequence of his wealth he continued to be a man of great influence even after his deposition, although, at the same time, notorious for his avarice (Antt. xx. 9. 2–4). He was put to death by the insurgents at the commencement of the Jewish war (Bell. Jud. ii. 17. 6, 9).

(h) Appointed by Agrippa II (50–100 A.D.): —

22. Ismael the son of Phabi (about 59–61 A.D.), Antt. xx. 8. 8, 11. He is probably identical with the person of the same name whose execution at Cyrene is incidentally mentioned, Bell. Jud. vi. 2. 2.

23. Joseph Kabi, son of Simon the high priest (61–62 A.D.), Antt. xx. 8. 11; comp. Bell. Jud. vi. 2. 2.

24. Ananos the son of Ananos (62 A.D., for only three months), Antt. xx. 9. 1. He was one of those who played a leading part during the first period of the Jewish war, but was subsequently put to death by the populace, Bell. Jud. ii. 20. 3, 22. 1–2, iv. from 3. 7 to 5. 2; Vita, 38, 39, 44, 60.

25. Jesus the son of Damnaios (about 62–63 A.D.), Antt. xx. 9. 1. and 4; comp. Bell. Jud. vi. 2. 2.

26. Jesus the son of Gamaliel (about 63–65 A.D.), Antt. xx. 9. 4, 7. In the course of the Jewish

war he is frequently mentioned along with Ananos, whose fate he also shared, Bell. Jud. iv. 3. 9, 4. 3, 5. 2; Vita, 38, 41. According to Rabbinical tradition, his wife, Martha, was of the house of Boethos.

27. Matthias the son of Theophilos (65 ff. A.D.), Antt. xx. 9. 7; comp. Bell. Jud. vi. 2. 2.

(i) Appointed by the people during the war (67-68 A.D.): —

28. Phannias or Phineesos the son of Samuel, and of humble origin, Bell. Jud. iv. 3. 8; Antt. xx. 10.

Owing to the frequency with which those high priests were changed, the number of those who had ceased to hold office was always something considerable. But, although they no longer discharged the active functions of the office, they still continued to occupy an important and influential position, as can still be shown with regard to several of them at least. We know from the New Testament, for example, what an amount of influence the elder Ananos or Hannas (No. 10) had even as a retired high priest. The same may be said of his son Jonathan (No. 15), who, long after he had ceased to hold office, conducted an embassy, in the year 52 A.D., to the Syrian viceroy Umidius Quadratus. This latter then sent him to Rome to answer for certain disturbances that had taken place in Judaea; and when he had got the matter settled in favour of the Jews, he took the opportunity of his being in Rome to request the emperor to send Felix as the new procurator. Then when Felix was found to be causing universal dissatisfaction in consequence of the way in which he was discharging the functions of his office, Jonathan took the liberty of reminding him of his duty, for doing which however he had to answer with his life. Another high priest, Ananias the son of Nedebaios (No. 21), ruled in Jerusalem almost like a despot after he had retired from office. Then the younger Ananos (No. 24) and Jesus the son of Gamaliel (No. 26), although no longer exercising the functions of the high-priest-hood, were found at the head of affairs in the earlier stage of the Jewish war. From all this it is evident that, though not actually in office, those men were by no means condemned to political inactivity. On the contrary, the office was such that it imparted to the holder of it a character indelibilis in virtue of which he retained, even after demitting it, a large portion of the rights and obligations of the officiating high priest, and of course the title of ἀρχιερεύς as well, a title that, in Josephus, is accorded to the whole of the ex-high priests. Consequently wherever in the New Testament ἀρχιερεῖς appear at the head of the Sanhedrim, we are to understand that those referred to are first and foremost the ex-high priests in question, inclusive at the same time of the one actually in office.

But sometimes we read of certain other personages who are described as ἀρχιερεῖς, and yet their names do not appear in the foregoing list. In the Acts (4:6) we have the following enumeration: Ἄννας ὁ ἀρχιερεὺς καὶ Καϊάφας καὶ Ἰωάννης καὶ Ἀλέξανδρος καὶ ὅσοι ἦσαν ἐκ γένους ἀρχιερατικοῦ. In a subsequent passage (19:14) mention is made of a high priest called Sceva with his seven sons. Josephus again mentions a certain Jesus, son of Sapphias, as being τῶν ἀρχιερέων ἕνα, also one Simon ἐξ ἀρχιερέων, who was still young at the time of the war, and consequently cannot be identical with Simon Kantheras (No. 17), and lastly, one Matthias, son of Boethos, τὸν ἀρχιερέα or ἐκ τῶν ἀρχιερέων. Not one of those just mentioned is to be found in our list. Besides there is many a high priest known to the Rabbinical traditions whose name does not appear there. This fact may perhaps be sufficiently accounted for by

what we are now going to mention.

Apropos of the irregular appointment of Phannias to the office of high priest, Josephus remarks, that the zealots, by acting as they did on this occasion, “had robbed of their importance those families from which in their order it had been the practice to select the high priests” (ἄκυρα τὰ γένη ποιήσαντες ἐξ ὧν κατὰ διαδοχὰς οἱ ἀρχιερεῖς ἀπεδείκυντο). The high-priesthood would therefore seem to have been vested in a few privileged families. The truth is, one only requires to glance at the foregoing list in order to be convinced that the office was confined to only a few families. To the family of Phabi, for example, belong Nos. 3, 11, 22; to the family of Boethos, Nos. 4, 7, 8, 17, 19, 26; to the family of Ananos (or Hannas), Nos. 10, 12, 14, 15, 16, 18, 24, 27; and to the family of Kamith, Nos. 13, 20, 23. Leaving Ananel, a Babylonian of humble origin (No. 1), Aristobulus the last of the Asmonaeans (No. 2), and Phannias, the high priest of the revolution period (No. 28), out of account, there remain only five (Nos. 5, 6, 9, 21, 25) who cannot be proved to have belonged to one or other of those families, although it is still possible that they did so. Now when one considers how the high-priesthood was thus confined to a few families, and in what high estimation the office was held, it is not difficult to see that the mere fact of belonging to any one of the privileged families in question must of itself have been sufficient to confer special distinction upon a man. And hence we can understand how it should be that Josephus, in a certain passage in which he wishes to tell us particularly who of the notabilities were among those who went over to the Romans, enumerates the υἱοὶ τῶν ἀρχιερέων along with the ἀρχιερεῖς themselves, In the Mishna again, we find that on one occasion the “sons of the high priests” (בְּנֵי כֹהֲנִים גְּדוֹלִים) are quoted as authorities on certain points of matrimonial law, and that too without mentioning their names, seeing that the simple fact of their being high priests’ sons stamped them as men of importance and authority. In another instance, we are informed that letters with unusually large seals had come “to the sons of the high priests” (לבני כהנים גדולים) from distant lands, from which we may again infer that these also enjoyed a certain reputation abroad. But they did not rest satisfied with the mere dignity of rank; so far from that, the members of those high-priestly families also played a prominent part in public affairs. According to Acts 4:6, among those who had seats and a right to speak and vote in the Sanhedrim were ὅσοι ἦσαν ἐκ γένους ἀρχιερατικοῦ, where, from all that has been already stated, it is certain that the γένος ἀρχιερατικόν can only refer to the privileged families now in question. Now, if the members of the high-priestly families occupied so distinguished a position, it is quite conceivable that the designation ἀρχιερεῖς would come to be used in a more comprehensive sense so as to include them as well. That this is what actually took place may be seen, to say nothing of all that has been previously advanced, from the passage in Josephus mentioned above, where after recording the fact that two high priests and eight high priests’ sons were among those who went over to the Romans, he proceeds to include these two categories under the common designation of ἀρχιερεῖς. This will also serve to account for the circumstance of high priests being sometimes mentioned that are not to be found in our list.

Consequently the high priests that, in the New Testament as well as in Josephus, appear as leading personages would consist, in the first instance, of the high priests properly so called, i.e. the one actually in office and those who had previously been so, and then, of the members of

those privileged families from which the high priests were taken. In the days of Roman rule they were at the head of the Sanhedrim and of the native government generally, and although the majority of them were unquestionably men of Sadducaean tendencies, yet in the actual conduct of affairs they bowed, however reluctantly, to the wishes of the Pharisees (see above, p. 154).

THE PRIESTHOOD AND THE TEMPLE WORSHIP

THE LITERATURE

Lightfoot, Ministerium templi quale erat tempore nostri servatoris (Opp. ed. Rotterdam, i. pp. 671–758).

Lundius, Die alten jüdischen Heiligthümer, Gottesdienste und Gewohnheiten, für Augen gestellet in einer ausführlichen Beschreibung des gantzen levitischen Priesterthums, ete., itzo von neuem übersehen und in beygefügten Anmerckungen hin und wieder theils verbessert, theils vermehret durch Johan. Christophorum Wolfium, Hamburg 1738.

Carpzov (Joh. Gottlob), Apparatus historico criticus antiquitatum sacri codicis (1748), pp. 64–113, 611 ff., 699 ff.

Ugolini, Sacerdotium Hebraicum, in his Thesaurus Antiquitatum sacrarum, vol. xiii. Ibid., still other cognate monographs in vols. xii. and xiii.

Bähr, Symbolik des mosaischen Cultus, 2 vols. 1837–1839), vol. i. 2nd ed. 1874.

Winer, Realwörterb., arts. “Priester,” “Leviten,” “Abgaben,” “Erstgeburt,” “Erstlinge,” “Hebe,” “Zehnt,” “Opfer,” etc.

Herzfeld, Geschichte des Volkes Jisrael, i. 387–424, iii. 106 ff., 162 ff.

Oehler, art. “Priesterthum,” in Herzog’s Real-Enc., 1st ed. vol. xii. 174–187. Ibid. by the same, arts. “Levi,” vol. viii. 347–358; “Nethinim,” vol. x. 296 f.; and “Opfercultus,” vol. x. 614–652. The same articles in the second edition as revised by Orelli.

De Wette, Lehrbuch der hebräisch-jüdischen Archäol. (4th ed. 1864), p. 268 ff.

Ewald, Die Alterthümer des Volkes Israel, Göttingen 1866.

Keil, Handbuch der biblischen Archäologie (2nd ed. 1875), pp. 166 ff., 200 ff., 357 ff., 373 ff.

Haneberg, Die religiösen Alterthümer der Bibel (2nd ed. 1869), pp. 356 ff., 508 ff., 599 ff.

Schenkel’s Bibellexicon, the same articles as in Winer.

Riehm, Handwörterbuch des biblischen Alterthums, the articles relating to our subject.

Graf, Zur Geschichte des Stammes Levi (Merx’ Archiv für wissenschaftl. Erforschung des A. T.’s, vol. i. 1869, pp. 68–106, 208–236).

Köhler, Lehrbuch der biblischen Geschichte, vol. i. 1875, pp. 363–454.

Wellhausen, Geschichte Israels, vol. i. 1878, pp. 15–174 (2nd ed., under the title: Prolegomena zur Geschichte Israels, 1883).

Dillmann, Exegetisches Handbuch zu Exodus und Leviticus (1880), pp. 455–461 and elsewhere.

Reuss, Geschichte der heiligen Schriften Alten Testaments (1881), sec. ccxciv.

I. THE PRIESTHOOD AS A DISTINCT ORDER

THE internal development of Israel subsequent to the exile was essentially determined by the direction given to it by two equally influential classes, viz. the priests on the one hand and the scribes on the other. During the centuries immediately following the exile and till far on into the Greek era, it was, in the first instance, the influence of the priests that was predominant. It was they who had been instrumental in organizing the new community; it was from them that the law had emanated; and to their hands had been entrusted the direction, not only of the material, but also of the spiritual affairs of the whole body of the people. But although originally it was they who were specially versed in the law and were looked upon as its authoritative interpreters, yet by and by there gradually grew up alongside of them an independent order of doctors or men learned in the law. And the importance and influence of these latter would necessarily go on increasing in proportion as the priests grew less and less zealous for the law of their fathers on the one hand, and as the law itself came to acquire a greater value and significance in the estimation of the people on the other. This was the case more particularly after the Maccabaean wars of independence. Ever since then the scribes got the spiritual superintendence of the people more and more into their own hands. And so the age of the priests was succeeded by that of the scribes (comp. Reuss, Geschichte der heiligen Schriften A. T'.s). This however is not to be understood as implying that the priests had now lost all their influence. Politically and socially they still occupied the foremost place quite as much as ever they did. It is true the scribes had now come to be recognised as the teachers of the people. But, in virtue of their political standing, in virtue of the powerful resources at their command, and, lastly and above all, in virtue of their sacred prerogatives — for, inasmuch as they enjoyed the exclusive right of offering Israel's sacrifices to God, their intervention was necessary to the fulfilment of his religious duties in the case of every member of the community, — in virtue of all this, we say, the priests still continued to have an extraordinary significance for the life of the nation.

Now this significance of theirs was due mainly to the simple fact that they constituted a distinct order, possessing the exclusive right to offer the people's sacrifices to God. According to the legislation of the Pentateuch, which had been regarded as absolutely binding ever since the time of Ezra and Nehemiah, "the sons of Aaron" were alone entitled to take part in the sacrificial worship. The priesthood was therefore a fraternity fenced round with irremovable barriers, for they had been fixed for ever by natural descent. No one could possibly be admitted to this order who did not belong to it by birth; nor could any one be excluded from it whose legitimate birth entitled him to admission. Now this order, so rigidly exclusive in its character, was in possession of the highest privilege that can well be conceived of, the privilege namely of offering to God all the sacrifices of the nation at large, and of every individual member of the community. This circumstance alone could not but be calculated to invest the priesthood with a vast amount of influence and authority, all the more that civil life was intertwined, in such an endless variety of ways, with the religious observances. But, in addition to this, there was the fact, that ever since the Deuteronomic legislation came into force in the time of Josiah (about 630 B.C.), it was declared to be unlawful to offer sacrifices anywhere but in Jerusalem, the whole worship being concentrated in its sole and only legitimate sanctuary. Consequently all the various offerings

from every quarter of the land flowed into Jerusalem and met at this one common centre of worship, the result being that the priests that officiated within it came to acquire great power and wealth. Moreover, this centralization of the worship had the additional effect of uniting all the members of the priesthood into one firmly compacted body.

From what has just been said it follows, as matter of course, that the primary requisite in a priest was evidence of his pedigree. On this the greatest possible stress was laid. The person who failed to produce it could claim no title whatever to the rights and privileges of the priesthood. Even so far back as the time when the first of the exiles returned under Zerubbabel, certain priestly families were debarred from the sacred office because they could not produce their genealogical registers. On the other hand, Josephus assures us, with regard to his own case, that he found his pedigree recorded "in the public archives." Consequently the family registers would appear to have had the character of public records on account of their importance for the community at large.

With the view of keeping the blood of the priestly stock as pure as possible, there were also certain regulations prescribed with regard to marriage. According to the law given in Lev. 21:7, 8, a priest was forbidden to marry a prostitute, or a deflowered maid, or a woman put away from her husband; consequently he could only choose an undefiled virgin or widow, and of course even then only such as were of Israelitish origin. At the same time there was no caste-like restriction forbidding them to many any but the daughters of priests. Nor were these regulations in any way relaxed in later times, for so far from that they came to be but the more sharply defined. We find, for example, that a chaluza, i.e. a widow whom her brother-in-law declined to marry (according to the law regarding levirate marriage), was also to be treated as one "who had been put away from her husband." Again a priest was forbidden to marry a woman who had been taken captive in war as being a person that might well be suspected of having been violated. Then, if a priest was already without children, he was forbidden, in marrying again, to marry a woman who was "incapable;" but, in any case, he was never to choose a female proselyte or emancipated slave; nor the daughter of a man who had been formerly a slave, except in those cases in which the mother happened to be of Israelitish extraction. The regulations were still more stringent in the case of the high priest. He was not allowed to marry even a widow, but only an undefiled virgin (Lev. 21:13-15). This, like the former regulations, was also enforced and rendered yet more precise in later times. In affirming, as he does, that the high priest could only marry a virgin belonging to a priestly family, Philo states what is at variance at once with the text of Leviticus and the later standpoint of the law, from both of which it is evident that it was permissible for the high priest to marry any Israelitish virgin, no matter to what family she might belong. Possibly Philo's view may have been suggested to him by the terms of the passage in Leviticus as it stands in the Septuagint, perhaps also by actual practice, or, it may be, by both combined. The regulation in Ezekiel (44:22), to the effect that a priest was only to marry a virgin, or the widow of a priest, found no place in the law as subsequently developed. Considering the great importance that was attached to the strict observance of those regulations, a priest on the occasion of his marriage was, of course, required to furnish precise evidence of his wife's pedigree. Josephus has described at length the very careful way in which this was gone about, while in the Mishna it is prescribed how far back the evidence is to extend, and in what cases it may be dispensed with.

Those regulations with regard to marriage are undoubtedly based upon the idea that the priesthood is a sacred order. The same idea has been further embodied in yet other prescriptions. According to the law (Num. 19), every one was defiled who came in contact with a

dead body, nay who even entered a house in which such body happened to be lying; but as for the priests, they were forbidden to approach a corpse or to take part in the funeral obsequies, the prohibition being absolute in the case of the high priest, while in the case of the ordinary priests, the only exception was in favour of very near blood relations: parents, children, and brothers or sisters (Lev. 21:1-4, 11-12; Ezek. 44:25-27). It would seem that the priest was not even at liberty to mourn for his own wife. Or are we to understand, although it is not expressly stated, that she is intended, as matter of course, to be included among the exceptions? In no case whatever was a priest to indulge in any token of grief calculated to disfigure the person, such as shaving the head or lacerating the body (Lev. 21:5, 6; comp. Ezek. 44:20), nor was the high priest to uncover his head and rend his garments (Lev. 21:10; comp. 10:6, 7).

Then again it was essential to the sacred character attaching to a priest, that he should be totally free from, every sort of physical defect. If any one had a bodily defect of any kind about him, no matter though he belonged to the "sons of Aaron," he was thereby disqualified from officiating as a priest. The various kinds of defects are already enumerated with pretty considerable detail in the law as found in Leviticus (21:16-23). And, as was to be expected, this too is one of those points on which a later age has exercised its ingenuity in the way of being minutely and painfully specific. It has been calculated that the number of bodily defects that disqualified a man for the office of the priesthood amount in all to 142. At the same time however the priests who, for the reason now in question, were debarred from exercising any of the functions of the priesthood, were entitled to a share of the emoluments as well as the others, for they too belonged to the ordo.

There is nothing prescribed in the law as to the age at which a priest was to be allowed to enter upon the duties of his office. Perhaps we may venture to assume that it must have been the same as that at which the Levites entered upon theirs. Yet even this latter is given differently in different parts of the Old Testament. The Rabbinical tradition states that a priest was duly qualified for his duties as soon as the first signs of manhood made their appearance, but that he was not actually installed till he was twenty years of age.

And now when all the requirements to which we have referred were found to be satisfied, and when his fitness had been duly established to the satisfaction of the Sanhedrim, the priest was set apart to his office by a special act of consecration. According to the leading passage in the law bearing on this matter, viz. Ex. 29 = Lev. 8, this solemn act consisted of three parts: (1) the washing of the body with water, (2) the putting on of the sacred vestments, and (3) a series of sacrifices the offering of which was accompanied with further ceremonies of a partly special kind, viz. the anointing of various parts of the body with blood, the sprinkling of the person and the garments with oil and blood, the "filling of the hands," i.e. the taking of certain portions of the victims and laying them upon the hands of the priest with the view of indicating thereby his future duties and rights. In several other passages (Ex. 28:41, 30:30, 40:12-15; Lev. 7:36, 10:7; Num. 3:3) there is superadded to these the pouring of ointment upon the head, an act which, according to the leading passage on the subject, was observed, and that as a mark of distinction, solely in the case of the high priest. The whole ceremony extended over seven days (Ex. 29:35 ff.; Lev. 8:33 ff.). How it fared with this ceremony at a later period has been, so far as several of its details are concerned, a matter of some dispute. It is probable that the pouring of oil upon the head continued to be retained as a mark of distinction in the case of the high priest.

As the priests were so numerous it was simply impossible that they could all officiate at the same time. It was therefore necessary to have an arrangement according to which they could do so in regular rotation. With a view to this the whole body of the priests was divided into

twenty-four families or courses of service. The account of the origin and organization of those twenty-four courses of service as given by the Rabbinical tradition is as follows: “Four courses of service (מִשְׁמָרוֹת) came back from the exile, viz.: Jedaiah, Harim, Pashur, and Immer.… Then the prophets that were among them arose and made twenty-four lots and put them into an urn. And Jedaiah came and drew five lots, which, including himself, would therefore make six. And Harim came and drew five lots, which, including himself, would therefore make six. And Pashur came and drew five lots, which, including himself, would therefore make six. And Immer came and drew five lots, which, including himself, would therefore make six.… And heads of the courses of service (רָאשֵׁי מִשְׁמָרוֹת) were appointed. And the courses were divided into houses (בָּתֵּי אָבוֹת). And there were courses consisting of five, six, seven, eight, or nine houses. In a course consisting of five houses, three of them had to serve one day each, while the remaining two had to serve two days each; in a course consisting of six houses, five of them had to serve one day each, while one had to serve two days; where it consisted of seven, each served one day; of eight, six served one day each and two served simultaneously the remaining day; of nine, five served one day each and four served simultaneously during two days.” It is true that what is here stated regarding the origin (or, according to the Talmud, the restoration) of the twenty-four courses of service cannot be said to possess the value of an independent tradition, that, on the contrary, it is based merely upon inferences from certain facts that are mentioned elsewhere. Yet it has so far hit the mark as substantially to represent the actual state of the case. For there returned from the exile, along with Zerubbabel and Joshua, four families of priests, viz.: the children of Jedaiah, Immer, Pashur, and Harim, numbering in all 4289 (Ezra 2:36–39 = Neh. 7:39–42). Further, that these four families comprised the whole body of the priesthood at the time of Ezra’s arrival, and therefore some eighty years afterwards as well, is evident from Ezra 10:18–22, But, along with these mention is also made, as early as the time of Zerubbabel and Joshua (Neh. 12:1–7), of twenty-two classes of priests, with a corresponding number of “heads” (ראשי הכהנים). And those same classes or divisions are also further met with in the time of Joshua’s successor, Joiakim the high priest (Neh. 12:12–21). It is evident therefore that the four families were subdivided into twenty-two classes. Then it is substantially the same arrangement that is still to be met with in the time of Ezra. When this latter arrived with a fresh band of exiles, he brought along with him two more priestly families (Ezra 8:2) and added them to the four that were already in the country (Ezra 10:18–22). But we find that shortly after, the number of classes was once more almost the same as it had been in Zerubbabel’s time, namely twenty-one, as may be seen from the list given in Neh. 10:3–9. However, only fourteen of the names mentioned in this latter passage are to be found in the two earlier lists (Neh. 12:1–7, 12–21), all the rest being different. Consequently the organization of the divisions must, in the meanwhile, have undergone certain alterations of one kind or another, as would no doubt be deemed necessary on account of a fresh accession of priestly families having been brought by Ezra, and for other reasons besides. However, under the new order of things the number of divisions remained the same as before and so continued, substantially at least, on through succeeding ages. In the time of the author of Chronicles, who traces back the arrangement that existed in his day to the time of David, the number of the divisions amounted to twenty-four (1 Chron. 24:7–18). It is true that, in the catalogue of names furnished by this writer, scarcely more than a third of those in the earlier lists are to be found. That being so, we are bound to assume that, in the meanwhile, important changes must have taken place, always supposing that our author has not drawn somewhat upon his own imagination for a number of the names attributed to the time of David. Be that as it may, it is certain that, from that point onwards, the division into twenty-four classes continued to subsist without any alteration whatever. For we learn on the express testimony of Josephus, that it was still maintained in his own day, to say nothing of the fact that some of the names of the division continued to be occasionally mentioned (Joiarib, 1

Macc. 2:1; Abia, Luke 1:5). It is somewhat strange that, in a passage in his contra Apionem, — a passage, however, that has come down to us only in a Latin version, — Josephus should be found speaking of four families or divisions (tribus) of the priests. One might perhaps be disposed to think that here the historian had in view the four families that returned with Zerubbabel. But as the context shows that he is clearly referring to the courses of service, there is nothing for it but to assume that the text has been corrupted, and that for four we ought to substitute twenty-four. Nor can it be said that this view is at once disposed of by the circumstance that Josephus alleges that the number in each division amounted to over 5000 souls. For it is probable that this number included the Levites (who were also divided into twenty-four divisions, every division of the priests having its corresponding division of Levites), and perhaps women and children as well; besides, we know only too well that one cannot depend a great deal on Josephus in the matter of numbers.

Each of the twenty-four main divisions was in turn broken up into a number of sub-divisions. If we may trust the Talmudic tradition quoted above (p. 182), the number of those sub-divisions ranged from five to nine for each main division. The main divisions were known either under the general designation of מַחְלְקוֹת (divisions, so 1 Chron. 28:13, 21; 2 Chron. 8:14, 23:8, 31:2, 15, 16), or, in so far as they were made up of the members of one family, they were called בֵּית אֲבוֹת (houses of their fathers, so 1 Chron. 24:4, 6), or, in so far as they had the services of the temple to attend to, they were described as מִשְׁמָרוֹת (watches, so Neh. 13:30; 2 Chron. 31:16). As regards the sub-divisions, for our knowledge of which we are indebted solely to the testimony of post-Biblical literature, they are known by the designation of בָּתֵּי אָבוֹת. And so now it had become the regular practice to distinguish the two by calling the main division a מִשְׁמָר and the sub-division a בֵּית אָב. At the same time this distinction is not necessarily involved in the signification of the words themselves. For as משמר may mean any division for service, so בית אב, on the other hand, may mean any body composed of the members of the same family, no matter whether they consist of few persons or of many. Accordingly, as we have just remarked, the author of the Book of Chronicles is still found to be making use of בית אבות (in Neh. 12:12 shortened into אבות) as one of his expressions for denoting the main divisions or courses. But it would appear that somewhat later the distinction referred to above came to be rigidly observed. In Greek the term for one of the main divisions is πατριά or ἐφημερία or ἐφημερίς, and for one of the sub-divisions φυλή.

Then each of the divisions, the principal and subordinate ones alike, was presided over by a head. In the Old Testament the heads of the main divisions are designated שָׂרִים (princes) or רָאשִׁים (heads). At a subsequent period this latter (ראש המשמר) seems to have become the curre designation, just as ראש בית אב came to be the one regularly employed to denote the head of a sub-division. Then, besides these, we sometimes come across the term “elders” in this connection, the זקני כהונה and the זקני בית אב.

The importance and influense of the various divisions was by no means alike. Notwithstanding their formal equality, in so far as they all took part in the services of the sanctuary in regular rotation, still those divisions, from the members of which high priests or other influential functionaries were selected, could not fail to acquire, in consequence, a greater amount of influence and importance. Hence we can quite believe that, as Josephus assures us, it was regarded as a great advantage to belong to the first of the twenty-four classes, i.e. to the class Joiarib, which had the honour of contributing the Asmonaean princes and high priests. Then we find that within the individual classes again influential coteries were formed. The families living in Jerusalem would no doubt understand how to secure for members of their own circle the

most important offices about the temple, knowing as they did how much influence they conferred upon those who filled them. But it was in the Roman period above all that the privileged families from which the high priests were drawn (see p. 173, above) were found to constitute a proud aristocracy, claiming to occupy a rank much superior to that of the ordinary priests. The social difference between the one circle and the other was so marked that, toward the close of the period just preceding the destruction of the temple, the high priests could even go the length of wresting the tithes from the other priests by violence, these latter being left to starve. As a consequence of this disparity of rank, their political sympathies were also so widely different that, at the outbreak of the revolution, the ordinary priests favoured this movement, whereas the high priests did everything in their power to allay the storm.

We must be careful to distinguish between the priests properly so called and the Levites, a subordinate class of sacred officials. It is true, no doubt, that this distinction is as yet unknown to the Book of Deuteronomy. There the Levites are all regarded as being as much entitled to share in the priestly functions as the rest, and "priests" and "Levites" are made use of simply as convertible terms (see especially, Deut. 18:5, 21:5; and generally, 17:9, 18, 18:1, 24:8, 27:9). The practice of distinguishing between the two orders is met with for the first time in Ezekiel; and there can scarcely be a doubt that it was precisely this prophet who was the first to introduce it. According to the legislation of Deuteronomy, all places of worship outside Jerusalem were to be suppressed. At the same time the "Levites" who officiated in them, i.e. the priests, were not deprived of their rights as such; all that was asked of them was that they should exercise their priestly functions exclusively in Jerusalem. This state of things however could hardly be expected to last long, In the first place it was too much to expect that the Jerusalem priests would long relish the idea of those colleagues from the provinces having the same right to officiate as themselves; but apart from this, there was the fact that they had been guilty, to a larger extent than the priests of Jerusalem, of blending the service of strange gods with the worship of Jehovah. Consequently Ezekiel now proceeded to push the state of things brought about by the Deuteronomist to what seemed to be its legitimate result: he prohibited the Levites from beyond Jerusalem from celebrating worship altogether. This was now to be the exclusive privilege of the Levites of the house of Zadok, i.e. of the Jerusalem priests. Hereafter none but the sons of Zadok were "to offer the fat and the blood before God," that is to say, none but these were to minister at the altar or cross the threshold of the inner sanctuary (the temple proper). To the other Levites the more subordinate class of duties was assigned, viz. the keeping watch over the temple, the slaughtering of the victims, and such like. An arrangement such as this had, at the same time, this further advantage, that it was now possible entirely to dispense with those Gentiles whom it had been necessary to employ for the purpose of performing the more menial services connected with the temple (see in general, Ezek. 44:6–16). The order of things thus introduced by Ezekiel was the one that in all essential respects came to be permanently adopted. The distinction which he had established between priests and the other Levites is treated in the code of the priests as one that had already come to be regularly recognised. In this code the distinction between "the sons of Aaron," i.e. the priests, and the rest of the Levites, is rigidly observed. According to its enactments it is only the former who are to enjoy the right of ministering at the altar and within the sanctuary itself (Num. 18:7). The Levites, on the other hand, are merely to act as assistants to the sons of Aaron "in all the service of the tabernacle" (Num. 18:4). Accordingly, what they are allowed and are called upon to do is to help the priests by performing a great many duties and services of the most varied character in connection with the temple, such as taking charge of the revenues and the sacred property, the bringing forward and preparing of all the different materials required for the celebration of worship, and others of a like nature (for more on this matter, see Part III.). We also find that the

duty of slaughtering and further preparing the victims was still assigned to them in later times precisely as it had been in that of Ezekiel. Only they were debarred from taking part in the ministrations at the altar and within the walls of the sanctuary (Num. 18:3; see in general, Num. 3:5–13 and 18:1–7).

Then, like the priests, the Levites came to form a strictly exclusive order, the privilege of belonging to which was based upon natural descent. Their origin was now ascribed to Levi, one of the twelve patriarchs of Israel (Ex. 6:17–25; Num. 3:14–39, 4:34–49, 26:57–62; 1 Chron. 5:27–6:66, and 23). Consequently in their case too as well as that of the priests it was birth that decided the claim to participation in the rights and functions of their order. The "priests" stood to them very much in the relation in which a privileged family stands to the whole stock to which it belongs. For the origin of the priestly order now came to be ascribed to Aaron, a great-grandson of Levi (Ex. 6:17 ff.).

But there is nothing that shows so plainly as just the history of the Levites itself how elastic and unsubstantial those genealogical theories were. In the post-exilic period, for example, we find that the "Levites," in the sense in which the term has been hitherto understood, were still strictly distinguished from the musicians, doorkeepers and temple servants (Nethinim, originally, at all events, slaves); this continues to be the case therefore not merely in the time of Zerubbabel, but also between eighty and a hundred years later, viz. in the time of Ezra and Nehemiah (see especially Ezra 2:40–58 = Neh. 7:43–60; further Ezra 2:70, 7:7, 24, 10:23, 24; Neh. 7:1, 73, 10:29, 40, 12:44–47, 13:5, 10). But gradually the musicians and the doorkeepers came to be included among the "Levites" also. For example, the circumstance of the musicians being now merged in the Levites is presupposed in several remodelled portions of the Book of Nehemiah. Later on, a similar distinction seems to have been accorded to the doorkeepers as well, for we find the author of Chronicles taking special pains to let it appear that both of the classes here in question belonged to the order of the Levites, and also to show that they too were descended from Levi. The musicians again were afterwards advanced a step higher still, in so far as, shortly before the destruction of the temple, King Agrippa II., with the concurrence of the Sanhedrim, conferred upon them the privilege of wearing linen robes similar to those worn by the priests.

The Levites, like the priests, were also divided into courses of service. But their history is involved in still greater obscurity than that of the courses of the priests. Among those who returned from exile with Zerubbabel and Joshua there were but very few "Levites" in the stricter sense of the word, only seventy-four in all; while in addition to these there were 128 singers and 139 doorkeepers (Ezra 2:40–42, the numbers in the corresponding passage, Neh. 7:43–45, diverging somewhat from those just given). Then at length when Ezra came he managed to bring with him only thirty-eight "Levites," and even these could be persuaded to accompany him only after serious expostulation (Ezra 8:15–20). The disinclination to return thus shown by the Levites was owing to the subordinate place that had now been assigned them. It may be safely assumed however that those who did return would ere long receive considerable accessions to their ranks from those of their order that had never left their native country. For there cannot be a doubt that, as the "Levites lived scattered all over the land, far fewer of them, comparatively speaking, were carried into captivity than of the "priests," by whom at that time only the priests of Jerusalem were meant. And hence we are enabled to account for the fact that, in the catalogue of Levites and singers in the time of Zerubbabel and Joshua as given in Neh. 12:8, we find a few more families than are to be met with in the catalogue of those who returned with Zerubbabel (Ezra 2:40 f.; Neh. 7:43 f.). In a list belonging to the time of Ezra and Nehemiah

seventeen families of Levites in the stricter sense of the word are already enumerated (Neh. 10:10–14 and Bertheau's note). In another, probably referring, like the former, to the time of Nehemiah as well, it is only the number of the Levites dwelling in Jerusalem that is given, inclusive of course of the singers, and it estimates that there were 284 of them (Neh. 11:15–18). It is to be presumed that the number of those who lived beyond the city, in the towns and villages of Judaea, would be considerably larger (Neh. 11:20, 36). It would appear that, in the time of the author of Chronicles, the division into twenty-four classes was not confined to the priests, but had been adopted in the case of the Levites as well. This writer, although including the musicians and doorkeepers among the Levites, nevertheless distinguishes between three leading groups: the Levites who did service about the temple generally, then the musicians, and lastly the doorkeepers (1 Chron. 23:3–5). He then proceeds in 1 Chron. 23:6–24 to give, in the case of the Levites or first group, a list of the houses of their fathers (בית אבות), which, after one or two corrections have been made, probably amount to twenty-four. As for the musicians again, he expressly divides them into twenty-four classes or courses (1 Chron. 25). With regard to the post-Biblical period we have testimony to the effect that at that time the division now in question had been regularly established in the case of the Levites generally, so that, in fact, each class of priests had now its corresponding class or course of Levites. As in the case of the priests, so also in that of the Levites, each of the various divisions or courses was presided over by a head (שָׂרִים or רָאשִׁים).

The question as to where the priests and Levites resided is one with regard to which we have very little information of a reliable kind; for we must here entirely dismiss from view the legislation with reference to the forty-eight Levitical cities, which never was more than a mere theory (Num. 35; Josh. 21). One thing however is certain, and that is, that under the new order of things that obtained subsequent to the exile, only a fraction of the priests and Levites lived in Jerusalem itself, while the rest were scattered over the towns and villages of Judaea, the majority of them being probably within a short distance of the capital and the centre of worship. In the list in Neh. 11:10–19, to which reference has been already made, the number of priests who lived in Jerusalem is stated to have been 1192, that of the Levites and musicians 284, and that of the doorkeepers 172. But the sum-total of the whole priests of the land amounted to something like five times that number, if not more (see note 5 while in the case of the other categories the proportion of those living beyond the city to those within it may have been greater still. In any case, the general fact that priests as well as Levites had their residences in the towns and villages of Judaea is confirmed by repeated and unquestionable testimony. But we are left with little or no information with respect to details.

II. THE EMOLUMENTS

The emoluments which the priests received from the people for their subsistence were, down to the time of the exile, of a very modest and rather precarious kind. But subsequent to this latter period they were augmented almost beyond measure. This fact enables us to see, in a peculiarly striking manner, what a vast increase of power and influence the priesthood had acquired through the new order of things that was introduced subsequent to the exile. And this increase of power was, no doubt, the cause of the loftier pretensions of the order, just as, on the other hand, it was in turn also the effect of the augmenting of the temporalities. Nor was it ever in the power of the scribes, who came after and who in themselves were not always favourably disposed toward the priests, to do anything in the way of altering this state of matters, now that the priestly law had been for so long the acknowledged law of God. Nay, it was for this very reason that the scribes only found themselves in the position of contributing towards the yet

further increase of the priests' emoluments. For proceeding as they did on the view that a man always secured for himself the divine approval in proportion to the punctuality and readiness with which he conformed to the requirements of the law, they almost invariably interpreted its prescriptions in a sense favourable to the priests. And so we have the singular spectacle of an age that had already begun to regard the priests with distrust, helping nevertheless to confirm and increase their power.

In the times previous to the exile there were as yet almost no imposts in the strict sense of the word at all, that is to say, none which were not connected with sacrifice, none which had the character of a pure tax. Allowances to the priests were only exacted on the occasion of sacrifices being offered, and only in connection with these, The person who came to sacrifice brought the choicest portions of the produce of his fields and the first-born of his cattle to offer to Jehovah. Of this one part was consumed upon the altar, another fell to the officiating priest, but the most of it was made use of by the offerer himself, who was required to hold a sacrificial feast with it in the presence of Jehovah. It is in this sense that we are to understand the requirement already met with in the earliest (Jehovistic) legislation, to the effect that the best of the produce of the field and the first-born of the cattle were to be brought before Jehovah (firstlings of the field, Ex. 22:28, 23:19, 34:26; the first-born of the cattle, Ex. 13:11–16, 22:29, 34:19, 20). The prescriptions in Deuteronomy bearing on this matter are perfectly plain and unequivocal. This book knows nothing whatever either of the exacting of the tithe, or of the first-born on the part of the priests. It was required no doubt that the tithe of the fruits of the field was to be separated and conveyed to Jerusalem to the sanctuary. But there it was not given to the priest, but consumed by the owner of it himself; and it was only every third year that it fell to the Levites, i.e. the priests, and to the poor (Deut. 14:22–29, 26:12–15; comp. also 12:6, 11, 17–19). It was precisely the same in the case of the firstlings of the sheep and oxen. These too, and that such of them as were males, were required to be brought to the sanctuary at Jerusalem, but they were consumed there by the owner himself in sacrificial feasts (Deut. 15:19–23; comp. also 12:6, 17–19, 14:23). Of all the things here mentioned the priests received only certain portions, that is to say, of the fruits of the field that were presented they got only the רֵאשִׁית, i.e. the best (Deut. 18:4, 26:1–11), while of the animals offered, they got merely the shoulder, the two cheeks and the stomach of each (Deut. 18:3), Beyond this there is no mention of anything else that was required to be given to the priest except a part of the fleece at the sheep-shearing (Deut. 18:4). As corroborative of what we have been saying we would point to the prescriptions of Ezekiel (44:28–30). Although a priest himself and showing an undoubted disposition to favour rather than to discourage the pretensions of his order, still he says quite as little about a tithe and the first-born being required to be given to the priests. The claims he makes on behalf of these latter are no doubt somewhat higher than those of Deuteronomy, still, on the whole, they move on the same lines. While Deuteronomy assigns to the priests only two portions of the victims, Ezekiel requires the whole of the sin-offerings and trespass-offerings (which as yet are quite unknown to Deuteronomy) to be given to them, and similarly with regard to the meat-offerings as well (Ezek. 44:29); also every "dedicated thing" (44:29); and lastly, the reshith, i.e. the best of the first-fruits, the choicest portions of offerings of every description, and of the dough in baking (44:30).

But we find a considerable advance upon all the exactions we have just been referring to when we come to those contained in the priest-code, which, in its enumeration of the various emoluments of the priests as given in Num. 18:8–32, coincides in many respects with Ezekiel, only it introduces in addition what constitutes a most important innovation, the tithe and the first-born. Like Ezekiel, the priest-code also assigns the sin-offerings, the trespass-offerings and the

meat-offerings, at least the greater portion of the latter, to the priests (Num. 18:9, 10; for fuller details, see Lev. 1-6). Of those sacrifices which their owners themselves were at liberty to make use of in furnishing the sacrificial feast (the so-called זִבְחֵי שְׁלָמִים), the priests were to get the breast and the right shoulder (Lev. 7:30-34), thus obtaining considerably choicer portions than those assigned to them in Deuteronomy. Again, as in Ezekiel so also in the priest-code, the priests are to get everything "dedicated" (Num. 18:14), and the choicest portions (the reshith) of the produce of the soil: the oil, the wine and the wheat (Num. 18:12). But to the reshith, the first-fruits, בִּכּוּרִים, are further added (Num. 18:13) as an impost of a different sort; then, in the last place, comes the most important item of all, one that considerably exceeded in value all the former ones, viz. the tithe (Num. 18:20-32) and the first-born (Num. 18:15-18). The tithe however belonged, in the first instance, to the "Levites," who in turn were required to pay a tenth part of it to the priests. With regard to the portion of the dough that was to be given to the priests, though omitted in the leading enumeration of the emoluments, it too is mentioned in the priest-code, but in a different place (Num. 15:17-21). We find that in Nehemiah's day those enactments were already in full force. According to Neh. 10:36-40, it was already the practice at that time for the priests to receive the first-fruits or bikkurim (10:36), the choicest portions of the fruits of the soil, which here, precisely as in the priest-code, are clearly distinguished alike from the first-fruits and the tithe (10:38), then the tithe after the manner described in the priest-code (10:38-40), then the first-born (10:37), and lastly, the portion of the dough (10:38). By the tithe here we are always to understand the tithe of the fruits of the ground and of the trees. But there is one passage in the priest-code where, in addition to the tithe just mentioned, that of the cattle is also exacted (Lev. 27:32, 33). But it may well be presumed that this requirement, standing there as it does in so entirely isolated a fashion, did not originally form part of the code. It would seem that the tithe of the cattle was actually exacted and paid in the time of the author of Chronicles; or possibly we have only to regard it as forming part of this writer's conceptions of what ought to be (2 Chron. 31:6). In post-Biblical times the whole passage, Lev. 27:30-33 has been understood as referring to a tithe in the sense of the one demanded by Deuteronomy.

The legal prescriptions of Deuteronomy and of the priests' code have not only been blended together so as to form one whole in a literary sense, but they would also appear to have been combined with each other in actual practice. Consequently we find that the law in its later developments has considerably augmented the already heavy imposts of the priest-code. With the Levites' tithe of this code there was now conjoined, and simply as "a second tithe" the one prescribed in Deuteronomy, and which was to be consumed by the owner himself before Jehovah. The discrepancy between the prescriptions of the code and those of Deuteronomy, with respect to the portions of the victims that were to be given to the priests, was now got rid of by regarding the former as referring exclusively to the victims offered in sacrifice, and the latter to such animals as were slaughtered for ordinary use, Of the former of these the priests, according to Lev. 7:30-34, were to receive the breast and the right shoulder, while of the latter they were to get, according to Deut. 18:3, a fore-leg, the cheeks, and the stomach. Lastly, to all the imposts of the priest-code there was further added the portion of the fleece at the sheep-shearing as prescribed in Deuteronomy (18:4). From this process of amalgamation there resulted the following list of the priests' emoluments, which we may venture to regard as the one that was in force in the time of Christ.

(I.) Of the victims the following portions fell to the priests: — (1) The sin-offerings in their entirety, at least as a rule, for only two, and that of a particular sort, were required to be burnt without the camp. (2) The trespass-offerings in their entirety also. In both instances it was only the fat that was burnt upon the altar, the flesh belonged to the priests. (3) Of the meat-offerings again they

got by far the larger portion, for as a rule only a small part of it was reserved to burn upon the altar, while the rest fell to the priests. All the sacrifices we have just mentioned were of very frequent occurrence, particularly the meat-offerings, which might not only be offered independently by themselves, but which also formed a necessary accompaniment to the majority of the animal sacrifices. To the same category we have further to refer (4) the twelve cakes of shewbread, a fresh supply of which was placed in the temple every week, while that which was taken away became the property of the priests. All the four classes of offerings now mentioned were "most holy," and as such could only be consumed in a holy place, i.e. within the inner court of the temple, and exclusively by the priests themselves (and not by their relations as well).

The regulations were not so stringent with regard to the two following offerings, viz. (5) the thank-offerings and (6) the burnt-offerings. Of the former, the זִבְחֵי שְׁלָמִים, i.e. those offerings which were consumed by the offerers themselves, and by Luther rendered "Dankopfer," or as it should rather be "Mahlopfer," the priests received two parts of each, viz. the breast and the right shoulder. These might be eaten in any "clean place" and therefore not within the sanctuary as in the previous instances, and that not by the priest alone, but by all who were connected with the priestly order as well, even by their wives and daughters. Lastly, of the burnt-offerings (6), the priests received comparatively speaking least of all, for they were entirely consumed upon the altar. But even of these they got the skins at least, and, considering how frequently sacrifices of this sort were offered, it was certainly not without good reason that Philo estimated the amount of revenue from this source also as something very considerable.

II. But considerable as the amount derived from those offerings no doubt was, still it formed but the smaller portion of the sacerdotal revenues, while for the most part it was only available for the officiating priests. The real bulk of the priests' emoluments, on the other hand, consisted strictly speaking of what was derived from those dues that were paid independently of the sacrifices altogether, and which consequently possessed the character of a genuine tax for the maintenance of the priesthood. These dues were levied partly upon the produce of the soil and partly upon the offspring of the cattle, and they had to be paid partly in kind, although in some instances they might also be ransomed for their equivalent in money. The dues derived from the produce of the soil were of a varied character, and had to be separated (with a view to payment) in the following order: (1) The first-fruits, בִּכּוּרִים. These offerings were taken from the socalled "seven kinds," i.e. from the principal products of the soil of Palestine as enumerated in Deuteronomy (8:8), viz. wheat, barley, vines, fig-trees, pomegranates, olives and honey. Those who lived in the vicinity of Jerusalem offered fresh fruits, while those living farther away brought them in a dried form. In going up to present their offerings the people went in common procession, and according to Philo and the Mishna it was made an occasion of merry-making. It was the practice for those living in the country to assemble in the principal towns of the districts to which they belonged and thence to go up to Zion in one merry company, marching to the music of the pipes. At the head of the procession was led the ox that was to form the festive offering, with its horns gilded and a garland of olive branches placed upon them. In Jerusalem the most eminent members of the priesthood came to meet the procession as it approached the sanctuary. The owners of the offerings then put wreaths round the baskets containing the first-fruits and carried them on their shoulders up the temple mount as far as the court. This was done even by the most distinguished personages; it had been done even by King Agrippa himself. As soon as the procession entered the court the Levites welcomed it with the singing of the thirtieth Psalm. And now each person proceeded to hand his basket to the priest, and as he did so, repeated the confession of Deut. 26:5–10, whereupon the priest took it and put it down

beside the altar. (2) Then came the so-called terumah (תְּרוּמָה). This was distinct from the first-fruits, and in so far as the offering of these latter had always rather more of a symbolico-religious significance, it hardly could be said to have belonged to quite the same category with them. The terumah possessed the character of a pure payment in kind toward the maintenance of the priests, for Rabbinical Judaism understands it in the more restricted sense of the term (terumah in the more comprehensive sense of the word meaning every "heave" whatsoever, i.e. everything paid to the sanctuary) as denoting the giving of the choicest of the fruits of the ground and of the trees to the priests. This impost was levied not only upon the "seven kinds," but upon every species of fruit, and that whether the fruits of the ground or the fruit of trees, Here as before the most important of them were wheat, wine and oil. The amount to be given was not regulated by any fixed measure, weight, or number, but was to be, on an average, one-fiftieth of the whole yield, the person who gave one-fortieth being regarded as giving liberally, while he who gave only one-sixtieth was considered to have given somewhat stingily. Whatever had once been set apart as a terumah could be lawfully made use of only by the priests. (3) After the materials of the two classes of offerings we have just mentioned had been duly separated, the largest and most important item of all now fell to be deducted, viz. the tithe. We know, from what the Gospels tell us, with what painful scrupulosity the prescriptions of the law in regard to this matter were observed, and how common it was to pay tithe even of the most insignificant and worthless objects, such as mint, anise, and cummin (Matt. 23; Luke 11:42). The principle laid down in the Mishna with respect to this is as follows: "Everything which may be used as food and is cultivated and grows out of the earth is liable to tithe." The revenue derived from the source now in question must have been very large indeed. Yet the greater proportion of it was intended not so much for the priests as for the more subordinate class of sacred officials, viz. the Levites. It was to these latter, in the first instance, that the tithe had to be paid, while they had in turn to hand over a tithe of that again to the priests. After separating this Levites' tithe from his produce, the owner had to deduct another one still, the so-called second tithe. But this, in common with several other imposts of a similar kind, was made use of by the owner himself in the way of furnishing a sacrificial feast at Jerusalem; consequently they were not for the benefit of the priests, and so do not fall to be considered here. (4) Then the last of the offerings taken from, the products of the soil was the so-called challah (חַלָּה), i.e. the offering from the kneaded dough (ἀπαρχὴ τοῦ φυράματος, Rom. 11:16). According to the Mishna, offerings of this sort required to be given in the case of dough that happened to be made from any one of the five following kinds of grain: wheat, barley, spelt, oats, and rye (?). The offering was not to be presented in the form of flour or meal, but required to be taken from the dough, i.e. as prepared for making bread. The quantity to be given was, in the case of private individuals, one twenty-fourth part, and, in the case of public bakers, one forty-eighth part of the whole piece.

Then there was a second leading class of regular offerings, viz. those derived from the rearing of cattle. These were of three different kinds: (1) The most important of them was that consisting of the male first-born of the cattle (that is to say therefore, the first-born whenever it happened to be a male). As far back as the earlier Jehovistic and Deuteronomist legislation we find that the male first-born of the cattle was required to be dedicated to God, i.e. was to be used in sacrifice and for sacrificial feasts (Ex. 13:11–16, 22:28, 29, 34:19, 20; Deut. 15:19–23). This the priestly legislation has converted into an allowance to be given to the priests (Ex. 13:1, 2; Lev. 27:26, 27; Num. 18:15–18; Neh. 10:37). Both legislations add to this the firstborn among men as well, for these two were regarded as, properly speaking, belonging to God, and consequently they required to be ransomed. Further, as a distinction had to be made between clean and unclean cattle, we accordingly have the following more specific regulations with respect to the

first-born: (a) the first-born of the cattle that were clean and suitable for sacrificial purposes, i.e. oxen, sheep and goats, were to be given in natura. If they were free from blemish they were to be treated as sacrifices, i.e. the blood was to be sprinkled upon the altar and the fat consumed in the altar fires. The flesh could be eaten by all who were connected with the order of the priests, even by their wives, and that in any part of Jerusalem (Num. 18:17, 18; Neh. 10:37; Ex. 22:29, 34:19; Deut. 15:19, 20). But if, on the other hand, the animals had any blemish about them, they belonged no less to the priests, only they were to be treated as unconsecrated food (Deut. 15:21-23). (b) The first-born of unclean animals above all, according to Philo, those of the horse, the ass, and the camel – and here too as in every other instance only the male ones – were to be ransomed by the payment of a certain sum of money fixed by the priest with a fifth part added (Num. 18:15; Neh. 10:37; Lev. 27:27). An ass was to be exchanged for a sheep (Ex. 13:13, 34:20). According to Josephus, the ransom would appear to have been effected by the payment of a fixed sum of one shekel and a half for each beast. (c) The first-born of man, i.e. the first child that happened to be a male, required to be "ransomed" as soon as it was a month old by the payment of five shekels (Num. 18:15, 16; comp. Num. 3:44 ff.; Neh. 10:37; Ex. 13:13, 22:28, 34:20). It was not necessary that the boy should be presented at the temple on the occasion of his being ransomed, as has been supposed, for the most part on the strength of Luke 2:22. As is expressly stated in the passages just referred to, the shekels in question were to be those of the Tyrian standard. This tax was imposed upon poor and rich alike.

(2.) Of all the flesh that was slaughtered generally the priests were to receive three portions, viz. the shoulder, the two cheeks, and the stomach. This is the sense in which Deut. 18:3 was understood, and was therefore taken as referring, not to animals offered in sacrifice, but to those slaughtered for ordinary use. According to the later interpretation of it, this prescription was also regarded as applying exclusively to such animals as were suitable for sacrifices, viz. oxen, sheep and goats.

(3.) Again, a portion of the proceeds of the sheep-shearing had to be given to the priests, only in those cases however in which a person owned more than one sheep – according to the school of Shammai, when he owned two, according to Hillel's school, on the other hand, not unless he owned five. This offering was said to amount to five Jewish (= ten Galilaean) sela.

III. Besides the regular offerings, there also fell to the priests a considerable number of an irregular and extra-ordinary character. To this category belonged, fundamentally at least, a large number of sacrifices offered on an almost endless variety of occasions (see p. 195 f. above); but besides these they also received the following offerings: (1) The consecration vows, or votive offerings. These might be of a very varied character. One could dedicate oneself or some other person to the sanctuary (to the Lord). In such cases it was usual to pay a certain sum of money by way of ransom, viz. fifty shekels for a man and thirty for a woman. But one could also dedicate animals, houses, or lands to the sanctuary. If the animals happened to be such as could be offered in sacrifice, then they had to be given in natura. But in the case of unclean animals and in that of houses and lands, a money ransom could be paid as before, though on certain conditions specified in the law. (2) A special form of consecration vow called the ban, i.e. something irredeemably devoted to the sanctuary. Whenever anything was devoted to the sanctuary in this form (as something banned, חֵרֶם) it fell to it, i.e. to the priests in natura, whether it were in the shape of a person, cattle, or lands. (3) Lastly, in those cases in which any one had appropriated or otherwise unlawfully got possession of anything, and in which it was no longer possible to restore the property to its rightful owner, a certain indemnity had to be paid, and this also fell to the priests. With regard to the two things last mentioned, the

law distinctly states that they were to belong to the priests personally, whereas the votive offering, on the other hand, would appear to have been devoted as a rule to purposes connected with the services of the sanctuary generally. At the same time Josephus distinctly affirms that the ransom of fifty or of thirty shekels to be paid in those cases in which any one had devoted him or herself to God formed part of the priests' emoluments. Further, the Rabbinical theologians hold that, besides the cherem and the indemnity offering, "the inherited field," consecrated as a votive offering (Lev. 27:16–21), was also to be included among the twenty-four different kinds of offerings that fell to the priests.

To what extent all the offerings to which we have referred were contributed by the Jews of the dispersion as well it is no longer possible to say with any degree of certainty in regard to any one of them in particular. In any case a large number of them was paid by those of the dispersion as wall, while the amount derived from all those sources was of so handsome a character that the priests always had a comfortable provision. As little are we any longer in a position always to form anything like a distinct conception of the mode in which those offerings were paid. Many of them, such as the challa and the three portions to be given on the occasion of slaughtering an animal, were of such a nature that they did not admit of being kept long. Consequently to carry these and such as these to Jerusalem for the purpose of presenting them there would be simply impossible. At any rate, in all those places in which there happened to be priests, they were given to them directly. But so far as it was at all practicable, the administration of the offerings was centralized in Jerusalem. Thither they were conveyed and handed over to those appointed to receive them, and from thence again they were distributed among the priests.

This central administration on the part of the priests extended to the tithe as well, which in point of fact was delivered, not to the Levites, but to the priests, in whose hands the further disposal of it was then left.

Nor were those priestly gifts made use of merely by the priests themselves, but the privilege of participating in the enjoyment of them was extended to those connected with them as well. The only things that had to be partaken of exclusively by priests were those known as "most holy" (see p. 236, above). All the others might be enjoyed by the whole of the members of a priest's household — his wife, his daughters and his slaves, with the exception however of hired workmen and daughters married to other than priests. But, in every instance, only those were at liberty to participate who were in a condition of Levitical purity. With regard to the priests no distinction was made, on this occasion, between those duly qualified to officiate and those debarred from doing so in consequence of some physical defect or infirmity. These latter might be allowed, when the division to which they belonged happened to be serving, to go even the length of participating in the "most holy" things themselves.

All the offerings to which we have hitherto been referring only went to form the personal emoluments of the priests. From these are now further to be distinguished those imposts which were directly intended to defray the expenses connected with public worship. The most important of them was the half-shekel or didraehma-tax. There was no tax of this description anterior to the exile, for down to that period it had been the practice for the kings to provide the public sacrifices at their own expense (Ezek. 45:17 ff., 46:13–15, according to the Septuagint). It was in existence however as early as the days of Nehemiah, although at that time it amounted only to a third of a shekel (Neh. 10:33, 34). The raising of it to half a shekel cannot have taken place till subsequent to Nehemiah's time. Consequently, the passage in the Pentateuch (Ex. 30:11–16), in which the half-shekel tax is prescribed, must be regarded as a later modification of

the terms of the priest code, which moreover is probable for yet other reasons. The actual payment of this tax in the time of Christ is placed beyond a doubt by the unquestionable testimony of various authorities. Then again it was one that had to be paid by every male Israelite of twenty years of age or upwards, no matter whether he were rich or poor, and that, in common with all sacred tribute, in money of the early Hebrew or Tyrian (Phoenician) standard.

The time for payment was the month Adar (somewhere about the month of March); while the mode of procedure on that occasion was to have the whole of the contributions payable by one community gathered together and then sent on to Jerusalem, there to be duly paid over in name of that community. This tax was spent mainly in defraying the expense of the daily burnt-offering, and of all the sacrifices generally that had to be offered in the name of the people, as well as for other objects of a public character. After the destruction of Jerusalem the didrachma had for a long time to be paid toward the support of the temple of Jupiter Capitolinus in Rome. It is true that in the reign of Nerva the calumnia fisci Judaici was put an end to, but the tax itself was not repealed.

Over and above the half-shekel tax, and as forming a matter of regular tribute for the temple, there was, above all, the furnishing of so much wood every year as fuel for the altar of burnt-offering. As early as the time of Nehemiah it was ordained that the priests, the Levites and the people were at certain periods of the year to furnish the necessary supply of wood for the altar, all of them according to the houses of their fathers, their turn being decided by lot (Neh. 10:34, 13:31). At a later period the “wood offering” took place, for the most part, on the 15th of the month Ab, a day which, for this very reason, came to acquire a certain festive character. However, at this same period wood was also furnished by certain families on other days besides the one just mentioned. Every species of wood was allowable except that of the olive and the vine.

Then, in the last place, freewill offerings formed a copious source of wealth for the temple. We have already stated that probably the largest share of the vows did not fall to the priests personally, but was used to defray the expenses incurred in connection with the services of the sanctuary (see p. 247, above). But however this might be, that was certainly the case with regard to those vows that were formed for some particular purpose, as well as those other voluntary gifts which did not assume exactly the character of a vow. Very often objects were presented that could be turned to account either in connection with the services of the temple or in the way of ornamenting it. For example, to mention just a single instance, one could present so much gold in the shape of a few leaves, or grapes, or clusters of grapes, with a view to the enlargement of the golden vine that was placed over the entrance to the temple; the wealthy Alabarch Alexander of Alexandria provided the gold and silver with which the gates of the court were covered; nor was it uncommon for distinguished Gentiles to present gifts to the temple (on this see close of present paragraph). As a rule, however, the gifts were bestowed in the shape of money, and then even the poor widow’s mite was not unwelcome (Mark 12:41–44; Luke 21:1–4). In the treasury of the temple thirteen trumpet-shaped boxes were erected, and into these the money was dropped that was intended for the various purposes connected with the religious services. No fewer than six of those boxes were for the reception of “voluntary gifte” pure and simple, without the object for which they were intended being further specified; and the whole of these latter were expended, at least so the Mishna affirms, in the purchase of burnt-offerings (just because it was supposed that in these most benefit would, so to speak, accrue to God).

III. THE VARIOUS FUNCTIONS OF THE PRIESTHOOD

As the priests were so numerous, their emoluments so plentiful, and their functions so varied, it was necessary that there should also be an extensive apportioning among them of the different departments of the service. As we have already pointed out in a previous section, the whole priest-hood was divided into twenty-four families, each of which formed a distinct body, with presidents and elders at its head. But apart from this social organization of the entire order, there was further, the organism of the special functions connected with the multifarious services of the sanctuary. Of those special offices there were two that (at least during the last century of the temple's existence, to which period the following account is to be understood as applying) were conspicuous above all the others, and to these we will here assign the foremost place.

1. The head of the whole priesthood was the supreme, or as we usually designate him, the high priest, כהן גדול, ἀρχιερεύς. The characteristic feature about the position of this distinguished functionary was the combining in one and the same person of both a civil and a sacred dignity. Not only was he the supreme religious functionary, the one to whom alone pertained the privilege of performing certain acts of worship of the highest religious significance, such as, above all, the offering of the sacrifice on the great day of atonement, but he was also, at the same time, the supreme civil head of the people, the supreme head of the State, in so far, that is, as the State was not under the sway of foreign rulers. In the days of national independence the hereditary Asmonaean high priests were priests and kings at one and the same time; while, at a later period again, the high priests were, at least the presidents of the Sanhedrim, and even in all political matters, the supreme representatives of the people in their relations with the Romans (for details, see § 23. IV., above). As was to be expected, considering the distinguished social position which he held, the high priest did not officiate except on festival occasions. He was, in fact, legally bound to do so only on the great day of atonement, when he was called upon to offer before the Lord the great sin-offering of the people (Lev. 16); though, according to later usage, he was further required to offer the daily sacrifice during the week immediately preceding the great day of atonement. Otherwise he was left perfectly free to sacrifice only when he felt disposed to do so. According to the testimony of Josephus, he officiated, as a rule, every Sabbath day, and on the occasion of the new moons or other festivals in the course of the year. We must beware of confounding with the sacrifices just mentioned, and which he offered as representing the people and in their name, the daily meat-offering which he required to offer purely on his own account (Lev. 6:12–16). But on those latter occasions it was not so much required that he himself should officiate (which he seldom did) as that he should defray the cost of the offerings. The somewhat unique character of the high priest's position found further expression in the special purity and holiness that were expected of him (see pp. 211, 214, above), as well as in the gorgeous official attire which he wore when exercising his sacred functions. Only at that part of the service on the great day of atonement at which he entered the holy of holies, he wore a simple white dress, which however was made of the most expensive Pelusian and Indian linen (or cotton?).

2. Next to the high priest in point of rank came the סָגָן or סֶגֶן, Aramaic סְגַן, regarding whose functions the conceptions of the Rabbinical authorities are anything but. clear. They seem to think that he was simply the representative of the high priest, and that his chief function was to act as the substitute of this latter, should he happen to be disqualified for taking part in the worship in consequence of Levitical defilement; and this view has also continued to be the prevailing one among Christian scholars down to the present day. But it is undoubtedly erroneous. Among all the passages in the Mishna in which the סגן is mentioned there is not one that throws any further light whatever upon his official position. All they can be said to tell us is that he stood next to the high priest in point of rank. When the high priest drew the lot, in the

case of the two he-goats, on the great day of atonement, the סגן stood at his right hand, while the president of the division or course that happened to be serving (ראש בית אב) was at his left. Again, when he had occasion to read a portion from the Scriptures, the president of the synagogue handed the roll to the סגן, who in turn passed it to the high priest. Also when he happened to offer the daily sacrifice, the סגן was still found at his side. From all this however we are not at liberty to infer that the segan (I prefer this Aramaic form because we are unable to say for certain what the Hebrew form of the singular was) was intended to act as the high priest's substitute on those occasions on which he was prevented from officiating himself. Such an inference would be decidedly wrong. For what the Mishna says with regard to this matter of the substitute is rather to this effect: "Seven days before the great day of atonement it is customary to appoint some other priest (כהן אהר) to be ready to take the place of the high priest in the event of any accident happening to the latter calculated to interrupt the service." This would surely have been extremely superfluous if there had been a permanent official whose duty it was to act as the high priest's representative or substitute. It appears to me that we need have no difficulty in arriving at a true and distinct conception as to what was the real position of the segan, if we will only take due note of the way in which the term סגנים is rendered in the Septuagint. For we find that there it is almost invariably represented by στρατηγοί. Consequently, the סגן can have been no other than the στρατηγὸς τοῦ ἱεροῦ, the captain of the temple, whom we find frequently mentioned in the Greek sources, both in Josephus and the New Testament. To this functionary was entrusted the chief superintendence of the arrangements for preserving order in and around the temple. And so when we consider the very important nature of this office, we can quite easily understand how the priest who had the honour to hold it should have been regarded as second only to the high priest himself.

Besides the segan or στρατηγός in the singular, we also meet with the plural form סגנים or στρατηγοί. When the festive processions of the country people went up to Jerusalem with the first-fruits, it was usual for the foremost among the priests to go out to meet them, namely the פַּחוֹת and סְגָנִים and גִּזְבָּרִים. The two first of those categories, the פַּחוֹת and the סְגָנִים, correspond the οἱ ἀρχιερεῖς καὶ στρατηγοί of Luke 22:4, 52. What we are to understand by the ἀρχιερεῖς has been already pointed out at p. 201 ff. above. But the סגנים or στρατηγοί are in any case, so far as the nature of their office is concerned, of the same order as the סגן or στρατηγός, only holding a somewhat lower rank, and therefore captains of the temple police as much as, though subordinate to, the chief στρατηγός.

In the lists of the priests that are given in several passages in the Talmud those who rank next to the high priest and the segan are the presidents of the courses of service, those at the head of the twenty-four leading divisions (ראש המשמר) being mentioned first, and those at the head of the sub-divisions (ראש בית אב) coming next. The functions of those presidents had however no immediate reference to the worship, but to the priesthood as a corporate body, in which aspect we have already had occasion to speak of them at p. 220 f. The sacred functions, properly so called, which still fall to be mentioned here besides those of the high priest and the segan, are those that related partly to the administration of the possessions and stores belonging to the sanctuary, partly to the superintendence of the temple police, and partly to the religious services themselves. All that we know with respect to those three categories is substantially as follows.

I. A very important function was that of the administration of the vast amount of property belonging to the temple. The store-chambers of the sanctuary were filled with possessions of multifarious kinds piled in masses one upon another. First there were the utensils employed in the sacrificial worship, which of themselves represented a handsome sum, and consisting of a

whole host of gold and silver basins, cups, pots and articles of a like kind used for such purposes as catching up and sprinkling the blood, for offering the frankincense and the meat- and drink-offerings, etc. Again there were large quantities of curtains, and priests' garments, and of the materials required for making them. And there were, in particular, vast collections of natural products, viz.: flour and oil for the meat-offerings, wine for the drink-offerings, fragrant substances with which to make the frankincense, and in addition to these things, the offerings contributed for the benefit of the priests. But, above all, there were also thelarge sums of money that were deposited in the store-houses of the temple, and which were of such a colossal character that they not unfrequently tempted greedy foreign potentates to plunder them, and yet it would appear that they were always speedily replaced. Then, in the last place, there fall to be added to the heaps of money stored in the temple the various sums deposited there by private individuals; for it was quite common to lodge such deposits in the temple from a feeling that the sacredness of the place afforded the best possible guarantee for their security. All the money and the various articles of value were kept in separate repositories (γαζοφυλάκια) in the inner court of the temple, and not only did they require to be constantly watched, but in consequence of the receiving on the one hand and giving out on the other that were continually going on, it was necessary that they should be under careful administration.

The treasurers, to whom the administration in question was entrusted, were called γαζοφύλακες in Greek and גִּזְבָּרִים in Hebrew. Nor were the functions of those officials confined merely to the money in the temple, but extended to the administration of all the possessions generally, that fell under any of the categories just mentioned. They had the custody of the sacred utensils, the veils, and the priests' garments; they took charge of the flour for the meat-offerings and of the wine for the drink-offerings; it was their duty to take delivery of things consecrated (or things presented to the temple), or to return them again on the ransom being duly paid; and they also purchased wood and gathered in the half-shekel tax. Of course among the treasurers too there were once more gradations of rank. According to the statements of the Old Testament, it would seem as though the whole of those offices had been in the hands of the Levites, This may have been actually the case so far as the more subordinate duties were concerned, but there can be no doubt whatever that the more important ones were in the hands of the priests. The fact is there is mention in Josephus of a particular occasion on which the γαζοφύλαξ (perhaps the chief one of his class) is put immediately on a level with the high priest, from his being regarded as one of the most distinguished of the temple officials. We also find that elsewhere the גִּזְבָּרִים are reckoned among the higher functionaries of the temple. When the Mishna affirms that there must have been at least three גִּזְבָּרִים in the temple, it is certain that it can have had in view only the head treasurers and not the entire staff of officials that were required for the administration of the treasury.

It is probable that, under the category of treasury officials, we should also include the amarkelin (אמרכלין), who are mentioned once in the Mishna without any hint whatever being given as to the nature of their functions, the consequence being that the Rabbinical writers indulge merely in empty conjectures on the point, conjectures based, to some extent, upon trivial etymological conceits. The term itself is of Persian origin, and means a "member of the chamber of accounts, or an accountant." Consequently in the Targum of Jonathan we find that in 2 Kings 12:10 and 22:4, for example, the term אמרכליא is substituted for the Hebrew expression שֹׁמְרֵי הַסַּף, "keepers of the threshold," by whom the priestly treasurers are meant. We have a term in every way identical with the one now in question in the Armenian expression hamarakar, which in like manner denotes an official having charge of the accounts (a chief treasurer). It is true no doubt that our term also occurs elsewhere in the Targums in the more comprehensive sense of chiefs

or heads generally. But seeing that, as a rule, the priestly אמרכלין are mentioned along with the גזברין, we may venture to regard it as certain that they also belonged to the same category as the treasurers. It is possible that they were among the subordinate officials of this department; but perhaps the distinction between the gisbarim and the amarkelin was something like this, that while to the former was assigned the duty of receiving and taking charge of the various treasures, the latter, on the other hand, were entrusted with the task of distributing among the priests the gifts and offerings that were intended for them. Besides the two classes just mentioned, the Jerusalem Talmud mentions yet a third, viz. the קתוליקין (καθολικοί), of whom however the Mishna knows nothing whatever.

II. For the duties connected with the police department, for which a very large staff of officials was required, it was mostly Levites that were employed. In early times indeed, and down even to the days of Ezra and Nehemiah, the "gate-keepers" (שׁעֲרִים) did not belong as yet to the order of the Levites, but were of a somewhat lower rank; it was the author of the Chronicles who was the first to include these officials also among the number of the Levites (see p. 224, above). In the inner court the duty of keeping watch and ward was discharged by the priests themselves. The author of the Chronicles, and subsequently Philo and the Mishna, have furnished us with several details regarding the organization of the department now in question. We learn from the first-mentioned authority that there were twenty-four wards in all, under four chiefs or captains, and that they were posted on the east, west, north and south sides of the temple (1 Chron. 26:12–18, also 9:17, 24–27). The statements of this writer are to be understood as applying to the temple of Zerubbabel. But the area of the temple esplanade, or the so-called outer court, was afterwards very much enlarged, especially by Herod, so that it now formed a large quadrangle, its longer side being that which extended from north to south. Within this large square again there was an oblong quadrangular space enclosed by strong walls, the longer side, in this instance, running from west to east; this was the so-called inner court, or "the court" in the strict sense of the word. This court was approached by a flight of steps, and at the foot of this stair was a railing within which no Gentile was allowed to pass. Any Gentile who ventured to pass this boundary and set foot within the inner court was punished with death; and the Roman authorities respected the scruples of the Jews in regard to this matter to such an extent that they sanctioned the execution of this sentence even in those cases in which Roman citizens had been the offenders. To this railing notices were attached at certain distances from each other, with the prohibition and the penalty for infringing it inscribed upon them in Greek and Latin. According to Philo, there were keepers in his day not only at the entrances to the inner court, but likewise at the gates of the outer one as well, one of their principal duties being to see that the prohibition in question was rigidly complied with. In addition to these there were watchmen patrolling all round by night and by day to make sure that nothing of an unseemly character was going on anywhere. According to the Mishna, there were twenty-one points at which the Levites kept watch (at night), and three at which the priests did so. The Levitical keepers were stationed partly at the gates and the corners of the outer court (inside of it), and partly at the gates and corners of the inner court (outside of it), while the priestly guards again had charge of the inner court. It was usual for a captain of the temple to go round at night to see that the guards were not sleeping at their posts. This captain was known under the designation of אִישׁ הַר הַבַּיִת. Besides this official, there is also occasional mention of an אִישׁ הַבִּירָה. Now, seeing that the Mishna knows of no other designation for the whole space around the temple — even in cases where it is to be distinguished from the inner court — but the expression הַר הַבַּיִת, we are accordingly to understand by the איש הר הבית, a captain who had charge of the outer court, and by the איש הבירה, on the other hand, the one who had the surveillance of the temple itself. For the בִּירָה cannot possibly have been intended to refer to Fort Antonia,

seeing that this latter was under the charge of a Roman φρούραρχος, but only to the temple itself. The two kinds of officials now mentioned would therefore be identical with the סגנים or στρατηγοί to whom we have already had occasion to refer.

It was also part of the watchmen's duty to open and close the whole of the gates of the courts, all of which were shut during the night; and accordingly there was also an officer appointed whose special duty it was to superintend "the shutting of the gates." According to Josephus, the services of two hundred men were required every time the gates were shut, and the heavy brazen gate in the east of the court took twenty men itself. Then as for the gate of the temple, we are told that when it was opened, so loud was the creaking, that it could be heard as far away as Jericho. The keys of the gates of the court were kept by the elders of the particular division of priests whose turn it was to be on watch duty within the court for the time being. When the divisions were changed, the one that retired handed them over to the one that came in to take its place. The morning sacrifice, as we know, required to be offered at daybreak, and that being the case the gates would of course have to be open some little time before; while at the Passover season they were open even so early as midnight.

III. It is true the acts of worship properly so called, i.e. the offering of the sacrifices with all the accompanying ceremonial, devolved as a whole upon the entire priesthood, who were divided into twenty-four courses, each of which conducted the worship by turns, and that for a week at a time (on this see next paragraph). Yet even here special stated officials were also necessary for certain particular functions. We get some idea of the multifarious nature of those functions from a passage in the Mishua in which are enumerated, though in a very confused and unsystematic order, the names of those persons who at a particular period (evidently in the closing years of the temple's existence) happened to fill the most important offices in connection with the worship of the sanctuary. From that passage it will be seen that there was, for example, a special official "over the lots" (No. 3), on whom devolved the duty of superintending the daily casting of the lots for determining the particular parts of the service that were to be apportioned to the various officiating priests. Then there was another functionary who was "over the seals" (No. 1), and another again "over the drink-offerings" (No. 2). For, with a view to simplifying matters, an arrangement had been adopted according to which "seals" or tokens were issued corresponding to the various kinds of drink-offerings, on presenting which people could get the particular drink-offering indicated upon them. The mode of proceeding was first of all to purchase a token from the official who was "over the seals," then to hand this to the one who was "over the drink-offerings," who in return would give to the person tendering it the amount of drink-offering requisite for the particular occasion for which it was wanted. There was a similar arrangement for the convenience of those who wished to be promptly supplied with birds for sacrificial purposes. All that was necessary was to drop the money into a box, whereupon it became the duty of the official who was "over the winged sacrifices" (No. 4) duly to purchase with it, as speedily as possible, the requisite offerings. Many of the offerings were of such a nature that they required a certain amount of skill to prepare them properly, a skill which belonged by inheritance to particular families. Accordingly the family of Garmu (No. 12) had charge of the preparing of the shewbread, that of Abtinas (No. 13) had the preparing of the frankincense. Then again the chief charge of the psalmody was entrusted to an official specially appointed for the purpose (No. 11). There was another whose duty it was to sound a cymbal (צלצל) by way of letting the Levites know when to commence the music (No. 10). There were besides a temple physician (No. 5), a master of the wells (No. 6), a herald (No. 7), whose voice was so powerful that it could be heard as far away as Jericho. Then further, as the veils in the temple required to be frequently renewed, there was an official appointed to see to the making

of them, and to take charge of the store in which they were kept (No. 14). And lastly, there was an official whose special duty it was to take charge of the priests' garments (No. 15).

A very numerous class of functionaries connected with the worship of the sanctuary was that of the sacred musicians, whose duty it was to accompany the offering of the "daily burnt-offering" and the other solemn services with singing and playing upon stringed instruments, and who were called in Hebrew מְשֹׁרְרִים (frequently so in Ezra and Nehemiah), and in Greek, ψαλτῳδοί, ἱεροψάλται, ὑμνῳδοί, κιθαρισταί τε καὶ ὑμνῳδοί. They formed a separate and exclusive order, to which none were admitted but those descended from a particular family, and down even to the time of Ezra and Nehemiah they were distinguished from the Levites, although at a subsequent period they were included amongst them (see above, p. 225 f.). They were divided into three families, those of Heman, Asaph and Ethan or Jeduthun (1 Chron. 6:16–32, 15:16–19, 25 the entire chapter; 2 Chron. 5:12), and the whole were sub-divided again into twenty-four courses of service (1 Chron. 25). The principal part of their duty was to sing, playing on an instrument being regarded merely in the light of an accompaniment to the singing. The musical instruments made use of for this purpose were chiefly the three following: – (1) The cymbal (מְצִלְתַּיִם, κύμβαλα), an instrument played by striking the one plate upon the other, and resembling the warning cymbal (צלצל), with which the signal was given for commencing the singing. As the dual form already serves to indicate, this instrument consisted of two large shallow plates made of brass, which, when struck the one upon the other, emitted a loud sound. Of a somewhat more musical and harmonious character were (2) the נֵבֶל, νάβλα, Luther: "psalter," and (3) the כִּנּוֹר, κινύρα, Luther: "Harfe." Both were stringed instruments, the νάβλα, according to Josephus, having twelve and the κινύρα ten strings. The νάβλα was played with the hand, whereas, according to the same authority just referred to, the κινύρα was played with the plectrum (in the earlier Biblical times the כִּנּוֹר was also played with the hand). A good deal has no doubt been written in which the nature of those instruments is fully discussed, but still no certain result has been arrived at. According to the Mishna, the number of נְבָלִים employed in the temple choir was never fewer than two and never more than six, whereas with regard to the כִּנּוֹרוֹת, there required to be nine of them at the very least, and their number might be multiplied a libitum. From all this one might venture to infer that the כִּנּוֹר was the chief, the leading instrument, while the נֵבֶל was rather intended to serve as an accompaniment to it. Besides the three instruments just referred to, reed pipes, חֲלִילִים, were also introduced into the choir on the occasion of the high festivals that occurred in the course of the year (Passover, Pentecost and the feast of Tabernacles).

But in addition to this, trumpets (חֲצוֹצְרוֹת) were in regular use, and while the playing upon the instruments hitherto mentioned was left entirely to the Levites (the traditions hesitating somewhat only with regard to the reed-pipes), the blowing with trumpets, on the other hand, was performed by priests. This latter was also an accompaniment above all of the offering of the daily burnt-offering, and of other parts of the service as well. The dawn of the Sabbath was likewise announced by some of the priests blowing trumpets from the roof of the temple.

The services of a more menial kind were performed, in the time of Zerubbabel, Ezra and Nehemiah, by temple slaves (נְתִינִים). It is true that נְתִינִים still continue to be mentioned in the literature of a later period, but it is no longer possible to make out with certainty what the nature of their duties now was. Instead of them we now meet with what are called "servants" (חַזָּנִים); nay we find that, in Philo, the cleaning and sweeping of the temple are mentioned along with the duty of watching as being all of them performed by the νεωκόροι, i.e. the Levites. There were also a good many functions that were left to be performed by boys belonging to the families of

the priests (פִּרְחֵי כְהֻנָּה).

IV. THE DAILY SERVICE

The daily worship of the sanctuary was conducted by the twenty-four divisions of the priests (see p. 216 ff. above), each division taking its turn and officiating for a week at a time. The divisions were changed every Sabbath day, the arrangement being that the retiring one should offer the morning sacrifice and the extra Sabbath offerings (according to Num. 28:9, 10) before leaving, while the one that came in to take its place was to offer the evening sacrifice and put the fresh shewbread upon the table. On the occasion of the three leading festivals of the year (Passover, Pentecost, and the feast of Tabernacles) the whole twenty-four courses officiated simultaneously. The attempts made by Christian scholars to make out on chronological grounds the week during which the course of Abia happened to serve in the year of our Lord's birth (Luke 1:5) have no tenable historical basis on which to rest. Every weekly division again was broken up into somewhere between five and nine sub-divisions, each of which officiated on an average for a single day the one after the other. If the sub-divisions happened to be fewer than seven, then some of them required to take their turn twice; but if, on the other hand, there happened to be more than seven, then on some of the days two of them officiated at the same time (see p. 216, above). But further, as never more than a fraction of the priests belonging to a sub-division were required to officiate at the regular daily offering of the public sacrifices, it was necessary to determine by lot those on whom the active duties of the day were to devolve. Like the priests, the Levites were also divided into twenty-four courses of service (see p. 227 f., above), which in like manner relieved each other every week. But lastly, in addition to this there was an analogous division of the people themselves into twenty-four courses of service (מִשְׁמָרוֹת), each of which had to take its turn in coming before God, every day for a whole week, by way of representing the whole body of the people while the daily sacrifice was being offered to Jehovah. The division actually engaged in the performance of this duty was known under the designation of מַעֲמָד, "a station." At the same time the case of the ordinary Israelites differed from that of the priests and Levites in this respect, that unlike these, the entire division did not require to go up to Jerusalem when its turn came. Instead of this the persons belonging to it met together in the synagogues in the towns in or near which they resided and there engaged in prayer and the reading of Scripture; probably in every instance it was merely a deputation of them that actually went up to Jerusalem to be present at the offering of the sacrifice. In that case it was this deputation that, in the strict sense of the word, constituted the מַעֲמָד, which "stood by" while the sacrifice was being offered.

The officiating priests wore, during the service, a special official dress, which consisted of the four following article: – (1) מִכְנָסִים, i.e. short breeches covering merely the hips and thighs, and made of byssus (probably not cotton, but fine white linen). Then over these (2) the כְּתֹנֶת, a long, somewhat close-fitting coat, reaching down to the feet, with narrow sleeves, and also made of byssus. This coat was fastened together somewhere about the breast with (3) a girdle (אַבְנֵט), which mostly consisted of byssus also, only it had ornaments of purple, scarlet and blue embroidered upon it. It was therefore the only part of the attire that had any colour about it, all the rest being pure white. Then the covering for the head was (4) the מִגְבָּעָה, a kind of cap or turban. Shoes are nowhere mentioned, and it may be regarded as certain that the priests always officiated without having anything on the feet.

As the white attire was a symbol of purity, so the officiating priests required to be men characterized by temperance and Levitical purity. During the period of their service they were prohibited from drinking wine or any other intoxicating beverage. Nor were they allowed to enter

the court for the purpose of officiating unless they were Levitically clean. Nay more, even those who were so were, in every instance, required to take a formal bath previous to their entering upon the services of the day. But besides this, they had then to go and wash the hands and feet in the brazen laver (כִּיּוֹר) that stood in the open air between the temple and the altar of burnt-offering.

As regards the sacrifices that were offered every day, they are to be distinguished into two classes, the public and the private sacrifices. The former were offered in name of the people, and were purchased with a portion of the people's own offerings, especially the half-shekel tax; while the latter again were those in which only private individuals were concerned, and which might be offered on a vast variety of occasions, some of them being voluntary and others of them being, for some particular reason or other, compulsory. Both those categories again were sub-divided into different sorts, varying according to the particular objects for which they were offered, though they all admit of being classified under the three following heads: – (1) the burnt-offerings, the essential characteristic of which lay in the fact that the whole victim was consumed upon the altar; (2) the sin- and the trespass-offerings, in the case of which only the fat was burnt upon the altar, while the flesh fell to the priests; (3) the peace-offerings (זִבְחֵי־שְׁלָמִים), according to Luther, "thank-offerings," in the case of which again it was only the fat that was burnt upon the altar, while the flesh was used by the owner of the sacrifice himself as material for a jocund sacrificial feast. As was only natural, it was the numerous private offerings of so many different kinds that constituted the bulk of the sacrifices. However, as it is with giving au account of the regular daily worship of the sanctuary that we are here concerned, it is only the public sacrifices that fall to be considered by us, and especially the most important of them all, the people's daily burnt-offering.

In order that the reader may be in a better position for understanding what is to follow, it will be well, before proceeding farther, to offer here one or two topographical observations. The inner court, within which the whole of the worship was celebrated, was divided by means of a wall into two divisions, a western and an eastern. The latter was called "the court of the women," not however because none but women were admitted to it, but because women as well as men were allowed to enter it. The beautiful gate-way in the east side of this court, with its elaborate two-leaved gate made of brass (ἡ θύρα ἡ λεγομένη ὡραία, Acts 3:2), formed the principal entrance to it; and hence it was that beggars were in the habit of sitting here (Acts 3:2). The western division again was reserved exclusively for male Israelites, and within it stood the temple proper. Comparatively speaking, this was not a large, but a handsome edifice. The interior, which was probably almost quite dark, was divided into two divisions, the larger one being to the front, and the other, which was only half as large, being at the back. The latter formed the "holy of holies," which was trodden by human foot only once in the year, and that by the high priest on the great day of atonement. In the front (and therefore eastern) division stood those three sacred articles, the punctual ministering at which on the part of the officiating priests formed one of the principal parts of the worship, viz.: (1) in the middle the golden altar of incense (מִזְבַּח הַזָּהָב), known also as the "inner altar" (מִזְבֵּחַ הַפְּנִימִי), upon which incense had to be offered every morning and evening; (2) to the south of the latter the golden candlestick with seven branches (מְנוֹרָה), which had to be kept constantly burning; and (3) to the north of the altar of incense the golden table for the shewbread, on which twelve fresh loaves had to be placed every Sabbath day. The front of the temple looked toward the east. Before it and in the open air stood the great altar of burnt-offering, or "the altar" κατ' ἐξοχήν, at which, with the exception of the burning of the incense, every act of sacrifice had to be performed. It was a high four-square erection of large dimensions, being, according to the Mishna, thirty-two cubits

square at the base (while for the sake of comparison it may be mentioned that the interior of the temple was only twenty cubits wide). It diminished in size toward the top in such a way as to form several stages or landings round it, although on the top it still measured as much as twenty-four cubits by twenty-four. The whole structure was built of unhewn stones which no tool had ever touched. Then, on the south side, there was a gradual ascent leading upward to the top of the altar, and this was likewise formed of unhewn stones. The fire upon this altar had to be kept continually burning by night as well as by day. Between the temple and the altar of burnt-offering there stood, and likewise in the open air, the brazen laver (כִּיּוֹר) already referred to, in which the priests were required to wash their hands and feet previous to their engaging in the worship of the sanctuary. To the north of the altar, and still in the open air, was the place for slaughtering the victims, where there were rings fastened in the ground to which the animals were tied when about to be slaughtered; while there were pillars at hand on which to hang the victims after they were killed, as wall as marble tables on which to skin them and wash the entrails. The temple, along with the altar of burnt-offering and the place for slaughtering, was surrounded by an enclosure within which, as a rule, none but priests were allowed to enter, ordinary Israelites being permitted to do so only "when it was necessary for the purpose of the laying on of hands, or for slaughtering, or waving" (תְּנוּפָה).

Now, as regards the regular worship of the sanctuary, the most important part of it was the daily burnt-offering offered in the name of the people at large, the עֹלַת הַתָּמִיד, or simply הַתָּמִיד, "the standing one." The practice of offering regular daily sacrifice is, comparatively speaking, of very ancient date. But it underwent certain modifications at different periods; not only in so far as, previous to the exile, the kings were in the habit of defraying the cost of the sacrifices (Ezek. 45:17 and 46:13–15, Sept. version), whereas they were subsequently provided at the expense of the people, but also as regards the character and number of the sacrifices themselves. In the time of Ahaz the morning sacrifice consisted only of a burnt-offering, and the evening one of simply a meat-offering (2 Kings 16:15). This had become so much of an established practice that various parts of the day took their names from it. To speak for example of anything as happening at the time "when the meat-offering was presented" was equivalent to saying toward evening (1 Kings 18:29, 36). Not only so, but this mode of denoting the hour of the day had become so completely established that it continued in use even long after the practice had been introduced of offering a burnt-offering in the evening as well (Ezra 9:4, 5; Dan. 9:21). It would appear that this had not been introduced as yet in Ezekiel's time. Yet in his day there must have been already an advance upon the older practice, in so far as, according to this prophet, both a burnt-offering and a meat-offering would seem to have been offered in the morning (Ezek. 46:13–15). On the other hand, by the time the priest-code came to be in force it was prescribed that both a burnt-offering and a meat-offering should be offered every morning and every evening as well, and further, that on every occasion they should also be accompanied with a drink-offering (Ex. 29:38–42; Num. 28:3–8). And so we find that, in the time of the author of the Chronicles, the practice thus established of offering a burnt-offering twice every day in the course of the daily service was looked upon as one of long standing (1 Chron. 16:40; 2 Chron. 13:11, 31:3). This then formed the true heart and centre of the whole sacrificial system of worship. In no circumstances whatever could it be allowed to be dispensed with. We find, for example, that in the year 70 Jerusalem had for a considerable time been invested by the Romans, and that, in consequence, the scarcity of food had reached a climax, but for all that the daily sacrifices continued to be regularly offered; and it was felt by the Jews to be one of the heaviest calamities that could have befallen them when, on the 17th of Tammuz, they at last found themselves in the position of having no more to offer.

The following are the more specific prescriptions contained in the priest-code with regard to the Tamid (Ex. 39:38–42; Num. 28:3–8). Every morning and evening alike a male lamb of a year old and without blemish was to be offered as a burnt-offering, and in doing so all those regulations were required to be observed that apply to burnt-offerings generally, particularly those contained in Lev. 1:10–13 and 6:1–6. Not only so, but on every occasion a meat-offering and a drink-offering were to be offered along with the burnt-offering, as it is prescribed by the priest-code that these were to accompany all burnt-offerings without exception (Num. 15:1–16). In cases in which the victim happened to be a lamb, the meat-offering was to consist of one-tenth of an ephah of fine flour (סֹלֶת), which was to be mixed (בָּלוּל, therefore not baked] with a quarter of a hin of pure oil; while the corresponding drink-offering was to consist of a quarter of a hin of wine. The time at which the morning sacrifice was to be offered was early dawn; that for the evening sacrifice again was to be, in Biblical phraseology, בֵּין הָעַרְבַּיִם, i.e. in the evening twilight, though at a later period it had become the practice to offer the evening sacrifice so early as the afternoon, or according to our mode of reckoning, somewhere about three o'clock.

It was also the regular practice to offer the daily meat-offering of the high priest in conjunction with the daily burnt-offering of the people. For, according to Lev. 6:12–16, the high priest was required to offer a meat-offering every day (תָּמִיד), both morning and evening, and one too which differed from that offered in the name of the people along with their burnt-offering, not only in respect of quantity, but also as regards the mode in which it was prepared. It consisted altogether of only the tenth of an ephah of fine flour, of which one half was offered in the morning and the other half in the evening; and not only was it mixed with oil, but after being so it was baked in a flat pan (מַחֲבַת); the cakes thus prepared were then broken into pieces, oil was poured over them, and then they were duly offered (Lev. 6:14; comp. Lev. 2:5–6). Owing to the circumstance of its being made read in a מַהֲבַת, it was known at a later period simply as the חֲבִיתִים, "the baked (the cakes), which is the designation already given to it, directly or indirectly, author of the Chronicles, and subsequently by the Mishna in particular. Now as the presenting of this offering was incumbent upon the high priest, we are, of course, justified in speaking of him as offering a daily sacrifice. At the same time it must be borne in mind that here the high priest is to be regarded as the offerer of the sacrifice only in the same sense in which the people is so in the case of the daily burnt-offering, i.e. he causes it to be offered in his name and at his own expense, but it was by no means necessary that he himself should officiate on the occasion. In fact the expression used in connection with this matter in Lev. 6:15 is not יקריב but merely יעשה. We learn from Josephus that the high priest officiated as a rule on the Sabbath and on festival days (see p. 255, above). But on ordinary occasions the meat-offering of the high priest, in common with the sacrifices of the people, was offered by the priests who happened to be officiating for the time being; and when the lots were drawn with the view of deciding who were to take the various parts of the service for the day, one was always drawn at the same time to determine who was to be entrusted with the duty of presenting the חֲבִיתִין, i.e. the meat-offering of the high priest. Nay more – seeing that the law speaks of this offering as being an offering of Aaron and his sons (Lev. 6:13), – there is no reason why it should not also be conceived of as a sacrifice which the priests offered for themselves.

Besides the offering of the sacrifices just referred to, the priests in the course of the daily service were also called upon to perform certain functions inside the temple in connection with the altar of incense and the candlestick. On the former incense had to be offered every morning and every evening alike (Ex. 30:7, 8), that offered in the morning being previous to the offering of the burnt-offering, and that in the evening, on the other hand, coming after it, so that the daily burnt-offering was, as it were, girt round with the offering of incense. Then further, with regard to

the candlestick, it had to be attended to every morning and every evening. In the morning the lamps were trimmed and replenished with oil, when one or more of them (according to Josephus three) were allowed to burn throughout the day. In the evening again the rest of them were lighted, for it was prescribed that during the night the whole seven were to be burning (see especially Ex. 30:7, 8; 2 Chron. 13:11; and in, general, p. 281, above).

Then lastly, with the view of imparting greater beauty to the worship, it was also deemed proper to have vocal and instrumental music. When the burnt-offering was being presented the Levites broke in with singing and playing upon their instruments, while two priests blew silver trumpets (2 Chron. 29:26-28; Num. 10:1, 2, 10). While this was going on the people were also assembled in the temple for prayer. At the pauses in the singing the priests sounded a fanfare with their trumpets, and as often as they did so the people fell down and worshipped. There was a special pealm for every day of the week, the one for Sunday being the 24th, for Monday the 48th, for Tuesday the 82nd, for Wednesday the 94th, for Thursday the 81st, for Friday the 93rd, and for the Sabbath the 92nd.

The form of the daily service in the temple which we have just been describing, is the same as that which had been already delineated with so much fondness by the son of Sirach (Sir. 50:11-21). A very circumstantial account of the morning service, founded evidently on sound tradition, is given in the Mishna in the tractate Tamid, the substance of which may here be subjoined by way of supplement to what we have already said.

The officiating priests slept in a room in the inner court. Early in the morning, even before daybreak, the official who had charge of the lots for deciding how the different functions for the day were to be apportioned came, and, in the first place, caused a lot to be drawn to determine who was to perform the duty of removing the ashes from the altar of burnt-offering. Those who were disposed to offer themselves for this task were expected to have taken the bath prescribed by the law previous to the arrival of the above-mentioned official. The lots were then drawn, and one of those who thus presented themselves was in this way told off to perform the duty in question. This person then set to work at once while it was still dark, and with no light but that of the altar fire. The first thing he did was to wash his hands and feet in the brazen laver that stood between the temple and the altar, after which he mounted the altar and carried away the ashes with a silver pan. While this was being done, those whose duty it was to prepare the baked meat-offering (of the high priest) were also busy with their particular function. Meanwhile fresh wood was laid upon the altar, and, while this was burning, the priests, after they had all in like manner washed their hands and feet in the brazen laver, went up to the lischkath ha-gasith, where the further drawing of the lots took place.

The official who had charge of this matter then caused lots to be drawn in order to determine — (1) who was to slaughter the victim; (2) who was to sprinkle the blood upon the altar; (3) who was to remove the ashes from the altar of incense; (4) who was to trim the lamps on the candlestick; further, who were to carry the various portions of the victim to the foot of the ascent to the altar, viz. who (5) was to carry the head and one of the hind legs; (6) who the two forelegs; (7) who the tail and the other hind leg; (8) who the breast and the neck; (9) who the two sides; (10) who the entrails; (11) who the offering of fine flour; (12) who the baked meat-offering (of the high priest); and (13) who the wine for the drink-offering. The next step was to go out to see whether there was as yet any symptom of daybreak. Then as soon as the dawn appeared in the sky they proceeded to bring a lamb from the lamb-house and the ninety-three sacred utensils from the utensil-room. The lamb that was thus to form the victim had now some water given to it from a golden bowl, whereupon it was led away to the slaughtering place on

the north side of the altar. Meanwhile the two whose duty it was to clean the altar of incense and trim the lamps proceeded to the temple, the former with a golden pail (טְנִי) and the latter with a golden bottle (כּוּד). They opened the great door of the temple, went in, and proceeded, the one to clean the altar of incense, and the other to trim the lamps. In the case of the latter however the arrangement was, that if the two that were farthest east were found to be still burning they were in the meantime to be left undisturbed, and only the other five were to be trimmed. But should it so happen that the two that were farthest, east were out, then they were, in the first place, to be trimmed and relighted before the trimming of the others was proceeded with. And so having finished their task, the two priests now retired, but they left behind them in the temple the utensils which they had been using.

While the two just referred to were thus occupied within the temple, the lamb was being slaughtered at the slaughtering place by the priest to whose lot this duty had fallen, another at the same time catching up the blood and sprinkling it upon the altar. The victim was then flayed and cut up into a number of pieces. The entrails were washed upon marble tables that were at hand for the purpose, There were whole six priests appointed to carry the pieces to the altar, one piece being borne by each priest. Then a seventh carried the offering of fine flour, an eighth the baked meat-offering (of the high priest), and a ninth the wine for the drink-offering. All the things here mentioned were in the first instance laid down on the west side of the ascent to the altar and at the foot of it, and then seasoned with salt, whereupon the priests betook themselves once more to the lischkath ha-gasith for the purpose of repeating the schma.

After they had repeated the schma, the lots were again drawn. In the first instance they were drawn among those who as yet had not been called upon to offer up incense in order to determine which one amongst them should now be entrusted with this duty. Then another was drawn to determine who were to lay the various parts of the victim upon the altar (which, if we are to believe Rabbi Elieser ben Jacob, was done by the same priests who had formerly carried them to the foot of the altar). Those on whom no lot fell upon this occasion were now free to go away, and accordingly they took off their official attire.

The priest to whose lot the duty of offering the incense had fallen now went and took a golden saucer (כַּף) covered with a lid, and inside of which again there was a smaller saucer (בָּזָךְ) containing the incense. Another priest took a silver pan (מַחְתָּה), and with it brought some live coal from the altar of burnt-offering and then emptied it into a golden pan. This being done, both entered the temple together. The one emptied the coals that were in his pan on to the altar of incense, prostrated himself in an attitude of devotion, and then withdrew. The other took the smaller saucer containing the incense out of the larger one, then handing this latter to a third priest, he emptied the incense out of the saucer on to the coals upon the altar, whereupon it ascended in clouds of smoke. This being done, he, like the other, fell down in an attitude of devotion, and then left the temple. But, previous to these latter having entered, the two who had charge of the cleaning of the altar of incense and the trimming of the lamps had also come back and entered for the second time, the former merely to bring away his utensils (the טְנִי), the latter in like manner to bring away his (the כּוּד), but also for the additional purpose of trimming the more easterly of the two lamps that had not yet been so; the other being allowed still to burn in order that with it the others might be lighted in the evening. If it, too, happened to be out, then it was trimmed like the others, and lighted with fire taken from the altar of burnt-offering.

The five priests who had been thus occupied inside the sanctuary now proceeded with their five golden utensils in their hands to the steps in front of the temple, and there pronounced the priestly benediction over the people, in the course of which the name of God was pronounced

as it spells (therefore יהוה, not אדוני).

And now, at this point, the offering of the burnt-offering was proceeded with, the priests who had been appointed to this duty taking up the portions of the victim that lay at the foot of the ascent to the altar, and after placing their hands upon them, throwing them on to the altar. In those cases in which the high priest officiated, he caused the pieces to be given to him by the ordinary priests, and then placing his hands upon them he threw them on to the altar. And now, in the last place, the two meat-offerings (that of the people and that of the high priest) and the drink-offering were presented. When the priest was bending forward to pour out the drink-offering a signal was given to the Levites to proceed with the music. They accordingly broke in with the singing of the psalm, and at every pause in the music two priests blew with silver trumpets, and every time they blew the people all fell down and prayed.

The evening service was exactly similar to the morning one, which has just been described. The only difference was that in the former the incense was offered after the burnt-offering instead of before it, while in the evening again the lamps were not trimmed, but simply lighted (see p. 290 f. above).

Those two daily public sacrifices formed the substratum of the entire worship of the temple. They were also offered, and that in the manner we have described, on every Sabbath and every festival day. But with the view of distinguishing them above ordinary occasions, it was the practice on those days to add further public offerings to the ordinary tamid. The addition on the Sabbath consisted of two male lambs of a year old, which were offered as a burnt-offering along with two-tenths of an ephah of fine flour as a meat-offering, and a corresponding amount of wine as a drink-offering. Consequently the sacrifices offered at a single service on the Sabbath would be exactly equivalent to the daily morning and evening sacrifices put together. On festival days again the additional offerings were on a still more extensive scale. On the occasion of the feast of the Passover, for example, there were offered as a burnt-offering, and that daily during the whole seven days over which the festival extended, two young bullocks, a ram, and seven lambs, along with the corresponding meat- and drink-offerings, and in addition to all this, a he-goat as a sin-offering (Num. 28:16–25); and on the feast of Weeks again, which lasted only one day, there were offered the same sacrifices as on each of the seven days of the feast of the Passover (Num. 28:26–31). Then on the occasion of the feast of Tabernacles, which, as being the festival that took place when the harvest was over, would naturally be celebrated with special tokens of thankfulness, the number of sacrifices was much greater still. On the first day of this feast there were offered; as a burnt-offering, thirteen young bullocks, two rams, and fourteen lambs, along with the corresponding meat- and drink-offerings, and over and above all this a he-goat as a sin-offering; while on each of the six following festival days, all those sacrifices were repeated, with this difference, that every day there was one bullock fewer than on the preceding day (Num. 29:12–34). Similar supplementary sacrifices and offerings, at one time on a larger at another on a smaller scale, were also prescribed for the other festivals (the new moon, the new year, and the great day of atonement) that occurred in the course of the year (see in general, Num. 28–29). Then to those sacrifices which merely served to indicate in a general way the festive character of the occasions on which they were offered, there were further added those special ones that had reference to the peculiar significance of the feast (on this see Lev. 16 and 23).

But copious as those public sacrifices no doubt were, they still seem but few when compared with the multitudes of private offerings and sacrifices that were offered. It was the vast number of these latter – so vast in fact as to be well-nigh inconceivable – that gave its peculiar stamp to

the worship at Jerusalem. Here day after day whole crowds of victims were slaughtered and whole masses of flesh burnt; and when any of the high festivals came round, there was such a host of sacrifices to dispose of that it was scarcely possible to attend to them all notwithstanding the fact that there were thousands of priests officiating on the occasion. But the people of Israel saw in the punctilious observance of this worship the principal means of securing for themselves the favour of their God.

SCRIBISM

I. CANONICAL DIGNITY OF HOLY SCRIPTURE

THE fact most essentially conclusive for the religious life of the Jewish people during the period under consideration is, that the law, which regulated not only the priestly service but the whole life of the people in their religious, moral and social relations, was acknowledged as given by God Himself. Its every requirement was a requirement of God from His people, its most scrupulous observance was therefore a religious duty, nay the supreme and in truth the sole religious duty. The whole piety of the Israelite consisted in obeying with fear and trembling, with all the zeal of an anxious conscience, the law given him by God in all its particulars. Hence the specific character of Israelitish piety during this period depends on the acknowledgment of this dignity of the law.

The age of this acknowledgment may be determined almost to the day and hour. It dates from that important occurrence, whose epoch-making importance is duly brought forward in the Book of Nehemiah, the reading of the law by Ezra, and the solemn engagement of the people to observe it (Neh. 8–10). The law, which was then read, was the Pentateuch in essentially the same form as we now have it. Isolated passages may have been subsequently interpolated, but with respect to the main substance, these need not be taken account of. Henceforward then the law given by God through Moses was acknowledged by the people as the binding rule of life, i.e. as canonical. For it is in the very nature of the law that its acceptance eo ipso involves the acknowledgment of its binding and normative dignity. Hence this acknowledgment was from that time onwards a self-evident assumption to every Israelite. It was the condition without which no one was a member of the chosen people, or could have a share in the promises given to them. "He who asserts that the Thorah is not from heaven (אין תורה מן השמים), has no part in the future world." It is however in the nature of the thing that this notion should, as time went on, be held with increasing strictness and severity. While its original meaning was only that the commands of the law were in their entirety and in their details the commands of God, the assumption of a divine origin was gradually referred to the entire Pentateuch according to its whole wording. "He who says that Moses wrote even one verse of his own knowledge (מִפִּי עַצְמוֹ) is a denier and despiser of the word of God." The whole Pentateuch was thus now regarded as dictated by God, as prompted by the Spirit of God. Even the last eight verses of Deuteronomy, in which the death of Moses is related, were said to have been written by Moses himself by means of divine revelation. Nay at last, the view of a divine dictation was no longer sufficient. The complete book of the law was declared to have been handed to Moses by God, and it was only disputed, whether God delivered the whole Thorah to Moses at once or by volumes (מְגִלָּה מְגִלָּה).

After the law and as an addition to it, certain other writings of Israelite antiquity, the writings of the prophets and works on the older (pre-exilian) history of Israel, attained to similar authority. They were for a long time respected and used as a valuable legacy of antiquity, before their canonization was thought of. Gradually however they appeared beside the law as a second class of "sacred Scriptures," and the longer their combination with the law became customary, the more was its specific, i.e. its legally binding dignity, and therefore its canonical validity, transferred to them. They too were regarded as documents in which the will of God was revealed in a manner absolutely binding. Lastly, at a still later stage there was added to this

body of the “prophets” (נביאים) a third collection of “writings” (כְּתוּבִים), which gradually entered into the same category of canonical Scriptures. The origin of these two collections is quite veiled in obscurity. The most ancient testimony to the collocation of both collections with the Thorah is the prologue to the Book of Wisdom (second century B.C.). We cannot, however, determine from it that the third collection was then already concluded; on the other hand, it is very probable that in the time of Josephus the canon had already assumed a lasting form, and indeed the same which it has to this day. Josephus expressly says, that there were among the Jews only twenty-two books acknowledged divine (βιβλία … θεῖα πεπιστευμένα); that all the others were not esteemed of equal credit (πίστεως οὐχ ὁμοίας ἠξίωται). He does not, indeed, separately enumerate them, but it is very probable that he means by them the collected writings of the present canon, and these only. For the Fathers, especially Origen and Jerome, expressly say, that the Jews were accustomed so to count the books of the present canon as to make their number twenty-two. It was only with respect to certain books, especially the Song of Solomon and the Book of Ecclesiastes, that opinion was not yet quite decided in the first century after Christ. Yet in respect of these also the prevailing view was already that they “defile the hands,” i.e. are to be regarded as canonical books. It cannot be proved of other books than those of our present canon, that they was ever reckoned canonical by the Palestinian Jews, although the Book of Wisdom was so highly esteemed that it was some times cited “in a manner only customary in the case of passages of Scripture.” It was only the Hellenistic Jews who combined a whole series of other books with those of the Hebrew canon. But then they had no definite completion of the canon at all.

Notwithstanding the combination of the Nebiim and Kethubim with the Thorah, they were never placed quite on a level with it. The Thorah always occupied a higher position as to its religious estimation. In it was deposited and fully contained the original revelation of the Divine will. In the prophets and the other sacred writings this will of God was only further delivered. Hence these are designated as the “tradition” (קַבָּלָה, Aramaean אַשְׁלָמְתָּא), and cited as such. On account of its higher value it was decided that a book of the law might be purchased by the sale of the Holy Scriptures, but not Holy Scriptures by the sale of a book of the law. In general, however, the Nebiim and Kethubim participate in the properties of the Thorah. They are all “Holy Scriptures” (כִּתְבֵי הַקֹּדֶשׁ); with respect to them all it is determined, that contact with them defiles the hands (so that they may not be touched inconsiderately, but with reverent awe). They are all cited by essentially the same formulas. For although special formulas are sometimes used for the Thorah, yet the formula, which most frequently occurs, שֶׁנֶּאֱמַר, “for it is said,” is applied without distinction to the Thorah and the other Scriptures; as also in the sphere of Hellenism (comp. the N. T.), the formula γέγραπται and the like. Nay the Nebiim and Kethubim are sometimes quoted as “the law” (νόμος). And there is perhaps nothing more characteristic of the full appreciation of their value on the part of the Jews, than the fact that they too are not first of all to Jewish conviction didactic or consolatory works, not books of edification or history, but also “law,” the substance of God’s claims upon His people.

II. THE SCRIBES AND THEIR LABOURS IN GENERAL

THE LITERATURE

Ursinus, Antiquitates Hebraicae scholastico-academicae. Hafniae 1702 (also in Ugolini’s Thesaurus, vol. xxi.).

Hartmann, Die enge Verbindung des Allen Testaments mit dem Neuen (1881), pp. 384–413.

Gfröer, Das Jahrhundert des Heils, i. (1838) pp. 109–214.

Winer, RWB. ii. 425–428 (art. “Schriftgelehrte”).

Jost, Das geschichtliche Verhältniss der Rabbinen zu ihren Gemeinden (Zeitschr. für die historische theologie (1850), pp. 351–377).

Levysohn, Einiges über die hebräischen und aramäischen Benennungen für Schule, Schüler und Lehrer (Franke’s Monatsschr. für Gesch. und Wissensch. des Judenth. (1858), pp. 384–389).

Leyrer, art. “Schriftgelehrt,” in Herzog’s Real-Encycl., 1st ed. vol. xiii. (1860) pp. 781–741.

Klöpper, art. “Schriftgelehrte,” in Schenkel’s Bibellexicon, vol. v. pp. 247–255.

Ginsburg, art. “Scribes,” in Kitto’s Cyclopaedia of Biblical Literature.

Plumptre, art. “Scribes,” in Smith’s Dictionary of the Bible.

Weber, System der altsynagogalen paläslinischen Theologie (1880), pp. 121–143.

Hamburger, Real-Encycl. für Bibel und Talmud, Div. ii., arts. “Gelehrter,” “Lehrhaus,” “Rabban,” “Schüler,” “Sopherim,” “Talmudlehrer,” “Talmudschulen,” “Unterhalt,” “Unterricht.”

Strack, art. “Schriftgelehrte,” in Herzog’s Real-Encycl., 2nd ed. xiii. (1884) pp. 696–698.

With the existence of a law is naturally involved the necessity of its scientific study, and of a professional acquaintance with it. Such necessity exists at least in proportion as this law is comprehensive and complicated. An acquaintance with its details, a certainty in the application of its several enactments to everyday life, can then only be attained by its being made a matter of professional occupation. In the time of Ezra, and indeed long after, this was chiefly the concern of the priests. Ezra himself was at the same time both priest and scribe (סוֹפֵר). The most important element of the Pentateuch was written in the interest of the priestly cultus. Hence the priests were at first the teachers and guardians of the law. Gradually however this was changed. The higher the law rose in the estimation of the people, the more did its study and exposition become an independent business. It was the law of God, and every individual of the nation had the same interest as the priests in knowing and obeying it. Hence non-priestly Israelites more and more occupied themselves with its scientific study. An independent class of “biblical scholars or scribes,” i.e. of men who made acquaintance with the law a profession, was formed beside the priests. And when in the time of Hellenism the priests, at least those of the higher strata, often applied themselves to heathen culture, and more or less neglected the law of their fathers, the scribes ever appeared in a relative contrast to the priests. It was no longer the priests, but the scribes, who were the zealous guardians of the law. Hence they were also from that time onwards the real teachers of the people, over whose spiritual life they bore complete sway.

In the time of the New Testament we find this process fully completed; the scribes then formed a firmly compacted class in undisputed possession of a spiritual supremacy over the people. They are usually called in the New Testament γραμματεῖς, i.e. “learned in Scripture,” “the learned,” corresponding to the Hebrew סוֹפְרִים, which in itself means nothing more than homines

literati (men professionally occupied with the Scriptures). That such occupation should concern itself chiefly with the law was self-evident. Besides this general designation, we also meet with the more special one νομικοί i.e. “the learned in the law,” “jurists” (Matt. 22:35; Luke 7:30, 10:25, 11:45 sq., 52, 14:3); and inasmuch as they not only knew, but taught the law, they were likewise called νομοδιδάσκαλοι, “teachers of the law” (Luke 5:17; Acts 5:34). Josephus calls them πατρίων ἐξηγηταὶ νόμων, or in Graecized fashion σοφισταί, also ἱερογραμματεῖς. In the Mishna the expression סוֹפְרִים is only used of the scribes of former times, who in the times of the Mishna had already become an authority. Contemporary scribes are always called חֲכָמִים in the Mishna. The extraordinary respect paid to these “scholars” on the part of the people was expressed by the titles of honour bestowed upon them. The most usual was the appellation רַבִּי, “my master;” Greek, ῥαββί (Matt. 3:7 and elsewhere). From this respectful address the title Babbi was gradually formed, the suffix losing its pronominal signification with the frequent use of the address, and רַבִּיbeing also used as a title (Babbi Joshua, Babbi Eliezer, Eabbi Akiba). This use cannot be proved before the time of Christ. Hillel and Shammai were never called Babbis, nor is ῥαββί found in the New Testament except as an actual address. The word does not seem to have been used as a title till after the time of Christ. רַבָּן, or as the word is also pronounced רַבּוֹן, is an enhanced form of רַב. The first form seems to belong more to the Hebrew, the second to the Aramaean usage. Hence רַבָּן is found in the Mishna as the title of four prominent scribes of the period of the Mishna (about A.D. 40–150), and in the New Testament, on the other hand, ῥαββουνί (רַבּוֹן or רַבּוּן) as a respectful address to Christ (Mark 10:51; John 20:16). In the Greek of the New Testament Rabbi is represented by κύριε (Matt. 8:2, 6, 8, 21, 25 and frequently) or διδάσκαλε (Matt. 8:9 and frequently); in St. Luke also by ἐπιστάτα (Luke 5:5, 8:24, 45, 9:33, 49, 17:13). Πατήρ and καθηγητής (Matt. 23:9, 10) are also mentioned as other names of honour given to scribes. The latter is probably equal to מוֹרֶה, “teacher.” The former answers to the Aramaic אַבָּא, which also occurs in the Mishna and Tosefta as the title of several Rabbis.

The Rabbis required from their pupils the most absolute reverence, surpassing even the honour felt for parents. “Let thine esteem for thy friend border upon thy respect for thy teacher, and respect for thy teacher on reverence for God.” “Respect for a teacher should exceed respect for a father, for both father and son owe respect to a teacher.” “If a man’s father and teacher have lost anything, the teacher’s loss has the precedence (i.e. he must first be assisted in recovering it). For his father only brought him into this world. His teacher, who taught him wisdom, brings him into the life of the world to come. But if his father is himself a teacher, then his father’s loss has precedence. If a man’s father and his teacher are carrying burdens, he must first help his teacher and afterwards his father. If his father and his teacher are in captivity, he must first ransom his teacher and afterwards his father. But if his father be himself a scholar, the father has precedence.” The Rabbis in general everywhere claimed the first rank. “They loved the uppermost rooms at feasts, and the chief seats in the synagogues and greetings in the markets, and to be called of men Rabbi, Rabbi” (Matt. 23:6, 7; Mark 12:38, 39; Luke 11:43, 20:46).

All the labours of the scribes, whether educational or judicial, were to be gratuitous. R. Zadok said: Make the knowledge of the law neither a crown wherewith to make a show, nor a spade wherewith to dig. Hillel used to say: He who uses the crown (of the law) for external aims fades away. That the judge might not receive presents was already prescribed in the Old Testament (Ex. 23:8; Deut. 16:9). Hence it is also said in the Mishna: “If any one receives payment for a judicial decision, his sentence is not valid.” The Rabbis were therefore left to other sources for obtaining a livelihood. Some were persons of property, others practised some trade as well as the study of the law. The combination of some secular business with the study of the law is

especially recommended by Rabban Gamaliel III., son of R Judah ha-Nasi. “For exertion in both keeps from sin. The study of the law without employment in business must at last be interrupted, and brings transgression after it.” It is known that St. Paul, even when a preacher of the gospel, practised a trade (Acts 18:3; 1 Thess, 2:9; 2 Thess. 3:8). And we are told the like of many Babbis. In such a case their occupation with the law was of course esteemed the more important, and they were cautioned against over-estimation of their secular business. The son of Sirach already warns against a one-sided devotion to handicraft, and extols the blessing of scriptural wisdom (Wisd. 38:24–39, 11). R. Meir said: Give yourselves less to trade and occupy yourselves more with the law; and Hillel: He who devotes himself too much to trade will not grow wise.

The principle of non-remuneration was strictly carried out only in their judicial labours, but hardly in their employment as teachers. Even in the Gospel, notwithstanding the express admonition to the disciples, δωρεὰν ἐλάβετε, δωρεὰν δότε (Matt. 10:8), it is also said that a labourer is worthy of his hire (Matt. 10:10; Luke 10:7), to which saying St. Paul expressly refers (1 Cor. 9:15) when he claims as his right — although he but exceptionally used it — a maintenance from those to whom he preached the gospel (1 Cor. 9:3–18; 2 Cor. 11:8, 9; Phil. 4:10–18. Comp, also Gal. 6:6). If such was the view of the times, it may be supposed that the Jewish teachers of the law also did not always impart their instruction gratuitously, nay the very exhortations quoted above, not to practise instruction in the law for the sake of selfish interest, lead us to infer that absence of remuneration was not the general rule. In Christ’s censures of the scribes and Pharisees their covetousness is a special object of reproof (Mark 12:40; Luke 20:47, 16:14). Hence, even if their instruction was given gratuitously, they certainly knew how to compensate themselves in some other way. The moral testimony borne to them by Christ was by no means of the best: “All their works they do to be seen of men: they make broad their phylacteries and enlarge the borders of their garments (Matt. 23:5), and love to go in long garments” (Mark 12:38; Luke 20:46).

The headquarters of the operations of the scribes was of course Judaea until A.D. 70. But we should be mistaken if we expected to find them there only. Wherever zeal for the law of the fathers was active they were indispensable. Hence we meet with them in Galilee also (Luke 5:17), nay in the distant Dispersion; for γραμματεῖς are frequently mentioned in Jewish epitaphs in Rome of the later imperial period (see above, note 2 and the Babylonian scribes of the fifth and sixth centuries were the authors of the Talmud, the chief work of Rabbinic Judaism.

After the separation of the Pharisaic and Sadducaean tendencies the scribes in general adhered to the former. For this was nothing else but the party, that acknowledged as an authoritative rule of life the maxims, which had in the course of time been developed by the scribes, and sought to carry them strictly out. Inasmuch however as the “scribes” were merely “men learned in the law,” there must have been also Sadducaean scribes. For it is not conceivable that the Sadducees, who acknowledged the written law as binding, should have had among them none who made it their profession to study it, In fact those passages of the New Testament, which speak of scribes who were of the Pharisees (Mark 2:16; Luke 5:30; Acts 23:9), point also to the existence of Sadducaean scribes.

The professional employment of the scribes referred, if not exclusively, yet first and chiefly, to the law, and therefore to the administration of justice. They were in the first instance Jurists, and their task was in this respect a threefold one: (1) the more careful theoretical development of the law itself; (2) the teaching of it to their pupils; (3) its practical administration, that is, the pronunciation of legal decisions as learned assessors in courts of justice.

1. First the theoretic development of the law itself. This indeed was immovably fixed as to its principles in the Thorah itself. But no codex of law goes into such detail as to be in no need of exposition, while some of the appointments of the Mosaic law are expressed in very general terms. Here then was a wide field for the labours of the scribes. They had always to develop with careful casuistry the general precepts given in the Thorah, that so a guarantee might exist, that the tendency of the precepts of the law had been really apprehended according to their full extent and meaning. In those points for which the written law made no direct provision a compensation had to be created, either by the establishment of a precedent, or by inference from other already valid legal decisions. By the diligence with which this occupation was carried on during the last centuries before the Christian era, Jewish law became gradually an extensive and complicated science; and this law not being fixed in writing, but propagated by oral tradition, very assiduous study was required to obtain even a general acquaintance with it An acquaintance however with what was binding was but the foundation and prerequisite for the professional labours of the scribes. Their special province was to develop what was already binding by continuous methodical labours into more and more subtle casuistic details. For all casuistry is by its very nature endless.

The object of all these labours being to settle a system of law binding on all, the work could not be performed in an isolated manner by individual scribes. It was necessary that constant mutual communication should be going on among them for the purpose of arriving, upon the ground of a common understanding, at some generally acknowledged results. Hence the whole process of systematizing the law was carried on in the form of oral discussions of the scribes among each other. The acknowledged authorities not merely gathered about them pupils, whom they instructed in the law, but also debated legal questions among themselves, nay discussed the entire matter of the law in common disputations. Of this method of giving structure to the law, the Mishna everywhere testifies. To make this possible, it was needful that the heads at least of the body of scribes should dwell together at certain central localities. Many indeed would be scattered about the country for the purposes of giving instruction and pronouncing judicial decisions. But the majority of those authorities, who were mainly of creative genius, must have been concentrated at some one central point – till A.D. 70 at Jerusalem, and afterwards at other places (Jabne, Tiberias).

The law thus theoretically developed by scholars was certainly, in the first place, only a theory. In many points it also remained such, the actual historical and political circumstances not allowing of its being carried into practice. In general however the labours of the scribes stood in an active relation to actual life; and in proportion as their credit increased, did their theory become valid law. In the last century before the destruction of Jerusalem the Pharisaic scribes bore already such absolute spiritual sway, that the great Sanhedrim, notwithstanding its mixed composition of Pharisees and Sadducees, adhered in practice to the law developed by the Pharisees (see above, p. 179). Many matters were besides of such a nature as not to need any formal legislation. For the godly would observe religious institutions, not on account of formal legislation, but by reason of a voluntary subjection to an authority which they acknowledged as legitimate. Hence the maxims developed by the scribes were recognised as binding in practice also, so soon as the schools were agreed about them. The scribes were in fact, though not upon the ground of formal appointment, legislators. This applies in a very special manner to the time after the destruction of the temple. There then no longer existed a civil court of justice like the former Sanhedrim. The Rabbinical scribes, with their purely spiritual authority, were now the only influential factors for laying down a rule. They had formerly been the actual establishes of

law, they now were more and more acknowledged as deciding authorities. Their judgment sufficed to determine what was valid law. As soon then as doubt arose concerning any point, or it was questioned whether this or that course of action should be embraccd, it was customary to bring the matter "before the learned," who then pronounced an authoritative decision. And so great was the authority of these teachers of the law, that the judgment of even one respected teacher sufficed to decide a question. New dogmas, i.e. new rules legally valid, sometimes even differing from what had hitherto been customary, were laid down, without even such special occasion. In such cases however it was always assumed that the decision of the individual agreed with the decision of the majority of all the teachers of the law, and was accepted by them (see No. 3). Hence it might happen that the decision of a single teacher would be subsequently corrected by the majority, or that even an eminent teacher would be obliged to subordinate his own view to those of a "court" of teachers.

The legislative power of the Rabbis was a thing so self-evident in the time of the Mishna, that it is often without further ceremony assumed also for the time before the destruction of Jerusalem. It is said quite naturally that Hillel decreed this or that, or that Gamaliel I. enacted this or that. And yet not Hillel or Gamaliel I., but the great Sanhedrim of Jerusalem, was then the ultimate resort for decision. For thence proceeded, as is said in the Mishna itself, "the law for all Israel." The truth in this representation is, that in any case the great teachers of the law were already the deciding authorities.

2. The second chief task of the scribes was to teach the law. The ideal of legal Judaism was properly, that every Israelite should have a professional acquaintance with the law. If this were unattainable, then the greatest possible number was to be raised to this ideal elevation. "Bring up many scholars" is said to have been already a motto of the men of the Great Synagogue. Hence the more famous Rabbis often assembled about them in great numbers, youths desirous of instruction, for the purpose of making them thoroughly acquainted with the much ramified and copious "oral law." The pupils were called תַּלְמִידִים, or more fully תַּלְמִידֵי חֲכָמִים. The instruction consisted of an indefatigable continuous exercise of the memory, For the object being that the pupils should remember with accuracy the entire matter with its thousands upon thousands of minutiae, and the oral law being never committed to writing, the instruction could not be confined to a single statement. The teacher was obliged to repeat his matter again and again (with his pupils. Hence in Rabbinic diction "to repeat" (שָׁנָה = δευτεροῦν) means exactly the same as "to teach" (whence also מִשְׁנָה = teaching). This repetition was not however performed by the teacher only delivering his matter. The whole proceeding was, on the contrary, disputational. The teacher brought before his pupils several legal questions for their decision and let them answer them or answered them himself. The pupils were also allowed to propose questions to the teacher. This form of catechetical lecture has left its mark upon the style of the Mishna, the question being frequently started how this or that subject is to be understood for the purpose of giving a decision. All knowledge of the law being strictly traditional, a pupil had only two duties. One was to keep everything faithfully in memory. R. Dosthai said in the name of R. Meir: He who forgets a tenet of his instruction in the law, to him the Scripture imputes the wilful forfeiture of his life. The second duty was never to teach anything otherwise than it had been delivered to him. Even in expression he was to confine himself to the words of his teacher: "Every one is bound to teach with the expressions of his teacher," חַיָּב אָדָם לוֹמַר בִּלְשׁוֹן רַבּוֹ. It was the highest praise of a pupil to be "like a well lined with lime, which loses not one drop."

For these theoretical studies of the law, whether the disputations of the scribes with each other

or instruction properly so called, there were in the period of the Mishna, and probably also so early as the times of the New Test., special localities, the so-called “houses of teaching” (Heb. בֵּית הַמִּדְרָשׁ, plur. בָּתֵּי מִדְרָשׁוֹת). They are often mentioned in conjunction with the synagogues as places, which in legal respects enjoyed certain privileges. In Jabne a locality which was called “the vineyard” (כֶּרֶם) is mentioned as a place of meeting of the learned, from which however we cannot infer, that כֶּרֶם was in general a poetic term for a house of teaching. In Jerusalem indeed the catechetical lectures were held “in the temple” (ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ, Luke 2:46; Matt. 21:23, 26:55; Mark 14:49; Luke 20:37; John 18:20), i.e. in the colonnades or some other space of the outer court. The pupils sat on the ground during the instruction (בְּקַרְקַע) of the teacher, who was on an elevated place (hence Acts 22:3: παρὰ τοὺς πόδας Γαμαλιήλ; comp. also Luke 2:46).

3. A third duty, which equally belonged to the calling of the scribes, was passing sentence in the court of justice. Their acquaintance with the law being a professional one, their votes could not but be of influential importance. It is true that at least during the period under consideration, a special and scholarly acquaintance with the law was by no means essential to the office of a judge. Any one might be a judge, who was appointed such through the confidence of his fellow-citizens. And it may be supposed, that the small local courts were for the most part lay courts. It was nevertheless in the nature of things, that confidence should be placed in a judge in proportion as he was distinguished for a thorough and accurate knowledge of the law. So far then as men learned in the law were to be found, it is self-evident that such would be called to the office of judge. With respect to the great Sanhedrim at Jerusalem, it is expressly testified in the New Testament, that γραμματεῖς also were among those who were its members (comp. above, p. 177 sq.). After the fall of the Jewish State, A.D. 70, the authority of the Rabbis increased in independent importance in this respect also. Being now recognised as independent legislators, they were also regarded as independent judges. Their sentences were voluntarily acquiesced in, whether they gave judgment collectively or individually. Thus it is e.g. related, that R. Akiba once condemned a man to 400 sus (denarii) as compensation for uncovering his head to a woman in the street.

This threefold activity of the scribes as men learned in the law formed their chief and special calling. But the Holy Scriptures are something besides law. Even in the Pentateuch narrative occupies a wide space, while the contents of other books are almost exclusively either historical or didactic. This fact always remained, customary as it was to look upon the whole chiefly from the view-point of law. These Scriptures then being also deeply studied, it was impossible not to let history be spoken of as history and religious edification as such. What however was common in the treatment of these Scriptures and those of the law was, that they too were dealt with as a sacred text, a sacred standard, which was not only to be deeply studied, but which had also to be subjected to a complete elaboration. As the law was more and more developed, so also was the sacred history and the religious instruction further developed, and that always in connection with the text of Scripture, which just in its quality of a sacred text silently invited to such deep investigation. In such development the notions of subsequent times had, of course, a very important influence in modifying results. History and dogma were not merely further developed, but fashioned according to the views of after times. This gave rise to what is usually called the Haggadah. It is true that it did not belong to the special province of teachers of the law to occupy themselves therewith, But since the manipulation of the law and that of the historical religious and ethical contents of the sacred text arose from a kindred exigency, it was a natural result, that both should be effected by the same persons. As a rule the learned occupied themselves with both, though some distinguished themselves more in the former and others more in the latter department.

In their double quality of men learned in the law and learned in the “Haggadah,” the scribes were also qualified above others for delivering lectures and exhortations in the synagogues. These were not indeed confined to appointed persons. Any one capable of so doing might stand up to teach in the synagogue at the invitation of the ruler (see § 27). But as in courts of justice the learned doctors of the law were preferred to the laity, so too in the synagogue their natural superiority asserted itself.

To the juristic and haggadic elaboration of Holy Scripture, was added a third kind of occupation therewith, viz. the care of the text of Scripture as such. The higher the authority of the sacred text, the more urgent was the necessity for its conscientious and unadulterated preservation. From this necessity originated all those observations and critical notes subsequently comprised under the name of the Massora (the computation of verses, words and letters, orthographical notes, critical remarks on the text, and such like). This work however was mainly the labour of a later period. During that with which we are occupied its first beginnings had at most been made.

III. HALACHAH AND HAGGADAH

THE LITERATURE

Surenhusius, Βίβλος καταλλαγῆς in quo secundum veterum theologorum Hebraeorum formulas allegandi et modos interpretandi conciliantur loca ex V. in N. T. allegata (Amstelodami 1713), especially pp. 57–88.

Wachner, Antiquitates Ebraeorum, vol. i. 1743, p. 353 sqq.

Döpke, Hermeneutik der neutestamentliclien Schriftsteller, part i. 1829.

Hartmann, Die enge Verbindung des Alten Testaments mit dem Neuen (1831), pp. 384–731.

Zunz, Die gottesdienstlichen Vorträge der Juden, historisch entwickelt, Berlin 1832.

Hirschfeld, Der Geist der talmudischen Auslegung der Bibel. Erster Thl. Halachische, Exegese 1840. The same, Der Geist der ersten Schriftauslegungen oder die hagadische Exegese, 1847.

Frankel, Vorstudien zu der Septuaginta (Leipzig 1841), pp. 163–203, especially pp. 179–191. The same, Ueber den Einfluss der palästinischen Exegese auf die alexandrinische Hermeneutik, Leipzig 1851 (354, p. 8). The same, Ueber palästinische und alexandrinischen Schriftforschung, Breslau 1854 (42, p. 4).

Welte, Geist und Werth der altrabbinischen Schriftauslegung (Tüb. Theol. Quartalschrift, 1842, pp. 19–58).

Reuss, Gesch. der heil. Schriften Neuen Testaments, § 502–505 (über die Auslegung des A. T. bei den Juden).

Diestel, Gesch. des Alten Testamentes in der christlichen Kirche (1869), pp. 6–14.

Herzfeld, Geschichte des Volkes Jisrael, iii. 137 ff., 226–263.

Jost, Geschichte des Judenthums und seiner, Secten i. 90 ff., 227–288.

Geiger, Urschrift und Uebersetzungen der Bibel in ihrer Abhängigkeit con der inneren Entwickelung des Judenthums, Leipzig 1857.

Pressel, “Rabbinismus,” in Herzog’s Real-Encycl., 1st ed. vol. xii. (1860), pp. 470–487.

Hausrath, Neutentamentl. Zeitgeschichte, 2nd ed. i. 80–113.

Freudenthal, Hellenistische Studien (1875), pp. 66–77 (on the influence of Hellenism upon the Palestinian Midrash, see also Geiger, Jüd. Zeitschr. xi. 1875, p. 227 sqq.).

Siegfried, Philo von Alexandria (1875), p. 142 sqq. (on the mutual influence of the Palestinian and Alexandrian theology and exegesis).

Bacher, Die Agada der babylonischen Amoräer, 1878.

Bacher, Die Agada der Tannaiten (Grätz’ Monatsschrift für Gesch. und Wissensch. des Judenth. 1882–1884). Also separately under the title, Die Agada der Tannaiten, vol. i. From Hillel to Akiba, Strasbourg 1884.

Weber, System der altsynagogalen palästin. Theologie (1880), especislly pp. 88–121.

Reuss, Gesch. der heiligen Schriften Alten Testaments (1881), § 411–416, 582–584.

Hamburger, Real-Enc. für Bibel und Talmud, Div. ii. (1888) art, “Agada” (pp. 19–27), “Allegorie” (pp. 50–53), “Exegese” (pp. 181–212), “Geheimlehre” (pp. 257–278), “Halacha” (pp. 388–358), “Kabbala” (pp. 557–603), “Mystik” (pp. 816–819), “Rabbiniemus” (pp. 944–956), “Recht” (pp. 969–980).

1. The Halachah

The theoretical labours of the scribes were, as has been already remarked in the preceding section, of a twofold kind, — 1. the development and establishment of the law, and 2. the manipulation of the historical and didactic portions of the Holy Scriptures. The former developed a law of custom, beside the written Thorah, called in Rabbinical language the Halachah (הֲלָכָה, properly that which is current and customary). The latter produced an abundant variety of historical and didactic notions, usually comprised under the name of the Haggadah or Agadah (הַגָּדָה or אֲגָדָה, properly narrative, legend). The origin, nature and contents of both have now to be more fully discussed.

Their common foundation is the investigation or exposition of the Biblical text, Hebr. דָּרַשׁ. By investigation however was not meant historical exegesis in the modern sense, but the search after new information upon the foundation of the existing text. The inquiry was not merely what the text in question according to the tenor of its words might say, but also what knowledge might be obtained from it by logical inference, by combination with other passages, by allegorical exegesis and the like. The kind and method of investigation was different in the treatment of the law and in that of the historical and dogmatico-ethic portions, and comparatively stricter in the former than in the latter.

The Halachic Midrash (i.e. the exegetic development of passages of the law) had first of all to regard only the extent and range of the several commands. It had to ask: to what cases in actual life the precept in question applied, what consequences it in general entailed, and what

was to be done, that it might be strictly and accurately observed according to its full extent. Hence the commandments were split and split again into the subtlest casuistic details, and care was taken by the most comprehensive precautionary measures, that no kind of accidental circumstance should occur in observing them, which might be regarded as an infringement of their absolutely accurate fulfilment. The legal task was not, however, exhausted by this analysis of the existing text. There were also many difficulties to solve, some arising from internal contradictions in the legal code itself, some from the incongruity of certain legal requirements with the actual circumstances of life; others, and these the most numerous, from the incompleteness of the written law. To all such questions scholars had to seek for an answer; it was their business to obviate existing discrepancies by establishing an authoritative explanation; to point out how, when the observance of a precept was either impossible, difficult, or inconvenient, by reason of the actual relations of life, a compromise might nevertheless be made with the letter of its requirements; and lastly, to find for all those cases of actual occurrence, which were not directly regulated by the written law, some legal direction when the need for such should arise. This last department especially furnished an inexhaustible source labour for juristic discussion. Again and again did questions arise concerning which the written or hitherte appointed law gave no direct answer, and to reply to which became therefore a matter of juristic discussion For answering such questions two means were actually at their disposal, viz. inference from already recognised dogmas and the establishment of an already existing tradition. The latter, so far as it could be determined, was of itself decisive.

Scientific exegesis (Midrash) was thus by no means the only source for the formation of a legal code. A considerable portion of what subsequently became valid law had on the whole no point of connection with the Thorah, but was at first only manner and custom. This or that had been done thus or thus, and so imperceptibly custom grew into a law of custom. When anything in the legal sphere had been so long usual that it could be said, it has always been thus, it was law by custom. It was then by no means necessary that its deduction from the Thorah should be proved; ancient tradition was as such already binding. And the recognised teachers of the law were enjoined and competent to confirm this law of custom.

From these two sources there grew up in the course of time a multitude of legal decisions by the side of, and of equal authority with, the written Thorah. These were all comprised under the common notion of the Halachah, i.e. the law of custom. For what was discovered by scientific investigation was, when it obtained validity, also law by custom, הֲלָכָה. Hence valid law now included two main categories, the written Thorah and the Halachah, which, till at least towards the close of the period with which we are occupied, was propagated only orally. Within the Halachah there are again different categories: (1) single Halachoth (traditional enactments) decidedly traced back to Moses; (2) the great body or Halachah proper; (3) certain enactments which are designated as the “appointments of the scribes” (דִּבְרֵי סוֹפְרִים) All three categories are of legal obligation. But their authority nevertheless differs in degree according to the above sequence, those of the first class being highest, and those of the third relatively lowest. For while the Halachah in general was regarded as having been at all times valid, there was with regard to the דִּבְרֵי סוֹפְרִים the conviction, that they were first introduced by the successors of Ezra, viz. by the סוֹפְרִים. There was in general, in the period of the Mishna, a perfect consciousness that many traditional ordinances had no kind of foundation in the Thorah, and that others were connected with it by the slightest of ties. Nevertheless the law of custom was quite as binding as the written Thorah; nay, it was even decided that opposition to the דברי סופרים was a heavier transgression this opposition to the decrees of the Thorah; because the former, being the authentic exposition and completion of the latter, were therefore in fact the

ultimate authority.

It was in the nature of the Halachah that it never could be a thing finished and concluded. The two sources, whence it arose, were continually flowing onwards. New enactments were always being evolved by successive scientific exegesis (Midrash), and new customs might always arise as usage differed. Both, when they had attained prescriptive right, became Halachah, the extent of which might thus be enlarged ad infinitum. But at each stage of development a distinction was always made between what was already valid and what was only discovered by the scientifie inferences of the Rabbis, between הֲלָכָה and דִּין (to judge). Only the former was legally binding, the latter in and of itself not as yet so. Not till the majority of the learned had decided in their favour were such tenets binding and henceforth admitted into the Halachah. For the majority of those distinguished for learning was the decisive tribunal. Hence the דִּבְרֵי חֲכָמִים were also to be kept as binding. It is self-evident however, that this principle applies only to such cases as were not decided by an already valid Halachah. For concerning any matter for which a Halachah is in existence this must be unconditionally obeyed, though ninety-nine should be against and only one for it. By the help of this principle of the majority the great difficulty which arose through the separation of the schools of Hillel and Shammai was overcome (see No. IV). So long as the differences between the two were not reconciled, the conscientious Israelite must have been in great perplexity which to adhere to. The majority here too gave the final decision, whether it was that the schools themselves compared numbers, and that one was outvoted by the other, or that subsequent scholars settled differences by their final decision.

The strictness with which the uuchangeableness of the Halachah was in general proclaimed might induce one to suppose, that what was once valid must remain unaltered. But there is no rule without exception, nor was, this so. Nor indeed are the cases few in which laws or customs were afterwards altered, whether on purely theoretical grounds, or on account of altered circumstances, or because the old custom entailed inconvenience.

Widely as the Halachah differed from the written Thorah the fiction was still kept up, that it was in reality nothing else than an exposition and more precise statement of the Thorah itself. The Thorah was still formally esteemed as the supreme rule from which all legal axioms must be derived. Certainly the Halacha had its independent authority, and was binding, even if no scriptural proof was adduced. Hence, though its validity did not depend upon success in finding a scriptural proof, it formed part of the business of the scribes to confirm the maxim of the Halachah by the Scriptures. More absolute was the demand for satisfactory confirmation in the case of newly advanced or disputed maxims. These could only obtain recognition by methodical Midrash, i.e. by, being deduced in a convincing manner from passages of Scripture, or from other already acknowledged propositions. The method of demonstration which was in such cases applied, was one which, though it indeed appears somewhat strange to us, has its rules and laws. A distinction was made between the proof proper (רְאָיָה) and the mere reference (זֶכֶר). Hillel is said to have laid down for the proof proper seven rules, which may be called a kind of Rabbinical logic. These seven rules are as follows: (1) קַלוָחוֹמֶר, “light and heavy,” i.e. the inference a minori ad majus; (2) גְּזֵרָה שָׁוָה, “an equal decision,” i.e. an inference from the similar, ex analogia; (3) בִּנְיָן אָב מִכָּתוּב אֶחָד, “a main proposition from one passage of Scripture,” i.e. a deduction of a main enactment of the law from a single passage of Scripture; (4) בִּנְיָן אָב מִשְּׁנֵי כְתוּבִים, “a main proposition from two passages of Scripture;” (5) וּפְרַט וּכְלָלבְּלָל וּפְרַט, “general and particular,” and “particular and general,” i.e. a more precise statement of the general by the particular, and of the particular by the general; (6) כֵּיוֹצֵא בוֹ בְּמָקוֹם אַחֵר, “by the similar in another passage,” i.e. a more precise statement

of a passage by the help of another; (7) דָּבָר הַלָּמֵד מֵעִנְיָנוֹ, "a thing which is learned from its connection," a more precise statement from the context. These seven rules were subsequently increased to thirteen, the fifth being specified in eight different manners, and the sixth omitted. The laying down of these thirteen Middoth is ascribed to R. Ismael. Their value for the correct interpretation of the law was so highly esteemed on the part of Rabbinic Judaism, that every orthodox Israelite recited them daily as an integral element of his morning devotions.

The matter which formed the subject of juristic investigation on the part of the scribes was in effect furnished by the Thorah itself. The precepts concerning the priestly sacrifices and religious usages in general occupy the largest space therein. For the peculiarity of the Jewish law is, that it is pre-eminently a law of ritual. It seeks in the first place to establish by law in what manner God desires to be honoured, what sacrifices are to be offered to Him, what festivals are to be kept in His honour, how His priests are to be maintained, and what religious rites in general are to be observed. All other matters occupy but a small space in comparison with this. The motive whence all the zealous labours of the scribes arose corresponded with this content of the law: it was the desire to make sure by an accurate expression of the law, that none of the claims of God should be violated in even the slightest particular, but that all should be most conscientiously observed to their fullest extent. The endeavours of the scribes were therefore directed chiefly to the development of (1) the precepts concerning sacrifices, the various kinds of sacrifice, the occasions on which it was to be offered, the manner of offering, and all connected therewith, i.e. of the entire sacrificial ritual; (2) the precepts concerning the celebration of holy seasons, especially of the Sabbath and the annual festivals – Passover, Pentecost, Tabernacles, the Day of Atonement, the New Year; (3) the precepts concerning tribute for the temple and priesthood – first-fruits, heave-offerings, tithes, the first-born, the half-shekel tribute, vows and freewill offerings and whatever related to them – their redemption, valuation, embezzlement, etc.; and lastly (4) the various other religious appointments, among which the precepts concerning clean and unclean occupy by far the largest space. The appointments of the law in this last respect were an inexhaustible source for the exercise of the most minute and conscientious acuteness on the part of the scribes. The statutes by which it was determined, under what circumstances uncleauness was incurred, and by what means it might be obviated, were truly endless and incalculable. Such religious decrees however by no means formed the exclusive matter of the labours of the scribes. For the law of Moses contains also the principles of a criminal and civil law; and the practical requirements of life offered occasion enough for the further development of these materials also. Of course the materials in question were not all equally elaborated. The laws concerning marriage were the most completely developed, partly because the marriage law gave more opportunity, and partly because this subject was the most closely connected with religion. The other departments of civil life are not treated with quite the same fulness in the Mishna (in the treatises Baba kamma, Baba mezia, and Baba bathra), and still less is the criminal law worked out (in the treatises Sanhedrin and Makkoth). The department of public law is as good as completely ignored. It is true that the Thorah furnished but extremely little opportunity for its development, and that such labour as was expended on it would have been utterly useless by reason of political circumstances.

2. The Haggada

The Haggadic Midrash, i.e. the elaboration of the historical and didactic portions of Holy Scripture, is of an entirely different kind from the Halachic Midrash. While in the latter the treatment is pre-eminently a development and carrying on of what is actually given in the text,

the Haggadic treatment does not take for the most part its content from the text, but interpolates it therein. It is an amplification and remodelling of what was originally given, according to the views and necessities of later times. It is true, that here also the given text forms the point of departure, and that a similar treatment to that employed in passages from the law takes place in the first instance. The history is worked up by combining the different statements in the text with each other, completing one by another, settling the chronology, etc. Or the religious and ethical parts are manipulated by formulating dogmatic propositions from isolated prophetic utterances, by bringing these into relation to each other, and thus obtaining a kind of dogmatic system. But this stricter kind of treatment is overgrown by the much freer kind, which deals in a perfectly unrestrained manner with the text, and supplements it by additions of the most arbitrary and manifold kind. In other words, the treatment is Midrash in its stricter sense in only the smaller portion, and is on the contrary and for the most part a free completion by means of אַגָּדוֹת, i.e. legends.

A canonical book of the Old Testament, viz. the Book of Chronicles, furnishes a very instructive example of the historical Midrash. A comparison of its narrative with the parallel portions of the older historical books (Kings and Samuel) will strike even the cursory observer with the fact that the chronicler has enlarged the history of the Jewish kings by a whole class of narratives, of which the older documents have as good as nothing, viz. by narratives of the merit acquired, not only by David, but by many other pious kings through their maintenance of, and more abundant provision for, the priestly ritual. The chronicler is especially solicitous to tell of the conscientious care of these kings for the institutions of public worship. In the older documents scarcely anything is found of these narratives which run through the whole of Chronicles. It may be said that their absence in the books of Kings and Samuel is no proof of their non-historical nature, and that the chronicler obtained them from other sources. But the peculiarity is, that the very institutions for the maintenance of which these kings are said to have been distinguished, belong in general to the post-exilian period, as may, at least in the main points, be still proved (see § 24). Evidently then the chronicler dealt with the older history from a stated point of sight, which appeared to him very essential; and as public worship was the most important matter in his own eyes, the theocratic kings could not but have been distinguished by their interest in it. At the same time he pursues the practical object of pointing out the just claims and high value of these institutions by showing the attention, which the most illustrious kings devoted to them. The notion that this was any adulteration of the history, was probably one which never occurred to him. He thought he was improving it by treating it according to the needs of his age. His work, or rather the larger work from which our Books of Chronicles are probably but an extract, is therefore, properly speaking an historical Midrash, as indeed it is expressly designated (מִדְרָשׁ) by its editor and abbreviator (2 Chron. 13:22, 24:27).

The method of dealing with the sacred history here described continued its exuberant growth to later ages and went on striking out over bolder paths. The higher the credit and importance of the sacred history rose in the ideas of the people, the more thorough was the labour bestowed upon it, and the more urgent was the impulse to give more accuracy, more copious elaboration of details, and to surround the whole with a more complete and brighter halo. Especially were the histories of the patriarchs and the great lawgiver more and more adorned in this fashion. The Hellenistic Jews were particularly active in this manner of working up history. Nay, one might almost have supposed that it had originated with them, but that the Books of Chronicles furnish proof to the contrary, and that the whole method of this Midrash so entirely corresponds with the spirit of Rabbinical scholarship. The literature, in which the remains of this Haggadic treatment of history are still preserved is comparatively copious and varied. We find such in the

works of the Hellenists Demetrius, Eupolemus, Artapanus (see concerning them, § 33); in Philo and Josephus, in the so-called Apocalypses, and generally in the pseudepigraphic literature; much also in the Targums and Talmud, but most in the Midrashim proper, which are ex professo devoted to the treatment of the sacred text (see above, § 3). Among these the oldest is the so-called Book of Jubilees, which may rank as the specially classic model of this Haggadic treatment of Scripture. The whole text of the canonical Book of Genesis is here reproduced in such wise, that not only are the particulars of the history chronologically fixed, but also enlarged throughout in contents, and remodelled according to the taste of after times. By way of illustrating this branch of labour on the part of the scribes, the following few specimens are given.

The history of the creation, e.g., is completed in the following manner: "Ten things were created in the twilight on the evening before the Sabbath – 1. the abyss of the earth (for Korah and his company); 2. the opening of the well (Miriam's); 3. the mouth of the ass (Balaam's); 4. the rainbow; 5. the manna in the wilderness; 6. the rod of Moses; 7. the shamir, a worm which spits stones; 8. alphabetic writing; 9. the writing of the tables of the law; 10. the stone tables. Some reckon with these: the evil spirits, the grave of Moses, and our father Abraham's ram; and others the first tongs for the preparation of future tongs. A copious circle of legends, with which we are acquainted by means of their deposits and continuations in later Jewish literature, was formed concerning the life of Adam. Enoch, who was miraculously translated to heaven by God, seemed especially adapted for revealing heavenly mysteries to men. Hence a book of such revelations was ascribed to him towards the end of the second century before Christ (see § 32). Later legends praise his piety and describe his ascension to heaven. The Hellenist Eupolemus (or whoever else may be the author of the fragment in question) designates him as the inventor of astrology. It is self-evident that Abraham, the ancestor of Israel, was a subject of special interest for this kind of historical treatment. Hellenists and Palestinians took equal pains with it A Hellenistic Jew, probably as early as the third century before Christ, wrote, under the name of Hecataeus of Abdera, a book concerning Abraham. According to Artabanus, Abraham instructed Pharethothes, king of Egypt, in astrology. He was in the eyes of Rabbinic Judaism a model of Pharisaic piety and a fulfiller of the whole law, even before it was given. He victoriously withstood – it is computed – ten temptations. In consequence of his righteous behaviour, he received the reward of all the ten preceding generations, which they had lost by their sin. Moses the great lawgiver and his age are surrounded with the brightest halo. The Hellenists, in works designed for heathen readers, represent him as the father of all science and culture. He was, according to Eupolemus, the inventor of alphabetical writing, which first came from him to the Phoenicians, and from them to the Greeks. Artapanus tells us that the Egyptians owed to him their whole civilisation. It is therefore something less, when it is only said in the Acts, that he was learned in all the wisdom of the Egyptians (Acts 7:22), though even this goes beyond the Old Testament. The history of his life and work is dressed up in the most varied manner in Hellenistic and Rabbinic legends, as may be seen even from the representations of Philo and Josephus. The names of the Egyptian sorcerers, who were conquered by Moses and Aaron, are known (2 Tim. 3:8). In the march through the wilderness, the Israelites were not merely once miraculously provided with water from a rock, bat a rock pouring forth water accompanied them during their whole wandering in the wilderness (1 Cor. 10:4). The law was not given to Moses by God Himself, but reached him by the means of angels (Acts 7:53; Gal. 3:19; Heb. 2:2). It was part of the perfection of his revelation to have been written in seventy languages on stones set up upon Mount Ebal (Deut. 27:2 sqq.). The two unlucky days in the history of Israel being Tammus 17 and Ab 9, the unfortunate events of the Mosaic age must of course have taken place on one of these two days; on Tammus 17 the tables of the law were broken, and on

Ab 9 it was ordained that the generation of Moses should not enter the land of Canaan. The strange circumstances at the death of Moses also furnished abundant material for the formation of legends (Deut 34). It is known that Michael the Archangel contended with Satan for his body (Jude 9). The history too of the post-Mosaic period was manipulated by historical Midrash in the same manner as the primitive history of Israel. To give only a few examples from the New Testament. In 1 Chronicles and Ruth there occurs in the list of David's ancestors a certain Salma or Salmon, the father of Boaz (1 Chron. 2:11; Ruth 4:20 sq.). The historical Midrash knows, that this Salmon had Rahab for his wife (Matt. 1:5). The drought and famine in the days of Elijah lasted, according to the historic Midrash, three and a half years, i.e. half of a week of years (Luke 4:25; Jas. 5:17). The author of the Epistle to the Hebrews mentions among the martyrs of the Old Testament those who were sawn asunder (Heb. 11:37). He means Isaiah, of whom the Jewish legend says that this was the manner of his death.

As in the case of the sacred history, so also in that of the religious and ethical matter of the Scriptures, the manipulation was of two kinds. On the one hand there was a dealing by combination, by inference and the like, with what was actually given; on the other there was also a free completion by the varied formations of creative religious speculation. And the two imperceptibly encroached one upon the other. Not a few of the doctrinal notions and ideas of after times actually arose from the circumstance, that the existing text of Scripture had been made a subject of "investigation," and therefore from reflection upon data, from learned inferences and combinations founded thereupon. Imagination freely employing itself was however a far more fertile source of new formations. And what was obtained in the one way was constantly blended with what was arrived at in the other. With the results of investigation were combined the voluntary images of fancy, nay the former as a rule always followed, either consciously or unconsciously, the same lines, the same tendency and direction as the latter. And when the free creations of speculation had gained a settled form, they were in their turn deduced from Scripture by scholastic Midrash.

These theological labours, which were always investigating old, and incessantly creating new material, were extended over the entire religious and ethical department. It was owing to them that the whole circle of religious ideas in Israel had received in the times of Christ on the one hand a fanciful, on the other a scholastic character. For the religious development was no longer determined and directed by the actual religious productivity of the prophets, but in part by the action of an unbridled imagination, not truly religious though dealing with religious objects, and in part by the scholastic reflection of the learned. Both these ruled and directed the development, in proportion as really religious life lost in inward strength.

It was in entire consistency with this tendency of the whole development, that special preference was shown for dealing with such objects as lay more at the circumference than in the centre of religious life, with the temporally and locally transcendent, with the future and the heavenly world. For the weaker the power of genuine religion, the more would fancy and reflection move from the centre to the circumference, and the more would such objects be detached from their central point and acquire an independent value and interest The grace and glory of God were no longer seen in the present earthly world, but only in the future and heavenly world. Hence on the one side eschatology, on the other mythological theosophy, were cultivated with the greatest zeal A copious abundance of notions concerning the realization of the salvation of Israel in a future period of the world's history was the growth of scientific investigation and unfettered religious fancy. The conditions, the premisses and the accompanying circumstances, under which the means and forces by which this salvation would

be realized, were stated, and most especially was it declared wherein it would consist and how surpassing would be its glory; in a word, Messianic dogma was more and more carefully cultivated and extensively developed. So too was there much solicitous occupation with the heavenly world: the nature and attributes of God, heaven as his dwelling-place, the angels as His servants, the whole fulness and glory of the heavenly world; such were the objects to which learned reflection and inventive fancy applied themselves with special predilection. Philosophic problems were also discussed: how the revelation of God in the world was conceivable, how an influence of God upon the world was possible without His being Himself drawn down into the finite, how far there was room for evil in a world created and governed by God, and the like. Two portions of Holy Scripture in particular gave much scope for the development of theosophic speculation, these were the history of the creation (מַעֲשֵׂה בְרֵאשִׁית) and the "chariot" of Ezekiel (מֶרְכָּבָה), i.e. the introductory vision of Ezekiel, chap. 1. In the explanation of these two portions, profound mysteries which, according to the view of scholars, ought to form an esoteric doctrine, were dealt with. "The history of the creation might not be explained before two, and the chariot not even before one, unless he were a scholar and could judge of it from his own knowledge." In these thus carefully guarded expositions of the history of the creation and of the chariot, we have the beginnings of those strange fancies concerning the creation and the spiritual world, which reached their climax in the so-called Kabbala of the Middle Ages.

The exposition and further development of the law was a process under comparatively strict regulations, but an almost unbridled caprice prevailed in the province of religious speculation. Rules and method, except in a very figurative sense, were here out of question. One thing especially, which made the development of the law so continuous and consequent, viz. the principle of a strict adherence to tradition, was here absent. The manipulator of the religious and ethical matter was not bound, like the interpreter of the law, to a strict adherence to tradition. He might give his imagination free play, so long as its products would on the whole admit of being inserted in the frame of Jewish views. A certain tradition was indeed formed in this sphere also, but it was not binding. Religious faith was comparatively free, while action was all the more strictly shackled. With the absence moreover of the principle of tradition in this department all rules in general ceased. For there was really but one rule for the "investigator," viz. the right of making anything of a passage, which his wit and understanding enabled him. If nevertheless certain "rules" are laid down even for Haggadic interpretation, it was only that caprice here became methodical. A number of such rules for Haggadic exposition are met with among the thirty-two Middoth (hermeneutical principles) of R. Joses ha-Gelili, the age of which cannot indeed be more particularly determined. Later Judaism discovered that there is a fourfold meaning of Scripture, which is indicated in the word פר״דס (Paradise), viz. 1. פְּשַׁט, the simple or literal meaning; 2. רֶמֶז (suggestion), the meaning arbitrarily imported into it; 3. דְּרוּשׁ (investigation), the meaning deduced by investigation; and 4. סוֹד (mystery), the theosophistic meaning.

It would be a superfluous task to give examples in illustration of this kind of exegetical method, since we are sufficiently acquainted with it from the New Testament and the whole body of ancient Christian literature. For together with Holy Scripture itself, its own mode of exegetical treatment was transferred by Judaism to the Christian Church. In saying this however it must also be remarked, that the exegetic method practised in the New Testament, when compared with the usual Jewish method, is distinguished from it by its great enlightenment The apostles and the Christian authors in general were preserved from the extravagances of Jewish exegesis by the regulative norm of the gospel. And yet who would now justify such treatment of Old Testament passages, as are found e.g. in Gal. 3:16, 4:22-25; Rom. 10:6-8; Matt. 22:31-32?

Jewish exegesis however, from which such a regulator was absent, degenerated into the most capricious puerilities. From its standpoint, e.g. the transposition of words into numbers, or of numbers into words, for the purpose of obtaining the most astonishing disclosures, was by no means strange, and quite in accordance with its spirit.

With the comparatively great freedom allowed to development in the sphere of religious notions, it is not to be wondered, that foreign influences also made themselves felt with more or less power. Palestine had already been for a long time open to the general intercourse of the world. So early as the foundation of the great world-powers of the Assyrians, Chaldaeans and Persians, influences of the most varied kind had passed over the land. When it lay for two centuries under Persian supremacy, it would indeed have been very surprising if this fact had left behind it no kind of trace in the sphere of Israelitish intellectual life. Nor could it, with all its struggles for intellectual isolation, have possibly withdrawn itself entirely from the supremacy of the Greek spirit Hence it cannot be denied that on the one hand Babylonian, on the other Greek influences are especially discernible in the development of Israel's religious notions. The amount of this influence may indeed be disputed. A careful investigation of details, especially in respect of the influence of Parseeism, has not as yet been made. This influence may perhaps have to be reduced to a comparatively small proportion. The fact however, that both Babylonian and Greek influences asserted themselves, is undeniable. At first sight indeed it seems strange, nay enigmatical, considering the high wall of partition which Judaism erected in respect of religion between itself and heathenism. There is however no need of appealing, in explanation to the circumstance, that such influences were felt at a time when this wall of partition was as yet no unscaleable one, for they continued to be exerted in later times also; nor to the fact, that no wall of partition is strong enough to resist the power of intellectual influences. The deepest reason that can be offered in explanation is, on the contrary, that legal Judaism itself laid the chief stress upon correctness of action, and that comparatively free play was therefore permitted in the sphere of religious notions.

IV. THE MOST FAMOUS SCRIBES

THE LITERATURE

The older Hebrew works on the Mishna teachers in Wolf, Biblioth. Hebr. ii. 805 sq. Fürst, Biblioth. Judaica, ii. 48 sq.

Ottho, Historia doctorum misnicorum qua opera etiam synedrii magni Hierosolymitani praesides et vice-praesides recensentur. Oxonii 1672 (frequently reprinted, e.g. also in Wolf's Biblioth. Hebr. vol. iv., and in Ugolini's Thesaurus, vol. xxi.).

Joh. Chrph. Wolf, Bibliotheca Hebraea, ii. 805-865 (gives an alphabetical catalogue of the scholars mentioned in the Mishna).

Herzfeld, Geschichte des Volkes Jisrael, iii. 226-263. The same, Chronologische Ansetzung der Schriftgelehrten von Antigonus von Socho bis auf R. Akiba (Monatsschr. für Gesch. und Wissensch. des Judenth. 1854, pp. 221-229, 273-277).

Kämpf, Genealogisches und Chronologisches bezuglich der Patriarchen aus dem Hillel'schen Hause bis auf R. Jehuda ha-Nasi, den Redacteur der Mischnah (Monatsschr. f. Gesch. und Wissensch. des Judenth. 1853, pp. 201-207, 231-236; 1854, pp. 89-42, 98-107).

Jost, Geschichte des Judenthums und seiner Secten, vols. i. ii.

Gräte, Geschichte der Juden, vols. iii. iv.

Derenbourg, Essai sur l'histoire et la géographie de la Palestine d'après les Thalmuds et les autres sources rabbiniques. P. i.: Histoire de la Palestine depuis Cyrus jusqu'à Adrien. Paris 1867.

The works, written in Hebrew, of Frankel (1859), Brüll (1876) and Weiss (1871-1876). For farther details concerning them, see the literature on the Mishna, § 3.

Friedländer, Geschichtsbilder aus der Zeit der Tanaiten und Armoräer, Brunn 1879 (a careless performance, see Theol. Litztg. 1880, p. 433).

Hamburger, Real-Encyclopädie für Bibel und Talmud, Div. ii., the several articles.

Bacher, Die Agada der Tanaiten (Monatsschr. für Gesch. und Wissensch. des Judenth. 1882-1884). Also separately, Die Agada der Tanaiten, vol. i. 1884.

It is not till the period of the Mishna, i.e. about 70 A.D., that we have any detailed information concerning individual scribes. Of those who lived before this time, our knowledge is extremely scanty. This too is almost the case in respect of Hillel and Shammai, the famous heads of schools; for, setting aside what is purely legendary, our information concerning them is comparatively small and unimportant The names and order of the most celebrated heads of schools since about the second century after Christ have been handed down to us chiefly by the 1st chapter of the treatise Aboth (or Pirke Aboth), in which is enumerated the unbroken succession of individuals, who were from Moses till the time of the destruction of Jerusalem the depositaries of the traditions of the law. The whole chapter runs as follows: —

1. Moses received the law upon Sinai, and delivered it to Joshua; he to the elders; the elders to the prophets; and the prophets delivered it to the men of the Great Assembly. These laid down three rules: Be careful in pronouncing judgment! bring up many pupils! and make a fence about the law! 2. Simon the Just was one of the last of the Great Assembly. He said: The world subsists by three things — by the law, the worship of God, and benevolence. 3. Antigonus of Socho received the tradition from Simon the Just. He said: Be not like servants who serve their master for the sake of reward, but be like those who do service without respect to recompense; and live always in the fear of God.

4. Joses ben Joeser of Zereda and Joses ben Johanan of Jerusalem received the tradition from them. Joses ben Joeser said: Let thy house be a place of meeting for the wise, dust thyself with the dust of their feet, and drink eagerly of their teaching. 5. Joses ben Johanan of Jerusalem said: Let thy house be always open (to guests), and let the poor be thy household. Avoid superfluous chatter with women. It is unbecoming with one's own wife, much more with the wife of, another. Hence the wise also say: He who carries on useless conversation with a woman, brings misfortune upon himself, is hindered from occupation with the law, and at last inherits hell.

6. Joshua ben Perachiah and Nithai of Arbela received the tradition from these. The former said: Procure a companion (in study), and judge all men according to the favourable sida. 7. Nithai of Arbela said: Depart from a bad neighbour; associate not with the ungodly; and think

not that punishment will fail.

8. Judah ben Tabbai and Simon ben Shetach received the tradition from these. The former said: Make not thyself (as judge) an advocate. When both sides stand before thee, look upon both as in the wrong. But when they are dismissed and have received sentence, regard both as justified. 9. Simon ben Shetach said: Test the witnesses well, but be cautious in examination, lest they thereby learn to speak falsehood.

10. Shemaiah and Abtalion received from them. Shemaiah taught: Love work, hate authority, and do not press thyself upon the great 11. Abtalion said: Ye wise, be cautious in your teaching, lest ye be guilty of error, and err towards a place of bad water. For your scholars, who come after you, will drink of it, die, and the name of God be thereby dishonoured.

12. Hillel and Shammai received from these. Hillel said: Be a disciple of Aaron, a lover of peace, a maker of peace, love men, and draw them to the law. 13. He was accustomed also to say: He who will make himself a great name, forfeits his own. He who does not increase his knowledge diminishes it, but he who seeks no instruction is guilty of death. He who uses the crown (of the law) (for external purposes) perishes. 14. The same said: Unless I (work) for myself, who will do so for me? And if I do so for myself alone, what am I? And if not now, when else? 15. Shammai said: Make the study of the law a decided occupation; promise little and do much; and receive every one with kindness.

16. Rabban Gamaliel said: Appoint yourself a teacher, you thus avoid the doubtful; and do not too often tithe according to mere chance.

17. His son Simon said: “I have grown up from early youth among wise men, and have found nothing more profitable for men than silence. Study is not the chief thing, but practice. He who speaks much only brings sin to pass.”

18. Rabban Simon ben Gamaliel said: The world subsists by three things – by the administration of justice, by truth, and by unanimity. (Thus also it is said, Zech. 8:16: “Let peace and truth judge in your gates.”)

So far the Mishna. Among the authorities here specified, those which chiefly interest us are “the men of the great assembly,” or of the great synagogue (אַנְשֵׁי כְנֶסֶת הַגְּדוֹלָה). They appear here as the depositaries of the tradition of the law between the last prophets and the first scribes known by name. Later Jewish tradition ascribes to them all kinds of legal enactments. Very recent, indeed really modern, is, on the other hand, the opinion, that they also composed the canon of the Old Testament. As no authorities tell us who they really were, there has been the more opportunity for the most varying hypotheses concerning them. The correct one, that they never existed at all in the form which Jewish tradition represents, was already advocated by older Protestant criticism, though it was reserved for the conclusive investigation of Kuenen to fully dissipate the obscurity Testing upon this subject The only historical foundation for the idea is the narrative in Neh. 8–10, that in Ezra’s time the law was solemnly accepted by a great assembly of the people. This “great assembly” was in fact of eminent importance to the maintenance of the law. But after the notion of a great assembly had been once fixed as an essential court of appeal for the maintenance of the law, an utterly non-historical conception was gradually combined therewith in tradition. Instead of an assembly of the people receiving the law, a college of individuals transmitting the law was conceived of, and this notion served to fill up the gap between the latest prophets and those scribes to whom the memory of

subsequent times still extended.

Together with the notion of the great synagogue may be dismissed also the statement, that Simon the Just was one of its latest members. This Simon is, on the contrary, no other than the high priest Simon L in the beginning of the third century before Christ, who, according to Josephus, obtained the surname ὁ δίκαιος. Undoubtedly this name was conferred on him by the Pharisaic party on account of his strict legal tendencies, while most of the high priests of the Greek period left much to be desired in this respect. It was on this very account also that he was stamped by Jewish tradition as a vehicle of the tradition of the law.

The most ancient scribe of whom tradition has preserved at least the name is Antigonus of Socho. Little more than his name is however known of him. The information too given in the Mishna of the subsequent scribes down to the time of Christ is extremely scanty and uncertain, as is indeed evident from the externally systematic grouping of them in five pairs. For there could hardly be historical foundation for such a fact as that in each generation only a pair of scholars should have specially distinguished themselves. It is likely that just ten names were known, and that these were formed into five pairs of contemporaries, after the analogy of the last and most famous pair, Hillel and Shammai. In such a state of affairs, of course, only the most general outlines of the chronology can be determined. The comparatively most certain points are the following. Simon ben Shetach was a contemporary of Alexander Jannaeus and Alexandra, and therefore lived about 90–70 B.C. Hence the first pair must be placed two generations earlier, viz. about 150 B.C. Hillel is said, according to Talmudic tradition, to have lived 100 years before the destruction of Jerusalem, and thus to have flourished about the time of Herod the Great. His supposed grandson, Gamaliel I., is mentioned in the Acts (5:34, 22:3), about 30–40 A.D. It has been already stated (p. 180 sq.) that subsequent tradition makes the whole five pairs presidents and vice-presidents of the Sanhedrim, and the utter erroneousness of this assertion is there pointed out They were in fact nothing more than heads of schools.

The first pair, Joses ben Joeser and Joses ben Johanan, is only mentioned, besides the chief passage in the treatise Aboth, a few times more in the Mishna, and still less frequently do we meet with the second pair, Joshua ben Perachiah and Nithai of Arbela. Of the third pair only Simon ben Shetach has a somewhat tangible form, though what is related of him is for the most part of a legendary character. There is no mention of any of these in Josephus. On the other hand, he seems to speak of the fourth pair, Shemaiah and Abtalion, under the names Σαμέας and Πωλίων. He tells us that when, in the year 47 B.C., the youthful Herod was accused before the Sanhedrim on account of his acts in Galilee, and all owners of property were silent through cowardly fear, that a certain Sameas alone raised his voice, and prophesied to his colleagues that they would yet all perish through Herod. His prophecy was fulfilled ten years later, when Herod, after his conquest of Jerusalem in the year 37, had all his former accusers executed. Only the Pharisee Pollio and his disciple Sameas (Πωλίων ὁ Φαρισαῖος καὶ Σαμέας ὁ τούτου μαθητής) were spared, nay highly honoured by him, because during the siege by Herod they had given counsel, that the king should be admitted into the town. The Sameas here mentioned is expressly identified by Josephus with the former. Lastly, Pollio and Sameas are mentioned by Josephus, and again in the same order, in a third passage. Unfortunately however we obtain no entire certainty as to time. For he informs us that the followers of Pollio and Sameas (οἱ περὶ Πωλίωνα τὸν Φαρισαῖον καὶ Σαμέαν) refused the oath of allegiance demanded of them by Herod, and were not punished on this account, “obtaining indulgence for the sake of Pollio” (ἐντροπῆς διὰ τὸν Πωλίωνα τυχόντες). Josephus relates this among the events of the eighteenth year of Herod (= 20–19 B.C.). It cannot however be quite certainly determined from

the context, whether this occurrence really took place in that year. Now the two names Σαμέας and Πωλίων so strikingly coincide with שְׁמַעְיָה and אַבְטַלְיוֹן that the view of their being identical is very obvious. The chronology too would about agree. The only thing that causes hesitation is, that Sameas is called the disciple of Pollio, while elsewhere Shemaiah stands before Abtalion. Hence we might feel tempted to identify Sameas with Shammai, but that it would then be strange, that Josephus should mention him twice in connection with Abtalion, and not with his contemporary Hillel. If however by reason of this connection we take Hillel and Shammai to be meant by Pollio and Sameas, there is against this identification, first the difference of the names Pollio and Hillel, and then the designation of Sameas as the disciple of Pollio, while Shammai was certainly no disciple of Hillel. All things considered, the connection of Sameas and Pollio with Shemaiah and Abtalion seems not only the more obvious, but the more probable.

Hillel and Shammai are by far the most renowned among the five pairs. An entire school of scribes, who separated, if not in principle, yet in a multitude of legal decisions, in two different directions, adhered to each of them. This circumstance certainly makes it evident, that both are of eminent importance in the history of Jewish law. Both indeed manifestly laboured with special zeal and ingenuity to give a more subtle completeness to the law, but it must not therefore be supposed, that their personal life and acts stand out in the clear light of history. What we know of them with certainty is comparatively very little. In the Mishna, the only trustworthy authority, they are each mentioned barely a dozen times. And what we know of them from later sources bears almost always the impress of the legendary. Hillel, called "the elder," הַזָּקֵן, to distinguish him from others, is said to have sprung from the family of David, and to have immigrated from Babylon to Palestine. Being poor he was obliged to hire himself as a day-labourer to earn a living for himself and his family and to meet the expenses of instruction. His zeal for study was so great that on one occasion, not being able to pay the entrance-fee into the Bethha-Midrash, he climbed up to the window to listen to the instruction. As this happened in winter, he was frozen with cold, and was found in this position by his astonished teachers and colleagues. Tradition tells strange things of the learning he acquired by such zeal. He understood all tongues, and even the language of the mountains, hills, valleys, trees, plants, of wild and tame animals and of daemons. At all events he was the most celebrated jurist of his age, but he was no more president of the Sanhedrim than was any other learned scribe of the time. The leading features of his character were the gentleness and kindness of which singular proofs are related. It is manifested in the first of the maxims given above: "Be a disciple of Aaron, a lover and maker of peace, love men and attract them to the law." Shammai, noted for sternness, and also called "the elder," הַזָּקֵן, was the antipodes of the gentle Hillel. The following example of his rigorous zeal for the literal observance of the law is given in the Mishna. When his daughter-in-law brought forth a child on the feast of Tabernacles, he had the ceiling broken through and the roof over the bed covered with boughs, that the newborn child also might keep the feast according to the precept of the law.

The tendencies of their respective schools correspond with the mildness of Hillel and the strictness of Shammai. The school of Hillel decided legal questions in a mitigated, that of Shammai in an aggravated sense. As they are however only minutiae on which the difference turns, it will not be worth while to follow the contrast into further details. Some examples may suffice. The command to prepare no food on the Sabbath was extended to laying-hens, and hence it was debated, whether and under what conditions an egg laid upon a holy day might or might not be eaten. Or it was discussed, whether fringes (Zizith) were needful or not to a square linen night-dress; or whether on a holy day a ladder might be carried from one pigeon-house to another, or might only be slanted from one hole to another. Of ideas of reformation, which

Jewish self-love would so willingly have us believe in, there is not, as we see, a single word. In practice the milder school of Hillel gained in the course of years the upper hand, though in many points it voluntarily relinquished its own view and assented to those of the school of Shammai, while in others neither the opinion of Hillel nor that of Shammai was subsequently followed.

An enactment, contrary indeed to the law, but authorized by the state of things, and certainly of salutary results, is connected with the name of Hillel. The legal appointment of a release of all debts every seventh year (Deut. 15:1–11) entailed the evil consequence, "that people hesitated to lend each other money," although the law itself warned against backwardness in lending on account of this institution (Deut. 15:9). In order then to do away with this evil, the so-called Prosbol (פְּרוֹזְבּוֹל = προσβολή), i.e. the delivery of a declaration, or as we should say a registered declaration, was introduced by Hillel's influence. It was, that is to say, allowed to a creditor to make in court a declaration to the following effect: מוֹסֵר אֲנִי לָכֶם אִישׁ פְּלוֹנִי וּפְלוֹנִי הַדַּיָּנִים שֶׁבְּמָקוֹם פְּלוֹנִי שֶׁכָּלְחוֹב שֶׁיֵּשׁ לִי שֶׁאֶגְבֶּנּוּ כָּל זְמָן שֶׁאֶרְצֶה, "I so and so deliver to you the judges of such and such a place (the declaration), that I may at any time I choose demand the payment of all my outstanding debts." Such a reservation made before a court secured the creditor even during the Sabbath year, and he needed not to be backward in lending money on its account. Thus credit was again laid upon a more solid foundation.

A Simon, said also to be the father of Gamaliel I., is generally named by both Jewish and Christian scholars as the son of Hillel. The existence of this Simon, and with him the whole genealogical relation, is however very questionable. We do not reach a really historical personage till Gamaliel I., רַבָּן גַּמְלִיאֵל הַזָּקֵן, as he is called in the Mishna, in distinction from Gamaliel II. It was at his feet that the Apostle Paul sat (Acts 22:3); and it was he who once gave counsel in the Sanhedrim to release the accused apostles, since their work, if it were of man, would come to nought, while if it were of God, it was in vain to oppose it (Acts 5:34–39). Christian tradition has in consequence of this represented him as being a Christian, while Jewish tradition glorifies him as one of the most celebrated teachers. "Since Rabban Gamaliel the elder died there has been no more reverence for the law (כָּבוֹד הַתּוֹרָה); and purity and abstinence (טָהֳרָה וּפְרִישׁוּת) died out at the same time." That he was as little the president of the Sanhedrim. as Hillel was, appears from Acts 5:34 sqq., where he figures as a simple member of it. Much confusion concerning him has arisen, especially among Christian scholars, by attributing to him matters which apply to Gamaliel II., e.g. labours at Jabne and elsewhere.

His son Simon also enjoyed extraordinary fame as a scribe. Josephus says of him: Ὁ δὲ Σίμων οὗτος ἦν πόλεως μὲν Ἱεροσολύμων, γένους δὲ σφόδρα λαμπροῦ, τῆς δὲ Φαρισαίων αἱρέσεως, οἳ περὶ τὰ πάτρια νόμιμα δοκοῦσι τῶν ἄλλων ἀκριβείᾳ διαφέρειν. Ἦν δ' οὗτος ἀνὴρ πλήρης συνέσεώς τε καὶ λογισμοῦ, δυνάμενός τε πράγματα κακῶς κείμενα φρονήσει τῇ ἑαυτοῦ διορθώσασθαι. He lived at the time of the Jewish war, and during its first period (A.D. 66–68) took a prominent part in the conduct of affairs. Still neither was he at any time president of the Sanhedrim.

Of profound importance to the further development of scribism was the fall of Jerusalem and the destruction of the hitherto relative independence of the Jewish commonwealth. The ancient Sanhedrin, at the head of which had stood the Sadducean high priests, now for ever retired from the stage. The Pharisaic teachers of the law, who during the last century before the destruction of the temple had already actually exercised very great influence, became the sole leaders of the people. Hence the direct result of the political fall was an increase of Rabbinical power and an exaltation of Rabbinical studies. Henceforth our authorities became more

copious, — the first codification of Jewish law having been undertaken by men directly connected with the generation which survived the fall of the city.

Jamnia or Jabne, which had since the Maccabaean period been chiefly inhabited by Jews, became after the destruction of the holy city a chief seat of these studies. The most distinguished of those scholars, who survived the fall of Jerusalem, seem to have settled here. Lydda or Lud is besides mentioned as an abode of eminent scribes. later on, perhaps subsequent to the middle of the second century after Christ, Tiberias became a centre of scribism.

The most important scribe in the decade after the destruction of Jerusalem was Rabban Johanan ben Sakkai. The period of his activity is evident from the circumstance, that he altered several legal enactments or customs "after the temple was destroyed." His place of residence seems to have been chiefly Jabne. But Berur Chail (ברור חיל) is also mentioned as a scene of his labours. And he must likewise have temporarily sojourned in Arab (ערב), where various legal questions were propounded for his decision. Among his legal innovations perhaps the most prominent is his doing away with the water of bitterness to be drunk by one accused of adultery. How closely connected he still was with matters as they were before the destruction of Jerusalem, is seen by the fact of his disputing concerning legal questions with Sadducees, who soon after it disappear from history. He is also the vehicle of ancient traditions which are referred to Moses himself. Legend tells us of him what Josephus tells us, of himself, viz. that he predicted to Vespasian his future elevation to the imperial dignity. R. Elieser ben Hyrkanos, R. Joshua ben Chananiah, R. Joses the priest, R. Simon ben Nathanael and R. Eleasar ben Arach are named in the Mishna as his five disciples. The best known and most eminent are the two first named, R. Elieser and R. Joshua.

R. Zadok, or as his name would be more correctly pronounced, R. Zadduk, was about contemporary with Rabban Johanan ben Sakkai. He is said to have lived before the destruction of the temple, and also to have held intercourse with Gamaliel II., Joshua and Elieser. He is in fact often mentioned in conjunction with them in the Mishna. In certain passages, according to which the date of his life would have to be considerably postponed, a subsequent R. Zadok is probably intended.

To the first decades after the destruction of the temple belongs also a distinguished priestly scribe, R. Chananiah, "president of the priests" (סגן הכהנים). He relates what his father had done, and what he had himself seen in the temple, and appears in the Mishna almost entirely as a narrator of the details of the priestly ritual. It is characteristic of him as an eminent priest, that he exhorts to prayer for the welfare of the heathen authorities.

R. Elieser ben Jacob also belongs to the first generation after the destruction of the temple. For it is very probable that a former scribe of the same name must be distinguished from the considerably later R. Elieser ben Jacob so frequently quoted in the Mishna. He flourished not long after the destruction of the temple, in which his uncle had ministered as a Levite, and he is frequently quoted as an authority in the treatise Middoth; nay, subsequent tradition even ascribes to him the composition of the whole treatise. It can no longer be decided in particular cases which passages are to be attributed to him and which to R. Elieser ben Jacob the younger. Perhaps the statements on circumstances of ritual may be referred to the elder.

Rabban Gamaliel II., son of Simon and grandson of Gamaliel I., the most renowned scholar of the turn of the century (about A.D. 90–110), lived only a few decades later than Johanan ben

Sakkai. The tribunal at Jabne, of which he was the head, was in his days generally acknowledged as the chief authority in Israel. The most famous scholars were here assembled about him, and in this respected circle Gamaliel was reckoned the decisive authority. Among the scholars in close intercourse with him, R. Joshua, about his equal in age, and R. Akiba, his junior, were the most eminent. On the other hand, Gamaliel does not seem to have entered into close relations with his famous contemporary R. Elieser ben Hyrcanus. At least there is no trace of this in the Mishna, while subsequent tradition on the contrary relates that Elieser was excommunicated by Gamaliel (see below). Gamaliel once undertook in conjunction with R. Joshua, R. Akiba and the equally renowned R. Eleasar ben Asariah, a sea voyage to Rome, which obtained a certain celebrity in Rabbinical literature. He is said to have been on one occasion removed by the seventy-two elders from the presidential dignity on account of his too autocratic dealings, and R Eleasar ben Asariah to have been appointed to replace him. Gamaliel was however, on showing contrition, soon reinstated in his office, which Eleasar voluntarily vacated. The elevation of Eleasar by the seventy-two elders to the headship of the school is at any rate evidenced by the Mishna. In his legal decisions Gamaliel followed the school of Hillel; it is mentioned as an exception, that in three things he decided in an aggravated sense, according to the school of Shammai. In general he is characterized as much by legal strictness on the one hand, as on the other by a certain amount of worldly conformity, nay of candour of judgment.

The two most celebrated contemporaries of Gamaliel were R. Joshua ben Chananiah and R. Elieser ben Hyrcanus, both pupils of Johanan ben Sakkai. We frequently find them disputing with each other on legal questions, and Akiba the younger taking part in these discussions. With Gamaliel however Joshua only, and not Elieser, seems to have been in familiar intercourse. According to later tradition this would be explained by the fact that Elieser was excommunicated by Gamaliel. R. Joshua was descended from a Levitical family. He was of a gentle and yielding disposition, and hence submitted to the unbending Gamaliel. “Since the death of R. Joshua, there is no longer any kind-heartedness (טוֹבָה) in the world.” His motto was, “Envy, evil desire and hatred bring a man out of the world. Pekiin or Bekiin (עקיעין, בקיעין), is named as the place of his labours. His close relations with Gamaliel however lead to the conclusion that he also resided partly at Jabne. Tradition relates of him, among other things, that he had various conversations with the Emperor Hadrian on religious subjects. In contrast with the yielding Joshua, Elieser was of a firm, unbending character, and a very strict adherent to tradition, over which, by reason of his faithful memory and extensive scholarship, he had more influence than any other. His teacher Johnnan ben Sakkai boasted of him, that he was like a well coated with lime, which does not loose a single drop. He was not to be moved by any reasons or representations from what he knew as tradition. Hence his strained relations with Gamaliel, although he is said to have been his brother-in-law. His dwelling-place was Lydda. The strange opinion of a modern scholar, that he was inclined to Christianity, nay was secretly a Christian, rests upon a legend which really proves the contrary. Elieser is at one time brought before a heathen tribunal, and looks upon this as a just punishment of God for his having been pleased with the ingenious solution of a legal question, which a Jewish Christian had communicated to him as having been derived from Jesus.

R. Eleasar ben Asariah, a rich and eminent priest, whose genealogy is traced back to Ezra, also occupies an honourable position together with those last mentioned. His wealth was so great, that it was said that after his death there was no longer any wealth among the learned. His relations with Gamaliel, Joshua and Akiba, his journey with them to Rome, his elevation by the seventy-two elders to the office of president, and his voluntary relinquishment of this position

have been already spoken of. It is evident even from these personal circumstances that he must have laboured in Jabne, a fact also testified elsewhere. He was also in personal relation with R. Ishmael and R. Tarphon, the contemporaries of Akiba.

R. Dosa ben Archinos (or Harkinos) was another contemporary of Gamaliel and Joshua, Of him it is especially stated, that he induced Joshua to submit to Gamaliel.

Among the later men of this generation is also Eleasar ben Zadok, son of the already mentioned R. Zadok. The son was, as well as the father, intimately acquainted with Gamaliel, and hence gives information concerning his enactments and the legal customs of his house.

R. Ishmael occupies an independent position among the scribes of the time. We find him indeed occasionally in Jabne. He was also intimate with his renowned contemporaries R. Joshua, Eleasar ben Asariah, Tarphon, and Akiba. His usual dwelling was however in the south of Palestine on the borders of Edom, in the village of Kephar-Asia (כפר עזיז), where Joshua once visited him. He seems, judging from his age, to have stood in nearer relation to Tarphon and Akiba than to Joshua; he questioned Joshua, and went "behind him" (like a pupil), while he was on equal terms with Tarphon and Akiba. It would be of special interest, if his father really did, as tradition asserts, also exercise the functions of high priest. The matter is however more than questionable, and only so far probable that he was of priestly descent. In the history of the Halachah, Ishmael represents a special tendency: in opposition to the artificial and arbitrary exegesis of Akiba, he adhered more to the simple and literal meaning of Scripture, but this must be understood in only a very comparative sense. The laying down of the thirteen Middoth, or exegetic rules for Halachic exegesis, is ascribed to him. A large portion of the exegetic material contained in two of the oldest Midrashim (Mechilta on Exodus, and Sifre on Numbers and Deuteronomy) comes from him and his disciples, even if these are not, as tradition asserts, the exclusive production of his school. According to the legend, Ishmael, like most of his contemporaries, is said to have died as a martyr in the Barkochba war.

Among those scribes who also had intercourse with Gamaliel, Joshua and Elieser, but stood more or less in a relation of discipleship to them, by far the most celebrated was R. Akiba ben Joseph. He flourished about A.D. 110–135. His relations with Gamaliel, Joshua and Elieser have already been spoken of (notes 19 20 20 He surpassed them all in influence and reputation. None gathered about him so large a number of pupils; none was so glorified by tradition. It is scarcely possible however to pluck the historically true from the garland of myths. Not even the place of his labours is known with certainty; from the Mishna it seems to have been Lydda, while the Babylonian Talmud names Bene-Barak (בני ברק). Such sentences of his as have been handed down are not only characteristic of his rigidly legal standpoint, but also show that he made dogmatic and philosophic questions the subjects of study. Like the ancient Zealots, he combined national patriotism with religious zeal. Hence he hailed the political hero Barkochba as the Messiah, and is said to have suffered martyrdom as one of the most eminent sacrifices for the national cause. Of his exegetic method it can only be said, that it is an exaggeration and degeneration of that which prevailed among the Rabbis in general, "it is the art of deducing heaps of Halachoth from every jot of the law." To attain this, the principle was acted on, that no word of the text was superfluous, that even the slightest, the most apparently superfluous elements of the text contain the most important truths. It is of much more value than these exegetical tricks, and of real epoch-making importance in the history of Jewish law, that in the time of Akiba, and probably under his direction, the Halachah, which had hitherto been only orally propagated, was for the first time codified. The various materials were arranged according to the point of view of their actual matter, and what was current law was recorded in writing

together with adductions of the divergent views of all the more eminent scribes. This work forms the foundation of the Mishna of R. Judah ha-Nasi, which has been preserved to us.

R. Tarphon, a priestly scribe, who is said to have been very much in earnest about his priestly duties and privileges, so far as this was possible after the destruction of the temple, was a contemporary of Akiba. He lived at Lydda, and was chiefly in intercourse with Akiba, but took part in a disputation with Eleasar ben Asariah, Ishmael and Joshua. Subsequent tradition makes him, like all the scribes of his time, a martyr in the Barkochba war. As this is however of just the same value as the Christian tradition, which makes all the apostles martyrs, he may very well be identical with that Trypho with whom Justin met, and who said of himself that he had fled from Palestine on account of the war. It is peculiar that hard words against the Gospels and against the Christian faith should have been reported exactly of him.

Beside R. Tarphon there remain to be mentioned as contemporaries of R. Akiba, R. Johanan ben Nuri, who lived also in the time of Gamaliel II., Joshua and Elieser, but is most frequently spoken of as in intercourse with Akiba; R. Simon ben Asai, or merely Ben Asai, who is famed for being specially indefatigable in study; R. Johanan ben Beroka, who was an associate of Joshua and Johanan ben Nuri; R. Joses the Galilean, who is mentioned as the contemporary of Eleasar ben Asariah, Tarphon and Akiba; R. Simon ben Nannos, or only Ben Nannos, also a contemporary of Tarphon and Akiba.

To the same period belongs also Abba Saul, who indeed gives an account even of a saying of Johanan ben Sakkai, and is repeatedly quoted as an authority concerning the arrangements of the temple, but cannot have been of earlier date than Akiba, since he frequently reports his sayings also. Also R. Judah ben Bethera, who is mentioned on the one hand as a contemporary of Elieser, on the other as a contemporary of R. Meir, and who must consequently have flourished in the period between the two, i.e. in the time of Akiba.

R. Judah, R. Joses, R. Meir and R. Simon, men of the next generation, are more frequently mentioned in the Mishna than all those hitherto named. Their labours however, having taken place in the middle of the second century, fall outside the limits of the period here dealt with.

VOLUME II: THE INTERNAL CONDITION OF PALESTINE, AND OF THE JEWISH PEOPLE, IN THE TIME OF JESUS CHRIST

PHARISEES AND SADDUCEES

THE LITERATURE

For the older literature, see Carpzov, Apparatus hist.-crit. pp. 173, 204, and Daniel, art. “Pharisäer,” in Ersch and Gruber’s Encyclopädie, § 3, vol. xxii. p. 18.

Triglandius, Trium scriptorum illustrium de tribus Judaeorum sectis syntagma, in quo Serarii, Drusii, Scaligeri opuscula quae eo pertinent cum aliis junctim exhibentur. 2 vols. Delphis 1703.

Ugolini, Trihaeresium sive dissertatio de tribus sectis Judaeorum (Thesaurus anliquitatum sacrarum, tom. xxii.; and other dissertations therein).

Joh. Gottlob Carpzov, Apparatus historico-criticus antiquitatum sacri codicis (1748), pp. 173–215.

Grossmann, De Judaeorum disciplina arcana. Part i.–ii. Lips. 1833–1834. The same, De philosophia Sadducaeorum. Part i.–iv. Lips. 1836–1838. The same, De Pharisaeismo Judaeorum Alexandrino. Part i.–iii. Lips. 1846–1850. The same, De collegio Pharisaeorum. Lips. 1851.

Daniel, art. “Pharisäer,” in Ersch and Gruber, Allgemeine Encyklop. der Wissensch. und Künste, § 3, vol. xxii. (1846) pp. 17–34.

Winer, Realwörterb. ii. 244–248 (Pharisäer), and 352–356 (Sadducäer).

Lutterbeck, Die neutestamentlichen Lehrbegriffe, i. (1852) pp. 157–222.

Reuss in Herzog’s Real-Enc., 1st ed. xi. 1859, pp. 496–509 (Pharisäer), and xiii. 1860, pp. 289–297 (Sadducäer).

Müller (Alois), Pharisäer und Sadducäer oder Judaismus und Mosaismus. Eine historisch-philosophische Untersuchung als Beitrag zur Religions-geschichte Vorderasiens (Report of the Session of the Viennese Academy, phil.-hist. class, vol. xxxiv. 1860, pp. 95–164).

Ewald, Gesch. des Volkes Israel, iv. 357 sqq., 476 sqq.

De Wette, Lehrb. der hebr.-jüdischen Archäologie (4th ed.), pp. 413–417.

Herzfeld, Gesch. des Volkes Jisrael, iii. 356 sqq., 382 sqq.

Jost, Gesch. des Judenthums und seiner Secten, i. 197 sqq., 216 sqq.

Geiger, Urschrift und Uebersetzungen der Bibel, pp. 101–158. The same, Sadducäer und Pharisäer (Jud. Zeitschr. vol. ii. 1868, pp. 11–54. Also printed separately). The same, Das Judenthum und seine Geschichte, Part i. (2nd ed. 1865) p. 86 sqq.

Grätz, Geschichte der Juden, vol. iii. (3rd ed. 1878) pp. 91 sqq., 647–657 (note 10).

Derenbourg, Histoire de la Palestine, pp. 75–78, 119–144, 452–456.

Hanne, Die Pharisäer und Sadducäer als politische Parteien (Zeitschr. für wissensch. Theol. 1867, pp. 131–179, 239–263).

Keim, Geschichte Jesu, i. 250–282.

Holtzmann in Weber and Holtzmann, Gesch. des Volkes Israel, ii. 124–135.

Hausrath in d. Prot. Kirchenzeitung, 1862, Nr. 44. The same, Zeitgesch. 2nd ed. i. 117–132. The same in Schenkel's Bibellexikon, iv. 518–529.

Ginsburg, arts. "Pharisees" and "Sadducees," in Kitto's Cyclopaedia of Biblical Literature.

Twisleton, the same article in Smith's Dictionary of the Bible.

Kuenen, De godsdienst van Israel, ii. 338–371, 456 sqq. The same, Theol. Tijdschrift, 1875, pp. 632–650 (advertisement of Wellhausen's work).

Wellhausen, Die Pharisäer und die Sadducäer. Eine Untersuchung zur inneren jüdischen Geschichte. Greifswald 1874.

Cohen, Les Pharisiens. 2 vols. Paris 1877.

Weber, System der altsynagogalen palästinischen Theologie. Leipzig 1880.

Reuss, Geschichte der heiligen Schriften Alten Testaments (1881), § 396, 546, 548–554.

Baneth, Ueber den Ursprung der Sadokäer und Boethosäer (Magazin für die Wissensch. des Judenth. Jahrg. ix. 1882, pp. 1–37, 61–95. Also separately as a Leipsic doctorial dissertation).

Hamburger, Real-Enc. für Bibel und Talmud, Div. ii. (1888) pp. 1038–1059 (art. "Sadducäer," etc. Comp. also the articles: "Amhaarez," "Chaber," "Chassidim," "Zaddikim").

Montet, Essai sur les origines des partis saducéen et pharisien et leur histoire jusqu'à la naissance de Jésus-Christ. Paris 1883 (comp. Theol. Litztg. 1883, p. 169).

Sieffert, art. "Sadducäer" and "Pharisäer," in Herzog's Real-Enc., 2nd ed. xiii. 1884, pp. 210–244.

The Testimony of Josephus.

Bell. Jud. ii. 8. 14: Φαρισαῖοι μὲν οἱ δοκοῦντες μετ’ ἀκριβείας ἐξηγεῖσθαι τὰ νόμιμα καὶ τὴν πρώτην ἀπάγοντες ἄρεσιν, εἱμαρμένῃ τε καὶ θεῷ προσάπτουσι πάντα, καὶ τὸ μὲν πράττειν τὰ δίκαια καὶ μὴ κατὰ τὸ πλεῖστον ἐπὶ τοῖς ἀνθρώποις κεῖσθαι, βοηθεῖν δὲ εἰς ἕκστον καὶ τὴν εἱμαρμένην• ψυχὴν δὲ πᾶσαν μὲν ἄφθαρτον, μεταβαίνειν δὲ εἰς ἕτερον σῶμα τὴν τῶν ἀγαθῶν μόνην, τὴν δὲ τῶν φαύλων ἀϊδίῳ τιμωρίᾳ κολάζεσθαι. Σαδδουκαῖοι δὲ, τὸ δεύτερον τάγμα, τὴν μὲν εἱμαρμένην παντάπασιν ἀναιροῦσι, καὶ τὸν θεὸν ἔξω τοῦ δρᾶν τι κακὸν ἢ ἐφορᾶν τίθενται, φασὶ δὲ ἐπ’ ἀνθρώπων ἐκλογῇ τό τε καλὸν καὶ τὸ κακὸν προκεῖσθαι, καὶ τὸ κατὰ γνώμην ἑκάστῳ τούτων ἑκατέρῳ προσιέναι. Ψυχῆς δὲ τὴν διαμονὴν καὶ τὰς καθ’ Ἅιδου τιμωρίας καὶ τιμὰς ἀναιροῦσι. Καὶ Φαρισαῖοι μὲν φιλάλληλοί τε καὶ τὴν εἰς τὸ κοινὸν ὁμόνοιαν ἀσκοῦντες, Σαδδουκαίων δὲ καὶ πρὸς ἀλλήλους τὸ ἦθος ἀγριώτερον, αἵ τε ἐπιμιξίαι πρὸς τοὺς ὁμοίους ἀπηνεῖς ὡς πρὸς ἀλλοτρίους.

Antt. xiii. 5. 9: Κατὰ δὲ τὸν χρόνον τοῦτον τρεῖς αἱρέσεις τῶν Ἰουδαίων ἦσαν, αἳ περὶ τῶν ἀνθρωπίνων πραγμάτων διαφόρως ὑπελάμβανον• ὧν ἡ μὲν Φαρισαίων ἐλέγετο, ἡ δὲ Σαδδουκαίων, ἡ τρίτη δὲ Ἐσσηνῶν. Οἱ μὲν οὖν Φαρισαῖοι τινὰ καὶ οὐ πάντα τῆς εἱμαρμένης εἶναι λέγουσιν ἔργον, τινὰ δ’ ἐφ’ ἑαυτοῖς ὑπάρχειν, συμβαίνειν τε καὶ μὴ γίνεσθαι. Τὸ δὲ τῶν Ἐσσηνῶν γένος πάντων τὴν εἱμαρμένην κυρίαν ἀποφαίνεται, καὶ μηδὲν ὃ μὴ κατ’ ἐκείνης ψῆφον ἀνθρώποις ἀπαντᾷ. Σαδδουκαῖοι δὲ τὴν μὲν εἱμαρμένην ἀναιροῦσιν, οὐδὲν εἶναι ταύτην ἀξιοῦντες, οὐδὲ κατ’ αὐτὴν τὰ ἀνθρώπινα τέλος λαμβάνειν, ἅπαντα δ’ ἐφ’ ἡμῖν αὐτοῖς τίθενται, ὡς καὶ τῶν ἀγαθῶν αἰτίους ἡμᾶς αὐτοὺς γινομένους καὶ τὰ χείρω παρὰ ἡμετέραν ἀβουλίαν λαμβάνοντας.

Antt. xiii. 10. 5: [Οἱ Φαρισαῖοι] τοσαύτην ἔχουσι τὴν ἰσχὺν παρὰ τῷ πλήθει ὡς καὶ κατὰ βασιλέως τι λέγοντες καὶ κατ’ ἀρχιερέως εὐθὺς πιστεύεσθαι.

Antt. xiii. 10. 6: Ἄλλως τε καὶ φύσει πρὸς τὰς κολάσεις ἐπιεικῶς ἔχουσιν οἱ Φαρισαῖοι.

Ibid.: Νόμιμα πολλά τινα παρέδοσαν τῷ δήμῳ οἱ Φαρισαῖοι ἐκ πατέρων διαδοχῆς, ἅπερ οὐκ ἀναγέγραπται ἐν τοῖς Μωϋσέως νόμοις, καὶ διὰ τοῦτο ταῦτα τὸ Σαδδουκαίων γένος ἐκβάλλει, λέγον ἐκεῖνα δεῖν ἡγεῖσθαι νόμιμα τὰ γεγραμμένα, τὰ δ’ ἐκ παραδόσεως τῶν πατέρων μὴ τηρεῖν. Καὶ περὶ τούτων ζητήσεις αὐτοῖς καὶ διαφορὰς γενέσθαι συνέβαινε μεγάλας, τῶν μὲν Σαδδουκαίων τοὺς εὐπόρους μόνον πειθόντων, τὸ δὲ δημοτικὸν οὐχ ἑπόμενον αὐτοῖς ἐχόντων, τῶν δὲ Φαρισαίων τὸ πλῆθος σύμμαχον ἐχόντων.

Antt. xvii. 2. 4: Ἦ γὰρ μόριόν τι Ἰουδαϊκῶν ἀνθρώπων ἐπ’ ἐξακριβώσει μέγα φρονοῦν τοῦ πατρίου νόμου, αὐτοῖς Χαίρειν τὸ θεῖον προσποιουμένω, οἷς ὑπῆκτο ἡ γυναικωνῖτις• Φαρισαῖοι καλοῦνται, βασιλεῦσι δυνάμενοι μάλιστα ἀντιπράσσειν, προμηθεῖς, κάκ τοῦ προύπτου εἰς τὸ πολεμεῖν τε καὶ βλάπτειν ἐπηρμένοι.

Antt. xviii. 1, 2: Ἰουδαίοις φιλοσοφίαι τρεῖς ἦσαν ἐκ τοῦ πάνυ ἀρχαίου τῶν πατρίων, ἥ τε τῶν Ἐσσηνῶν καὶ ἡ τῶν Σαδδουκαίων• τρίτην δὲ ἐφιλοσόφουν οἱ Φαρισαῖοι λεγόμενοι. Καὶ τυγχάνει μέντοι περὶ αὐτῶν ἡμῖν εἰρημένα ἐν τῇ δευτέρᾳ βίβλῳ τοῦ Ἰουδαϊκοῦ πολέμου, μνησθήσομαι δὲ ὅμως καὶ νῦν αὐτῶν ἐπ’ ὀλίγον.

§ 3: Οἵ τε γὰρ Φαρισαῖοι τὴν δίαιταν ἐξευτελίζουσιν, οὐδὲν εἰς τὸ μαλακώτερον ἐνδιδόντες, ὧν τε ὁ λόγος κρίνας παρέδωκεν ἀγαθῶν, ἕπονται τῇ ἡγεμονίᾳ, περιμάχητον ἡγούμενοι τὴν φυλακὴν ὧν ὑπαγορεύειν ἠθέλησε. Τιμῆς γε τοῖς ἡλικίᾳ προήκουσι παραχωροῦσιν, οὐδὲν ἐπ’ ἀντιλέξει τῶν εἰσηγηθέντων ταῦτα θράσει ἐπαιρόμενοι. Πράσσεσθαί τε εἱμαρμένῃ τὰ πάντα ἀξιοῦντες, οὐδὲ τοῦ ἀνθρωπείου τὸ βουλόμενον τῆς ἐπ’ αὐτοῖς ὁρμῆς ἀφαιροῦνται, δοκῆσαν τῷ θεῷ κρᾶσιν γενέσθαι καὶ τῷ ἐκείνης βουλευτηρίῳ καὶ τῶν ἀνθρώπων τὸ θελῆσαν

προσχωρεῖν μετ’ ἀρετῆς ἢ κακίας. Ἀθάνατόν τε ἰσχὺν ταῖς ψυχαῖς πίστις αὐτοῖς εἶναι, καὶ ὑπὸ χθονὸς δικαιώσεις τε καὶ τιμὰς αἷς ἀρετῆς ἢ κακίας ἐπιτήδευσις ἐν τῷ βίῳ γέγονε, καὶ ταῖς μὲν εἰργμὸν ἀϊδιον προτίθεσθαι, ταῖς δὲ ῥᾳστώνην τοῦ ἀναβιοῦν. Καὶ δι’ αὐτὰ τοῖς τε δήμοις πιθανώτατοι τυγχάνουσι, καὶ ὁπόσα θεῖα εὐχῶν τε ἔχεται καὶ ἱερῶν ποιήσεως ἐξηγήσει τῇ ἐκείνων τυγχάνουσι πρασσόμενα. Εἰς τοσόνδε ἀρετῆς αὐτοῖς αἱ πόλεις ἐμαρτύρησαν ἐπιτηδεύσει τοῦ ἐπὶ πᾶσι κρείσσονος ἔν τε τῇ διαίτῃ τοῦ βίου καὶ λόγοις.

§ 4: Σαδδουκαίοις δὲ τὰς ψυχὰς ὁ λόγος συναφανίζει τοῖς σώμασι, φυλακῆς δὲ οὐδαμῶν τινῶν μεταποίησις αὐτοῖς ἢ τῶν νόμων• πρὸς γὰρ τοὺς διδασκάλους σοφίας ἣν μετίασιν, ἀμφιλογεῖν ἀρετὴν ἀριθμοῦσιν. Εἰς ὀλίγους τε ἄνδρας οὗτος ὁ λόγος ἀφίκετο, τοὺς μέντοι πρώτους τοῖς ἀξιώμασι, πράσσεταί τε ὑπ’ αὐτῶν οὐδὲν ὡς εἰπεῖν• ὁπότε γὰρ ἐπ’ ἀρχὰς παρέλθοιεν, ἀκουσίως μὲν καὶ κατ’ ἀνάγκας, προσχωροῦσι δ’ οὖν οἷς ὁ Φαρισαῖος λέγει, διὰ τὸ μὴ ἂν ἄλλως ἀνεκτοὺς γενέσθαι τοῖς πλήθεσιν.

Antt. xx. 9. 1: αἵρεσιν δὲ μετῄει τὴν Σαδδουκαίων οἵπερ εἰσὶ περὶ τὰς κρίσεις ὠμοὶ παρὰ πάντας τοὺς Ἰουδαίους, καθὼς ἤδη δεδηλώκαμεν.

Vita, 2, fin.: ἠρξάμην πολιτεύεσθαι τῇ Φαρισαίων αἱρέσει κατακολουθῶν, ἣ παραπλήσιός ἐστι τῇ παρ’ Ἕλλησι Στωικῇ λεγομένῃ.

Vita, 38: τῆς δὲ Φαρισαίων αἱρέσεως, οἳ περὶ τὰ πάτρια νόμιμα δοκοῦσι τῶν ἄλλων ἀκριβείᾳ διαφέρειν.

THE TESTIMONY OF THE MISHNA.

(a) On Perushim and Zaddukim.

Jadajim iv. 6: “The Zaddukim said to the Perushim: We must blame you, Perushim, for maintaining that the Holy Scriptures defile the hands, while antagonistic books (ספרי המירם or perhaps ספרי המירם = the books of Homer) do not defile the hands. To this Rabban Johanan ben Sakkai replied: Is this then the only thing of the kind, for which the Perushim can be reproached? They also say: The bones of an ass are clean, and those of the high priest Johanan unclean. To which they replied: Bones are declared unclean according to the proportion of affection, lest perhaps some one should make spoons of the bones of his father or his mother. Hereupon he replied: So too is it with the Holy Scriptures only a proof of affection, when it is declared that they defile the hands, while antagonistic books (the books of Homer) are not loved, and therefore contact with them does not defile.”

Ibid. iv. 7: “The Zaddukim said also: We must blame you, Perushim, for declaring what is poured into an unclean vessel to be clean. The Perushim replied: We must blame you, Zaddukim, for declaring a channel coming out of a burying-place to be clean. The Zaddukim also said: We must blame you, Perushim, for saying: If my ox or my ass does harm, I owe compensation; and if my man-servant or my maid-servant does harm, I am free. If I must pay compensation for an ox or an ass, to whom I have no legal obligations, why should I not owe compensation for what my manservant and maid-servant do, to whom I have legal obligations? They replied: That which applies to an ox and an ass, which have no reason, cannot apply to a man-servant or maid-servant, who has reason. For else they might, if I make them angry, set fire to the field of another, and force me to pay expenses.”

Ibid. iv. 8: “A Galilaean heretic once said: I blame you, Perushim, for writing in a writing of

divorcement the name of the governor with that of Moses. The Perushim answered: We must blame thee, Galilaean heretic, for nevertheless writing the name of the governor and the name of God upon one page, and besides this the former above and the latter below. For it is written in the Bible (Ex. 5:2): Pharaoh said: Who is Jahveh, that I should obey Him and let Israel go?"

Chagiga ii. 7: "The garments of Am-haarez are Midras (מִדְרָס, that is, defiled by pressure) for Perushim; those of the Perushim are Midras for those who eat the heave; those of the latter are Midras for those who eat holy things; and those of the latter are Midras for those who sprinkle the water of purification."

Sota iii. 4: "R. Joshua used to say: A foolish saint, a wise sinner, a Pharisaic woman (אִשָּׁה פְּרוּשָׁה) and the sufferings of Perushim destroy the world."

Erubin vi. 2: "Rabban Gamaliel relates: A Zadduki once lived with us in a Maboi (a street fenced off for the purpose of freer Sabbath intercourse) in Jerusalem. Then my father said: Bring quickly all your goods into the Maboi, before the Zadduki can bring anything there, and make it unlawful for you. R. Judah quotes the saying differently: Do quickly what you have to do in the Maboi before the Zadduki brings anything there, and makes it unlawful for you."

Makkoth i. 6: "False witnesses are only to be executed, when sentence has been passed upon one found guilty through them. The Zaddukim say: Only when he has been already executed; because it is said (Deut. 19:21), life for life. But the learned hare refuted this, because it is said (Deut. 19:19) you shall do to him as he thought to do to his brother. His brother therefore still exists."

In Para iii. 3 the ordinary printed text has only צדוקים. Better authorities have מינים.

Para iii. 7: "The priests who burned the red heifer, were purposely declared unclean on account of the Zaddukim, that they might not assert, that the heifer was prepared by such only as had become clean through the setting of the sun."

Nidda iv. 2: "The daughters of the Zaddukim are, if they walk in the ways of their fathers, equal to Samaritan women. If they walk openly in the ways of Israel, they are equal to Ieraelitish women. R. Joses says: They are all looked upon as Israelitish women, unless it is proved that they walk in the ways of their fathers."

(b) On Chaber and Am-haarez.

Demai ii. 3: "He who takes upon himself to be a Chaber (חָבֵר) sells neither fresh nor dry fruits to the Am-haarez (עַם הָאָרֶץ), buys from them no fresh, does not enter their houses as a guest, nor receive them as guests within his walls. R. Judah says: He must also breed no small cattle, not be frivolous in oaths and jokes, not defile himself with the dead, must on the other hand wait in the school-house. He was however answered: All this does not amount to the main thing."

Demai vi. 6: "If a Chaber and an Am-haarez inherit from their father, who was an Am-haarez, the former may say: Do thou take the wheat in this place and I will take the wheat in that place, thou the wine of this, I of that place. But he may not say to him: Do thou take wheat and I barley; thou the moist, I the dry."

Demai vi. 12: "If an Am-haarez says to a Chaber: Buy me a bundle of vegetables, buy me a loaf,

the latter may buy without special remark and is free from the duty of tithing. But if he added: I buy this for myself and that for my friend, and they get mixed, he must tithe all, even if the latter were a hundred (i.e. a hundred times as great as his own").

Shebiith v. 9 = Gittin v. 9: "One woman may lend to another, who is suspected about shebiith (the eating of the fruits of the seventh year), A flour sieve, a corn sieve, a hand mill and a stove, but may not help her to gather or to grind. The wife of a Chaber may lend the wife of an Am-haarez a flour sieve and a corn sieve, and may also help her to gather, to grind and to winnow. But. when once water has been poured on the flour she may no longer handle it with her, for one must not assist the transgressor. Besides, this latter has been only allowed for the sake of peace, just as one may in the seventh year wish success to the labour of the Gentiles, but not to that of an Israelite, etc."

Bikkurim iii. 12: "R. Judah says: A priest may make a present of the first-fruits only to a Chaber."

Tohoroth vii. 4: "If the wife of a Chaber has left the wife of an Am-haarez grinding at the mill in her house, the house is unclean if the mill stops; but if it goes on grinding, only that is unclean which the woman could reach by stretching out her hand. If there are two such women there, all is, according to R. Meir, unclean, because while the one is grinding, the other can touch everything, but according to the learned, only that which each could touch by stretching out her hand."

Tohoroth viii. 5: "If the wife of an Am-haarez enters the house of a Chaber to fetch out his son, his daughter, or his cattle, the house remains clean, because she has no permission to stay there."

The priests and scribes were the two influential factors which determined the inner development of Israel after the captivity. In Ezra's time they were still virtually identical. From the commencement of the Greek period they were more and more separated, and about the period of the Maccabaean conflict two parties sharply contrasted with each other were developed from them. The Sadducean party proceeded from the ranks of the priests, the party of the Pharisees from the scribes. We know these two parties from the testimony especially of the New Testament and Josephus as two circles in hostile opposition to each other. But we shut out beforehand the comprehension of their nature, if we view the contrast between the two as one really the result of opinion. The Pharisees were by nature the rigidly legal, the Sadducees in the first instance only the aristocrats, who certainly were driven by the historical development into that opposition to Pharisaic legality, which however formed no fundamental element of their nature. Hence we gain but a distorted image by opposing the differences between them to each other point by point. On the contrary, the characteristic feature of the Pharisees arises from their legal tendency, that of the Sadducees from their social position.

I. THE PHARISEES

The Pharisees were simply those who were specially exact about the interpretation and observance of the law, hence they were the rigidly legal, who spared themselves no pains and privations in its punctual fulfilment. "They were considered to interpret the law with accuracy." "They valued themselves upon their accurate interpretation of the law of their fathers." "They renounce the enjoyments of life and in nothing surrender themselves to comfort." Hence they were those, who seriously and consistently strove to carry out in practice the ideal of a legal life set up by the scribes. And this is to say, that they were the classic representatives of that

tendency, which the internal development of Israel altogether adopted during the post-exilian period. What applies to this in general applies in a specific manner to the Pharisaic party. It was the germ proper, which was distinguished from the rest of the mass only by its greater strictness and consistency. Hence the law, in that maturity of complication which had been given to it by the labours of the scribes during the course of centuries, was the basis of all its efforts. To carry this out in every point was the beginning and end of all its endeavours. Hence all that has been said above (§ 25. III.) on the development of Jewish law by the labours of the scribes, and all that will be adduced farther on (§ 28) on the nature of Jewish legaliam, serves to characterize Pharisaism. The legalism there described is just the Pharisaic. But as Pharisaism rests upon the foundation of the law as developed by the scribes, so did it also in its turn govern the farther development of Jewish law. When the Pharisaic party had once been formed as such, all the more famous scribes, at least all those who influenced the future development, proceeded from its midst. There were indeed Sadducean scribes. But their work has left no trace behind it in history. All the influential scribes belonged to the Pharisaic party. This may be assumed as self-evident, and is confirmed by the fact, that in the few cases in which the party position of the scribes is named, they are as a rule designated as Pharisees.

After what has been said, it is self-evident, that the Pharisees would declare not only the written Thorah, but also the "oral law" developed by the scribes as binding. This whole multitude of enactments now passed as the correct exposition and further development of the written Thorah. Zeal for the one implied zeal for the other. Hence it is expressly said in Josephus, "The Pharisees have imposed upon the people many laws taken from the tradition of the fathers (ἐκ πατέρων διαδοχῆς), which are not written in the law of Moses. When John Hyrcanus forsook the Pharisees, he abolished the laws which they had introduced κατὰ τὴν πατρῴαν παράδοσιν, and at the restoration under Alexandra they were re-enacted. In the New Testament also testimony is given to the estimation in which the Pharisees held the παράδοσις τῶν πρεσβυτέρων (Mark 7:3; Matt. 15:2). That the same standpoint with regard to this παράδοσις was represented by the entire body of Jewish Rabbinism has already been shown (vol, i. p. 334 sq.). The Halacha or traditional law, as developed and settled by the labours of the scribes, was declared to be as legally binding as the written Thorah. R. Eleasar of Modein said: He who interprets Scripture in opposition to tradition (שֶׁלֹּא כַהֲלָכָה) has no part in the world to come. Among the reasons for which the tempest of war bursts upon the country, are named among others, "People who interpret Scripture in opposition to tradition" (שֶׁלֹּא כַהֲלָכָה). The traditional interpretation and the traditional law are thus declared absolutely binding. And it is consequently but consistent when deviation from these is declared even more culpable than deviation from the written Thorah. It is more culpable to teach contrary to the precepts of the scribes, than contrary to the Thorah itself." If the traditional interpretation is binding, it is in fact this and not the written law which decides in the last instance. Nor is anything else than this established Pharisaic principle of tradition meant by the rhetorical expression of Josephus, that the Pharisees do not allow themselves to oppose the injunctions of those who precede them in age. Certainly there is infinitely more insight in these words of Josephus, than in the assertion of Geiger, that Pharisaism is "the principle of progressive development," and that Protestantism is only "the full reflection of Pharisaism."

As in its position towards the law, so too in its religious and dogmatic views does Pharisaism simply represent the orthodox standpoint of later Judaism. In this respect the following points are brought forward, some from the New Testament, some from Josephus, as characteristic of the Pharisees in contradistinction to the Sadducees.

1. The Pharisees teach “that every soul is imperishable, but that only those of the righteous pass into another body, while those of the wicked are, on the contrary, punished with eternal torment”; or, as it is said in another passage, “they hold the belief that an immortal strength belongs to souls, and that there are beneath the earth punishments and rewards for those (souls), who in life devoted themselves to virtue or vileness, and that eternal imprisonment is appointed for the latter, but the possibility of returning to life for the former.” The Sadducees, on the other hand, say that there is no resurrection (μὴ εἶναι ἀνάστασιν, Matt. 22:23; Mark 12:8; Luke 20:27; Acts 23:8; comp. 4:1, 2). “They deny the continuance of the soul and the punishments and rewards of the world below.” “According to their teaching, souls perish together with bodies.” What is here represented in a philosophizing style as the doctrine of the Pharisees, is merely the Jewish doctrine of retribution and resurrection, already testified by the Book of Daniel (Dan. 12:2), by all subsequent Jewish literature, and also by the New Testament, as the common possession of genuine Judaism. The righteous will rise to life eternal in the glory of the Messianic kingdom, but the unrighteous will be punished with eternal torment. Nor is the essence of this faith the mere opinion of a philosophical school with respect to immortality, but that upon which depends the direct religious interest of the personal salvation of each individual. For this appears to be guaranteed only on the assumption of a resurrection of, the body. Hence so great weight is laid upon this, that in the Mishna it is even said, that he who says, that the resurrection of the dead is not to be inferred from the law, has no part in the world to come. The Sadducees, by denying the resurrection and immortality in general, renounced at the same time the entire Messianic hope, at least in that form which later Judaism had given it. And it was they and not the Pharisees who – from the stand point of later Judaism – represented a sectarian opinion.

2. The Pharisees also taught the existence of angels and spirits, while the Sadducees denied them (Acts 23:8). This statement of the Acts, though not confirmed by other testimony, is nevertheless thoroughly trustworthy, as in entire accordance with the picture which we elsewhere obtain of the two parties. That in this respect also the Pharisees represented the general standpoint of later Judaism needs no proof.

3. Josephus ascribes also to Pharisees and Sadducees different views concerning Divine providence and human freedom. The Pharisees “make everything depend on fate and on God, and teach that the doing of good is indeed chiefly the affair of man, but that fate also co-operates in every transaction.” “They assert, that everything is accomplished by fate. They do not however deprive the human will of spontaneity, it having pleased God that there should be a mixture, and that to the will of fate should be added the human will with its virtue or baseness.” They say, that “some but not all things are the work of fate; some things depend on the will of man as to whether they are done or not.” The Sadducees deny fate entirely, and place God beyond the possibility of doing or providing anything evil. They say, that good and evil are at man’s choice, and the doing of the one or the other at his discretion. “They deny fate by asserting that it is nothing, and that human affairs are not brought to pass by its means. They ascribe on the contrary all to us, maintaining, that we are ourselves the cause of our prosperity, and that we also incur misfortune through our own folly.” At the first glance it seems very strange to meet with such philosophemes among the religious parties of Palestine, and the suspicion arises, that Josephus not only gave a philosophic colouring to religious views, according to his own fancy, but that without further ceremony he imputed philosophic theories to his countrymen; a suspicion which is increased when we also add his statements concerning the Essenes, whence results the systematic statement, that the Essenes taught an absolute fate, the Sadducees utterly denied fate, and the Pharisees struck out a middle path between the

two. And to strengthen our suspicion still more, Josephus expressly assures us elsewhere, that the Pharisees corresponded to the Stoics, and the Essenes to the Pythagoreans. In fact the very expression εἱμαρμένη, which is utterly impossible to any Jewish consciousness, proves that we have at least to deal with a strongly Hellenized colouring of Jewish views. Still it is merely the garment which is borrowed from Greece. The matter itself is genuinely Jewish. For after all, what Josephus says, when once we strip off its Greek form, is nothing more than this, that according to the Pharisees everything that happens takes place through God's providence, and that consequently in human actions also, whether good or bad, a co-operation of God is to be admitted. And this is a genuine Old Testament view. For, on the one hand, the strict comprehension of the idea of the Divine omnipotence leads to a conception of human actions, whether good or bad, as effected by God. On the other hand, the Old Testament lays quite as much emphasis on the moral responsibility of man; he himself incurs guilt and punishment if he acts wrongly, as he also gains merit and reward if he acts rightly. And for later Judaism the moral independence of man was a fundamental thought, a primary assumption of its zeal for the law and its hope for the future. Both lines of thought are genuinely Jewish. It is highly probable in itself, that the reflection of the learned and educated was directed towards the antinomy involved in them and sought to find a means of reconciling them. Nay, we have distinct testimony that this was the case, that Rabbinical Judaism did in fact make the problem of Divine Providence and human freedom the subject of its thought. This is not however to say, that the three possible standpoints, (1) absolute fate, (2) absolute freedom, (3) interposing inspection, were each represented in so systematic a manner as Josephus states by the three parties of Essenes, Sadducees and Pharisees. This systematizing is certainly the weakest point in the representation of Josephus. Still there may be a certain amount of truth in it. It may be, that in the view of the Essenes the Divine, in that of the Sadducees the human factor occupied the foreground. In any case the Pharisees embraccd with equal resolution both lines of thought: the Divine omnipotence and providence and human freedom and responsibility. That the one continued to exist beeide and notwithstanding the other is emphatically stated in a saying of Akiba: הַכֹּל צָפוּי וְהָרְשׁוּת נְתוּנָה "Every thing is beheld (by God), but freedom is given (to man)." Herein also the Pharisees represent not a sectarian opinion, but the correct standpoint of Judaism.

In politics too the standpoint of the Pharisees was the genuinely Jewish one of looking at political questions not from a political, but from a religious point of view. The Pharisees were by no means a "political" party, at least not directly. Their aim, viz. the strict carrying out of the law, was not political, but religious. So far as no obstruction was cast in the way of this, they could be content with any government. It was only when the secular power prevented the practice of the law in that strict manner which the Pharisees demanded, that they gathered together to oppose it, and then really became in a certain sense a political party, opposing even external resistance to external force. This took place not only at the time of the oppression by Antiochus Epiphanes, but also under the Jewish princes John Hyrcanus and Alexander Jannaeus, who opposed Pharisaic ordinances from their Sadducaean standpoint. On the other hand, the Pharisees had, under Alexander, who left the whole power in their hands, a leading position in the government, which however they used only for the carrying out of their religious demands. To politics as such they were always comparatively indifferent. It must however be admitted, that there were two different religious points of view, especially at the time when Israel was under heathen government or under government friendly to the heathen, from which to judge of the political situation, and that according as the one or the other was placed in the foreground, an opposite demeanour would be maintained towards it. The idea of the Divine Providence might be made the starting-point. Thence would result the thought, that the sway of the heathen

over Israel was the will of God, that it was He who had given to the Gentiles power over His people to punish them for their transgressions, that this government of the Gentiles could last only so long as it was the will of God. Hence first of all this chastisement of God must be willingly submitted to; a heathen and moreover a harsh government must be willingly borne, if only the observance of the law was not thereby prevented. From this standpoint the Pharisees Polio and Sameas, e.g., exhorted their fellow-citizens to submit to the rule of Herod. In the time also of the great insurrection against the Romans, we see the chief Pharisees, like Simon the son of Gamaliel, at the head of that mediatizing party, who only joined in the insurrection because they were forced to do so, while they were in heart opposed to it. An entirely different result however was arrived at, when the thought of Israel's election was placed in the foreground. Then the rule of the heathen over the people of God would appear as an abnormity whose abolition was by all means to be striven for. Israel must acknowledge no other king than God alone, and the ruler of the house of David, whom He anointed. The supremacy of the heathen was illegal and presumptuous. From this standpoint it was questionable, not merely whether obedience and payment of tribute to a heathen power was a duty, but whether it was lawful (Matt. 22:17 sqq.; Mark 12:14 sqq.; Luke 20:22 sqq.). From this standpoint, as it seems, the majority of the Pharisees refused to take the oath to Herod. It may be supposed that this was the specially popular standpoint, both with the people and the Pharisees. Indeed it must have been such, since every non-Pharisaic government, even when it did not prevent the practice of the law, involved a certain compromise of its free exercise. Hence it was a Pharisee, one Saddukos, who in conjunction with Judas of Galilee founded the revolutionary party of the Zealots. Indifferent then as Pharisaism at first was to politics, the revolutionary current, which in the time of Christ was continually increasing among the Jewish people, must be set to the account of its influence.

The characteristics of Pharisaism hitherto described show no peculiarity by which it may be distinguished from post-exilian Judaism in general. So far as it is only regarded as an intellectual tendency, it is simply identical with that adopted by the Judaism of the post-exilian period, at least in its main branches and classic representatives. Still it formed a party within the nation, an ecclesiola in ecclesia. In one of the two passages in which Josephus, or rather his authority Nikolaus Damascenus, speaks of the refusal of the oath by the Pharisees, he designates them as a μόριόν τι Ἰουδαικῶν ἀνθρώπων, and states their number as six thousand. This leads us to infer a definite boundary of their circle. In the New Testament also and in Josephus the Pharisees evidently appear as a decided fraction of the people. In the same sense also must their name be explained. It is in Hebrew פְּרוּשִׁים, in Aramaic פְּרִישִׁין, stat. emphat. פְּרִישַׁיָּא, whence the Greek Φαρισαῖοι. That this literally means "the separated" is undoubted. The only question can be, to what to refer the term. Are they those who separate themselves from all uncleanness and all illegality, or those who separate themselves from certain persons? The first is spoken for by the circumstance, that in Rabbinic Hebrew also the substantives פְּרִישָׁה and פְּרִישׁוּת occur with the meaning "separation," scil. from all uncleanness. But if only a separation from uncleanness, without any reference to persons, were intended, other positive epithets would have been more obvious (the "clean," the "just," the "pious," or the like). Besides, a separation from uncleanness is at the same time a separation from unclean persons. If then the latter is in any case to be included, it seems obvious to derive the name from that "separation," which took place in the time of Zerubbabel and then again in the time of Ezra, when Israel separated from the heathen dwelling in the land and from their uncleanness (Ezra 6:21, 9:1, 10:11; Neh. 9:2, 10:29). Wellhausen however is in the right when he objects to this, that this separation, to which all Israel then submitted, had about it nothing characteristic of the Pharisees. For the Pharisees must have their name from a separation, which the bulk of the

nation did not undergo with them; in other words, from a separation made by them, in consequence of their stricter view of the notion of uncleanness, not only from the uncleanness of the heathen, but also from that with which, according to their view, a great portion of the people were affected. It was in this sense that they were called the separated or the separating, and they might have been so called from either praise or blame. They might so have called themselves, because they kept as far as possible from all uncleanness, and therefore also from contact with unclean persons. Or they might have been so named in a reproachful sense by their adversaries, as "the separatists," who for the sake of their own special cleanness separated themselves from the bulk of the nation. The latter was certainly the original meaning of the name. For it is not probable that they gave it to themselves. Other positive self-designations would have been more obvious to them, and in fact they first appear in history under the name of חֲסִידִים (see below). Their adversaries however called them "the separatists." This also explains why the name so seldom occurs in our oldest Rabbinical authority the Mishna; in the chief passage in the mouth of an adversary and only twice besides. The last-named fact certainly shows that the Pharisees on their part accepted the party name when once naturalized. And they might well do so, for from their standpoint the "separation" from which they obtained the name was one thoroughly praiseworthy and well-pleasing to God.

If the name Perushim shows that the Pharisees appeared as "separatists" in the eyes of their adversaries, another name shows us their own view of their character and community. They called themselves merely Chaberim (חֲבֵרִים), "neighbours," this term being, in the language of the Mishna and of ancient Rabbinical literature in general, exactly identical with that of Perushim. It is self-evident from the matter of the passages given above (vol. ii. p. 8), that a Chaber in them everywhere means one who strictly observes tke law, especially the laws relating to cleanness and uncleanness. And indeed the term comprises all those who do so, and therefore not merely those who are scholars by profession. For it is not the unlearned, but as the tenor of the passages shows, the bulk of those in whom no strict observance of the law can be assumed, the "people of the land" (עַם הָאָרֶץ), who form the contrast. Hence the usage of language of the Middle Ages, according to which a Chaber is a "colleague" of the Rabbis, a scholar, must not be imported into these passages of the Mishna. On the contrary, Chaber is in the latter any one who strictly observes the law, including the παραδόσεις τῶν πρεσβυτέρων, and is thus identical with Pharisee. This gives us however a deeper insight of the self-estimation of Pharisaism. It so far stands on a level with the general Judaism of the post-exilian period, that to it also the population of Palestine is divided into two categories: (1) The congregation of Israel, i.e. the Chaberim, for חָבֵר means simply "neighbour," fellow-countryman, and (2) the people dwelling in the land. In the eyes of Pharisaism however the former term is restricted to the circle of those, who strictly observe the law together with the entire παραδόσις τῶν πρεσβυτέρων. All besides are Am-haarez, and therefore do not belong to the true congregation of Israel. Consequently Pharisaism estimates itself as very specially the ecclesiola in ecclesia. Only the circle of the Pharisaic association represents the true Israel, who perfectly observe the law and have therefore a claim to the promises.

And their demeanour practically agreed with this theoretical estimation. As an Israelite avoided as far as possible all contact with a heathen, lest he should thereby be defiled, so did the Pharisee avoid as far as possible contact with the non-Pharisee, because the latter was to him included in the notion of the unclean Am-haarez. "The garments of the Am-haarez are unclean for the Perushim." "A Chaber does not go as a guest to an Am-haarez nor receive him as a guest within his walls." "If the wife of a Chaber has left the wife of an Am-haarez grinding in her house, the house is unclean if the mill stops; if it goes on grinding, only unclean so far as she

can reach by stretching out her hand," etc. When then the Gospels relate, that the Pharisees found fault with the free intercourse of Jesus with "publicans and sinners," and with His entering into their houses (Mark 2:14–17; Matt. 9:9–13; Luke 5:27–32), this agrees exactly with the standpoint here described. The Pharisees did in fact "separate" from the people of the land, so far as to avoid close intercourse with them. Hence the name Perushim was rightly given them; nay, from their own standpoint they had no reason for rejecting it.

This exclusiveness of Pharisaism certainly justifies the calling it an αἵρεσις, a sect, as is done both in the New Test. (Acts 15:5, 26:5) and by Josephus. Nevertheless it remains the fact, that it was the legitimate and classic representative of post-exilian Judaism in general. It did but carry out with relentless energy the consequences of its principle. Those only are the true Israel who observe the law in the strictest manner. Since only the Pharisees did this in the full sense, they only were the true Israel, which was related to the remaining bulk of the people as these were to the heathen.

Not till after these general characteristics of Pharisaism had been discussed could the question concerning its origin arise and its history be briefly sketched. Viewed according to its essence, it is as old as legal Judaism in general. When once the accurate observance of the ceremonial law is regarded as the true essence of religious conduct, Pharisaism already exists in principle. It is another question however when it first appeared as a sect, as a fraction within the Jewish nation. And in this sense it cannot be traced farther back than to the time of the Maccabaean conflicts. In these the "pious" (οἱ Ἀσιδαῖοι, i.e. חֲסִידִים), who plainly formed a special fraction. within the people, also took part (1 Macc. 2:42, 7:12 sqq.). They fought indeed on the side of Judas for the religion of their fathers, but they were not identical with the Maccabaean party. They evidently represented, as may be inferred from their name, that strictest party which upheld with special zeal the observance of the law. Hence they are the same party, whom we again meet with some decades later under the name of Pharisees. It appears that during the Greek period, when the chief priests and rulers of the people took up an increasingly lax attitude towards the law, they united themselves more closely into an association of such as made a duty of its most punctilious observance. When then the Maccabees raised the standard to fight for the faith of their fathers, these "pious" took part in the conflict, but only as long as the faith and the law were actually contended for. When, this was no longer the case, and the object of the contest became more and more the national independence, they seem to have retired. Hence we no longer hear of them under Jonathan and Simon. Not till John Hyrcanus do they again appear, and then under the name of "Pharisees," no longer indeed on the side of the Maccabees, but in hostile opposition to them. The course of affairs had brought it to pass, that the priestly family of the Maccabees should found a political dynasty. The ancient high-priestly family had been supplanted. The Maccabees or Asmonaeans had entered into its political inheritance. But with this, tasks which were essentially political had devolved upon them. The chief matter in their eyes was no longer the carrying out of the law, but the maintenance and extension of their political power. The prosecution however of these political objects could not but more and more separate them from their old friends the "Chasidim" or "Perushim." Not that they had apostatized from the law. But a secular policy was in itself scarcely reconcilable with that legal scrupulosity and carefulness which the Pharisees required. It was inevitable, that sooner or later there should be a breach between them and their two opposite pursuits. This breach occurred under John Hyrcanus. At the beginning of his government, he still adhered to the Pharisees, but afterwards renounced them and turned to the Sadducees. The occasion of the breach is related by Josephus in a legendary style. But the fact itself, that this change took place under Hyrcanus, is thoroughly authentic. And in consequence we henceforth find the

Pharisees the opponents of the Asmonaean priest-princes. They were such not only under John Hyrcanus, but also under Aristobulus I, and especially Alexander Jannaeus. Under the latter, who as a fierce warrior entirely disregarded the interest of religion, it came even to open revolution. For six years Alexander Jannaeus with his mercenary troops was in conflict against the people led by the Pharisees. And what he at last attained was only the external intimidation, not the real subdual of his opponents. The stress laid upon religious interests by the Pharisees had won the bulk of the nation to their side. Hence it is no cause for surprise, that Alexandra for the sake of being at peace with her people abandoned the power to the Pharisees. Their victory was now complete, the whole conduct of internal affairs was in their hands. All the decrees of the Pharisees done away with by Hyrcanus were reintroduced, and they completely ruled the public life of the nation. And this continued in all essentials even during subsequent ages. Amidst all the changes of government; under Romans and Herodians, the Pharisees maintained their spiritual hegemony. Consistency with principle was on their side. And this consistency procured them the spiritual supremacy. It is true that the Sadducaean high priests were at the head of the Sanhedrin. But in fact the decisive influence upon public affairs was in the hands, not of the Sadducees, but of the Pharisees. They had the bulk of the nation as their ally, the women especially were in their hands. They had the greatest influence upon the congregations, so that all acts of public worship, prayers and sacrifices were performed according to their injunctions. Their sway over the masses was so absolute, that they could obtain a hearing, even when they said anything against the king or the high priest, consequently they were the most capable of counteracting the designs of the kings. Hence too the Sadducees in their official acts adhered to the demands of the Pharisees. because otherwise the multitude would not have tolerated them. This great influence actually exercised by the Pharisees is but the reverse side of the exclusive position which they took up. It was just because their requirements stretched so far, and because they only recognised as true Israelites those who observed them in their full strictness, that they had so imposing an effect upon the multitude, who recognised in these exemplary saints their own ideal and their legitimate leaders.

II. THE SADDUCEES

The nature of the Sadducees is not as evident as that of the Pharisees. The scanty statements furnished by documents can only with difficulty be brought under a single point of sight. And the reason of this seems to lie in the nature of the case. The Sadducees are no simple and consistent phenomenon like the Pharisees, but so to speak a compound one, which must be apprehended from different points.

The most salient characteristic is that they are aristocrats. Josephus repeatedly designates them as such. “They only gain the well-to-do, they have not the people on their side.” “This doctrine has reached few individuals, but these are of the first consideration.” When Josephus here says, that this doctrine has reached but few, this is quite consistent with his manner of always depicting Pharisaism and Sadduceeism as philosophical tendencies. Taking off this varnish, his actual statement is, that the Sadducees were the aristocrats, the wealthy (εὔποροι), the persons of rank (πρῶτοι τοῖς ἀξιώμασιν). And that is to say, that they chiefly belonged to the priesthood. For from the commencement of the Greek, nay from the Persian period, it was the priests who governed the Jewish State, as it was also the priesthood in general that constituted the nobility of the Jewish people. The New Testament testifies superabundantly and Josephus expressly, that the high-priestly families belonged to the Sadducean party. Rightly however as this view is for the first time expressly advocated by Geiger, it must not be so understood as to make the Sadducees nothing more than the party of the priests, The contrast of Sadducees and

Pharisees is not a contrast of the priestly and the strictly legal party, but of aristocratic priests and strictly legal persons. The Pharisees were by no means in hostile opposition to the priests as such. On the contrary, they interpreted the legal enactments concerning the revenues of the priesthood abundantly in their favour, awarding to them in full measure, pressed down, shaken together and running over, their heave-offerings, tithes, first-born, etc., and decidedly acknowledging the greater sanctity and higher rank of the priests in the Theocracy. On the other hand too, the priests were not all thoroughly hostile to Pharisaism. There were, at least in the last decades before, and the first decades after the destruction of the temple, a large number of priests who themselves belonged to the Rabbinical class. Hence the opponents of the Pharisees were not the priests as such, but only the aristocratic priests: those who by their possessions and offices also occupied influential civil positions.

In view of these facts it is an interesting conjecture of Geiger's – which he indeed expresses as a certainty – that the Sadducees derive their name צַדּוּקִים, Σαδδουκαῖοι, from that Zaddok the priest, whose family had exercised the priestly office at Jerusalem since the time of Solomon. At all events it may now be considered as settled, that the name must not, as was formerly often thought, be derived from the adjective צַדִּיק, but from the proper name צָדוֹק. For in the first derivation the change from i to u is inexplicable, while on the other hand the pronunciation Zadduk (Σαδδούκ, צַדּוּק) is undoubtedly guaranteed by the concurrent testimony of the Septuagint, of Josephus, and of a vowel-pointed MS. of the Mishna for the proper name Zadok. The party name צדוקים is thus related to צדוק as בויתסים to Boethos or אפיקורוסים to Epicuros. The further question, from what Zadok the Sadducees derive their name is of less certain decision. An apocryphal legend in the Aboth de-Rabbi Nathan traces it to a supposed disciple of Antigonus von Socho named Zadok. But the legend is useless notwithstanding the vigorous defence of it by Baneth, (1) because the Aboth de-Rabbi Nathan cannot, on account of their late origin, be at all regarded as historical authority for our period, (2) because especially what is said of the Boethosees is certainly erroneous (see note 8 and (3) because the legend contains no tradition, but only a learned combination: the Sadducees, who denied the immortality of the soul, being said to have embraced this heresy through a misunderstanding of the saying of Antigonus of Socho, that we ought to do good without regard to future reward. Thus there is left us only the choice of deriving the name of the Sadducees from one Zadok, unknown to us, who in some time equally unknown founded the party of the aristocrats, or of referring it to the priestly race of the Zadokites. The former is possible, and is preferred e.g. by Kuenen and Montet, but the latter is certainly the more probable. The posterity of Zadok performed priestly service in the temple from the time of Solomon. After the Deuteronomic reformation, which interdicted all sacrifice out of Jerusalem, the rites there carried on were alone esteemed legitimate. Hence Ezekiel in his ideal picture of the theocracy awards to the "Zadokites" (בְּנֵי צָדוֹק) alone the right of officiating as priests in the temple at Jerusalem (Ezek. 40:46, 43:19, 44:15, 48:11). Ezekiel's demand did not indeed entirely prevail on the restoration of worship after the captivity, since some of the other priestly races were also able to maintain their rights. Still the Zadokites formed the pith and chief element of the priesthood in the post-exilian period. This is seen especially from the circumstance, that the Chronicler in his genealogy traces back the house of Zadok to Eleasar, the elder son of Aaron, thus giving us to understand, that the Zadokites had, if not the only, still the first and nearest claim to the priesthood (1 Chron. v. 30-41). This procedure of the Chronicler at the same time proves, that the name of the ancestor of this race was still vividly remembered in his times, and therefore in the Greek period also. Consequently a party which attached itself to the aristocratic priests might very well be named the Zadokitian or Sadducaean. For though the aristocratic priests were but a fraction of the בְּנֵי צָדוֹק, they were still its authoritative representatives and their tendency the Zadokian.

This distinctive mark of the Sadducees, viz. their aristocratic character, being now settled, the further mark must next be added, that they acknowledged only the written Thorah as binding, and on the other hand rejected the entire traditionary interpretation and further development of the law during the course of centuries by the scribes. “The Sadducees say, only what is written is to be esteemed as legal. On the contrary, what has come down from the tradition of the fathers need not be observed.” So far removed were they from the principle of absolute authority as held by the Pharisees, that they thought it, on the contrary, commendable to oppose their teachers. It is evident, that what was in question was simply a rejection of the παράδοσις τῶν πρεσβυτέρων, and therefore of the entire mass of legal decisions which had been made by the Pharisaic scribes for the completion and application of the written law. The opinion of many Fathers, that the Sadducees acknowledged only the Pentateuch, but rejected the prophets, is not confirmed by documentary authority, and has therefore been given up as erroneous by modern scholars. Beside these main principles, on which the Sadducees opposed the entire Pharisaic tradition, specific legal differences between Sadducees and Pharisees have but a minor interest. A number of differences of this kind are mentioned in Rabbinical literature. Some of these notices cannot however be esteemed as historical tradition, especially the statements of the very late commentary on Megilloth Taanith. So far as they are trustworthy, they are so isolated and unconnected that no unifying principle can be perceived in them, and certainly not that discovered by Geiger, viz. an advocacy of priestly interests by the Sadducees. In penal legislation the Sadducees were, according to Josephus, the more, and the Pharisees the less severe. This may be connected with the fact that the former strictly adhered to the letter of the law, while the latter sought to mitigate its severity by interpretation. In one point mentioned in the Mishna the Sadducees even went beyond the demands of the law. They required compensation, not only if an ox or an ass (Ex. 21:32, 35 sq.), but also if a man-servant or a maid-servant had injured any one. On the other hand, they insisted that false witnesses should be put to death, only when the accused had already been executed in consequence of their false witness (Deut. 19:19-21), while the Pharisees required that this should take place so soon as sentence had been passed. Thus in this instance the latter were the more severe. These differences were evidently not differences of principle. The same is the case in questions of ritual. For here too a difference of principle can only so far be spoken of, that the Sadducees did not regard as binding Pharisaic decrees with respect e.g. to clean and unclean. They derided their Pharisaic opponents on account of the oddities and inconsistencies into which their laws of cleanness brought them. On the other hand, the Pharisees pronounced all Sadducees unclean, “if they walk in the ways of their fathers.” How far however the Sadducees were from renouncing the principle of Levitical uncleanness in itself, appears from the fact of their demanding even a higher degree of cleanness for the priests who burnt the red heifer, than the Pharisees did. This last is at the same time the only point in which a certain amount of priestly interest, i.e. of interest in priestly cleanness, is perceived. With respect to the festival laws it is mentioned that the “Boethosees” (who must be regarded as a variety of the Sadducees) maintained that the sheaf of first-fruits at the Passover was not to be offered on the second day of the feast, but on the day after the Sabbath in the week of the festival, and that consequently the feast of Pentecost, seven weeks later (Lev. 23:15), was always to be kept on the day after the Sabbath. This difference is however so purely technical, that it merely gives expression to the exegetic view of the Sadducees, who did not acknowledge tradition. It certainly never had any practical importance. The only difference of importance in the law of festivals, and especially in the interpretation of the law of the Sabbath, is that the Sadducees did not acknowledge as binding the confused mass of Pharisaic enactments. The difference in principle then between the two parties is confined on the whole to this general rejection of Pharisaic tradition by the Sadducees. All other differences were such as would necessarily

result, if the one did not acknowledge the obligation of the other's exegetical tradition. Nor must it be thought, that the Sadducees rejected Pharisaic tradition according to its entire tenor. Quite apart from the fact, that since the time of Alexandra they had no longer carried out their views into practice, they also theoretically agreed with Pharisaic tradition in some, perhaps in many particulars. They only denied its obligation, and reserved the right of private opinion.

In this rejection of the legal tradition of the Pharisees, the Sadducees represented the older standpoint. They stopped at the written law. For them the whole subsequent development was without binding power. They also represented a like, one might say archaic, standpoint by their religious views, the chief of which have already been spoken of (vol. ii. p. 12 sqq.) – (1) they refused to believe in a resurrection of the body, and retribution in a future life, nay in any personal continuity of the individual; (2) they denied angels and spirits; (3) lastly, they maintained, "that good and evil are at the choice of man, who can do the one or the other at his discretion," and consequently, that God exercises no influence upon human actions, and that man is therefore himself the cause of his own prosperity and adversity. With regard to the two first points, the Sadducees undoubtedly represented the original standpoint of the Old Testament, in distinction from the later Jewish. For with the exception of the Book of Daniel the Old Testament also knows of no resurrection of the body, and no retribution in another world in the sense of later Judaism, that is to say, no personal salvation of the individual after this earthly life, nor any punishment in the world to come for the sins of this life, but only a shadowy continued existence in Sheol. So too is the belief in angels and demons, in the development which it subsequently attained, still foreign to the Old Testament. The Sadducees then in both these respects remained essentially at the more ancient standpoint. Only we must not indeed say, that their special motive was the conservative feature, the cleaving to the old as such. On the contrary, it is evident that a certain amount of worldliness was the result of the superior political position of the Sadducees. Their interests were entirely in this world, and they had no such intensively religious interest as the Pharisees. Hence it was their slighter amount of religious energy which made the older standpoint seem sufficient for them. Nay, it is probable that in their case, as men of rank and culture, illuministic motives also intervened. The more fantastically the imaginary religious sphere of Judaism was fashioned, the less were they able to follow the course of its development. It is from this point of view indeed that the stress laid by the Sadducees on human freedom is chiefly to be explained. If the statements of Josephus on this point are on the whole worthy of credence, we can only perceive in this stronger insistance upon liberty also, a recession of the religious motive. They insisted that man was placed at his own disposal, and rejected the thought that a divine co-operation takes place in human actions as such.

The last-named particulars also show in part, how it was just the high aristocracy that acceded to the tendency designated as "Sadducean." In order to understand the genesis of this tendency, we must start from the fact, that the whole conduct of political affairs was already in the Persian, but especially in the Greek period, in the hands of the priestly aristocracy. The high priest was chief of the State, eminent priests undoubtedly stood at the head of the Gerusia (the Sanhedrim of the day). The duties of the priestly aristocracy were therefore quite as much political as religious. This necesarily involved a very real regard to political interests and points of view in all their proceedings. But the more decidedly these came to the foreground, the more did those of religion recede. This seems to have been especially the case in the Greek period, and indeed for this reason, that political interests were now combined with Greek culture. They who then wanted to effect anything in the political world must of necessity stand on a more or less friendly footing with Hellenism. Thus Hellenism gained ground more and more in the higher

ranks of the priesthood at Jerusalem, which was in the same proportion alienated from the Jewish religious interest. Hence it is comprehensible, that it was just in these circles that Antiochus Epiphanes most easily found an admission of his demands. A portion of the priests of rank were even ready without further ceremony to exchange Jewish for heathen rites. This triumph of heathenism was not indeed of long continuance, the Maccabaean rising putting a speedy end to it. Still the tendencies of the priestly aristocracy remained essentially the same. Though there was no longer any talk of heathen rites, though the special friends of the Greeks were either expelled or silenced, there was still among the priestly aristocracy the same worldly-mindedness and the same at least comparative laxity of interest in religion. On the other hand, however, a revival and strengthening of religious life was the result of the Maccabaean rising. The rigidly legal party of the "Chasidees" gained more and more influence. And therewith their pretensions also increased. Those only were to be acknowledged as true Israelites who observed the law according to the full strictness of the interpretation given to it by the scribes. But the more strenuously this demand was made, the more decided was the recusancy of the aristocrats. It seems as though it were just the religious revival of the Maccabaean period which led to a firmer consolidation of parties. The "Chasidees" were consistent with their principles, and became "Pharisees." The high aristocracy rejected the results that had been reached during the last few centuries in both the interpretation of the law and the development of religious views. They saw in the παράδοσις τῶν πρεσβυτέρων an excess of legal strictness which they refused to have imposed upon them, while the advanced religious views were, on the one hand, superfluous to their worldly-mindedness, and on the other, inadmissible by their higher culture and enlightenment. The heads of this party belonging to the ancient priestly race of the Zadokites, they and their followers were called Zadokites or Sadducees by their opponents.

Under the earlier Maccabees (Judas, Jonathan, and Simon) this "Zadokite" aristocracy was necessarily in the background. The ancient high-priestly family which, at least in some of its members, represented the extreme philo-Hellenistic standpoint, was supplanted. The high-priestly office remained for a time unoccupied. In the year 152, Jonathan was appointed high priest, and thus was founded the new high-priestly dynasty of the Asmonaeans, whose whole past compelled them at first to support the rigidly legal party. Nevertheless there was not in the times of the first Asmonaeans (Jonathan, Simon) an entire withdrawal of the Sadducees from the scene. The old aristocracy was indeed purged from its more extreme philo-Grecian elements, but did not therefore at once wholly disappear. The Asmonaean parvenus had to come to some kind of understanding with it, and to yield to it at least a portion of seats in the "Gerusia." Things remained in this position till the time of John Hyrcanus, when the Sadducees again became the really ruling party, John Hyrcanus, Aristobulus I., and Alexander Jannaeus becoming their followers. The reaction under Alexandra brought the Pharisees back to power. Their political supremacy was however of no long duration. Greatly as the spiritual power of the Pharisees had increased, the Sadducean aristocracy were able to keep at the helm in politics, and that notwithstanding the overthrow of the Asmonaeans and Herod's proscriptions of the ancient nobility who had leagued with them. The high-priestly families of the Herodian-Roman period belonged also to the Sadducean party. This is decidedly testified for at least the Roman period. The price at which the Sadducees had to secure themselves power at this later period was indeed a high one, for they were obliged in their official actions actually to accommodate themselves to Pharisaic views. "Nothing is, so to speak, done by them, for whenever they obtain office they adhere, though unwillingly and by constraint, to what the Pharisees say, as otherwise the multitude would not tolerate them."

With the fall of the Jewish State the Sadducees altogether disappear from history. Their strong point was politics. When deprived of this their last hour had struck. While the Pharisaic party only gained more strength, only obtained more absolute rule over the Jewish people in consequence of the collapse of political affairs, the very ground on which they stood was cut away from the Sadducees. Hence it is not to be wondered, that Jewish scholars soon no longer even knew who the Sadducees really were. In the Mishna we still find some trustworthy traditions concerning them; but the Talmudic period, properly so called, has but a very misty notion of them.

SCHOOL AND SYNAGOGUE

“THE people which knoweth not the law is accursed” (John 7:49). Such was the fundamental conviction of post-exilian Judaism. And this of itself implies that a knowledge of the law was esteemed as the possession worthy above all others to be striven after. Hence the exhortation: To the law! is sounded abroad in every key. Joses ben Joeser said: Let your house be a house of assembly for those wise in the law (חֲכָמִים); let yourself be dusted by the dust of their feet, and drink eagerly their teaching. Joshua ben Perachiah said: Get thyself a teacher (רַב). Shammai said: Make the study of the law thy special business (קְבַע). Rabban Gamaliel said: Appoint for thyself a teacher, so wilt thou avoid what is doubtful. Hillel said: An ignorant man cannot be truly pious (לֹא עַם־הָאָרֶץ חָסִיד). He also said: The more teaching of the law, the more life; the more school, the more wisdom; the more counsel, the more reasonable action. He who gains a knowledge of the law gains life in the world to come. R. Joses ha-Kohen said: Give thyself the trouble to learn the law, for it is not obtained by inheritance. R. Eleasar ben Arach said: Be diligent in the study of the law. R. Chananiah ben Teradion said: When two sit together and do not converse about the law, they are an assembly of scorners, of which it is said: sit not in the seat of scorners. When however two sit together and converse about the law, the Shechinah is present among them. B. Simon said: When three eat together at one table and do not converse about the law, it is as though they ate of the offerings of the dead. But when three eat together at one table and converse about the law, it is as though they ate at the table of God. B. Simon said: He who in walking repeats the law to himself, but interrupts himself and exclaims, How beautiful is this tree! How beautiful is this field ! the Scripture will impute it to him as though he had forfeited his life. R. Nehorai said: Always travel towards a place where there is instruction in the law, and say not that it will come after thee, or that thy companions will preserve it for thee; also depend not upon thine own acuteness. The same R. Nehorai said: I lay aside all the trade of the world, and teach my son only the law, for its reward is enjoyed in this world, and the capital (הַקֶּרֶן) remains for the world to come. The following things have no measure: the Peah, the first-fruits, pilgrimage, benevolence, the study of the law. The following are things whose interest (פֵּירוֹת) is enjoyed in this world, while the capital (הַקֶּרֶן) remains for the world to come: reverence for fathers and mothers, benevolence, peace-making among neighbours, and the study of the law above them all. A bastard who knows the law takes precedence of a high priest if he is ignorant.

Such an estimation of the law would necessarily impel to the employment of every possible means for bestowing upon the whole people the benefit of the most thorough knowledge and practice of the law. What the Pharisaic scribes had established in their schools as the law of Israel, was to become both in theory and practice the common possession of the whole nation. For both the knowledge and practice of the law were required. Josephus boasts of it as an excellence of the Israelitish nation, that in their case neither one nor the other received a one-sided preference, as in the case of the Spartans, who educated by custom, not by instruotion (ἔθεσιν ἐπαίδευον, οὐ λόγοις), and, on the other hand, of the Athenians and other Greeks, who contented themselves with theoretic instruction, and neglected practice. “But our lawgiver very carefully combined the two. For he neither left the practice of morals silent, nor the teaching of the law unperformed.” The instruction which formed the prerequisite of practice began in early youth, and continued during the whole life of the Israelite. The care of its foundation rested with the school and family, that of its farther carrying on with the synagogue.

I. THE SCHOOL

THE LITERATURE

Ursinus, Antiquitates Hebraicae Scholastico-Academicae, Hafniae 1702 (also in Ugolini's Thesaurus, vol. xxi.).

Pacht, De eruditione Judaica (dissertatio, quam praeside A. G. Waehnero examini submittet auctor J. L. Pacht), Gotting. 1742. It specially treats, pp. 50–55: de ludis puerorum.

Andr. Georg Waehner, Antiquitates Ebraeorum, vol. ii. (Gottingae 1742), pp. 783–804: de eruditione Ebraeorum.

Ant. Theod. Hartmann, Die enge Verbindung des A. T. mit dem Neuen (1831), pp. 377–384.

Gfrörer, Das Jahrhundert des Heils, i. 186–192.

Winer, RWB., arts. "Kinder" and "Unterricht." Still more literature is here given.

Herzfeld, Gesch. des Volkes Jisrael, iii. 243, 266–268.

Keim, Gesch. Jesu, i. 424 sqq.

Diestel, art. "Erziehung," in Schenkel's Bibetlex. ii. 172 sq.

Ginsburg, art. "Education," in Kitto's Cyclopaedia of Biblical Literature.

S. R. Hirsch, Aus dem rabbinischen Schulleben. Frankf. a. M. 1871 (Progr.).

Elias van Gelder, Die Volksschule des jüdischen Alterthums nach talmudischen und rabbinischen Quellen. Berl. 1872 (Leipziger Dissertat.).

Leop. Löw, Die Lebensalter in der jüdischen Literatur (Szegedin 1875), pp. 196 sqq., 407 sqq.

Mos. Jacobson, Versuch einer Psychologie des Talmud (Hamburg 1878), pp. 93–101.

Jos. Simon, L'éducation et l'instruction des enfants chez les anciens Juifs d'après la Bible et le Talmud, 3rd ed. Leipzig 1879, O. Schulze.

Hamburger, Real-Enc. für Bibel und Talmud, Div. i. art. "Erziehung," Div.ii.arts. "Lehrer," "Mizwa," "Schule," "Schüler," "Unterricht."

According to the statement of Josephus, Moses had already prescribed "that boys should learn the most important laws, because this is the best knowledge and the cause of prosperity." "He commanded to instruct children in the elements of knowledge (reading and writing), to teach them to walk according to the laws, and to know the deeds of their forefathers. The latter, that they might imitate them; the former, that growing up with the laws they might not transgress them, nor have the excuse of ignorance." Josephus repeatedly commends the zeal with which the instruction of the young was carried on. "We take most pains of all with the instruction of children, and esteem the observation of the laws and the piety corresponding with them the most important affair of our whole life." "If any one should question one of us concerning the

laws, he would more easily repeat all than his own name, Since we learn them from our first consciousness, we have them, as it were, engraven on our souls; and a transgression is rare, but the averting of punishment impossible." In like manner does Philo express himself: "Since the Jews esteem their laws as divine revelations, and are instructed in the knowledge of them from their earliest youth, they bear the image of the law in their souls." "They are taught, so to speak, from their swaddling-clothes by their parents, teachers, and those who bring them up, even before instruction in the sacred laws and the unwritten customs, to believe in God the one Father and Creator of the world." Josephus boasts of himself, that in his fourteenth year he had already so accurate an acquaintance with the law, that the high priest and chief men of Jerusalem used to come to him to learn particulars respecting the law. In view of all this testimony it cannot be doubted, that in the circles of genuine Judaism boys were from their tenderest childhood made acquainted with the demands of the law. That this education in the law was, in the first place, the duty and task of parents is self-evident. But it appears, that even in the age of Christ, care was also taken for the instruction of youth by the erection of schools on the part of the community. It does not indeed say much. when later tradition fells us that Simon ben Shetach already prescribed that children (תינוקות) should frequent the elementary schools (בית הספר). For this Simon ben Shetach is quite a point of meeting for all kinds of myths. In any case however, in the period of the Mishna, and therefore at latest in the second century after Christ, the existence of elementary schools is assumed. There are e.g. legal appointments with regard to the חַזָּן (servant of the congregation), who instructs children (תינוקות) in reading on the Sabbath. Or it is ordained, that an idle man shall not keep a school for children, לאילמוד אדם רוק סופרים. Or it is appointed, that in certain cases the testimony of an adult with respect to what he saw as a child (קטן) in the elementary school (בית הספר) is valid. Hence the later tradition, that Joshua ben Gamla (= Jesus the son of Gamaliel) enacted that teachers of boys (מלמדי תינוקות) should be appointed in every province and in every town, and that children of the age of six or seven should be brought to them, is by no means incredible. The only Jesus the son of Gamaliel known to history is the high priest of that name, about 63-65 after Christ (see above, vol. i. p. 201). It must therefore be he who is intended in the above notice. As his measures presuppose a somewhat longer existence of boys' schools, we may without hesitation transfer them to the age of Christ, even though not as a general and established institution.

The subject of instruction, as already appears from the above passages of Josephus and Philo, was as good as exclusively the law. For only its inculcation in the youthful mind, and not the means of general education, was the aim of all this zeal for the instruction of youth. And indeed the earliest instruction was in the reading and inculcation of the text of Scripture. Hence the elementary school was called simply the בֵּית הַסֵּפֶר, because it had to do with the book of the Thorah, or as is once expressly declared, with the text of Scripture (the סִקְרָא) in distinction from בֵּית הַמִּדְרָשׁ, which was devoted to further "study." It was therefore at bottom only the interest in th law, which made instruction in reading pretty widely diffused. For since in the case of the written Scripture (in distinction from oral tradition) great importance was attached to its being actually read (see below on the order of public worship), elementary instruction in the law was necessarily combined with instruction in reading. A knowledge of reading must therefore be everywhere assumed, where a somewhat more thorough knowledge of the law existed. Hence we find even in pre-Christian times books of the law in the possession of private individuals. On the other hand however the difficult art of writing was less general.

Habitual practice went hand in hand with theoretical instruction. For though children were not actually bound to fulfil the law, they were yet accustomed to it from their youth up. It was made a

duty of adults e.g. to enjoin children to keep the Sabbath. Children were to be gradually accustomed to strict fasting on the day of atonement one or two years before the age when it was incumbent. Certain points were even binding upon children. They were not bound indeed e.g. to the reading of the Shema and the putting on of Tephillin, but they were so to the usual prayer (the Shemoneh Esreh) and to prayer at table. Boys had to be present at the tenderest age in the temple at the chief festivals. Especially were boys bound to the observance of the feast of Tabernacles. As soon then as the first signs of manhood appeared, the growing Israelite was bound to the full observance of the law, he then entered upon all the rights and duties of a full-grown Israelite, and was henceforth a בַּר מִצְוָה. Thus the widely-diffused opinion, supported especially by the remarks of Lightfoot and Wetzstein on Luke 2:42, that the attainment of the twelfth year formed the boundary between being bound and not bound to the observance of the law, is in two respects inaccurate: first, because, a younger boy was bound by certain precepts, and next because no definite age but the signs of approaching puberty formed this boundary. Besides, when a definite age was subsequently fixed, it was not that of twelve, but of thirteen years.

II. THE SYNAGOGUE

THE LITERATURE

Maimonides, Hilchoth Tephilla (in his great work Mishne Thorah), gives a systematic statement of such tradition concerning the nature of the synagogue as was held valid in his time.

Vitringa, De synagoga vetere libri tres: quibus tum de nominibus, structura, origine, praefectis, ministris et sacris synagogarum agitur, tum praecipue formam regiminis et ministerii earum in ecclesiam christianum translatam esse demonstrator, Franequerae 1696.

Joh. Gottl. Carpzov, Apparatus historico criticus (1748), pp. 307–326.

A number of older monographs on single subjects is collected in Ugolini's Thesaurus Antiquitatum sacrarum, vol. xxi.

Hartmann, Die enge Verbindung des Alten Testaments mit dem Neuen (1831), pp. 225–376.

Zunz, Die gottesdienstlichen Vorträge der Juden (1832), pp. 1–12, 329–360.

Winer, Realwörterb. ii. 548–551, "Synagogen."

Herzfeld, Geschichte des Volkes Jisrael, iii. 129–137, 183–226.

Jost, Geschichte des Judenthums, i. 168 ff.

Keil, Handbuch der biblischen Archäologie (2nd ed. 1875), pp. 164 ff., 444 ff.

Leyrer, art. "Synagogen," in Herzog's Real-Enc., 1st ed. vol. xv. (1862), pp. 299–314.

De Wette, Lehrb. der hebr.-jüd. Archäologie (4th ed. 1864), pp. 369–374.

Hausrath, Neutestamentl. Zeitgesch., 2nd ed. vol. i. (1873) pp. 73–80.

Haneberg, Die religiösen Alterthümer der Bibel (1869), pp. 349–355, 582–587.

Ginsburg, art. “Synagogue,” in Kitto’s Cyclopaedia of Biblical Literature.

Plumptre, art. “Synagogue,” in Smith’s Dictionary of the Bible.

Kneucker, art. “Synagogen,” in Schenkel’s Bibellex. v. pp. 443–446.

Sieffert, Die jüdische Synagoge zur Zeit Jesu (Beweis des Glaubens, 1876, pp. 3–11, 225–239).

Hamburger, Real-Encyclopädie für Bibel und Talmud, Div. ii. 1883, art. “Synagoge.”

Löw, Leop., Der synagogale Ritus (Monatsschr. für Gesch. und Wissensch. des Judenth. 1884, pp. 97 ff., 161 ff., 214 ff., 305 ff., 364 ff., 458 ff.).

Strack, art. “Synagogen,” in Herzog’s Real-Enc., 2nd ed. xv. 96–100.

A deeper and more professional acquaintance with the law could only be obtained at the feet of the scribes in the Beth-ha-Midrash (see above, § 25). It was in the nature of things, that only a small fraction would acquire this. For the bulk of the people it was no small advantage, if only an elementary knowledge should become and remain a common property. But even this object was only attainable through an institution, by means of which the law was being brought nearer and nearer during his whole life to each individual of the nation. Such an institution was created by post-exilian Judaism in the custom of the reading of Scripture on the Sabbath day in the synagogue. For it is necessary first of all to remark, that the main object of these Sabbath day assemblages in the synagogue was not public worship in its stricter sense, i.e. not devotion, but religious instruction, and this for an Israelite, was above all instruction in the law. Josephus rightly views the matter in this light: “Not once or twice or more frequently did our lawgiver command us to hear the law, but to come together weekly, with the cessation of other work, to hear the law and to learn it accurately.” Nor was Philo in the wrong, when he called the synagogues “houses of instruction,” in which “the native philosophy” was studied and every kind of virtue taught. In the New Testament too, the διδάσκειν always figures as the chief function of the synagogue. The origin of these meetings on the Sabbath in buildings erected for the purpose, must at any rate be sought for in the post-exilian period. The first traces of them are the מוֹעֲדֵי אֵל of Ps. 74:8, probably of the Maccabaean era. But their commencement may well be transposed considerably farther back, perhaps to the time of Ezra. In the times of Christ the “teaching in the synagogue on the Sabbath day” was already an established and naturalized institution (Mark 1:21, 6:2; Luke 4:16, 31, 6:6, 13:10; Acts 13:14, 27, 42, 44, 15:21, 16:13, 17:2, 18:4). According to Acts 15:21, Moses “had from generations of old (ἐκ γενεῶν ἀρχαίων) in every city them that preach him, being read in the synagogues every Sabbath.” Josephus and Philo, and subsequent Judaism in general, trace back the whole system to Moses himself. This is indeed of interest only as showing that later Judaism regarded it as an essential element of its religious institutions. The utter absence of testimony forbids our thinking of a pre-exilian origin.

The whole system presupposes above all things the existence of a religious community. And here the question arises, whether in the time of Christ the civil and religious community was so separated in the towns and provinces of Palestine, that the latter possessed an independent organization. To gain clearness on the subject, we must first consider that the political constitution differed in the different towns of Palestine. We have seen (vol. i. p. 148) that a threefold variety was in this respect possible, and actually existed. The Jews might be excluded from civic rights, or Jews and non-Jews might have equal civil rights, or Jews only might be in possession of them. The first two cases were possible in towns with a chiefly Greek or strongly

mixed population. In both cases the Jews would, in respect of their religious wants, be thrown back upon self-organization as a religious community. For whether they co-operated or not in the direction of civil affairs, the necessity of independent organization for religious matters was the same. In both these cases therefore the question started must be answered in the affirmative, and consequently the position of the synagogal community would be the same in these towns as in those of the Dispersion. Quite different however was the state of affairs in towns of an entirely or an almost exclusively Jewish population. Here the local authorities certainly consisted of Jews, and the few non-Jewish inhabitants were excluded from the college of elders or town senate. Of this there is no doubt with respect to Jerusalem. Since then the local authorities had often to deal also with religious affairs (for the Jewish law knows of no severance of these from civil affairs), it is a priori very probable, that the matters of the synagogue were under their jurisdiction. Or would a separate council of elders be appointed for this special purpose? In small places at all events this would have been very un-natural. But even in the larger towns, where there were several synagogues, there was no occasion for it. It was enough if the necessary officials for each synagogue (a ruler of the synagogue, an almoner and a minister), who had to care for its special concerns, were appointed by the local authorities. At least there was no urgent reason for the formation of a college of elders for each separate synagogue, though with the scantiness of our material we have to concede the possibility of this being done. Nay, in one case it is even probable; for the Hellenistic Jews in Jerusalem, the Libertines, Cyrenians, Cilicians and Asiatics evidently formed separate communities (Acts 6:9). But these were special circumstances, the difference of nationality making a special organization necessary. A separation of the political and religious community would have been quite unnatural for the simple circumstances especially of the smaller places of Palestine. It would disagree with the character of post-exilian Judaism, which indeed knows of the political, only in the form of the religious community. But there are not wanting also positive proofs, that the civil community as such also directed the affairs of the synagogue. In the Mishna e.g. it is presupposed as quite self-evident, that the synagogue, the sacred ark, and the sacred books were quite as much the property of the town, and therefore of the civic community, as e.g. the roads and the bathing establishment. The inhabitants of the town (בְּנֵי הָעִיר) had therefore the right of disposing of the former as of the latter. When Eleasar ben Asariah says, that the Musaph-prayer may only be used in a town congregation (בְּחֶבֶר עִיר), we may infer that the town congregation included the civic community as such in the synagogue worship. We may consequently assume it as probable that the congregation of the synagogue had only in towns with a mixed population an independent existence beside the political community. In purely Jewish localities, the elders of the place will have been also the elders of the synagogue. So far as the community is viewed as religious, it is called כְּנֶסֶת (properly assembly, Greek συναγωγή, Aramaean כנישתא), its members therefore בְּנֵי הַכְּנֶסֶת.

The authority of the elders of the community in religious matters must be conceived of as analogous to that which they possessed in civil affairs. As then the civil administration and jurisdiction were entirely in their hands, so presumably was the direction of religious matters exclusively their affair. There is at least no trace of any direct deliberation and determination of the whole congregation in individual cases of discipline and government, of the kind which we meet with in the Christian Church at Corinth, In the Jewish community, on the contrary, these were administered by means of appointed officials, i.e. the elders of the congregation. In particular were the latter very probably competent to exercise that most important act of religious discipline, the infliction of excommunication or exclusion from the congregation. The strict administration of this means of discipline was for post-exilian Judaism nothing less than a vital question. In its continual contact with its heathen neighbours, the Jewish Church could only

keep itself intact by the most careful separation from itself of all foreign elements. As then the firmer organization of the post-exilian Church had begun by the proclamation, that every one who would not submit to the new order should be excluded from the congregation (Ezra 10:8), so had care to be continually exercised for the exclusion of opposing elements in the way of Church discipline. That this regulation actually existed in the time of Christ is proved by repeated allusions in the New Testament (Luke 6:22; John 9:22, 12:42, 16:2). The only question is, whether there were various kinds of exclusion. Many scholars have, after the example of Elias Levita († 1549) in his "Tishbi," distinguished three different kinds: (1) (2) ,נִדּוּי שַׁמַּתָּא (3) ,חֵרֶם. Of these however the latter forthwith falls away, נִדּוּי and שַׁמַּתָּא being, as Buxtorf already showed, used in the Talmud synonymously. Only the distinction between two kinds has been handed down: the נִדּוּי or temporary exclusion, and the חֵרֶם or permanent ban. It is however difficult to say how old this distinction is. All that is directly testified to in the New Testament is the ἀφορίζειν (Luke 6:22) or ἀποσυνάγωγον ποιεῖν or γίνεσθαι (John 9:22, 12:42, 16:2), therefore only the custom of expulsion as such. When in the well-known passage of the First Epistle to the Corinthians the expression παραδοῦναι τῷ Σατανᾷ (ver. 5) also occurs beside αἴρειν ἐκ μέσου (ver. 2), it is just a question, whether by the former we are to understand a stricter form of excommunication. In the Mishna too expulsion is only mentioned as such and the possibility of readmission assumed. On the other side, the Old Testament is already acquainted with the term חֵרֶם, i.e. the permanent excommunication or curse; and that it was current (in the sense of the curse) at least as a dogmatic notion to later Judaism also, is proved by the expressions ἀνάθεμα and ἀναθεματίζειν so repeatedly occurring in the New Testament (Rom. 9:3; 1 Cor. 12:3, 16:22; Gal. 1:8, 9; Mark 14:71; Acts 23:12, 14:21). The actual practice of anathematizing in the synagogues is proved from the 2nd century after Christ and onwards by the statement of Justin and other Fathers, that the Jews in their daily prayer always pronounced curses upon the Christians. It is true that the infliction of the ἀνάθεμα upon certain individuals is not here spoken of, and it is also questionable, whether the curses were pronounced directly upon Christians. But at any rate the actual custom of anathematizing in public worship at that period is proved. It is therefore at least possible, that so early as the time of Christ, two kinds of exclusion from the congregation took place, either without or with the infliction of the ἀνάθεμα. Nothing more definite can be asserted in the absence of direct evidence. It is highly probable that only the elders of the congregation were authorized to inflict this extreme penalty. For as in post-exilian Judaism the bulk of the people as such nowhere – so far as we know – exercised jurisdiction, we must not assume it with respect to excommunication. In fact we see, e.g. from John 9:22, that it was inflicted by the Ἰουδαίοις, i.e. in the language of this Gospel, by the authorities of the nation. And this is indirectly confirmed by the circumstance, that in the era of the Mishna, when the political organization of the nation was dissolved, and the professional scribes more and more acquired the powers of the former local authorities, it was just the "learned" (חֲכָמִים) who inflicted and abolished excommunication. In the Talmudic and post-Talmudic periods also, this was in the hands of competent church authorities.

Besides the elders who had the general direction of the affairs of the congregation, special officers were appointed for special purposes. But the peculiarity here is, that just for the acts proper to public worship – the reading of the Scriptures, preaching and prayer – no special officials were appointed. These acts were, on the contrary, in the time of Christ still freely performed in turn by members of the congregation, on which account e.g. Christ was able, whenever He came into a synagogue, to immediately address the congregation (see further particulars below on the order of public worship). But though no official readers, preachers and liturgists were appointed, it was above all necessary that: (1) An official should be nominated, who should have the care of external order in public worship and the supervision of the

concerns of the synagogue in general. This was the Ruler of the synagogue. Such ἀρχισυνάγωγοι are met with in the entire sphere of Judaism, not only in Palestine, but also in Egypt, Asia Minor, Greece, Italy, and the Roman Empire in general. The office and title were also transferred from the Jews to the Judaeo-Christian churches of Palestine, nay it is also found occasionally in Christian churches beyond Palestine. The Hebrew title רֹאשׁ הַכְּנֶסֶת is undoubtedly synonymous with it. That this office differed from that of an elder of the congregation is proved by the joint occurrence of the titles πρεσβύτεροι and ἀρχισυνάγωγοι. But it is most instructive, that according to the evidence of the inscriptions one and the same person could fill the offices of both ἄρχων and ἀρχισυνάγωγος. The ἄρχοντες were in the Dispersion the "chiefs" of the congregation, in whose hands lay the direction in general. The office therefore of the Archisynagogos was at all events distinct from theirs. Nor can he have been the chief of the archontes, who was called γερουσιάρχης (see below, § 31, on the Dispersion). He had therefore nothing to do with the direction of the community in general. His office was, on the contrary, that of specially caring for public worship. He was called "archisynagogus," not as head of the community, but as conductor of their assembly for public worship. As a rule he was indeed taken out of the number of the elders of the congregation. Among his functions is specially mentioned e.g. that of appointing who should read the Scriptures and the prayer, and summoning fit persons to preach. He had to take care that nothing unfitting should take place in the synagogue (Luke 13:14), and had also the charge of the synagogue building. There was generally but one archisynagogus for each synagogue. Sometimes however more than one are mentioned for one synagogue; so especially Acts 13:15 (ἀπέστειλαν οἱ ἀρχισυνάγωγοι πρὸς αὐτούς), while the more indefinite expression εἷς τῶν ἀρχισυναγώγων (Mark 5:22) may also be explained as: one of the class of the presidents of the synagogues (see Weiss on the passage). In later times the title ἀρχισυνάγωγος seems to have been bestowed as a mere title upon even minors and women. It is remarkable that archisynagogi occur in heathen worship also. It may however be here left undecided, whether the use of the expression originated in the Jewish or heathen sphere.

Besides the ruler of the synagogue, we meet with as officers of the congregation (2) the receivers of alms גַּבָּאֵי צְדָקָה. They had certainly nothing to do with public worship as such, and are therefore, where the civil and the religious communities were not separated, to be regarded rather as civil officials. They must however be named here, because it was in the synagogues that the collection of alms took place. According to the Mishna the collection was to be made by at least two, the distribution by three persons. Not only was money collected (in the box, קוּפָּה), but also natural products (in the dish, תַּמְחוּי). Lastly we have to name the minister, Hebr. חַזָּן הַכְּנֶסֶת; Greek ὑπηρέτης. His office was to bring forth the Holy Scriptures at public worship and to put them by again. He was in every respect the servant of the congregation, having e.g. to execute upon those condemned to it the punishment of scourging, and also to instruct children in reading. The שְׁלִיחַ צִבּוּר, who had to pronounce the prayer at public worship in the name of the congregation, is also generally regarded as one of its officers. In truth however the prayer was not said by a permanent officer, but by any member of the congregation (see below on Public Worship). Hence whoever said the prayer in the name of the congregation was always called שְׁלִיחַ צִבּוּר, "plenipotentiary of the congregation." And the "ten unemployed men" (עֲשָׂרָה בַטְלָנִין, decem otiosi), whose business it was, especially in the post-Talmudic period, to be always present for a fee in the synagogue at public worship, for the purpose of making up the number of ten members required for a religious assembly, are still less than the Sheliach-Zibbur to be regarded as officials. Besides, the arrangement was still quite unknown in the time of the Mishna. The expression itself occurs indeed in the Mishna, but it can originally have designated none else than such persons as were not prevented by business from visiting the synagogue

even on week days. For on the Sabbath every Israelite was unemployed, and therefore otiosum esse would be no specific mark of individuals. That such is the meaning also in this passage of the Mishna is quite clear from the context. Hence the usual Sabbath day worship is not even thought of in it; and still less is it said, that in every congregation ten unemployed men must be present. On the contrary, it is only stated, as a mark of a large town, that even on week days there was always without difficulty a sufficient number of synagogue frequenters present. It was not till considerably later, that the above-named arrangement was made, and an altered meaning thus given to the term.

The building, in which the congregation assembled for public worship, was called בֵּית הַכְּנֶסֶת, Aramaic בֵּי כְנִישְׁתָּא or merely כְּנִישְׁתָּא, Greek συναγωγή or προσευχή. The designations συναγώγιον, προσευκτήρον and σαββατεῖον appear in single instances. Synagogues were built by preference outside the towns and near rivers, or on the seashore for the sake of giving every one a convenient opportunity for performing such Levitical purification as might be necessary before attending public worship. The size and architecture were of course very various. In northern Galilee ruins of ancient synagogues are preserved to the present time, the oldest of which are of the second, nay possibly of the first century after Christ. They may perhaps give an idea of the style of building employed for synagogues in the time of Christ. The large synagogue at Alexandria is said to have had the form of a Basilica. It is possible, that they were sometimes built like theatres, without a roof, but this is only really testified concerning those of the Samaritans. It is certainly true, that on their fast days the Jews did not offer their public prayers in the synagogue, but in an open space, perhaps also at the sea-shore. But this was done in quite open spaces, and does not prove the existence of unroofed buildings. Still more improbable is it, that just such buildings were called προσευχαί in a narrower sense, in distinction from the synagogues proper (as was after the precedent of others, admitted in the 1st edition of this work). For the testimony of Epiphanius, the supposed chief authority, by no means proves this. The Acts of the Apostles seems rather to speak for a distinction between the terms προσευχή and συναγωγή, since here, chap. 16:13, 16, a προσευχή is spoken of at Philippi, and then directly after, chap. 17:1, a συναγωγή at Thessalonica. If however any distinction at all is to exist, it can only be, that the προσευχή was intended solely for prayer, the συναγωγή for other acts of worship also. But even this distinction is untenable in Acts 16:13, 16, since here the προσευχή is evidently the usual place of the Sabbath assembly, in which Paul also embraces the opportunity of preaching. And since, on the other hand, Philo in particular uses the word of the synagogue proper, no material distinction can be established between the two expressions.

Considering the value laid on these Sabbath assemblies, we must assume that there was in every town of Palestine, and even in smaller places, at least one synagogue. In the post-Talmudic period it was required, that a synagogue should be built wherever but ten Israelites were dwelling together. In the pre-Talmudic age indeed this requirement cannot be literally shown to have existed, though quite in agreement with its spirit. In the larger towns there was a considerable number of synagogues, as e.g. in Jerusalem, Alexandria, Rome. The different synagogues of one and the same town seem to have been sometimes distinguished from each other by special emblems. Thus there was in Sepphoris a “synagogue of the vine” (כניש̇תא דגופנא), in Rome a synagogue of the olive tree (συναγωγὴ ἐλαίας).

The fittings of the synagogues were in New Testament times very simple. The chief was the closet (תֵּיבָה) in which were kept the rolls of the law and the other sacred books. These were wrapped in linen cloths (מִטְפָּחוֹת), and lay in a case (תִּיק = θήκη). An elevated place (בימה =

βῆμα, tribune), upon which stood the reading-desk, was erected, at least in post-Talmudic times, for him who read the Scriptures aloud or preached. Both are mentioned in the Jerusalem Talmud, and may well be assumed for the time of Christ. Among other fittings, lamps may also be mentioned. Lastly trombones (שׁוֹפָרוֹת) and trumpets (חֲצוֹצְרוֹת) were indispensable instruments in public worship. The former were blown especially on the first day of the year, the latter on the feast days.

The order of divine worship was in New Testament times already tolerably developed and established. The congregation sat in an appointed order, the most distinguished members in the front seats, the younger behind; men and women probably apart. In the great synagogue at Alexandria the men are said to have sat apart according to their respective trades (אוּמָנוּת). If there was a leper in the community a special division was prepared for him. So at least the Mishna required. Ten individuals were necessary to form a regular assembly for public worship (see above, vol. ii. p. 67). The chief parts of the service were, according to the Mishna, the recitation of the Shema, prayer, the reading of the Thorah, the reading of the prophets, the blessing of the priest. To these were added the translation of the portions of Scripture read, which is assumed in the Mishna (see below), and the explanation of what had been read by an edifying discourse, which in Philo figures as the chief matter in the whole service.

The Shema, so called from its commencing words, יִשְׂרָאֵל, consists of the sections Deut. 6:4–9, 11:13–21, Num. 15:37–41, together with certain benedictions before and after (see particulars in Appendix). It was always distinguished from prayer proper, and is rather a confession of faith than a prayer. Hence the “reciting” not the “praying” of the Shema is spoken of (קריאת שמע). As the Shema undoubtedly belongs to the times of Christ, it is evident that certain established prayers were then already customary in public worship. It can however hardly be ascertained, how much of the somewhat copiously developed liturgy of post-Talmudic Judaism reaches back to that period. The formula by which the reader summoned to prayer, בָּרְכוּ אֶת יהוה, is expressly mentioned in the Mishna. The custom too of praying the three first and three last benedictions of the Shemoneh Esreh (of which particulars are given in the Appendix) at Sabbath and festival worship, reaches back to the age of the Mishna. It was the custom to pray standing and with the face turned towards the Holy of Holies, i.e. towards Jerusalem. The prayer was not uttered by the whole congregation, but by some one called upon for this office (the שְׁלִיחַ צִבּוּר) by the ruler of the synagogue, the congregation making only certain responses, especially the אָמֵן. He who pronounced the prayer stepped in front of the chest in which lay the rolls of the law. Hence עָבַר לִפְנֵי הַתֵּיבָה is the usual expression for “to lead in prayer.” Every adult member of the congregation was competent to do this. The same individual, who said the prayer, might also recite the Shema, read the lesson from the prophets and, if he were a priest, pronounce the blessing.

The Scripture lessons (from both the Pentateuch and the prophets) might also be read by any member of the congregation, and even by minors. The latter were only excluded from reading the Book of Esther at the feast of Purim. If priests and Levites were present, they took precedence in reading the lesson. It was customary for the reader to stand (Luke 4:16: ἀνέστη ἀναγνῶναι). Both sitting and standing were allowed at the reading of the Book of Esther, and the king was also allowed to sit when he read his portion of Scripture at the feast of Tabernacles in the Sabbatic year. The lesson from the Thorah was so arranged that the whole Pentateuch consecutively was got through in a cycle of three years, for which purpose it was divided into 154 sections (פָּרְשִׁיּוֹת). On Sabbaths several members of the congregation, at the least seven, who were summoned for the purpose by some official, originally indeed by the ruler of the

synagogue, took part in the reading. The first and the last of these had to pronounce a thanksgiving (בְּרָכָה) at the beginning and at the end. Each had (at the reading of the Thorah) to read at least three verses, and might never repeat them by heart. Such at least was the order prescribed by the Mishna, which certainly was observed only in the synagogues of Palestine. The Talmud expressly remarks of non-Hebraist Jews, that among them the whole Parashah was always read by one; and with this agrees Philo, who evidently assumes that the lesson from the Thorah was read by one person (see the passages, vol. ii. p. 76). The reading of the law was already followed in New Testament times by a paragraph from the prophets (i.e. the נְבִיאִים, which include the older historical books), as we see from Luke 4:17, where Jesus reads a section from Isaiah, and from Acts 13:15: ἀνάγνωσις τοῦ νόμου καὶ τῶν προφητῶν. These lessons from the prophets are mentioned also in the Mishna. As these formed the conclusion of the reading from the Scriptures, it was called הִפְטִיר בַּנָּבִיא (to close with the prophet), on which account the prophetic paragraphs were called Haphtaroth. For these no lectio continua was required; hence a choice of them was open, and they were always read by one person. They were moreover only read at the chief services on the Sabbath, and not also at week-day and Sabbath afternoon services.

The sacred language in which the sections of Scripture were read aloud being no longer familiar to the bulk of the people, it was necessary to ensure their better understanding by translation. Hence the reading was accompanied by a continuous translation into the Aramaic dialect. Whether the translator (מְתוּרְגְּמָן) was a permanent official, or whether any competent members of the congregation officiated by turns as interpreters, must, in the absence of more definite evidence, be here left uncertain. In the lesson from the Thorah the reader had to read one verse at a time for the translator, in the lesson from the prophets three, unless one verse formed a separate paragraph, when he was then to read it also alone.

The reading of the Scriptures was followed by an edifying lecture or sermon (דְּרָשָׁה), by which the portion which had been read was explained and applied. That such explanations were the general practice is evident from the διδάσκειν ἐν ταῖς συναγωγαῖς, so frequently mentioned in the New Testament, from Luke 4:20 sqq., and from the express testimony of Philo (see above, p. 76). The preacher (דַּרְשָׁן) used to sit (Luke 4:20: ἐκάθισεν) on an elevated place. Nor was such preaching confined to appointed persons, but, as appears especially from Philo, open to any competent member of the congregation. The service closed with the blessing, pronounced by a priestly member of the congregation, to which the whole congregation responded (אָמֵן). If no priest were present, the blessing was not pronounced, but made into a prayer.

The order above described is that of the principal service on the forenoon of the Sabbath. The congregation assembled also on the Sabbath afternoon at the time of the Minchah offering. When then Philo says, that the Sabbath assemblies lasted μέχρι σχεδὸν δείλης ὀψίας (see above, p. 76), this is not without foundation considering the length of these services. At the afternoon service no lesson from the prophets, but only one from the Pentateuch, was read. And only three members of the congregation, neither more nor less, took part in the reading. The same order was also observed at week-day services, which were regularly held on the second and fifth week-days (Mondays and Fridays). There was also a meeting for the reading of the Thorah, in which four members of the congregation shared in the Parashah. Nor was there any festival in the year, which was not distinguished by public worship and reading from the law; and the Mishna prescribed lessons from the Pentateuch for every festival.

APPENDIX

The Shema and the Shemoneh Esreh

The Shema and the Shemoneh Esreh occupy, on the one hand from their antiquity, on the other from the high estimation in which they were held, so prominent a position in the Jewish liturgy, that further particulars concerning them must here be given.

1. The Shema consists of the three paragraphs, Deut. 6:4-9, 11:13-21, and Num. 15:37-41; therefore of those passages of the Pentateuch, in which is chiefly inculcated that Jehovah alone is the God of Israel, and in which the use of certain mementos is prescribed for the constant remembrance of Him. The three paragraphs are expressly named in the Mishna by the words with which they begin: (1) וְהָיָה אִם שָׁמֹעַ (2) ,שְׁמַע, and (3) וַיֹּאמֶר. Around this nucleus are grouped at the beginning and end thanksgivings (Berachahs); and the Mishna prescribes that two benedictions should be said before, and one after, the morning Shema, and two before, and two after, the evening Shema. The initial words of the concluding benediction are cited in the Mishna just as they are used to this day, viz. אֱמֶת וְיַצִּיב. If then the wording of the benedictions was subsequently considerably increased, they still belong fundamentally to the period of the Mishna. This prayer, or more correctly this confession of faith, was to be said twice a day, viz. morning and evening, by every adult male Israelite; women, slaves and children were not required to repeat it. It was not necessary that it should be recited in Hebrew, any other language being admissible for the purpose. How ancient this custom of repeating the Shema was, appears from the fact that the Mishna already gives such detailed directions concerning it. It mentions moreover that it was already repeated by the priests in the temple, which assumes the use of it at least before A.D. 70. Nay, for Josephus the origin of this custom is lost in so hoar an antiquity, that he regards it as an enactment of Moses himself.

2. The Shemoneh Esreh. Somewhat more recent than the Shema, but still very ancient as to its groundwork, is the Shemoneh Esreh, i.e. the chief prayer, which every Israelite, even women, slaves and children, had to repeat three times a day, viz. morning, afternoon (at the time of the Minchah offering) and evening. It is so much the chief prayer of the Israelite, that it is also called merely הַתְּפִלָּה, "the prayer." In its final, authentic and fixed form it does not consist, as its name שְׁמוֹנֶה עֶשְׂרֵה denotes, of eighteen, but of nineteen Berachahs. Its words, as given in every Jewish prayer-book, are as follow: —

"1. Blessed art thou, O Lord, our God and the God of our fathers, the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac, the God of Jacob, the great God, the mighty and tremendous, the Most High God, who bestowest gracious favours and createst all things, and rememberest the piety of the patriarchs, and wilt bring a redeemer to their posterity, for the sake of Thy name in love. O King, who bringest help and healing and art a shield. Blessed art Thou, O Lord, the shield of Abraham. 2. Thou art mighty for ever, O Lord; Thou restorest life to the dead, Thou art mighty to save; who sustainest the living with beneficence, quicken est the dead with great mercy, supporting the fallen and healing the sick, and setting at liberty those who are bound, and upholding Thy faithfulness unto those who sleep in the dust. Who is like unto Thee, Lord, the Almighty One; or who can be compared unto Thee, O King, who killest and makest alive again, and causest help to spring forth? And faithful art Thou to quicken the dead: Blessed art Thou, O Lord, who restorest the dead. 3. Thou art holy and Thy name is holy, and the saints daily praise Thee. Selah. Blessed art Thou, O Lord; the God most holy. 4. Thou graciously impartest to man knowledge, and teachest to mortals reason. Let us be favoured from Thee with knowledge, understanding and wisdom. Blessed art Thou, O Lord, who graciously impartest knowledge. 5. Cause us to turn, O our Father, to Thy law, and draw us near, O our King, to Thy service, and restore us in perfect repentance to Thy presence. Blessed art Thou, O Lord, who delightest in

repentance. 6. Forgive us, our Father, for we have sinned; pardon us, our King, for we have transgressed; ready to pardon and forgive Thou art. Blessed art Thou, O Lord, most gracious, who dost abundantly pardon. 7. Look, we beseech Thee, upon our afflictions, and plead our cause and redeem us speedily for the sake of Thy name, for a mighty Redeemer Thou art. Blessed art Thou, O Lord, the Redeemer of Israel. 8. Heal us, O Lord, and we shall be healed; save us, and we shall be saved; for our praise art Thou; and bring forth a perfect remedy unto all our infirmities; for a God and King, a faithful healer, and most merciful art Thou. Blessed art Thou, O Lord, who healest the diseases of Thy people Israel. 9. Bless unto us, O Lord our God, this year and grant us an abundant harvest, and bring a blessing on our land, and satisfy us with Thy goodness; and bless our year as the good years. Blessed art Thou, O Lord, who blessest the years. 10. Sound with the great trumpet to announce our freedom; and set up a standard to collect our captives, and gather us together from the four corners of the earth. Blessed art Thou, O Lord, who gatherest the outcasts of Thy people Israel. 11. O restore our judges as formerly, and our counsellors as at the beginning; and remove from us sorrow and sighing; and reign over us, Thou O Lord alone, in grace and mercy; and justify us. Blessed art Thou, O Lord the King, for Thou lovest Righteousness and justice. 12. To slanderers let there be no hope, and let all workers of wickedness perish as in a moment; and let all of them speedily be cut off; and humble them speedily in our days. Blessed art Thou, O Lord, who destroyest enemies and humblest tyrants. 13. Upon the just and upon the pious and upon the elders of Thy people the house of Israel, and upon the remnant of their scribes, and upon righteous strangers, and upon us, bestow, we beseech Thee, Thy mercy, O Lord our God, and grant a good reward unto all who confide in Thy name faithfully; and appoint our portion with them for ever, and may we never be put to shame, for our trust is in Thee. Blessed art Thou, O Lord, the support and confidence of the righteous. 14. And to Jerusalem Thy city return with compassion, and dwell therein as Thou hast promised; and rebuild her speedily in our days, a structure everlasting; and the throne of David speedily establish therein. Blessed art Thou, O Lord, the builder of Jerusalem. 15. The offspring of David Thy servant speedily cause to flourish, and let his horn be exalted in Thy salvation; for Thy salvation do we hope daily. Blessed art Thou, O Lord, who causest the horn of salvation to flourish. 16. Hear our voice, O Lord our God, pity and have mercy upon us, and accept with compassion and favour these our prayers, for Thou art a God who heareth prayers and supplications; and from Thy presence, O our King, send us not empty away, for Thou hearest the prayers of Thy people Israel in mercy. Blessed art Thou, O Lord, who hearest prayer. 17. Be pleased, O Lord our God, with Thy people Israel, and with their prayers; and restore the sacrificial service to the Holy of Holies of Thy house; and the offerings of Israel, and their prayers in love do Thou accept with favour; and may the worship of Israel Thy people be ever pleasing. O that our eyes may behold Thy return to Zion with mercy. Blessed art Thou, O Lord, who restorest Thy glory (שְׁכִינָה) unto Zion. 18. We praise Thee, for Thou art the Lord our God and the God of our fathers for ever and ever; the Rock of our life, the Shield of our salvation, Thou art for ever and ever. We will render thanks unto Thee, and declare Thy praise, for our lives which are delivered into Thy hand, and for our souls which are deposited with Thee, and for Thy miracles which daily are with us; and for Thy wonders and Thy goodness, which are at all times, evening and morning and at noon. Thou art good for Thy mercies fail not, and compassionate for Thy loving-kindness never ceaseth; our hopes are for ever in Thee. And for all this praised and extolled be Thy name, our King, for ever and ever. And all that live shall give thanks unto Thee for ever, Selah, and shall praise Thy name in truth; the God of our salvation and our aid for ever. Selah. Blessed art Thou, O Lord, for all-bountiful is Thy name, and unto Thee it becometh us to give thanks. 19. Great salvation bring over Israel Thy people for ever, for Thou art King, Lord of all salvation. Praised be Thou, Lord, for Thou blessest Thy people Israel with salvation."

From the contents of this prayer it is evident, that it first attained its finally authentic form after the destruction of Jerusalem, that is, after A.D. 70. For it presupposes in its 14th and 17th Berachah the destruction of the city and the cessation of the sacrificial service. On the other hand, it is already cited in the Mishna under the name שְׁמוֹנֶה עֶשְׂרֵה, and it is mentioned, that R. Gamaliel II., R. Joshua, R. Akiba and R. Elieser – all authorities of the beginning of the second century – debated whether all the eighteen thanksgivings or only a selection from them must be said daily, also in what manner the additions concerning the rainy season and the Sabbath should be inserted, and in what form to pray on New Year's day. Hence it must have virtually attained its present form about A.D. 70-100, and its groundwork may safely be regarded as considerably more ancient. This inference is confirmed by the definite information of the Talmud, that Simon the cotton dealer at Jabne in the time of Gamaliel II. arranged the eighteen thanksgivings according to their order, and that Samuel the Little, at R. Gamaliel's invitation, inserted the prayer against apostates (מִינִים), which makes it consist, not of eighteen, but of nineteen sections.

LIFE UNDER THE LAW

I

ALL zeal for education in the family, the school and the synagogue aimed at making the whole people a people of the law. The common man too was to know what the law commanded, and not only to know, but to do it. His whole life was to be ruled according to the norm of the law; obedience thereto was to become a fixed custom, and departure therefrom an inward impossibility. On the whole this object was to a great degree attained. Josephus declares: “Even if we are deprived of wealth, of towns, and of other possessions, the law remains to us for ever. And no Jew will be so far from his native land, nor so much fear a hostile ruler, as not to fear the law more than him.” So faithfully did most of the Jews adhere to their law, that they willingly incurred even torture and death itself in consequence. “Often already,” says Josephus, “have many of the prisoners been seen to endure the rack and all kinds of death in theatres, for the sake of not uttering a word against the law and the other Holy Scriptures.”

But what were the motives, whence sprang this enthusiasm for the law, what the means whereby it obtained this enormous sway over minds? To answer briefly: it was faith in Divine retribution, and that a retribution in the strictest juristic sense. The prophetic idea of the covenant, which God had entered into with the chosen people, was apprehended in the purely juristic sense; the covenant was a legal one, by which both the contracting parties were mutually bound. The people to observe the law given them by God, exactly, accurately and conscientiously: while God was also bound in return to pay the promised recompense in proportion to their performances. And the obligation held good not only with respect to the nation as a whole, but to every individual; performance and recompense always stood in corresponding relations to each other. He who did much had to expect from God’s justice the bestowal of much reward; while on the other hand every trangression entailed its corresponding punishment. The externalism with which this belief in retribution weighed, on the one side transgression and punishment, on the other the fulfilment of the law and reward by each other, will appear from what follows: “Seven different plagues came into the world on account of seven chief transgressions. (1) If part of the people tithe their fruits and part do not, such a famine arises through drought that part of the people are in want and part have enough. (2) If no one tithes, there follows a famine from the devastations of war and from drought. (3) If nowhere the heave dough has been separated, a famine consuming all arises. (4) A pestilence rages when such crimes gain the upper hand as have in Scripture the penalty of death pronounced upon them, but whose perpetrators are not delivered up to justice for its execution. (5) War devastates the land because of delay of sentences, turning aside of law and illegal interpretation of Scripture, (6) Wild beasts get the upper hand on account of perjury and the desecration of the divine name. (7) Carrying away into foreign lands is the punishment for idolatry, incest, murder, and neglect of the Sabbatic year.” With like conscientiousness was the reward for the fulfilling of the law computed. “Whoever fulfils only one law, good is appointed to him, his days are prolonged, and he will inherit the land.” “According to the proportion of pains taken will be the reward” (לְפוּם צַעֲרָא אַגְרָא). “Know that everything is taken account of” (דַּע שֶׁהַכֹּל לְפִי הַחֶשְׁבּוֹן). Thus every fulfilment of the law involves its corresponding reward. And God only gave so many commandments and so many laws to the people of Israel, that they might obtain great rewards. Both punishment and reward are bestowed on men in the present life. But full retribution does not follow till the life to come, the

עוֹלָם הַבָּא. Then will all seeming inequalities be reconciled. He, who was in this life visited with sorrows, notwithstanding his righteousness, will then receive the fuller reward. But apart from this, full recompense does not take place till the world to come. For the present world is still a world of imperfection and of evil. In the future world all weakness will cease. Then will Israel, both as a nation and as individuals, be rewarded for a faithful fulfilling of the law by a life of undisturbed happiness. Good works – such as reverence of parents, benevolence, peace-making among neighbours, and above all the study of the law – may therefore be looked upon as a capital, whose interest is already enjoyed in this life, while the capital itself remains for the life to come. This hope of a future retribution was therefore the mainspring of all zeal for the law. Nay the entire religious life of the Jewish people during the period of which we are treating just revolved round these two poles: Fulfilment of the law and hope of future glory. Zeal for the former derived its vitality from the latter. The saying of Antigonus of Socho: "Be not like servants who serve their master for the sake of reward, but be like those who do service without respect to reward," is by no means a correct expression of the keynote of Pharisaic Judaism, which was in fact like the servants who serve for the sake of recompense.

To what results then did this zeal for the law lead? They corresponded with its motives. As the motives were essentially of an external kind, so also was the result an incredible externalizing of the religious and moral life. This result was indeed inevitable, when once religion was made into law, and that indeed in such wise, that all religion was made to consist in nothing else, than in the strict obedience to a law, which regulated the civil and social as well as the individual life in all its relations. By this view of religious duty, which forms the characteristic distinction of post-exilian Judaism, the whole religious and moral life was drawn down into the sphere of law, and the result necessarily was as follows: (1) First of all the individual life was thus regulated by a norm, whose application to this sphere at all is an evil. The province of law is simply to order the relations of men to one another according to certain standards. Its object is not the individual as such, but only civil society as a whole. The functions of the latter are to be so regulated, that the fulfilment of his individual task within this framework is to be made possible to each. The application of the legal norm to the individual life therefore of itself subjects the latter to a false standard. For if external constraint is of the essence of law, freedom is of the essence of moral action. The moral life of the individual is a healthy one, only when it is governed by internal motives. Its regulation by external standards is an adulteration of it in its very principle. (2) The application of the legal norm to the religious and moral life also involves the placing of the most varying avocations of life upon a level, as though of equal value. For every employment is regulated absolutely by the law, not merely the behaviour of men to one another in the State and in society, but also those most special manifestations of the inner life of the individual: how he shows his gratitude to God or evidences his repentance for sins he has committed, how he manifesta his love to his neighbour, how he fashions his daily life in its most external respects, in manners and customs. All falls under the same point of view – under the norm of the law, and that a law which comes forward with Divine authority. Thus the purport of an act is comparatively indifferent. Merely conventional demeanour in outward matters and ceremonies is of the same value as the fulfilment of the highest religious and moral duties. The former is raised to the rank of the latter, and the latter lowered to that of the former. There is always and everywhere only one duty – the fulfilling of the law, i.e. the fulfilling of all that has once been commanded by God, no matter of what kind it may be. (3) Hence it is self-evident, that all in reality depends upon satisfying the law. There is no higher task in the department of law. If the requirement of the law is exactly fulfilled, duty is satisfied. Thus the only question that can be raised is: what is commanded? and what must be done that the commandment may be fulfilled? That every art should be directed only to compounding with the letter of the law is an inevitable

consequence. This task will perhaps be aggravated, more rather than less will be done for the sake of meeting in practice the whole extent of the law. But still one purpose only will be kept in view, that of satisfying the letter. And this cannot be done without damage to the substance. The real value of the good is left out of account. Not the doing of the good as such, but merely formal accuracy in fulfilling the letter of the law is the aim. And notwithstanding all zeal, nay just because of it, true morality must of necessity be a loser. (4) Lastly the purely formal point of sight has the further consequence, that the moral duty is split up into an endless atomistic multitude of separate duties and obligations. All law is necessarily casuistic, for it lays down a multiplicity of individual statutes. All casuistry is by its nature endless. The one case may have been divided into ever so many sub-species; but each sub-species can again be split into sub-divisions, and there is here no end to the dividing. The most conspicuous proof of this is furnished by the marvellous labours of the Pharisaic scribes. With all their diligence and acuteness in making distinctions, they never came to an end. But the testimony cannot be refused them, that they really worked hard to do so. Jewish law became in their hands a widely ramified science. They cut up the law into thousands upon thousands of single commands, and thus, as far as in them lay, set up a rule for the direction of every conceivable case of practical life. Marvellous however as were their performances, it is here that their most grievous error is found. All free moral action was now completely crushed under the burden of numberless separate statutory requirements. The greater their number, the more fatal is the effect of the fundamental error of transferring the juristic mode of treatment to the region of religion and morality. In every department of life action no longer proceeds from inward motive, is no longer the free manifestation of a moral disposition, but results from the external constraint of statutory requirement. And such requirement reaches equally to everything, to the greatest as to the least, to the most important as to the most indifferent; every act, whether great or trifling, when estimated by a moral standard, is now of the same value; there is but one point of view for all: to do what is commanded, because it is commanded. And thus there is of course no higher vocation, than to be faithful to the letter for the letter's sake. All depends, not on the inward motive, but on the external correctness of an action. And all this petty and mistaken zeal insisted finally on being the true and genuine service of God. The more men wearied themselves out with it, the more they thought to gain the Divine approbation. As St. Paul says: ζῆλον θεοῦ ἔχουσιν, ἀλλ' οὐ κατ' ἐπίγνωσιν (Rom. 10:2). How far this unwise zeal for God went astray, and what a heavy burden it laid upon the life of the Israelite, may be made evident by a series of concrete examples.

II

One of the most important points, both with respect to its extent and the value attributed to it, was that of Sabbath sanctification. The brief prohibition of work on the Sabbath which is found in the Pentateuch, and which hardly at all enters into detail (Ex. 16:23-30, 20:8-11, 23:12, 31: 12-17, 34:21, 35:1-3; Lev. 23:3; Num. 15:32-36; Deut. 5:12-15. Comp. Jer. 17:21-24; Amos 7:5; Neh. 10:32, 13:15 sqq.), was in the course of time developed in so many-sided a manner as to form of itself an extensive branch of knowledge. For of course the Rabbis could not rest satisfied with this simple prohibition. They must also accurately define what work was forbidden. And consequently they at last, with much ingenuity, got out of it, that on the whole thirty-nine kinds of work were prohibited, but very few are of course anywhere alluded to in the Pentateuch. These thirty-nine prohibited works are: (1) sowing, (2) ploughing, (3) reaping, (4) binding sheaves, (5) threshing, (6) winnowing, (7) cleansing crops, (8) grinding, (9) sifting, (10) kneading, (11) baking, (12) shearing wool, (13) washing, (14) beating, (15) dyeing, (16) spinning, and (17) warping it, (18) making two cords, (19) weaving two threads, (20) separating

two threads, (21) making a knot, (22) untying a knot, (23) sewing two stitches, (24) tearing to sew two stitches, (25) catching a deer, (26) killing, (27) skinning, and (28) salting it, (29) preparing its skin, (30) scraping off the hair, (31) cutting it up, (32) writing two letters, (33) blotting out for the purpose of writing two letters, (34) building, (35) pulling down, (36) putting out a fire, (37) lighting a fire, (38) beating smooth with a hammer, (39) carrying from one tenement to another.

Each of these chief enactments again require further discussions concerning their range and meaning. And here, properly speaking, begins the work of casuistry. We will bring forward just a few of its results. According to Ex. 34, ploughing and reaping were among the forbidden works. But to gather a few ears of corn was already looked upon as reaping. When on one occasion the disciples did this on the Sabbath, they were found fanlt with by the Pharisees, not on account of plucking the ears, which (according to Deut 23:26) was permitted, but because they were thus guilty of doing reaping work on the Sabbath (Matt 12:1, 2; Mark 2:23, 24; Luke 6:1, 2). The prohibition of making and untying a knot (Nos. 21 and 22) was much too general to rest satisfied with. It was also necessary to state to what kind of knot this applied, and to what it did not "The following are the knots, the making of which renders a man guilty: The knot of camel-drivers and that of sailors; and as one is guilty by reason of tying, so also of untying them. R. Meir says: Guilt is not incurred by reason of a knot, which can be untied with one hand. There are knots by reason of which one is not guilty, as one is in the case of the camel-driver's and sailor's knots. A woman may tie up a slit in her shift and the strings of her cap, those of her girdle, the straps of the shoes and sandals, of skins of wine and oil, of a pot with meat" And to tie strings of the girdle being permitted, it was agreed that a pail also might be tied over the well with a girdle, but not with a rope. The prohibition of writing on the Sabbath (No. 32) was further defined as follows: "He who writes two letters with his right or his left hand, whether of one kind or of two kinds, as also if they are written with different ink or are of different languages, is guilty. He even who should from forgetfulness write two letters is guilty, whether he has written them with ink or with paint, red chalk, India-rubber, vitriol, or anything which makes permanent marks. Also he who writes on two walls which form an angle, or on the two tablets of his account-book, so that they can be read together, is guilty. He who writes upon his body is guilty. If any one writes with dark fluid, with fruit juice, or in the dust on the road, in sand, or in anything in which the writing does not remain, he is free. If any one writes with the wrong hand, with the foot, with the mouth, with the elbow; also if any one writes upon a letter of another piece of writing, or covers other writing; also if any one meaning to write ח has only written two ז ז, or if any one has written one letter on the ground and one upon the wall, or upon two walls of the house, or upon two pages of a book, so that they cannot be read together, he is free. If in forgetfulness he writes two letters at different times, perhaps one in the morning and one towards evening, R. Gamaliel pronounces him guilty, the learned declare him free." According to Ex. 16:23, it was forbidden to bake and to boil on the Sabbath. Hence the food, which it was desired to eat hot on the Sabbath, was to be prepared before its commencement, and kept warm by artificial means. In doing this however care must be taken, that the existing heat was not increased, which would have been "boiling." Hence the food must be put only into such substances as would maintain its heat, not into such as might possibly increase it. "Food to be kept warm for the Sabbath must not be put into oil-dregs, manure, salt, chalk, or sand, whether moist or dry, nor into straw, grape-skins, flock, or vegetables, if these are damp, though it may if they are dry. It may, however, be put into clothes, amidst fruits, pigeons' feathers, and flax-tow. R. Jehudah declares flax-tow unallowable, and permits only coarse tow." According to Ex. 35:3, it was forbidden to kindle a fire on the Sabbath. This prohibition was supplemented by that of extinguishing a fire. With regard to the latter, the question arose, how it was to be observed,

when a non-Israelite approached a fire. “If a non-Israelite comes to extinguish a fire, one must neither say to him: ‘put it out,’ nor ‘do not put it out,’ and that because one is not obliged to make him rest.” It is self-evident that the prohibition to extinguish fire would be extended to lights and lamps. Concerning these it was ordained as follows: “He who extinguishes a light because he is afraid of heathen, robbers, or the evil spirit, or for the sake of one sick, that he may sleep, is free. If it is done however to save the oil, the lamp, or the wick, he is guilty. R. Joses declares him in each case free, except with respect to the wick, because he thus prepares, as it were, a coal.” “A vessel may be placed under a lamp to catch the sparks, but water may not be put therein, lest the lamp be extinguished.” Very specially copious material for discussion was furnished by the last of the thirty-nine chief works, the carrying a burden from one tenement to another (הַמוֹצִיא מֵרְשׁוּת), which was, according to Jer. 17:21-24, forbidden. We shall see farther on, what refined sophistry was applied towards enlarging the notion of the רְשׁוּת. It may here be briefly mentioned, that even the bulk of what might not be carried from one place to another on the Sabbath was exactly determined. Thus e.g. he was guilty of Sabbath desecration who carried out so much food as was equal in weight to a dry fig, or so much wine as was enough for mixing in a goblet, or milk enough for one swallow, honey enough to put upon a wound, oil enough to anoint a small member, water enough to moisten an eye-salve, paper enough to wiite a custom-house notice upon, parchment enough to write the shortest portion of the Tephillin, i.e. the שמע ישראל, upon, ink enough to write two letters, reed enough to make a pen of, etc. It was forbidden also to carry such garments as did not belong to clothing proper. A warrior might not go out with coat of mail, helmet, greaves, sword, bow, shield, or spear. A cripple might, according to R. Meir, go out with his wooden leg, R. Joses, on the other hand, does not allow it. Only on the breaking out of a fire are some concessions made with respect to burden-bearing. “All the Holy Scriptures may be saved from a conflagration. The case of the book may be saved with the book, that of the Tephillin with the Tephillin, even if there is money in it. Food for the three Sabbath meals may be saved. If a fire breaks out on the evening of the Sabbath, let food be saved for three meals; if it takes place in the forenoon, for two; if in the afternoon, for one only. A basketful of bread may also be saved, even if enough for a hundred meals, a cake of figs, a cask of wine.”

The caution of these guardians of the law did not however confine itself to asserting what was forbidden on the Sabbath itself. They extended their prohibitions to every transaction, which might only possibly lead to a desecration of the Sabbath. This prophylactic care was the cause of the following enactments: “Let not a tailor go out at twilight with his needle, for he might forget (when the Sabbath begins) and go out with it. Nor the writer with his reed.” “Meat, onions and eggs may not be cooked, unless there is time to cook them by day. Bread may not be put into the oven in the twilight, nor cakes upon the coals, unless their surfaces can harden while it is still day. R. Elieser says: If there is only time for the under surface to harden.” Caution goes still farther, when e.g. it is forbidden to read by lamplight on the Sabbath, or to cleanse clothing from vermin. For both are transactions in which a clear light is especially necessary. And thus there is obviously a temptation to stoop the lamp for the purpose of leading more oil to it, and this would offend against the prohibition of kindling fire. Hence these actions are altogether forbidden. It is indeed permitted to a schoolmaster to take care how children read by light. But he himself may not read by a light.

Besides these thirty-nine chief works, many other actions and employments, which cannot be summed up under any of them, are also forbidden. We learn of some of them e.g. from the following prescription with regard to the holy days (on which the rest was less strict). “All things, by which punishment is incurred on the Sabbath, because of their breaking its rest, or because

of acts arbitrary in themselves, or acts legal at other times, are also not allowed on the holy day. The following because of the rest: one may not climb a tree, ride upon a horse, swim in the water, clap with the hands, strike upon the hips, or dance. The following because the acts are arbitrary: one may not hold a court of justice, acquire a wife by earnest money, pull off the shoe (the Chaliza on account of a refusal of levirate marriage), nor consummate levirate marriage. The following because they are legal transactions: one may not consecrate anything, put a value on anything, devote anything, nor separate heave and tithe. All this is declared unlawful on a holy day, not to mention a Sabbath." To such appointments belongs also the enactment, that no one should on the Sabbath go farther than 2000 cubits from his dwelling, i.e. from where he is at the beginning of the Sabbath. This was called the "Sabbath limit," תְּחוּם הַשַּׁבָּת, and a distance of 2000 cubits a Sabbath day's journey (Acts 1:12: σαββάτου ὁδός). How ingeniously this prescription, founded on Ex. 16:29, as well as that concerning the carrying of burdens, was evaded, will be shown farther on.

Notwithstanding the great strictness with which the commandment to hallow the Sabbath was treated, certain cases, in which exceptions were tolerated, had of necessity to be acknowledged. Some such exceptions were allowed for the sake of humanity and some on account of a still higher and more sacred command. In the latter respect the necessities of the temple-ritual came especially under consideration. The daily burnt-offering must be offered on the Sabbath also, nay a special offering besides was ordered on the Sabbath day (Num. 28:9, 10). Hence it was self-evident, that all the transactions necessary for offering these sacrifices must be lawful even on the Sabbath (Matt. 12:5: τοῖς σάββασιν οἱ ἱερεῖς ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ τὸ σάββατον βεβηλοῦσιν καὶ ἀναίτιοί εἰσιν. The acts necessary for offering the Passover sacrifice were also allowed on the Sabbath, but in this case it was very carefully settled what transactions were and what were not permitted. To the same category belongs also the command of circumcision. All that was necessary for circumcision might be done on the Sabbath, so far, that is, as it could not be done on the day before. For whatever could have been done on the day before was forbidden. For the sake of humanity it was permitted to render assistance to a woman at her delivery, and it was laid down as a general principle, that all danger to life should supersede the Sabbath (כָּל־סָפֵק נְפָשׁוֹת דּוֹחֶה אֶת הַשַּׁבָּת). "If a building falls upon any one, and it is doubtful whether he is under it or not, whether he is alive or dead, whether he is a non-Israelite or an Israelite, the ruins over him may be cleared away on the Sabbath. If he is found alive, they may be cleared farther; if he is dead, they must be left." A physician may attend a patient if he is in danger. R. Matthijah ben Charash even allowed that a remedy might on the Sabbath be put into the mouth of any one feeling pain in the throat, because it might be dangerous. This is however cited as only the opinion of this scholar, and by no means as holding good in general. At any rate medical assistance was only allowed on the assumption that life was in danger. "A fracture (of a limb) may not be attended to. If any one has sprained his hand or foot, he may not pour cold water on it." "A priest officiating in the temple may, on the Sabbath, put on again the plaister which he took off during his ministration; otherwise this may not be done; a plaister may not be put on for the first time on the Sabbath.... If a priest hurts his finger, he may on the Sabbath bind it with rushes for service in the sanctuary, otherwise this is not allowed; for the pressing out of the blood, it is everywhere forbidden." It quite agrees with this, that the enmity of the Pharisees should have been excited against Jesus on account of His cures on the Sabbath (Matt. 12:9–13; Mark 3:1–5; Luke 6:6–10, 13:10–17, 14:1–6; John 5:1–16, 9:14–16). Even the principle, that danger to life should supersede the Sabbath, was by no means regarded as at all times decisive. At the beginning of the Maccabaean rising a troup of legalists let themselves perish to the last man, rather than have recourse to the sword on the Sabbath. From that time forward it

was determined to take up the sword for defence, but not for attack upon the Sabbath. And this principle was on the whole adhered to. But use was made of it only in cases of extreme necessity. And it often happened even in later times, that hostile generals were able to make use of the Jewish Sabbath to the disadvantage of the Jews. How strictly the observance of the Sabbath was universally adhered to by Jewish soldiers, appears from the fact, that a man like Josephus regards it as a thing self-evident, and that the Romans even found themselves obliged to release the Jews entirely from military service, because Jewish Sabbatarianism and Roman discipline were irreconcilable contrasts.

III

Far deeper was the influence upon daily life of the manifold and far-reaching ordinances concerning cleanness and uncleanness and the removal of the latter, than that of the law of the Sabbath. The Old Testament (Lev. 11-15; Num. 5:1-4, and especially chap, 19) had already given tolerably numerous and stringent precepts on these points, by declaring (for what reasons may be left undiscussed) first certain incidents of sexual life, then certain appearances on persons and objects comprised under the joint term of leprosy, and lastly, the corpses of both men and animals, as unclean and imparting uncleanness. It also gives detailed prescriptions concerning purification by sacrifices or lustrations, which are of very different kinds according to the kind and degree of uncleanness. But ample as were these enactments, they are still but poor and scanty compared with the abundance stored in the Mishna. No less than twelve treatises (filling the whole of the last part of the Mishna) deal with the matters appertaining to this subject. The enumeration of the "chief kinds of uncleanness" (אָבוֹת הַטֻּמְאוֹת), which it must be owned are for the most part based on the enactments of the Pentateuch (Lev. 11-15), form the foundation of all these discussions. On this foundation however is raised an enormous and very complicated structure. For with each of the chief kinds the question has again to be dealt with: under what circumstances such uncleanness is incurred, in what manner and to what extent it is transferred to others, what utensils and objects are and what are not capable of contracting uncleanness, and lastly, what means and regulations are required for its removal. To give at least a notion to what an extensive branch of knowledge this doctrine of uncleanness had been developed, some of the enactments concerning the utensils, which do and which do not contract uncleanness and by contact propagate it, are here given. The Old Testament basis is in Num. 19:14, 15 and 31:20-24.

A main question is first of all concerning the material of which the utensils are composed, and next concerning their form: whether they are hollow or flat. With respect to hollow earthen vessels, it is determined that the air in them contracts and propagates uncleanness, as does also the hollow of the foot, but not their outer side. Their purification can only result from their being broken. But how far must the breaking go to effect purification? To this question too we receive an exact answer. A fraction is still esteemed a vessel (and therefore susceptible of defilement) "if, of a vessel holding a log, so much is left as to be able to hold enough to anoint the little toe with; and if, of a vessel holding from a log to a seah, space for a quarter of a log, from one to two seahs space for half a log; and from two or three seahs to five, space for a log is left." "While then hollow earthen vessels are not susceptible of defilement outside, though they are so within, the following earthen vessels contract no uncleanness at all: a flat plate without a rim, an open coal-shovel, a gridiron with holes in it for grains of wheat, brick gutters, although they are bent and have a hollow, and others besides. The following are, on the contrary, capable of defilement: a plate with a rim, a whole coal-shovel, a plate full of bowl-like receptacles, an earthen spice-box or a writing apparatus with several receptacles. Of wooden,

leathern, bone and glass vessels, the flat ones are also insusceptible of defilement; the deep ones, on the contrary, not only like the earthen ones, contract defilement in their atmosphere, but also on the outside. If they break, they are clean. If utensils are again made of them, they are again susceptible of defilement. Here too arises again the difficult question: When are they to be accounted broken? "In all vessels for domestic purposes the measure (of a hole producing cleanness) is a pomegranate. R. Elieser says: The measure depends upon the use of the utensil." "The pomegranate appointed as a measure is one not too large, but of a medium size." "If a foot is wanting to a chest, a trunk or a press, it is clean, although capable of holding things. R. Joses considers all these as susceptible of defilement if, though not in proper repair, they are capable of holding the measure." "A (three-footed) table, to which one foot is wanting, is clean, so is it if a second foot is gone, but if the third is also gone and it is to be used as a flat board, it is susceptible of defilement." "A seat of which one side plank is missing is clean, so is it although a second is missing. If a hand-breadth in height is left it is capable of defilement." Moreover in hollow utensils not only are the inside and outside, but also the "place for laying hold," to be distinguished. "If e.g. the hands are clean and the outside of the cup unclean, and the cup is held at the part which serves for holding, one need not be anxious lest the hands should be defiled by the outside of the cup." "Of metal vessels the smooth and the hollow are capable of defilement. If they are broken, they are clean; if vessels are again made out of them they are in their former uncleanness." "Every metal vessel, which has a special name of its own, is capable of defilement; except a door, the bolt, the lock, the hinge-socket, the hinge, the knocker and a gutter; because they are fastened to the ground." "In a bridle, the bit is capable of defilement, the plates on the cheeks are clean; according to R. Akiba, unclean. The learned say: only the bit is unclean, but the plates, only when they are fastened to it." "Round horns (for blowing) are susceptible of defilement, straight ones are clean. If the mouthpiece is of metal, it is capable of defilement." "Wood used on metal utensils is capable of defilement, metal used on wooden ones is clean. E.g. a wooden key with metal teeth is capable of defilement, even if the tooth is of only one piece. But if the key is of metal and the tooth of wood, it is not capable of defilement."

The enactments concerning the removal of defilement by sacrifices and lustrations form a fit pendant to those concerning defilement. We will here quote a few of the latter. The main question in this matter is, as to what water is adapted to the different kinds of purification: to the sprinkling of the hands, the washing of utensils, the bath of purification for persons. The Mishna distinguishes six gradations of water reservoirs: 1. A pond and the water in ditches, cisterns or pits, also spring water no longer flowing, and collected water to the amount of less than forty seahs. All this, so far as it has not been defiled, is adapted for (the preparation of) Challa, and for legal washing of the hands. 2. Spring water still running. This may be used for the heave (Terumah) and for the washing of the hands. 3. Collected water which amounts to forty seah. In this one may plunge oneself (take a bath of purification) and utensils. 4. A spring with little water, into which more drawn water has been poured. It resembles the former by purifying as a plunging bath in the place where it is collected (i.e. without running), and clean spring water, in that vessels are purified in it although there is but little of it. 5. Running water in which a change has taken place (i.e. water arising from mineral or warm springs). This purifies in running. 6. Clean spring water. This serves as a plunging-bath for running sores, for the sprinkling of lepers, and is suitable for sanctifying with ashes of purification. These general maxims then form the foundation of a casuistry, which here again loses itself in endless detail. The Mishna especially launches forth in wearying diffuseness on what conditions and prerequisites the "collected water" mentioned in No. 3 (i.e. such rain, spring or river water as is not drawn, but conducted directly through gutters or pipes into a receptacle) is fit for bathing and for plunging of

utensils, for which purpose the chief matter is that no “drawn water” should be mingled with it. We give a few examples by way of illustration. “R. Elieser says: A quarter of a log of drawn water, to begin with, makes the water, which afterwards falls into it, unfit for a plunging bath; but three logs of drawn water, if there was already other water there. The learned say: three logs, whether at the beginning or to make up the quantity.” “If any one places vessels under the pipes (which run into the plunging bath), they make the bath unsuitable (because it then counts as drawn water). According to the school of Shammai it is all the same, whether they have been placed there or forgotten; according to the school of Hillel, they do not make it unfit, if they were only forgotten.” “If drawn water and rain water are mixed in the court, or in the excavation, or upon the steps of the bathing-place, the bath is fit, if there is most of the fit water, and unfit, if there is most of the unfit, or if there is an equal quantity of both. But only so, if they were mixed before they arrived at the collected water. If both run into the bath, then if it is certain that there were in it forty seahs of proper water before three logs of drawn water fell into it, it is fit, but otherwise unfit.” It was also disputed, whether snow, hail, hoar frost, ice and the like were fit to mix in the filling of a plunging bath or not. Extremely minute too are the directions concerning the washing or correct pouring upon the hands. It was needful that the hands should always have water poured on them before eating. (To dip them in water was only necessary for eating holy things, i.e. things pertaining to sacrifices.) Then it was fully discussed, from what vessels such pouring should take place, what water was suitable for it, who might pour it, and how far the hands must be poured on. We see with what zeal all these enactments concerning the washing of hands and the cleansing of cups, pots, dishes and seats were already observed in the time of Christ, from repeated allusions in the Gospels, which again receive their full light and aptest illustration through the details of the Mishna (Matt. 15:2; Mark 7:2–5; Matt. 23:25, 26; Luke 11:38, 39).

IV

From what has been stated it is abundantly evident, what enormous importance was everywhere attributed to external correctness of action, which is indeed a self-evident result, when once moral obligations are regarded in a legal manner. Highly characteristic of this strong tendency to externalism are the three mementoes, by which every Israelite, who is faithful to the law, is to be constantly reminded of his duties towards God. These three mementoes are: 1. The Zizith (צִיצִית, plur. צִיצִיּוֹת), κράσπεδα in the LXX. and in the New Testsment, כרוספדין in the Targum Onkelos, and τὸ κόκκινον ῥάμμ in Justin Martyr, tassels or fringes of hyacinth blue or white wool, which every Israelite, by reason of the prescription, Num. 15:37 sqq., Deut. 22:12, had to wear at the four corners of his upper garment. They were to be used, as it is said in the passage first quoted, “that ye may look upon them and remember all the commandments of the Lord and do them.” 2. The Mesusa (מְזוּזָה), an oblong box, fixed to house and room doors above the right hand door-post, on which was written (according to the direction, Deut. 6:9, 11:20), in twenty-two lines, the two paragraphs, Deut. 6:4–9 and 11:13–21. 3. The Tephillin or prayer-straps, which every male Israelite had to put on at morning prayer (except on Sabbaths and holy days), in the Old Testament טוֹטָפוֹת (frontlets and bracelets), in Rabbinic Hebr. תְּפִלִּין (from תְּפִלָּה, prayer), in the New Testament φυλακτήρια (preservatives, amulets), incorrectly translated “Denkzettel” (memorandum) by Luther. Their use is founded upon the passages Ex. 13:9, 16; Deut 6:8, 11:18. There were two of them: (a) The תְּפִלָּה שֶׁל יָד (Tephilla for the hand) or תְּפִלָּה שֶׁל זְרוֹעַ (Tephilla for the arm), a small dice-shaped hollow parchment case, in which lay a small roll of parchment, on which were written the passages Ex. 13:1–10, 13:11–16; Deut. 6:4–9, 11:13–21. It was fastened by means of a strap drawn through it to the upper part of the left arm. (b) The תְּפִלָּה שֶׁל רֹאשׁ (Tephilla for the head), a case of the same kind, but differing

from the former by being divided into four compartments, holding four little rolls of parchment, on which were the above-named passages from the Bible. It was fastened by means of a strap to the forehead just below the hair. Of these three mementoes the first is at any rate founded on the directions of the Pentateuch, and probably the two others also, inasmuch as, at least in the passage of Deuteronomy, the literal interpretation is certainly the correct one (see Dillmann on Ex. 13:16). But the value which was set upon these externals, and the care with which everything was here ordered down to the smallest detail, is quite characteristic of later Judaism. How many threads the Zizith were to consist of, how long they were to be, how many knots were to be tied in them, and in what manner these were to be made, how the paragraphs of the Mesusa and Tephillin were to be written, how large the cases and how long the straps of the latter were to be, how they were to be fastened to the head and arm, and how often the straps should be bound round the latter: all this was settled with the most anxious care. There was almost as great reverence for the Tephillin as for the Scriptures. It was permitted to rescue the former as well as the latter from a fire even on the Sabbath. The Tephillin and Mesusa were held in such superstitious estimation that they were looked upon as preservatives against demoniacal powers, as is evident in the case of the former from the name φυλακτήρια.

Such external formalism is, as all can see, very far removed from true piety. The latter certainly might even under such a burden still continue to maintain a bare existence; but when besides this even prayer itself, that centre of the religious life, was bound in the fetters of a rigid mechanism, vital piety could scarcely be any longer spoken of. This fatal step had also been already taken by Judaism in the time of Christ. The two chief prayers then always customary for private use are: (1) the Shema, which was to be recited twice a day, not a prayer properly speaking, but a confession of the God of Israel; and (2) the Shemoneh Esreh, the usual daily prayer, which was to be said morning, noon and evening (particulars § 27, Appendix). These prayers too were now made the subjects of casuistic discussions, and their use was thereby degraded to an external function. This applies especially to the Shema, to which we may here the more confine ourselves, in that it is questionable, whether the Shemoneh Esreh had in the time of Christ already attained a settled form. First of all, the period of time within which the evening and morning Shema were to be said had to be exactly determined. The point of commencement for the former was the time “when the priests return to eat their Terumah (Heave);” the point of conclusion, according to R. Elieser, the end of the first night-watch; according to the usual view, midnight; according to R. Gamaliel, the appearance of dawn. The morning Shema may be said “as soon as one can distinguish between blue and white. R. Elieser says: between blue and leek-green.” It may be said “till the sun appears. R. Joshua says till three o’clock (nine according to our reckoning), for it is the custom of the children of princes not to rise till three.” The Shema, consisting chiefly of paragraphs from the Bible, the question next arose, whether any one, who at the time for saying the Shema is reading the Bible, and reads the paragraphs in question in the midst of their context, has sufficiently done his Shema duty or not. To this it is answered: If he thought of it (אִם כִּוֵּן לִבּוֹ), he has sufficiently done it; but not otherwise. It is very characteristic, and a confirmation of the saying of Christ (Matt. 6:5) concerning praying in the streets, that the question is also discussed, whether and under what circumstances salutations may be made while praying the Shema. Three cases came under consideration: (1) Salutations from fear (2) (מִפְּנֵי הַיִּרְאָה); salutations from reverence (מִפְּנֵי הַכָּבוֹד); and (3) salutations of every one (לְכָל אָדָם); besides which a salutation and a response to a salutation were to be distinguished; and lastly, it was to be considered, that there were in the Shema itself natural breaks, viz. between the first and second Berachah, betwen the latter and the paragraph Deut. 11:13–21, and between that and the paragraph Num. 15:37–41, and lastly between that and the final Berachah. R. Meir therefore allowed that at the

breaks the salutation from reverence might be made and returned, but that in the middle only the salutation from fear might be given and returned. R. Jehudah however went a step farther, and allowed also to return the salutation of reverence in the middle, and at the breaks to return the salutation of every one. The following general directions were given: "He who prays the Shema, without making it audible to his ear, has performed his duty. R. Joses says: He has not performed it. He who prays and has not exactly noticed the letters has, according to R. Joses, satisfied his duty; but according to R. Jehudah he has not. He who prays in a wrong order has not done his duty. He who makes a mistake must begin again where he made the mistake. Workmen may pray in a tree or upon the wall."

It was a good custom, that food and drink should (according to the precept Deut. 8:10) never be partaken of without thanksgiving to God. Grace (Berachoth) was said both before and after meals, and also by women, slaves and children. But here too regulations were made down to the pettiest detail: viz. what form was to be used for the fruits of the trees, what for wine, what for the fruits of the ground, for bread, for vegetables, for vinegar, for unripe fallen fruit, for locusts, milk, cheese, eggs; and scholars contended as to when this and when that form was suitable. "If a blessing has been spoken on wine before the meal, the wine after the meal is exempt." "If the blessing has been pronounced over a side-dish before the meal, the side-dish after the meal is exempt. If the blessing has been said over the bread, the side-dish is exempt." "If salted food is set before any one first and bread afterwards, the blessing is to be spoken over the salted food and the bread exempted." "If any one has eaten figs, grapes and pomegranates, he is to say three blessings afterwards. This is the opinion of R. Gamaliel. The learned say: one blessing of threefold purport." "For how much food is formal preparation for thanksgiving requisite? For food the size of an olive. R. Jehudah says: of an egg." "If any one has eaten and forgotten to say grace, he must, according to the school of Shammai, return to his place and say grace; the school of Hillel allows him to say it where he remembers it. How long does the obligation to say grace last? Till the food is digested."

When such restriction was laid upon prayer by the legal formula, it could not but be chilled into an external performance. Of what avail was it that the prayers themselves were beautiful and copious (as must be admitted especially of the Shemoneh Esreh), if they were nevertheless only said for the sake of "fulfilling a duty"? Of what avail was it for R. Elieser to declare, that "he who makes his prayer an appointed duty (קְבַע), his prayer is no devout supplication," when he himself contributed to make it the former? If a legalistic treatment of the moral life in general is an evil, it is twice and thrice such in the case of prayer, that tenderest blossom of the inmost heart. It was only the necessary result of such a mode of treatment, that men sank so low as to degrade prayer to the service of vanity (Matt. 6:5), and to misuse it as a covering of inward impurity (Matt. 15:7 sq.; Mark 7:6, 12:40; Luke 20:47).

A further point, in which the utter externalism of the religious life comes to light, is that of fasting. That the Pharisees fasted often, and set great value upon this act, we learn in a general manner from the Gospels (Matt. 9:14; Mark 2:18; Luke 5:33). Particulars as to the kind and manner of fasting are found in the Mishna, whose details are again confirmed by the Gospels. Public or general fasts (which were ordered especially on the failure of rain in autumn, and at all times of public misfortune) were always delayed till the second and fifth days of the week (Monday and Thursday), and so that they always began on the second. Thus a three days' fast would fall upon the second, fifth and second (Monday, Thursday, Monday), and a six days' fast would then continue on the fifth, second and fifth, etc. Besides these general and appointed fasts, to which every one had to submit, there was also much voluntary fasting, and the strictest went so

far as to fast on the two above-named weekdays all the year round. The external behaviour differed according to the strictness of the fast. In the slighter kind they used still to wash and anoint themselves; in the stricter both were omitted; and in the strictest of all, every kind of pleasant transaction, even mutual greetings, were abstained from. It was generally preferred to practise fasting in the most public manner possible, and thus to make a show of pious zeal. But the worst was the fundamental view, from which all this proceeded. It was thought by such self-infliction to put a pressure upon God, and as it were to extort favours from Him if He withheld them. The longer the rain was delayed in autumn, the stricter did the fasting become. If the 17th Marcheshvan came before the rain fell, individuals began to hold fasts of three days. If the new moon of Chisleu appeared without rain having fallen, three general fasts were ordered. If after these had taken place no rain had fallen, three more fast days, and indeed with certain severities, were ordered. If these passed by without rain, seven general fast days were prescribed, again with fresh severities.

V

The examples brought forward will have made sufficiently evident the manner in which the moral and religious life was conceived of and regulated from the juristic point of view. In all questions everything depended only upon settling what was according to law, and that with the utmost possible care, that so the acting subject might have certain directions for every individual case. In a word: ethic and theology were swallowed up in jurisprudence. The evil results of this external view on practical matters are very evident. And such results were its necessary consequence. Even in that most favourable case of juristic casuistry moving on the whole in morally correct paths, it was in itself a poisoning of the moral principle, and could not but have a paralysing and benumbing effect upon the vigorous pulsation of the moral life. But this favourable case by no means occurred. When once the question was started: “What have I to do to fulfil the law?” the temptation was obvious, that a composition with the letter would be chiefly aimed at, at the cost of the real demands of morality, nay of the proper intention of the law itself.

A tolerably harmless, and in its harmlessness a ludicrous example of the manner in which elaborate ingenuity may find ways and means of at once evading the law and yet fulfilling it, is given by the appointments concerning the so-called Erubh. It was, as we know, forbidden among other things to carry on the Sabbath an object out of one tenement (רְשׁוּת) into another. This had the inconvenient effect of preventing almost all freedom of movement on the Sabbath, for the term רְשׁוּת (or more exactly רְשׁוּתהַיָּחִיד), the private tenement or dwelling, was a very narrow one. If however this term could be enlarged, and the largest possible tenements instituted, the evil would happily be remedied. The first means adopted for the attainment of this object was the so-called commixture or connection of courts (עֵרוּב חֲצֵרוֹת), i.e. the connection of several houses standing in one court (each of which forms a רְשׁוּת הַיָּחִיד) into one רְשׁוּת הַיָּחִיד. Such a connection was effected by all the inhabitants collecting a certain amount of food before a Sabbath or holy day and placing it in an appointed place, thus showing that they regarded the whole court, with all the dwellings in it, as a common whole. By this contrivance it became lawful to the joint inhabitants to carry in and out within this רְשׁוּת on a holy day. Of course it was now settled with great conscientiousness, what kind of food might be used for this Erubh, and how much food was necessary, and what particulars were to be observed, as may be read at length in the Mishna. Not very much however was obtained by this connection of courts. Hence another means supplementary of the former and far more prolific was hit upon, viz. the “connection of entrances” (עֵרוּב מָבוֹי), i.e. the shutting off of a narrow court or of a space

enclosed on three sides by a cross beam, a rope or a string, by which these became רְשׁוּת הַיָּחִיד, and thus spaces within which carrying in and out was allowed. In this case also it was very anxiously debated, how high and how broad the openings, the shutting up of which was in question, must be, and of what kind must be the means of closure, the beams, ropes, etc., how thick, how wide, etc.

Besides the carrying of things from one tenement to another, walking a distance of more than 2000 cubits on the Sabbath was also forbidden. For this too a means of mitigation was devised by the "connection of boundaries" (עֵרוּב תְּחוּמִין). That is, he who desired to go farther than 2000 cubits had only before the beginning of the Sabbath to deposit somewhere within this limit, and therefore perhaps at its end, food for two meals. He thus declared, as it were, that here would be his place of abode, and he might then on the Sabbath go not merely from his actual to his legal abode, but also 2000 cubits from the latter. Nay such particular preparation was not necessary in all cases. If e.g. any one should be on the road when the Sabbath began, and see at a distance of 2000 cubits a tree or a wall, he might declare it to be his Sabbath abode, and might then go not only 2000 cubits to the tree or wall, but also 2000 cubits farther. Only he must do the thing thoroughly, and say: "My Sabbath place shall be at its trunk" (שְׁבִיתָתִי בְעִקָּרוֹ). For if he said only: "My Sabbath place shall be under it" (שְׁבִיתָתִי תַּחְתָּיו), this did not hold good, because it was too general and indefinite.

Innocent as such trifling may be in itself, it nevertheless erribly shows, that the moral point of view was entirely superseded by the legal and formal one, that the effort was merely to do justice to the letter of the law, even though its meaning was evaded.

Such shifting of the right point of view necessarily led, in more important cases than those just touched upon, to results in direct opposition to a moral view of things. The woe pronounced by our Lord upon the scribes for lightly trifling with the oath by saying: "Whosoever shall swear by the temple, it is nothing; but whosoever shall swear by the gold of the temple, he is bound: and whosoever sweareth by the altar, it is nothing; but whosoever sweareth by the sacrifice that is on it, he is bound" (Matt. 23:16–18), is well known. So too is their lax interpretation of the injunction concerning divorce, Deut. 24:1: That a man might put away his wife if he had found anything shameful in her (עֶרְוַת דָּבָר), Only the school of Shammai left the words their proper meaning. The school of Hillel explained them away as: If she has even spoiled his food. And lastly, according to R. Akiba, a man was allowed to put away his wife if he had found another fairer than she was. The laws of purification gave occasion for treating the sphere of the intercourse of the sexes in a manner very similar to the slippery casuistry of the Jesuits — a striking proof how the casuistic method, as such, leads by an inward necessity to such errors, Another point too affords a striking parallel with Jesuitism, viz. the postponement of the duties of natural piety, e.g. towards a father or mother, to supposed religious obligations: "If a man shall say to his father or his mother, that whereby thou mightest have been profited by me is Corban, that is to say, given to God, you allow him to do no more for father or mother" (Mark 7:11, 12; comp. Matt. 15:5); it is thus that Jesus reproves the Pharisees, and in agreement with this we read in the Mishna, that a vow made cannot be revoked "on account of the honour due to parents" (בכבוראביו ואמו). Thus the religious obligation, in its external and formal sense, stands above the supreme duty of natural piety.

All this shows that the Lord had only too much reason for rebuking His contemporaries for straining out a gnat and swallowing a camel (Matt. 23:24), and for hurling in their faces the heavy accusation of making clean the outside of the cup and platter, but being within full of extortion and excess. Like whited sepulchres, which indeed appeared beautiful without, but

within are full of dead men's bones and of all uncleanness, they also appeared righteous before men, but within were full of hypocrisy and iniquity (Matt. 23:27, 28; Luke 11:44). It would however be unjust to find in such words of rebuke, however well founded, a universal characteristic of the whole period. Justice requires us to mention, that many an excellent saying of the learned men of that age, affording proof, that all moral judgment was not stifled under the rubbish of Halachic discussions, has been preserved. We may recall perhaps the already mentioned exhortation of Antigonus of Socho, to be like servants, who do service without regard to reward, or that of R. Elieser, not to make prayer a settled duty. Hillel's motto was, judge not thy neighbour till thou come into his place. R. Elieser ben Hyrkanos said: Let your neighbour's honour be as dear to you as your own. R. Jose ha-Kohen said: Let your neighbour's property be as dear to you as your own. He also said: Do all your acts in the name of God. R. Judah ben Tema said: Be bold as a leopard, light as an eagle, swift as a stag, and strong as a lion, to do the will of your Father in heaven.

But when we look away from the single rays of light, and from the deeper shadows which form their contrast, we cannot better characterize the entire tendency of the Judaism of that period, than by the words of the apostle: "They have a zeal for God, but not according to knowledge. It was a fearful burden which a spurious legalism had laid upon the shoulders of the people. They bind heavy burdens and grievous to be borne, and lay them on men's shoulders" (Matt. 23:4; Luke 11:46). Nothing was left to free personality, everything was placed under the bondage of the letter. The Israelite, zealous for the law, was obliged at every impulse and movement to ask himself, what is commanded? At every step, at the work of his calling, at prayer, at meals, at home and abroad, from early morning till late in the evening, from youth to old age, the dead, the deadening formula followed him. A healthy moral life could not flourish under such a burden, action was nowhere the result of inward motive, all was, on the contrary, weighed and measured. Life was a continual torment to the earnest man, who felt at every moment that he was in danger of transgressing the law; and where so much depended on the external form, he was often left in uncertainty whether he had really fulfilled its requirements. On she other hand, pride and conceit were almost inevitable for one who had attained to mastership in the knowledge and treatment of the law. He could indeed say that he had done his duty, had neglected nothing, had fulfilled all righteousness. But all the more certain is it, that this righteousness of the scribes and Pharisees (Matt. 5:20), which looked down with proud thanks to God upon the sinner (Luke 18:9–14), and pompously displayed its works before the eyes of the world (Matt. 6:2, 23:5), was not that true righteousness which was well-pleasing to God.

THE MESSIANIC HOPE

THE LITERATURE

Schöttgen, Horae Hebraicae et Talmudicae, vol. ii. De Messia, 1742. (A work of eminent scholarship, but ruled by the effort to make the Rabbis into Christian theologians. Even the doctrine of the communicatio idiomatum is proved from Rabbinic works.)

Bertholdt, Christologia Judaeorum Jesu apostolorumque aetate in compendium redacta observationibusque illustrata. Erlangae 1811.

Moraht, De iis, quae ad cognoscendam Judaeorum Palaestinensium, qui Jesu tempore vivebant, Christologiam evangelia nobis exhibeant, deque locis messianis in illis allegatis. Gotting. 1828.

De Wette, Biblische Dogmatik Alten und Neuen Testaments (3rd ed. 1831), pp. 159–179. The same, Commentatio de morte Jesu Christi expiatoria (Opuscula theologica, 1830, pp. 1–148).

Von Cölln, Biblische Theologie, vol. i. (1836), pp. 479–511.

Mack, Die messianischen Erwartungen und Ansichten der Zeitgenossen Jesu (Tüb. Theol. Quartalschr. 1836, pp. 3–56, 193–226).

Gfrörer, Das Jahrhundert des Heils (also under the title, Gesch. des Urchristenthums, vols. i.–ii. 1838), ii. 195–444.

Bauer (Bruno), Kritik der evangelischen Geschichte der Synoptiker, vol. i. 1841, pp. 391–416.

Zeller, On the Assertion that prae-Christian Judaism had no Messianic Dogmatic (Theol. Jahrb. 1843, pp. 35–52).

Hellwag, Baur, and Zeller's Theol. Jahrb. 1848, pp. 151–160 (in the article, On the notion of the pre-existence of Christ in the primitive Church).

Hilgenfeld, Die jüdische Apokalyptik in ihrer geschichtlichen Entwickelung. Jena 1857.

Oehler, art. "Messias," in Herzog's Real-Enc., 1st ed. vol. ix. p. 408 sqq., 422–441. In the 2d ed. revised by Orelli, ix. 641 ff.

Colani, Jésus-Christ et les croyances messianiques de son temps, 2nd ed. Strasbourg 1864, pp. 1–68.

Langen, Das Judenthum in Palästina zur Zeit Christi. Freiburg 1866, pp. 391–461.

Ewald, Geschichte des Volkes Israel, vol. v. (3rd ed. 1867) pp. 135–160.

Keim, Geschichte Jesu, vol. i. 1867, pp. 239–250.

Holtzman, Die Messiasidee zur Zeit Jesu (Jahrbb. für deutsche Theol. 1867, pp. 389-411). The same in Weber and Holtzmann's Gesch. des Volkes Israel (1867), ii. 191-211.

Hausrath, Neutestamentliche Zeitgeschichte, vol. i. (2nd ed. 1873) pp. 165-176.

Weiffenbach, Quae Jesu in regno coelesti dignitas sit synopticorum sententia exponitur (Gissae 1868), pp. 47-62.

Ebrard, Wissenschaftl. Kritik der evangelischen Geschichte (3rd ed. 1868), pp. 835-849.

Wittichen, Die Idee des Reiches Gottes, dritter Beitrag zur biblischen Thevlogie insbesondere der synoptichen Reden Jesu (Göttingen 1872), pp. 105-165.

Anger, Vorlesungen über die Geschichte der messianischen Idee, edited by Krenkel (Berlin 1873), pp. 78-91.

Castelli, Il Messia secondo gli Ebrei, Firenze 1874 (p. 358).

Vernes, Histoire des idées messianiques depuis Alexandre jusqu' à l'empereur Hadrien, Paris 1874 (p. 294).

Stähelin, Jahrb. für deutsch Theologie, 1874, pp. 199-218 (in the article, Zur paulinischen Eschatologie).

Schönefeld, Ueber die messianische Hoffnung von 200 vor Christo bis gegen 50 nach Christo, Jena 1874.

Drummond, The Jewish Messiah, a Critical History of the Messianic Idea among the Jews from the rise of the Maccabees to the closing of the Talmud, London 1877 (p. 395).

Stapfer, Les idées religieuses en Palestine à l'époque de Jésus-Christ (2nd ed. 1878), pp. 111-182.

Weber, System der altsynagogalen palästinischen Theologie aus Targum, Midrasch und Talmud dargestellt (Leipzig 1880), pp. 322-386.

Reuss, Geschichte der heiligen Schriften Alten Testaments (1881), § 555, 556.

Hamburger, Real-Encyclopädie für Bibel und Talmud, Div. ii. (1883), arts. "Messianische Leidenszeit," "Messias," "Messiasleiden," "Messias Sohn Joseph," "Messiaszeit" (pp. 735-779). Comp. also "Armilus," "Belebung der Todten," "Ewiges Leben," "Lohn und Strafe," "Paradies," "Vergeltung," "Zukunftsmahl."

Within the sphere of the religious ideas held by the Jewish people during the period with which we are occupied, two groups may be distinguished: (1) General religious ideas, with respect to the relation of man and of the world to God, and (2) Specific Israelitish ideas, which have for their object the relation of the Jewish people to Jahveh as the God of Israel. The latter are those which are the really prevailing ideas, they form the centre around which the others are grouped and to which they are related. These specific Israelitish ideas however received again their special tinge in later times from the legal view of the relation between Jahveh and Israel. The thought, that God had selected this one people for His possession and therefore bestowed His

benefits upon them exclusively, was now supplemented by the other, that He had also given them a law, and thereby bound Himself to bestow His benefits under the presupposition, that they observed this law. Thus the maxim, that God gave many commands and ordinances to the people of Israel for the purpose of providing them with much reward now formed the core of the religious consciousness. Very simple observation however showed, that this reward was in present experience bestowed neither upon the nation as a whole, nor upon individuals, in the proportion to be expected. The more intensely therefore the consciousness of the nation and the individual was penetrated by this thought, the more must their gaze have been directed to the future, and the worse the state of the present, the more ardent must that gaze have been. Hence we may say, that in later times the religous consciousness was concentrated upon the hope of the future. The better future to be expected was the special object towards which all other religious ideas teleologically referred. As the work of the Israelite was virtually the observance of the law, so was his faith virtually belief in a better future. Round these two poles (as we have already remarked, p. 93) did the religious life of the Jewish people revolve during our period. They were zealous for the law in order one day to obtain reward. This central position of the hope of the future in the religious consciousness of Israel justifies us in again specially directing our attention thereto.

I. RELATION TO THE OLDER MESSIANIC HOPE

The hope of a better future was already with the prophets of the Old Testament an essential element of their religious consciousness. Nor was it ever entirely lost by the people, though it was not always as lively as it again became in an increasing degree after the Maccabaean rising. In the course of time however this hope of the future experienced many changes. There was indeed far greater freedom of movement in the sphere of faith than in that of action. While legal precepts were binding to their very smallest details, and must therefore be handed down unaltered from one generation to another, comparatively freer play was permitted to faith, and provided certain fundamentals were adhered to, the individual need could here come forward more freely (see above, § 25. III. Halachah and Haggadah). Hence too the hope of the future was developed in very various manners. Still certain common ground lines may here be observed, by which the later Messianic hope is on the average characteristically distinguished from the older. The older Messianic hope virtually moves within the boundary of the then present circumstances of the world, and is nothing else than the hope of a better future for the nation. That the nation should be morally purified from all bad elements, that it should exist unmolested and respected in the midst of the Gentile world, whilst its enemies were either destroyed or forced to acknowledge the nation and its God, that it should be governed by a just, wise and powerful king of the house of David, and that therefore internal justice, peace and happiness would prevail, nay that all natural evils would be abolished and a state of unclouded prosperity would appear – this may be said to have formed the foundation of the future hope among the older prophets, This picture however underwent very important alterations in the consciousness of a subsequent age, partly in the times of the later prophets, but especially in the post-canonical period.

1. And first, the view became more and more extended from the nation to the world: the eye was fixed not only on the future of the nation, but on the future of the world. While in the former vision the heathen nations were only objects of consideration, so far as they stood in some kind of relation to Israel, the expectation of after times fixed its gaze more and more decidedly upon the fate of all mankind, nay of the whole world. The judgment was originally a visitation by which either Israel was purified or its enemies destroyed; it subsequently became the judgment of the

world, in which the fate of all men and all nations will be decided, and that either by God Himself or by His Anointed, the Messianic, King of Israel. The ideal kingdom of the future does not, according to former expectation, extend beyond the actual limits of the Holy Land; according to the later view, the future kingdom of God comprises all mankind, who willingly or by compulsion are united under the sceptre of Israel into a universal monarchy. Thus the Messiah is the judge and ruler of the world. Nay even the irrational creation, heaven and earth, and therefore the whole universe in the strict sense, is transformed, the old destroyed and a new and glorious one made in its stead. This extension of the idea of the future was partly brought about by the extension of the political horizon. The more the small separate states were absorbed by the great universal monarchies, the more obvious was it to view the ideal kingdom of the future also as a universal monarchy. After the overthrow of the last heathen universal monarchy God Himself assumes the sceptre and founds a universal kingdom, which He, the heavenly King, rules by means of His people. But still more important than the enlargement of the political horizon in the development of the Messianic idea, was the enlargement of the notion of God and of the view of the world in general. In the original view Jehovah is only the God and King of Israel. He is subseqently more and more decidedly and evidently regarded as the God and King of the world. With this again is connected the ever increasing hold upon the consciousness of the nation of "the world" as a single whole comprising all existence. The growing universalism of the expectation of the future was virtually conditioned by this enlargement of the religious consciousness in general.

2. With this enlargement of the future hope is combined however, on the other hand, a far more decided reference of this hope to the individual. This too is connected with the development of the religious consciousness in general. Originally Jehovah is the God of the nation, who directs with His mighty hand the woe or weal of the people. The lot of the individual was hardly thought of. But as the religious consciousness deepened, the individual could not but more and more feel himself the object of God's care. Each individual knew his fate to be in the hand of God, and was sure that God would not forsake him. The strengthening of this individual belief in providence gradually resulted in a more individual hope of the future. This was indeed comparatively very late, as it cannot be pointed to till the time of Daniel. The form in which it was first manifested was that of a belief in the resurrection. The pious Israelite being certain, that his personal and indeed his enduring and eternal salvation is the will of God, expects, that he and all the godly will have a share in the future glory of the nation. He then who is seized by death before this is realized, may hope, that he will one day be raised up again by God and transplanted to the kingdom of His glory. According to this the object of the resurrection is a participation in the glorious future of the nation, and the basis of faith in the resurrection is the ever more powerfully developing interest of personal salvation. But not only did the interest of salvation take an individual form, but reflection was more and more directed to the future fate of the individual in malam partem also. God keeps in heaven an account of the deeds of each individual, at least of each Israelite. And decision will be given at the judgment on the ground of what is contained in these heavenly books, and reward or punishment meted to each exactly according to his merits. The result of this again was, that the expectation of a resurrection was now that of a general resurrection: not only were the righteous, but the unrighteous also to rise, to receive their sentence at the judgment. This expectation however never attained general acceptance, many looking only for a resurrection of the just. Lastly however the individual interest was no longer satisfied with a resurrection for the purpose of participation in the Messianic kingdom. This was no longer regarded as the ultimate and supreme felicity, but a higher, an eternal, a heavenly happiness expected afterwards, even an absolutely glorious state in heaven; as on the other hand for the wicked, not merely an exclusion from Messiah's

kingdom, but eternal torment and punishment in hell.

3. These last particulars are already connected with a further peculiarity, by which the hope of the future entertained in later, is distinguished from that of older times; for it had now become more and more transcendent, and was more and more trausferred to the supernatural and supermundane. The older hope kept within the range of present circumstances. A destruction of the enemies of Israel, a purification of the people and their glorious future, were expected. However ideal the representation of this future prosperity, it still remains within the circle of present circumstances. In the later view the present and the future became more and more pure contrasts, the gulf between the two ever deeper, the view ever more dualistic. With the appearance of Messianic times a new course of the world, a new עוֹלָם, is to begin. This future course of the world (עוֹלָם הַבָּא) is however in all respects the entire contrast to the present course of the world (עוֹלָם הַוֶּה). The present is under the rule of the ungodly powers of Satan and his angels, and therefore sunk in sin and sorrow. The future is under the rule of God and His Anointed: and only righteousness and happiness prevail therein. There can scarcely be any connection between the two. By a miraculous act of God the one will be destroyed, the other called into existence. However much this view may be supported by the former representation, the contrast between now and then is much more sharply drawn than in the former view. The latter sees far more the gracious government of God in the present time also. According to the later representation it might almost seem, as if God had for the present given over the government to the Satanic powers, and had reserved for the future world the full exercise of His sway. Accordingly the future salvation is also more and more regarded as purely transcendental. All the benefits of the future world come down from above, from heaven, where they had pre-existed from all eternity. They are kept there for the saints as an “inheritance,” which will one day be bestowed upon them. In particular does the perfect, the glorious, new Jerusalem, which will at the time of the consummation of all things descend to earth in the place of the old, exist there already. So too the Messiah, the perfect King of Israel, chosen by God from eternity, is already there in communion with God. All that is good and perfect can come only from above, because all that is earthly is in its present condition the direct contrary to the divine. At last therefore the hope of the future outsteps altogether the limits of earthly existence. The final happiness is not even found in the kingdom of glory upon the renewed earth, but in an absolute state of glory in heaven. As the salvation itself, so also is the manner of its realization more and more transcendentally conceived of. The judgment is a forensic act, in which, without the intervention of earthly powers, the fate of men is decided simply by the verdict of God, or of His Anointed; and the execution of this sentence is effected only by supernatural powers, by a miraculous act of God, which destroys the old and calls the new order of things into existence.

4. Lastly, the Messianic hope received an entirely new colouring in later times from the fact that it, like the whole circle of religious ideas in general, was increasingly dogmatized by the diligent labour of the scribes. In place of vigorous religious productiveness came the learned investigation of the prophetic writings, by which the details of the Messianic picture of the future were dogmatically settled. The task of the scribes was indeed at first the settling and treatment of the law. But they then, according to the same method, worked at and settled in detail the whole circle of religious ideas, and especially the Messianic expectations. Thus the poetic picture became learned dogma. While in the ideal imagery of the prophets the boundary of the literal and figurative meaning is evidently a fluctuating one, the sacred text of the prophets is taken at its word by the scribes of a later age, the poetic image is stiffened into dogma, and the character of the whole picture of the future becomes thereby increasingly an externally transcendental one. Not only moreover were all the existing details collected and dogmatically

arranged, but new details were elicited by their learned combination, after the manner of Haggadic Midrash (see above, § 25. III.). For the sake of obtaining new disclosures, the most heterogeneous passages were with the utmost ingenuity brought into relation with each other, and the details of Messianic theology thereby more accurately and comprehensively determined. It cannot be denied however, that such learned material also fluctuated, for it never became really binding like the details of the law. Thus the individual was at liberty to appropriate now more now less of it, and to fashion it according to his own perceptions, so that the Messianic hope was always fluctuating and is met with in very different forms among different individuals.

It must moreover be also remarked, that the peculiarities of the later Messianic expectation here described are by no means equally found everywhere. Even in later times, the old hope of a glorious future for the nation maintained the supremacy. This forms even in the later view of the future the determining ground-plan of the picture. And just as upon this foundation the characteristic peculiarities of the later view have stronger or weaker influence, and produce this or that alteration, is the old image now more now less, now in one way now in another, specially modified and supplemented.

But did this hope, we would next inquire, always continue active among the people ? Did it not itself die out with the dying out of ancient prophecy, and revive to new life through the Christian movement? The latter has been frequently asserted, especially so far as the Messianic idea in its narrower sense of the expectation of a Messianic King is concerned. It is thought, that this was again stirred up by the appearance of Jesus Christ, and that it was thereby revivified even in the circles of Judaism. This assertion has been made in a summary manner by Bruno Bauer and Volkmar, in a more enlightened one and with better foundation by Holtzmann. The statements adduced by the latter are about these. After the almost total extinction of the Messianic idea in the last centuries before Christ, it was reconstructed in the way of scholarship "by means of mere literary investigation." This process of new formation had in the time of Jesus been already entered upon, but did not receive its completion till the Christian period and under the partial influence of Christian ideas. The Messianic idea was in the time of Christ by no means an active one in the popular consciousness. An essential distinction between the later scholastic and the former prophetic idea of the Messiah was, that the prophets did not expect His appearance till after God Himself had in a decisive battle destroyed the hostile powers, while according to the later dogmatic the Messiah was to come to hold a judgment, and that a judgment in a forensic form. Setting aside for the present the latter point, we may sum up our verdict on Holtzmann's view by saying, that he is decidedly in the right, when he insists on the scholastic character of the later Messianic idea, but in the wrong, when he as good as denies the Messianic idea to the last centuries before Christ, and represents it as not yet transferred to popular consciousness during the life of Jesus. The latter is in opposition to the gospel history, and the former he can only maintain by either entirely disregarding evidence to the contrary (as Henoch, xc. 37-38; Orac. Sibyll. 3:46-50; Philo, de praem. et poen. § 16), or casting doubt upon the time of its composition (as the Psalterium Salomonis), or explaining it away in an arbitrary manner (as Orac. Sibyll. 3:652 sqq., which is said to relate to Simon the Maccabaean). In truth the Messianic idea never quite died out at least not in its more general form of the hope of a better future for the nation. In any case it was again very active in the last centuries before Christ, and especially in the time of Christ, as the course of the gospel history shows. It there appears as thoroughly alive among the people, without Jesus doing anything to revive it; and indeed it appears as a rule in the last centuries before Christ, not only in its general form as the hope of a better future of the nation, but also in its special form as the hope of a Messianic King.

This will appear as we present in the following pages: (1) The development of the Messianic idea in its historical course; and (2) give a Systematic view of Messianic dogmatics.

II. HISTORICAL SURVEY

The prophecies of the Book of Daniel (about 167 to 165 before Christ) had a profound influence upon the form of the Messianic idea. In the time of the affliction (עֵת צָרָה, 12:1), which had come upon Israel by reason of the insane measures of Antiochus Epiphanes, the prophet predicts the approaching deliverance. God will Himself sit in judgment on the kingdoms of this world, and will take from them power and dominion, and root up and destroy them for ever. But "the saints of the Most High" will receive the kingdom and possess it for ever and ever. All peoples and nations and tongues will serve them, and their kingdom will never be destroyed (7:9–27, 2:44). The righteous too who have fallen asleep will have their share in it; for they will awake from the dust of the earth to everlasting life, but the ungodly to everlasting contempt (12:2). Whether the author conceived of this kingdom of the saints of the Most High, as with a Messianic King at its head, cannot be made out, at any rate he makes no mention of him. For he, who appears in the form of a man (כְּבַר אֱנָשׁ, 7:13), is by no means the personal Messiah, but, as the author plainly and expressly says in the interpretation, the people of the saints of the Most High (7:18, 22, 27). As the kingdoms of the world are represented by beasts, which rise up out of the sea, so is the kingdom of the saints represented by a human form, which descends from the clouds of heaven. The coming up out of the sea, i.e. the abyss, points to the anti-divine origin of the former, the coming from heaven to the divine origin of the latter. Thus the core of Daniel's Messianic hope is the universal dominion of the saints (see especially 2:44, 7:14, 27). And indeed the author does not, as might appear from chap. 7, conceive of this as brought about by a mere judicial sentence of God. On the contrary, he says expressly (2:44), that the kingdom of the saints shall "break in pieces and destroy," i.e. conquer by force of arms the world-kingdoms, by the help indeed of God and according to His will. It is also deserving of attention, that in this book the hope in a resurrection of the body is for the first time plainly and decidedly expressed (12:2). Hence here as formerly, the Messianic hope is the hope of a glorious future for the nation, but with the double modification that the future kingdom of Israel is conceived of as a universal kingdom, and that all the saints who have died will share in it.

In the apocryphal books of the Old Testament the Messianic hope cannot, by reason of the historical or didactic nature of these books, be brought prominently forward. But it is by no means absent from them. Thus we find, in the Book of Ecclesiasticus, all the essential elements of the older Messianic hope, the expectation of penal judgment upon the heathen (Ecclus. 32:18, 19, 33:1 sqq.), the deliverance of Israel from their troubles (Ecclus. 50:24), the gathering of the dispersed (33:11), the everlasting duration of the nation (37:25, 40:13), nay, the everlasting duration of the Davidic dynasty (47:11). In the other apocryphal books too, we meet first one and then another element: that God will judge the heathen (Judith 16:17), and gather the dispersed of Israel into one nation again (2 Macc. 2:18; Bar. 2:27–35, 4:36, 37, 5:5–9); that the people shall be established for ever (2 Macc. 14:15), and that the throne of David shall be an eternal one (1 Macc. 2:57). The author of the Book of Tobit hopes, not only that the righteous will be gathered, the nation of Israel exalted, and Jerusalem rebuilt in the most splendid manner with gold and precious stones (Tob. 13:12–18, 14:7), but also, in common with certain prophets of the Old Testament, that all the heathen will be converted to God (Tob. 13:11, 14:6, 7). In the Hellenistic Wisdom of Solomon the national element is, as may be conceived, in the background, nay the author cannot, by reason of his Platonistic anthropology, expect true happiness for the soul till after death. With him therefore the important element is, that the

righteous dead will one day sit in judgment upon the heathen (Wisd. 3:8, 5:1; comp. 1 Cor. 6:2 sq.). The explanation of the just man in Wisd. 2:12–20 as the Messiah, which is prevalent in older exegesis, is utterly unfounded.

The stream of Messianic prediction flows forth in copious abundance in the oldest Jewish Sibyllines, which appeared about 140 B.C. Sibyll. 3:286 sq. must not indeed be referred to these (Καὶ τότε δὴ θεὸς οὐρανόθεν πέμψει βασιλῆα, Κρινεῖ δ' ἄνδρα ἕκαστον ἐν αἵματι καὶ πυρὸς αὐγῇ), where on the contrary Cyrus is spoken of. Nor can the υἱὸς θεοῖο, 3:775, be appealed to. For according to the correct supposition of Alexandre, we must read νηόν instead of υἱόν. And lastly, it is quite a mistake to understand by the κόρη, in whom, according to Sibyll. 3:748–786, God will dwell, the mother of Messiah (an explanation into which, following Langen, even Weiffenbach suffered himself to be seduced). For the κόρη, Hebr. בְּתוּלָה, is nothing else than Jerusalem. Still after the withdrawal of all these passages, it remains certain, that the whole section, Sibyll. 3:652–794, is of almost exclusively Messianic purport, although only a short mention of the Messianic King is made at the beginning. From the east (ἀπ' ἠελίοιο), it is here said, will God send a king, who will put an end to all war upon earth, killing some, and fulfilling the promises to others. And he will do this not according to his own counsel, but in obedience to the commands of God. At his appearance (for this is certainly the meaning of the author), the kings of the heathen assemble once more for an attack upon the temple of God and the Holy Land. They offer their idolatrous sacrifices round about Jerusalem. But God will speak to them with a mighty voice, and they will all perish by the hand of the Immortal. The earth will quake and the mountains and hills be overturned, and Erebus will appear. The heathen nations will perish by war, sword and fire, because they lifted their spears against the temple (663–697). Then will the children of God live in peace and quietness, because the hand of the Holy One protects them (698–709). And the heathen nations seeing this will be encouraged to bless and praise God, to send gifts to His temple and to accept His law, because it is the most just in all the world (710–726). Peace will then prevail among all the kings of the earth (743–760). And God will set up an eternal kingdom over all men. Men will bring offerings to the temple of God from all parts of the earth. The prophets of God will lay down the sword, for they are judges of men and just kings. And God will dwell upon Zion and universal peace will prevail upon earth (766–794). The writer lays the chief stress, as we see, upon the circumstance, that the law of God will attain recognition and validity among all the nations of the earth, but he expects not this alone, but the setting up of a universal kingdom over all mankind (766–767: βασιλήϊον εἰς αἰῶνας πάντας ἐπ' ἀνθρώπους) with Jerusalem as its theocratic centre. It is only at the beginning that he thinks of the king sent from God as the instrument for the establishment of the universal peace. But he is undoubtedly to be thought of as the intervening cause, when it is said, ver. 689, that God exterminates the attacking heathen by war and sword (πολέμῳ ἠδὲ μαχαίρῃ). And if the prophets of God (θεοῦ μεγάλοιο προφῆται, i.e. indeed the Israelites, the saints of the Most High as they are called in Daniel) are only generally spoken of as judges and kings (780–781), still a theocratic king at their head is at least not excluded by the words of the author. It is in any case worthy of remark, that even an Alexandrian, when painting the future, cannot dispense with the God-sent king.

The original portion of the Book of Enoch (in the last third of the 2nd century before Christ) contains comparatively little that is Messianic. It is the conclusion of the vision of Judgment (c. 90:16–38), which is here chiefly to be considered. The author expects in the first place a last powerful attack of the heathen (here chiefly the Syrian) power, which is however rendered vain by the miraculous intervention of God (90:16–19). A throne is then erected in the delightful land and God sits in judgment. First the fallen angels and then the apostate Jews are cast into the

fiery pit (90:20-27). Then the old Jerusalem (for the "house" is Jerusalem) is done away with, and God brings a new Jerusalem and places it on the spot where the old one stood (90:28-29). In this new Jerusalem dwell the pious Jews, and the heathen do them homage (90:30). Hereupon the Messiah appears (under the image of a white bullock), and all the heathen pray to Him and are converted to God (90:37-38). The transcendent character of the later Messianic idea here comes forward: the new Jerusalem has nothing in common with the old, but is brought from heaven in a miraculous manner.

We meet with the Messianic King depicted in sharper outlines and fuller colours in the Psalterium Salomonis, composed in the time of Pompey (63-48 B.C.). These Psalms are instructive, if only because their author dwells both upon God Himself being the King of Israel (17:1), and David's house never becoming extinct before God (17:5). Hence it must not be concluded, without further ceremony, that when the former takes place, the latter is excluded. The longing for the Davidic king is especially ardent in the author, for Jerusalem had, in his time, fallen under the heathen rule of the Romans, and no hope for the future could be built upon the Sadducean-minded dynasty of the Asmonaeans. Hence he hopes, that God will raise up a prince of the house of David to rule over Israel, to crush their enemies, and to cleanse Jerusalem from the heathen (17:23-27). He will gather a holy people, and will judge the tribes of the nation, and not suffer unrighteousness in their midst, he will divide them in the land according to their tribes, and no stranger shall dwell among them (17:28-31). The heathen nations will serve him and will come to Jerusalem, to bring the wearied children of Israel as gifts and to see the glory of the Lord. He is a righteous king and one taught of God (17:32-35). And there is no unrighteousness in his days, for all are saints. And their king is the Lord's anointed. He will not place his trust in horse or rider. For the Lord Himself is his King. And he will strike the earth with the word of his mouth for ever (17:36-39). He will bless the people of the Lord with wisdom; and he is pure from sin; and he will rule over a great people and not be weak. For God makes him strong by His Holy Spirit. He will lead them all in holiness, and there is no pride among them (17:40-46). This is the beauty of the king of Israel. Happy are they, who are born in his days (17:47-51). The writer expects, as it appears, not godly kings in general of David's house, but a single Messiah endowed by God with miraculous powers, pure from sin and holy (17:41, 46), whom God has made powerful and wise by the Holy Spirit (17:2), and who therefore strikes his enemies not with external weapons, but with the word of his mouth (17:39 after Isa. 11:4). He is however, notwithstanding such idealism, represented as quite a worldly ruler, as an actual king of Israel. Comp. generally, Ps. 18:6-10, and especially Ps. 11: (the gathering of the dispersed) and 3:16, 14:2 sqq. (the resurrection of the just).

As the oppression of the Pompeian period was the occasion of the Psalter of Solomon, so also was the despotism of Antony and Cleopatra that of a more recent Sibylline piece (Orac. Sibyll. 3:36-92). When Rome had then obtained dominion over Egypt also, the Sibyllist expected the appearance of the kingdom of God on earth and the coming of a holy king to rule for ever over every land. The passage in question (3:46-50) is as follows: —

Αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ Ῥώμη καὶ Αἰγύπτου βασιλεύσει,

Εἰς ἓν ἰθύνουσα, τότε δὴ βασιλεία μεγίστη

Ἀθανάτου βασιλῆος ἐπ' ἀνθρώποισι φανεῖται.

Ἥξει δ' ἁγνὸς ἄναξ, πάσης γῆς σκῆπτρα κρατήσων

Εἰς αἰῶνας πάντας, ἐπειγομένοιο χρόνοιο.

The immortal King, whose kingdom is to appear among men, is of course God Himself. On the other hand, none other than the Messiah can be meant by the ἁγνὸς ἄναξ, who is to possess the sceptre of every kingdom. Here too, as in the Psalter of Solomon, we find the personal Messiah and the idea of the kingdom of God in direct combination.

If in the Psalter of Solomon the form of the Messianic King is already one far surpassing the ordinary human form, this feature comes out more strikingly in the figurative discourses of the Book of Enoch (chap. 37–71). The image of the Messiah is here chiefly drawn, in continuation of the Book of Daniel, by "the Son of man" being understood of the person of Messiah, and the coming from heaven taken literally; pre-existence being therefore ascribed to the Messiah. But unfortunately the date of the composition of this book is so uncertain, that we must renounce its insertion in the historical development. Use can only be made of it for the systematic survey.

The Assumptio Mosis, of about the beginning of the Christian era, predicts in words of beautiful aspiration the approach of the kingdom of God. The author, after bringing into view a time of tribulation such as that under Antiochus Epiphanes, continues, chap. 10.: "Then will his kingdom appear among all creatures, and the devil will have an end, and sorrow will disappear with him. Then will the Heavenly One arise from the seat of his kingdom and will come from his holy habitation with wrath and anger for his children's sake, and the earth will tremble to its ends, and the high mountains be lowered, and the hills fall. The sun will give no light, and the moon be changed into blood (comp. Joel 3:4), and the stars fall into confusion. And the sea Will retreat to the abyss, and the water-springs fail, and the rivers be dried up. Then will the most High God, the alone Eternal, come forth to chastise the heathen and destroy all idols. Then wilt thou be happy, O Israel, and wilt tread upon the neck and wings of the eagle. And God will exalt thee and make thee soar to the firmament, and thou wilt thence look down upon thine enemies on earth, and shalt see them and rejoice, and give thanks and acknowledge thy Creator." That in this magnificent picture of the future there should be no mention of the Messianic King, is certainly not accidental, if it is the case that the author belonged to the party of the Zealots (see below, § 32). This circumstance would then, as Wieseler justly remarks, be explained by the fact, that the author's ideal would be, not a monarchic, but, if we may use the expression, a democratically constituted kingdom of God.

Equally without mention of a Messianic King, and on the whole in merely general outlines, does the Book of Jubilees describe the time of joy and delight, which will appear for Israel on their repentance. "The days will begin to increase, and the children of men will be older from generation to generation and from day to day, till the length of their life approaches a thousand years. And there will be none old or weary of life, but they will all be like children and youths, and will pass and live all their days in peace and joy, without there being any Satan or other evil spoiler; for all their days will be days of blessing and healing. At that time will the Lord heal His servants, and they will arise and see ever deeper peace and pursue again their enemies. And they will see it and give thanks, and rejoice for evermore. And they will see all the judgments and all the curse of their enemies. Their bones will indeed rest in the earth, but their spirits will have many joys, and they will perceive, that it is the Lord who sits in judgment and shows grace to hundreds and thousands and to all who love Him." While it is here said only in general, that the servants of the Lord "will again pursue their enemies," in another passage the dominion of the world is promised to the seed of Jacob. God said to Jacob: "I am the Lord thy God, who made heaven and earth. I will cause thee to grow and will greatly increase thee; and kings shall proceed from thee and shall rule everywhere, even wherever the foot of the children of men

shall tread. And I will give to thy seed the whole earth, which is under heaven, and they shall rule according to their choice over all nations; and afterwards they shall draw the whole earth to themselves and inherit it to eternity."

It is very characteristic testimony to the intensity of the Messianic hope in the age of Jesus Christ, that even a moralist like Philo should depict the happiness to be expected by the righteous, in the frame and with the colouring of Jewish national expectations. Two passages of his work "on the reward of the good and the punishment of the wicked" come in this respect especially under consideration (De exsecrationibus, § 8-9, ed. Mang. ii. 435 sq., and De praemiis et poenis, § 15-20, ed. Mang. ii. 421-428). In the former passage he expresses the hope, that all Israelites, or rather all who are converted to the law of God (for it depends on this and not on natural descent from Abraham), will be gathered in the Holy Land. "Though they should be in the ends of the earth as slaves among their enemies, who have taken them captive, yet will they all be set at liberty at a given sign on one day, because their sudden turning to virtue astonishes their masters. For they will release them because they are ashamed of bearing rule over their betters. When then this unexpected freedom is bestowed on those, who were before scattered in Hellas and in barbarous countries, on islands and on the continent, they will hasten with one impulse from all quarters to the place pointed out to them, led by a Divine superhuman appearance, which, invisible to all others, is visible only to the delivered. … When then they have arrived, the ruined cities will be rebuilt, and the desert reinhabited, and the barren land become fertile." In the other passage (De praemiis et poenis, § 15 sqq., Mang. ii. 421 sqq.), Philo describes the time of prosperity and peace, which will appear when men turn to God. Before all they will be safe from wild beasts. "Bears, lions, panthers, Indian elephants, tigers and all kinds of beasts of uncontrollable strength and power will turn from their solitary ways of life to one according to law, and from intercourse with few, after the manner of gregarious animals, will accustom themselves to the sight of man, who will not as formerly be attacked by them, but feared as their master, and they will respect him as their natural lord. Some even, emulating the tame animals, will offer him their homage by wagging their tails like lap-dogs. The race too of scorpions, snakes and other reptiles will then no longer have any harmful poison" (§ 15). A further blessing of this time is peace among men. "Then says the prophecy (LXX. Num. 24:7) a man who goes to battle and makes war shall go forth and subdue great and populous nations, God Himself sending help to His saints. This consists in unshaken boldness of mind and invincible strength of body, qualities each of which singly is terrible to enemies, but which when combined nothing is able to resist. But some of the enemies are, as the prophecy says, not even worthy to perish by the hand of man. Against them He (God) will send swarms of wasps, who fight to a shameful overthrow for the saints. But these (instead of τοῦτον we must read τούτους, i.e. the saints) will not only have certain victory in battle without bloodshed, but also invincible power of government for the welfare of their subjects, who will submit from either love, fear, or reverence. For they (the saints) possess three qualities, which are the greatest, and which found an indestructible dominion. Holiness, great power and benevolence (σεμνότητα καὶ δεινότητα καὶ εὐεργεσίαν), the first of which produces reverence, the second fear, the third love, but if they are harmoniously combined in the soul, they produce subjects, who are obedient to their rulers" (§ 16). Philo next mentions riches and prosperity (§ 20), health and strength of body, as blessings of Messianic times (§ 17-18). It is evident, that notwithstanding his efforts always to lay the chief emphasis on the ethic, he was not able to avoid popular notions. For he too expected, after the realization of the ethic ideal, a time of external prosperity and happiness for the pious and virtuous, one feature of which would be, that they should have dominion upon earth. Nor was the Messianic King absent from this image. For who else than he could be intended by the man, who goes to battle, carries

on war and subdues great and populous nations? And the less such a God-sent hero is required by Philo's fundamental view, the more worthy of remark is it, that he is nevertheless included in his description of the Messianic age.

But even apart from such evidence, it is already plain from the New Testament, that the Messianic idea was anything but extinct in the popular consciousness in the period before Christ. We easily see from the question of John: "Art Thou He that should come, or do we look for another?" (Matt. 11:3; Luke 7:19-29), that the coming One was expected. And the whole course of the gospel history – to mention only Peter's confession (Matt. 16:13 sqq.; Mark 8:27 sqq.; Luke 9:18 sqq.) – clearly shows that Jesus in acknowledging Himself to be the Messiah, was only connecting Himself with existing ideas He by no means aimed in the first place at the revival and animation of Messianic hopes. And yet we find, that at His entry into Jerusalem, the whole multitude hailed Him as the Messiah (Matt. 21; Mark 11; Luke 19; John 12). Such scenes are only to be explained on the assumption, that the Messianic hope was, before His appearance, already active in the nation.

This also needs no proof for the period after Christ. The numerous popular tumults of a politico-religious kind, which took place in the time of the Roman procurators (A.D. 44-66), give sufficient evidence of the feverish tension, with which a miraculous intervention of God in history and the appearance of His kingdom on earth were expected. How else could men such as Theudas the Egyptian have found believers for their promises by hundreds and thousands? Even Josephus superabundantly confesses, that the Messianic hope was one of the most powerful levers in the great insurrection against Rome. He himself did not indeed shrink from applying the Messianic prophecies to Vespasian, and in this respect he found approving faith from Tacitus and Suetonius.

On the state of the Messianic hope after the destruction of the temple, and during the last decades of the first century after Christ, we have copious information in the Apocalypses of Baruch and Ezra. The Apolcaypse of Baruch describes the course of the last things as follows: A time of general and terrible confusion will first of all occur, Men will mutually hate and fight against each other. The disreputable will rule over the respectable, the base will be exalted above the illustrious, the ungodly above heroes. And the nations (whom God has previously prepared for the purpose – we cannot but think of Gog and Magog) will come and fight against the princes who remain. And it will come to pass, that he who escapes from war, will perish by the earthquake, and he who escapes this, by fire, and he who escapes the fire, by famine. And he who escapes all these ills will be delivered into the hands of the Messiah (70:2-10). For he will be manifested, and destroy the hosts of the last universal kingdom. And the last prince, who is left, will be chained and brought to Zion, and the Messiah will convict him of ungodliness and put him to death (39:7-40:2). The Messiah will gather the nations, and to some he will grant life, and others he will destroy with the sword. He will grant life to those who have submitted to the seed of Jacob. But those who have oppressed Israel will be destroyed (72:2-6). Then will he sit upon the throne of his kingdom for ever; and peace will appear, and sorrow and tribulation depart from mankind, and joy prevail over the whole earth. And the wild beasts shall come and serve men, and vipers and serpents shall be subject to children. And the reapers shall not be faint, nor the builders weary (73-74; comp. 40:2, 3). And the earth shall yield her fruits a thousandfold, and on one vine there shall be a thousand branches, and on one branch a thousand clusters, and on one cluster a thousand grapes, and one grape will yield a cor of wine. And manna will again fall from heaven, and it shall be again eaten in those days (29:5-8). And after the end of that time all the dead will arise, the just and the unjust, in the same bodily form

which they formerly had. Then will judgment be held. And after the judgment the risen will be changed. The bodies of the just will be transfigured in brightness, but those of the unjust will dwindle and become uglier than before. And they will be given up to torment. But the just will behold the invisible world, and will dwell in the high places of that world. And Paradise spreads out before them, and they see the hosts of angels who stand before the throne of God. And their glory is greater than that of the angels (chap, 30, 50, and 51; comp. 44:15).

The eschatological expectations of the fourth Book of Esdras agree in all essential points with those of Baruch. He too predicts first a time of fearful want and distress (5:1–13, 6:18–28, 9:1–12, 13:29–31). After this the Messiah, the Son of God, will be revealed, and it will come to pass, that when the nations hear His voice they will forget war amongst each other, and will assemble in an innumerable multitude for an attack against the anointed. But he will stand upon Mount Zion, and will convict them of their ungodliness, and destroy them by the law without battle and without weapons (13:25–28, 32–38; comp. 12:31–33). Then will the hidden city (viz. New Jerusalem) appear (7:26); and the ten tribes will return to the Holy Land (13:39–47). And the anointed will protect and rejoice the people of God in the Holy Land, and show them many miracles for four hundred years (7:27, 28, 12:34, 13:48–50; comp. 9:8). And after this the anointed and all men who have breath will die. And the world will again return to the silence of death for seven days, as at the beginning. And after seven days a world which now sleeps will awake, and the corrupt world will perish. And the earth will restore those who sleep in it; and the receptacles will give back the souls committed to them (7:29–32). And the Most High will appear upon the judgment-seat, and long-suffering will have an end; only judgment will remain, and the reward come to light (7:33–35). And the place of torment will be revealed, and opposite to it the place of rest; the pit of hell, and opposite to it Paradise. And the Most High will say to the risen: Behold Him whom you denied and did not honour, and whose commands you did not obey. Here is joy and delight, there is fire and torment. And the length of the day of judgment will be a week of years (6:1–17, according to the computation of the Ethiopic translation; comp. also vv. 59 and 68–72, ed. Fritzsche, in Bensley, The Missing Fragment, etc. 1875, pp. 55–58, 64, 69 sq.).

Thus the two Apocalypses. That their hopes are not those of individuals, but form an essential element of Jewish consciousness is still shown by the Shemoneh Esreh, the daily prayer of the Israelites, which received its present form about A.D. 100. As it has been fully given above (p. 85 sq.), we need here only recall that in the 10th petition the gathering of the dispersed, in the 11th the reinstitution of the native authorities, in the 14th the rebuilding of Jerusalem, in the 15th the sending of the son of David and the setting up of his kingdom, and lastly, in the 17th, the restoration of the sacrificial worship at Jerusalem, are prayed for. Such was the hope and prayer of every Israelite after the destruction of the Jewish polity.

We have in this survey purposely passed over the Targums, in which “King Messiah” frequently appears. For the opinion, that the older Targums originated in the time of Jesus Christ, may now be regarded as given up. They probably belong to the third or fourth century after Christ, at any rate, there is no proof of their greater antiquity, though they often fall back upon older exegetical traditions. Their case is the same as that of the other rabbinical works (the Mishna, Talmud, and Midrash), viz. that they are based upon older materials, but do not in their existing form belong to the period of which we are treating. The essential outlines of the Messianic hope of Judaism in this later time. (about the beginning of the third century) are very well summed up by the author of the Philosophumena, who describes them in the following manner: they say that the Messiah will proceed from the house of David, not from a virgin and the Holy Ghost, but from a

man and woman, as it is appointed to all to be born from seed. He will, they believe, be king over them, a warlike and powerful man, who will gather together the whole nation of the Jews, and carry on war with all nations, and build Jerusalem as a royal city for the Jews, in which he will assemble the whole nation, putting it into its old condition as a ruling and a sacrifice-offering nation, which will long dwell in safety. Afterwards war will arise against them collectively, and in this war the Messiah will fall by the sword. Not long after will follow the end and the conflagration of the world, and then will be fulfilled that which is believed with respect to the resurrection, and retribution be done to every one according to his works.

III. SYSTEMATIC STATEMENT

We supplement this historical survey by giving also in the following pages a systematic statement of Messianic doctrinal theology on the foundation of the Shema, as resulting from the Apocalypse of Baruch and the fourth Book of Esdras. For the eschatological expectation is most fully developed in these two Apocalypses.

1. The last tribulation and perplexity. Almost everywhere when the last things are referred to, the thought recurs with different variations, that the appearance of redemption must be preceded by a period of special trouble and affliction. It was indeed in itself an obvious thought, that the path to happiness should pass through tribulation. This was also expressly predicted in the Old Testament (Hos. 13:13; Dan. 12:1, and elsewhere); and thus was formed in Rabbinical theology, the doctrine of the חֶבְלֵי הַמָּשִׁיחַ, the travail of the Messiah, which must precede His birth, i.e. His appearing (the expression according to Hos. 13:13; comp. Matt. 24:8: πάντα δὲ ταῦτα ἀρχὴ ὠδίνων; Mark 13:9: ἀρχαὶ ὠδίνων ταῦτα). The threatening troubles will be announced by omens of all kinds. The sun and moon will be darkened, swords appear in heaven, trains of horse and foot march through the clouds (Orac. Sibyll. 3:795–807; comp. 2 Macc. 5:2, 3. Joseph. Bell. Jud. vi. 5. 3. Tacit. Hist. v. 13). Everything in nature falls into commotion and confusion. The sun appears by night, the moon by day. Blood trickles from wood, the stone gives forth a voice, and salt is found in fresh water (4 Ezra 5:1–13). Places that have been sown will appear as unsown, full barns be found empty, and the springs of the wells be stopped (4 Ezra 6:18–28). Among men all the restraints of order will be dissolved, sin and ungodliness rule upon earth. And men will fight against each other as if stricken with madness, the friend against the friend, the son against the father, the daughter against the mother. Nation will rise against nation, and to war shall be added earthquakes, fire, and famine, whereby men shall be carried off (Book of Jubilees in Ewald's Jahrb. vol. iii. p. 23 sq. Apocal. Baruch 70:2–8; 4 Ezra 6:24, 9:1–12, 13:29–31; Mishna, Sota ix. 15). Comp. also Matt. 24:7–12, 21; Mark 13:9; Luke 21:23; 1 Cor. 7:26; 2 Tim. 3:1.

2. Elijah as the forerunner. The return of the prophet Elijah to prepare the way of the Messiah was expected on the ground of Mal. 3:23, 24. This view is already taken for granted in the Book of Ecclesiasticus (48:10, 11). It is, as is well known, frequently alluded to in the New Testament (see especially Matt. 17:10; Mark 9:11; also Matt. 11:14, 16:14; Mark 6:15, 8:28; Luke 9:8, 19; John 1:21). It was even transferred to the Christian circle of ideas. According to Mal. 3:24, the object of his mission is chiefly considered to be, to make peace upon earth and in general to substitute order for disorder (Matt. 17:11: ἀποκαταστήσει πάντα; Mark 9:12: ἀποκαθιστάνει πάντα). The chief passage in the Mishna is as follows: "R. Joshua said: I received the tradition from R. Johanan ben Sakkai, who received it from his teacher as a tradition in a direct line from Moses at Mount Sinai, that Elias would not come to pronounce clean or unclean, to reject or admit families in general, but only to reject those who had entered by violence, and to admit those who had been rejected by violence. There was, beyond Jordan, a family of the name of

Beth Zerefa, which a certain Ben Zion had excluded by violence. There was there another family (of impure blood), whom this Ben Zion had admitted by violence. Therefore he comes to pronounce such clean or unclean, to reject or to admit them. R. Jehudah says: only to admit, but not to reject. R. Simon says: his mission is merely to arrange disputes. The learned say neither to reject nor admit, but his coming is merely with the object of making peace in the world. For it is said: 'I send you, Elijah the prophet, to turn the heart of the fathers to the children, and the heart of the children to the fathers' (Mal. 3:4)." To the duty of the institutors of peace and order belongs also the decision of disputed cases. Therefore it is said in the Mishna, that money and property whose owners are disputed, or anything found whose owner is unknown, must wait "till Elijah comes." The view that he will anoint the Messiah, and raise the dead, is also found in single instances. Besides Elijah, the prophet like Moses, who is promised Deut. 18:15 (John 1:21, 6:14, 7:40), was expected by many, while by others this passage was applied to the Messiah Himself. Allusions are also found in the New Testament to other prophets as forerunners of the Messiah, as e.g. Jeremiah (Matt. 16:14). In Christian authorities a return of Enoch is also spken of (Ev. Nicodemi, c. 25, and the patristic exegetes on Rev. 11:3).

3. The appearing of the Messiah. After these preparations the Messiah will appear. For it is by no means the case, that pre-Christian Judaism did not expect the Messiah till after the judgment, and that it was under the influence of Christianity, that the notion of the Messiah Himself sitting in judgment upon His enemies was first found. For not only in Baruch and Ezra, not only in the figurative addresses of the Book of Enoch and in the Targums (where perhaps Christian influence might be admitted), but also in the oldest Sibyll (3:652-656), in the Psalter of Solomon (17:24, 26, 27, 31, 38, 39, 41), and in Philo (De praemiis et poenis, § 16), and thus in decidedly pre-Christian documents, does Messiah appear for the overthrow of the ungodly powers. And the opposite view, that He will not appear till after the judgment, is found only in a solitary instance, viz. in the groundwork of the Book of Enoch (90:16-38). Hence His appearing must undoubtedly be spoken of in this place.

First with regard to his name as the appointed King of Israel and the anointed of God, he is most frequently called the Anointed, the Messiah (Enoch 48:10, 52:4; Apocal. Baruch 29:3, 30:1, 39:7, 40:1, 70:9, 72:2; Ezra 7:28, 29, where the Latin translation is interpolated; Ezra 12:32: Unctus); Greek, Χριστὸς κυρίου (Psalt. Solom. 17:36, 18:6, 8); Hebr. הַמָּשִׁיחַ (Mishna, Berachoth i. 5); Aramaic, מְשִׁיחָא (Mishna, Sota ix. 15); or מַלְכָּא מְשִׁיחָא (both frequently in the Targums). The designation — the Son of man — which arose from appropriating directly to the Messiah, the image in Daniel of one coming in the clouds of heaven in the form of a man, but which, according to the context in Daniel, signifies the church and kingdom of God, is peculiar to the figurative addresses of the Book of Enoch (46:1-4, 48:2, 62:7, 9, 14, 63:11, 69:26, 27, 70:1). Inasmuch as the Messiah is the chosen instrument of God, and the love of God rests upon Him, He is called the Elect (Enoch 45:3, 4, 49:2, 51:3, 5, 52:6, 9, 53:6, 55:4, 61:8, 62:1), or like the theocratic king in the Old Testament, the Son of God (Enoch 105:2; 4 Ezra 7:28, 29, 13:32, 37, 52, 14:9). In Enoch the title Son of the Woman once occurs, perhaps as a Christian interpolation, Enoch 62:5. It was universally acknowledged, on the ground of Old Testament prophecy, that He would proceed from the race of David (Psalt. Solom. 17:5, 23; Matt. 22:42; Mark 12:35; Luke 20:41; John 7:42; 4 Ezra 12:32; Targum Jonathan on Isa. 11:1; Jer. 23:5, 33:15). Hence, Son of David is a usual title of the Messiah (frequently in the New Testament υἱὸς Δαυίδ; in Targum Jonathan on Hosea 3:5, בַּר דָּוִיד; in the Shemoneh Esreh, 15th Berachah, צֶמַח דָּוִד). As Davidic He was also to be born in Bethlehem, the town of David (Micah 5:1 with the Targum; Matt. 2:5; John 7:41, 42).

Whether pre-Christian Judaism regarded the Messiah as simply human, or as a being of a higher order, and especially whether it attributed to him pre-existence, cannot, with the uncertainty about the dates of authorities, be positively decided. The original Messianic hope did not expect an individual Messiah at all, but theocratic kings of the house of David. Subsequently the hope was consolidated and raised more and more into the expectation of a personal Messiah as a ruler endowed by God with special gifts and powers. In the time of Christ this form had at all events long been the prevailing one. But this naturally implies that the picture would more and more acquire superhuman features. The more exceptional the position awarded to the Messiah, the more does He Himself step forth from ordinary human limits. In the freedom with which the religious circle of ideas moved, this was effected in a very different fashion. In general however the Messiah was thought of as a human king and ruler, but as one endowed by God with special gifts and powers. This is especially evident in the Solomonian Psalter. He here appears as altogether a human king (17:23, 47), but a righteous one (17:35), free from sin and holy (17:41, 46), endowed by the Holy Ghost with power, wisdom and righteousness (17:42). It is the same view, only briefly expressed, which designates him as ἁγνὸς ἄναξ (Orac. Sibyll. 3:49). Elsewhere, on the other hand, even pre-existence is ascribed to him, and his whole appearing raised more to the superhuman. So especially in the figurative addresses in the Book of Enoch. It must not indeed be reckoned in this respect, that he is, as already mentioned, called the Son of God. For the official predicate tells us nothing at all of His nature; nor does His designation in Enoch as the Son of man of itself tell us anything. The whole view of His person is however in both the above-named works one essential supernatural. In the figurative addresses in the Book of Enoch, it is said of Him: He was (before his manifestation on earth) hidden and kept with God (46:1, 2, 62:7). His name was named before the Lord of spirits, before the sun and the signs were created, before the stars were made (48:3). He was chosen and was hidden with God before the world was created, and will be with Him to eternity (48:6). His countenance is as the appearance of a man, and full of grace, like one of the holy angels (46:1). It is he, who has righteousness, with whom righteousness dwells, and who reveals all the treasures of that which is concealed, because the Lord of spirits has chosen him, and his lot before the Lord of spirits has surpassed everything through uprightness for ever (46:3). His glory is from eternity to eternity, and his power from generation to generation. In him dwells the spirit of wisdom, and the spirit of Him who gives knowledge, and the spirit of instruction and strength, and the spirit of those who have fallen asleep in righteousness. And he will judge the hidden things, and no one will be able to hold vain discourse before him, for he is chosen before the Lord of spirits according to his good pleasure (49:2–4). In essential agreement with this are the expressions of the fourth Book of Ezra. Compare especially 12:32: Hic est Unctus, quem reservavit Altissimus in finem; and 13:24: Ipse est, quem conservat Altissimus multis temporibus. As his pre-existence is here expressly taught, so is it presupposed when it is promised to Ezra, that after his admission into heaven he will return with the Messiah (tu enim recipieris ab hominibus, et converteris residuum cum filio meo et cum similibus tuis, usquequo finiantur tempora). And quite in accordance with Enoch is his pre-existence designated as a state of concealment with God (13:52): Sicut non potest hoc vel scrutinare vel scire quis, quid sit in profundo maris, sic non poterit quisque super terram videre filium meum, vel eos qui cum eo sunt, nisi in tempore diei. It has been in many respects attempted, but hardly with justice, to refer this entire series of thought to Christian influences. It is indeed perfectly comprehensible from Old Testament premises. Such expressions as Micah 5:2, that the origins of Messiah are from of old, from the days of eternity (מִקֶּדֶם מִימֵי עוֹלָם), might easily be understood in the sense of a pre-existence from eternity. Besides, the passage Dan. 7:13–14 need only be understood of the person of the Messiah and taken literally, and the doctrine of the pre-existence is already stated. For it is self-evident, that he who

comes down from heaven, was before in heaven. This view was favoured by the fact that the whole course of the development tended towards the notion, that everything truly valuable previously existed in heaven. On the other hand, many traces show that post-Christian Judaism, far from elevating the person of the Messiah, under Christian influence to the supernatural, strongly emphasized the human side in opposition to Christianity. We need only recall the saying in Justin's Dialogus cum Tryphone, c. 49: πάντες ἡμεῖς τὸν Χριστὸν ἄνθρωπον ἐξ ἀνθρώπων προσδοκῶμεν γενήσεσθαι. And akin with this is a Talmudic passage Jer. Taanith ii. 1 (given by Oehler, ix. 437, 2nd ed. 667): "R. Abbahu said: If a man says to thee – I am God, he lies; I am the Son of man, he will at last repent it; I ascend to heaven, if he said it he will not prove it." Thus it was just the humanity upon which post-Christian Judaism strongly insisted. And so much the less cause have we to refer the view of the pre-existence to Christian influence.

Concerning the time of Messiah's appearing the later Rabbis made all manner of ingenious computations. The view that the present world would last six thousand years, corresponding to the six days of creation, because one day is with God as a thousand years, seems to have been pretty widely disseminated. But the date of the advent of Messiah seems under this presupposition to have been very variously computed, according as his days were identified with the future עוֹלם or still reckoned in the present עוֹלָם(comp. below, No. 9). According to the former and older view, the Messianic period would begin after the lapse of the sixth thousand (so Barnabas, Irenaeus and others). On the latter supposition (that the days of the Messiah belonged to the present עוֹלָם), the present course of the world was divided into three periods: 2000 years without law, 2000 years under the law, and 2000 years of the Messianic period. According to this computation the time appointed for the Messiah's advent had already arrived, but he could not yet appear because of the transgressions of the people. This latter was, at least in rigidly legal circles, the general view: the Messiah cannot come until the people repent and perfectly fulfil the law. "If all Israel would together repent for a whole day, the redemption by Messiah would ensue." If Israel would only keep two Sabbaths properly, we should be immediately redeemed.

The manner of Messiah's advent is represented as sudden all at once he is there and appears as a victorious ruler. As on the other hand it is assumed, that he is born as a child in Bethlehem, the two views are combined by the admission, that he will at first live in concealment and then suddenly come forth from concealment. Therefore the Jews say in John 7:27: ὁ Χριστὸς ὅταν ἔρχηται, οὐδεὶς γινώσκει πόθεν ἐστίν. And in Justin's Dialogus cum Tryphone it is just on this account that the possibility, that Messiah may have already been born, is left open to the representative of the Jewish view. It is related in the Jerusalem Talmud, that the Messiah was born on the day the temple was destroyed, but some time after carried away from his mother by a tempest. In the Targum on Micah 4:8 also, it is assumed that he is already present, but still concealed, and that because of the sins of the people. In later writers is found the view that he would proceed from Rome. The belief that he would at his advent authenticate himself by miracles was universal (Matt. 11:4 sqq.; Luke 7:22 sqq.; John 7:31).

4. Last attack of the hostile powers. After the appearing of the Messiah, the heathen powers will assemble against him for a last attack. This expectation too was suggested by Old Testament passages, especially by Dan. 11. It is very plainly expressed Orac. Sibyll. 3:663 sqq. and 4 Ezra 13:33 sqq., also in Enoch 90:16, only that here it is not an attack against Messiah, but against the people of God. It is frequently held, that this last attack takes place under the leadership of a chief adversary of the Messiah, of an "Antichrist" (the name is in the N. T. in the Johannean

Epistles, 1 John 2:18, 22, 4:3; 2 John 7; the thing in Apoc. Baruch c. 40; 2 Thess. 2; Rev. 13). In later Rabbinic authorities the enigmatical name Armilus (ארמילוס) occurs for this chief adversary of the people of Israel. The reappearance of Gog and Magog is also expected on the ground of Ezek. 38–39, but as a rule not till after the close of the Messianic kingdom, as a last manifestation of the ungodly powers (Rev. 20:8, 9).

5. Destruction of the Hostile Powers. The destruction of the hostile powers takes place according to Old Testament prediction by means of a great judgment, inflicted by God Himself upon His adversaries. This view is most faithfully adhered to in the Assumptio Mosis, the tenth chapter of which in many respects recalls Joel chaps, 3 and 4 Closely akin to it is the statement in the groundwork of the Book of Enoch, inasmuch as here too God Himself destroys the power of the heathen nations (90:18, 19) and then sits in judgment, at which judgment however only the fallen and disobedient angels and the apostate Israelites (the blinded sheep) are condemned (90:20–27), while the heathen nations submit to the people of God (90:30). The Messiah, who is altogether absent in the Assumptio Mosis, here first appears after the judgment (90:37). It is common to both, that it is God Himself who sits in judgment. The ordinary notion however was, that the Messiah would destroy the hostile powers. Already in the oldest Sibyllist (3:652 sqq.) he appears "to put an end to all war upon earth, killing some and fulfilling the promises given to others." In Philo (De praem. et poen. § 16) it is said of him, that he "takes the field and makes war and will subdue great and populous nations." Still more clearly does he appear in the Psalterium Salomonis as the conqueror of the heathen adversaries of God's people, and it is here specially noteworthy, that he overthrows his enemies by the mere word of his mouth (ἐν λόγῳ στόματος αὐτοῦ, according to Isa. 11:4). In entire agreement with these older types is the destruction of the heathen world-powers represented in the Apocalypse of Baruch and the fourth Book of Ezra as the first act of the Messiah, when he appears (Apoc. Baruch 39:7–40:2, 70:9, 72:2–6; 4 Ezra 12:32, 33, 13:27, 28, 35–38). The only difference is, that, according to the fourth Book of Ezra, this destruction results from a sentence of God's anointed (13:28: non tenebat frameam neque vas bellicosum; 13:28: perdet eos sine labore per legem), while in the Apocalypse of Baruch although forensic forms are spoken of, yet weapons of war are also mentioned (the former 40:1, 2, the latter 72:6). Still more decidedly than in the fourth Book of Ezra, is the judgment of the Messiah upon an ungodly world described as purely forensic in the figurative addresses in the Book of Enoch. One might indeed feel tempted to ascribe to this book also the view of a war of extermination, since it is said of the Son of man, chap. 46:4–6, that he stirs up the kings and the mighty ones from their beds, loosens the bridles of the powerful and breaks the teeth of sinners; that he thrusts kings from their thrones and out of their kingdoms, and (52:4–9) that nothing on earth is able to resist his power. "There will be no iron for war, nor coat of mail; brass will be of no avail, and tin will be of no avail and will be of no esteem, and lead will not be desired." But in other places it is repeatedly said, that the elect, the Son of man, will sit upon the throne of His glory to judge men and angels (45:3, 55:4, 69:27, 61:8, 9). In the chief passage also, chap. 62., the judgment is described in purely forensic forms. The Lord of spirits sits upon the throne of his glory (62:2), and the Son of the woman, the Son of man, sits upon the throne of his glory (62:5 sqq.). And the kings and mighty ones of the earth are struck when they see him with fear and terror, and extol and praise and supplicate him, and entreat mercy from him (62:4–9). But the Lord of spirits will reject them, so that they will speedily flee before his face, and their faces be filled with shame. And the avenging angels will receive them, to exercise retribution upon them, for having ill-treated his children and his elect (62:10, 11). Finally, we again find in the Targums the view, that the Messiah overcomes his enemies in battle, as a mighty hero. So in Jonathan on Isa. 10:27: "The nations are crushed by the Messiah;" and especially in Pseudo-Jonathan and Jerushalmi on Gen. 49:11: "How beautiful

is King Messiah, who will proceed from the house of Judah. He girds his loins and enters the field and sets the battle in array against his foes and kills kings." We just see from all this, that the general idea of a destruction of the anti-godly powers by the Messiah is fashioned very variously as to its particulars. Not till after the destruction of the ungodly can the Messianic age appear, For "as long as there are sinners in the world, so long does the wrath of God endure, but as they disappear from the world the divine wrath also vanishes."

6. Renovation of Jerusalem. Since the Messianic kingdom is to be set up in the Holy Land (comp. e.g. 4 Ezra 9:9), Jerusalem itself must first of all be renovated. This was however expected in diverse manners. In the simplest it was regarded only as a purification of the holy city, especially "from the heathen, who now tread it under foot" (Psalt. Salom. 17:25, 33). After the destruction of Jerusalem it took the form of a rebuilding and indeed of a rebuilding "to an eternal building" (Shemoneh Esreh, 14th Berachah). With this is however found the view, that already in the pre-Messianic time a far more glorious Jerusalem than the earthly exists with God in heaven, and that this will, at the commencement of the Messianic age, descend to earth. The Old Testament foundation for this hope is especially Ezek. 40–48, also Isa. 54:11 sqq., 60; Hag. 2:7–9; Zech. 2:6–17; the new Jerusalem described in these passages being conceived of as now already existing in heaven. This ἄνω Ἰερουσαλήμ (Gal. 4:26), Ἰερουσαλὴμ ἐπουράνιος (Heb. 12:22) καινὴ Ἰερουσαλήμ (Rev. 3:12, 21:2, 10) is also, as is well known, often spoken of in the New Testament; comp. also Test. Dan. c. 5: ἡ νέα Ἰερουσαλήμ. According to the Apocalypse of Baruch, this heavenly Jerusalem was originally in Paradise before Adam sinned. But when he transgressed the command of God, it was taken from him, as was also Paradise, and preserved in heaven. It was afterwards shown in a vision of the night to Abraham, and also to Moses upon Mount Sinai (Apoc. Baruch 4:2–6). Ezra too saw it in a vision (4 Ezra 10:44–59). This new and glorious Jerusalem is then to appear on earth in the place of the old one, which it will far surpass in pomp and beauty, Enoch 53:6, 90:28, 29; 4 Ezra 7:26. Comp. also Apoc. Baruch 32:4.

7. Gathering of the Dispersed. That the dispersed of Israel would share in the Messianic kingdom, and for this purpose return to Palestine, was so self-evident, that this hope would have been cherished even without the definite predictions of the Old Testament. The Psalterium Salomonis (Ps. 11) poetically describes how the dispersed of Israel will assemble from the west and east, from the north and from the Isles, and come to Jerusalem. The Greek Book of Baruch expresses a partly verbal agreement with the Psalt. Sal. (4:36, 37, 5:5–9). Philo sees the dispersed under the leadership of a divine appearance coming from all quarters to Jerusalem (De exsecrationibus, § 8–9). The prediction too of Isaiah, that the heathen nations shall themselves bring the dispersed as an offering to the temple (Isa. 49:22, 60:4, 9, 66:20) reappears in the Psalt. Salom. (17:34), while the gathering is at the same time described as the work of the Messiah (Psalt. Salom. 17:28. Jonathan on Jerem. 33:13). According to the fourth Book of Ezra, the ten tribes departed into a hitherto uninhabited country called Azareth (so the Latin version) or Arzaph (finis mundi, so the Syrian), that they might there observe their laws. Thence will they return at the commencement of the Messianic period, and the Most High will dry up the sources of the Euphrates, that they may pass over (4 Ezra 13:39–47). With this universal hope of the gathering of the dispersed, it is striking, that the return of the ten tribes is altogether doubted by individuals like R. Akiba. From the daily prayer however of the Shemoneh Esreh: "Lift up a banner to gather our dispersed and assemble us from the four ends of the earth," it is seen that such doubts were confined to individuals.

8. The kingdom of glory in Palestine. The Messianic kingdom will indeed have the Messianic

King at its head, but its supreme ruler is God Himself (comp. e.g. Orac. Sibyll. 3:704–706, 717, 756–759; Psalt. Salom. 17:1, 38, 51; Shemoneh Esreh, 11th Berachah. Joseph. Bell. Jud. ii. 8. 1). With the setting up of this kingdom, the idea of God's kingship over Israel becomes full reality and truth. God is indeed already the King of Israel. He does not however exercise His kingship to its full extent, but on the contrary temporarily exposes His people to the heathen world-powers, to chastise them for their sins. In the glorious future kingdom He again takes the government into His own hand. Hence it is called in contrast to the heathen kingdoms, the kingdom of God (βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ, in the New Testament, especially in Mark and Luke. Sibyll. 3:47, 48: βασιλεία μεγίστη ἀθανάτου βασιλῆος. Comp. Psalt. Salom. 17:4; Assumptio Mosis 10:1, 3). Of similar meaning is the expression occurring in Matthew, βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν, "kingdom of heaven." For "heaven" here is, according to a very current Jewish expression, a metonymy for God. It is the kingdom, which is governed not by earthly powers, but by heaven.

The Holy Land forms the central point of this kingdom. Hence "to inherit the land" is equivalent to having part in the Messianic kingdom. But it is not confined to the limits of Palestine; on the contrary, it is as a rule conceived of as in some way or other comprising the whole world. Already, in the Old Testament, it was predicted that the Gentiles too should acknowledge the God of Israel as the supreme Judge (Isa. 2:2 sqq.; Micah 4:1 sqq., 7:16 sq.), be converted to Him (Isa. 42:1–6, 49:6, 51:4, 5; Jer. 3:17, 16:19 sq.; Zeph. 2:11, 3:9; Zech. 8:20 sqq.), and be consequently admitted into the theocracy (Isa. 55:5, 56:1 sqq.; Jer. 12:14; Zech. 2:15), so that Jahveh is King over the whole earth (Zech. 14:9) and the Messiah a banner for all nations (Isa. 11:10). Most decidedly is power over all the kingdoms of the world promised in the Book of Daniel to the saints of the Most High (Dan. 2:14, 7:14, 27). This hope was also stedfastly adhered to by later Judaism, though in a different manner. According to the Sibyllines the heathen, when they see the quiet and peace of God's people, will of themselves come to reason, and praise and celebrate the only true God, send gifts to His temple and walk after His laws (Orac. Sibyll. 3:698–726). Then will God set up a kingdom over all men, in which the prophets of God are judges and righteous kings (3:766–783). According to Philo the pious and virtuous receive the rule over the world, because they possess the three qualities, which especially make men competent to be rulers, viz. σεμνότης, δεινότης and εὐεργεσία. And other men submit to them through αἰδώς or φόβος or εὔνοια (De praem. et poen. § 16). Elsewhere the rule of the saints appears more as one founded on power. The heathen do homage to the Messiah, because they perceive that God has given him power (Enoch 90:30, 37. Figurative addressee, xlviii, 5, liii. 1; Psalt. Salom. 17:32–35; Sibyll. 3:49: ἁγνὸς ἄναξ πάσης γῆς σκῆπτρα κρατήσων. Apoc. Baruch 72:5. Targum on Zech. 4:7: The Messiah will rule over all kingdoms). This notion conies forward in the most one-sided form in the Assumptio Mosis, whose author desires nothing more ardently, than that Israel should tread upon the neck of the eagle (10:8: tunc felix eris tu Istrahel, et ascendes supra cervices et alas aquilae). According to the Book of Jubilees (Ewald's Jahrb. vol. iii. p. 42) it was already promised to Jacob, that kings should go forth from him, who should rule, wherever the children of men had trodden. "And I will give unto thy seed the whole earth, which is under heaven, and they shall rule at their pleasure over all nations, and afterwards they shall draw to themselves the whole earth and inherit it for ever" (comp. also Rom. 4:13, and its expositors, especially Wetzstein).

The Messianic period is moreover described, and that mostly on the ground of Old Testament passages, as one of joy and gladness. All war, strife, discord and quarrels shall cease, and peace, righteousness, love and faithfulness prevail upon earth (Orac. Sibyll. 3:371–380, 751–760. Philo, De praem. et poen. § 16; Apoc. Baruch 73:4, 5). The wild beasts also will lose their enmity to man and serve him (Sibyll. 3:620–623, 743–750; Apoc. Baruch 29:5–8). Wealth and

prosperity will prevail among men (Philo, De praem. et poen. § 17–18). The age of man will increase to near upon a thousand years, and yet men will neither be old nor weary of life, but like children and youths ("Jubilees" in Ewald's Jahrb. iii. 24). All will rejoice in bodily health and strength. Women will bring forth without pain, and the reaper will not weary at his work (Philo, De praem. et poen. § 20. Apoc. Baruch 73:2, 3, 7, 74:1).

These external blessings are not however the only ones. On the contrary, they result from the fact, that the Messianic Church is a holy nation, which God has sanctified, and which the Messiah governs in righteousness. He suffers no unrighteousness to remain in its midst, and there is not a man in it who knows wickedness. There is no unrighteousness among His people, for they are all holy (Psalt. Salom. 17:28, 29, 36, 48, 49, 18:9, 10). Life in the Messianic kingdom is a continual λατρεύειν θεῷ ἐν ὁσιότητι καὶ δικαιοσύνῃ ἐνώπιον αὐτοῦ (Luke 1:74, 75). And the rule of Messiah over the heathen world is by no means conceived of as resting only on power, but frequently in such wise, that he is a light to the Gentiles (Isa. 42:6, 49:6, 51:4; Enoch 48:4; Luke 2:32. Comp. especially the already mentioned passages of the Sibyllines, 3:710–726). An Israelite being unable to conceive of a λατρεύειν θεῷ otherwise than in the form of the temple worship and the observance of the law, it is in truth self-evident, that these are not to cease in the Messianic kingdom. In fact this is at least the prevailing view. Hence after the destruction of the temple the daily prayer of the Israelite is for the restoration of the sacrificial ritual (עֲבוֹדָה).

In this glorious future kingdom not only the dispersed members of the nation, but also all deceased Israelites are to participate. They will come forth from their graves to enjoy, with those of their fellow-countrymen who are then living, the happiness of Messiah's kingdom.

The eschatological expectations of many terminate with this hope of a kingdom of glory in Palestine, seeing its duration is conceived of as everlasting. As Old Testament prophecy had promised to the people of Israel that they should dwell in the land for ever (Jer. 24:6; Ezek. 37:25; Joel 4:20), that David's throne should never be vacant (Jer. 33:17, 22), and David should always be the king of Israel (Ezek. 37:25), and as, especially in the Book of Daniel, the kingdom of the saints of the Most High is designated an everlasting one (מַלְכוּת עָלַם, Dan. 7: 27), so also is eternal duration frequently ascribed to the Messianic kingdom by later writers (Sibyll. 3:766; Psalt. Salom. 17:4; Sibyll. 3:49–50; Enoch 62:14). Hence too the Jews say in. John 12:34: Ἡμεῖς ἠκούσαμεν ἐκ τοῦ νόμου ὅτι ὁ Χριστὸς μένει εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα, showing that this view was also current in later Jewish theology. Subsequently however the glory of the Messianic kingdom was regarded as not ultimate and supreme, but a still higher and heavenly happiness Was expected after it, and hence a duration bounded by time, the measure of which is fully discussed in the Talmud, was ascribed to the reign of the Messiah. The Apocalypse of Baruch and the fourth Book of Ezra, among the more ancient monuments, hold this view the most decidedly. It is indeed said of the Messiah in the former, c. 73:1, that He sits in aeternum super throno regni sui. But what is meant by this is seen from another passage, c. 40:3: Et erit principatus ejus stans in saeculum, donec finiatur mundus corruptionis. Hence the rule of Messiah lasts only as long as this transitory world. Similarly it is said in the fourth Book of Ezra (12:34), that He will redeem and revive the people of God quoadusque veniat finis, dies judicii. Still farther detail is given in the chief passage, 7:28, 29: Jocundabuntur, qui relicti sunt, annis quadragentis. Et erit post annos hos, et morietur filius meus Christus et omnes qui spiramentum habent homines. The duration of Messiah's kingdom is by others, and also in the above-named passage of the Talmud (Sanhedrin 99), computed at 400 years. From it we also learn that this computation rests upon Gen. 15:13 (the bondage in Egypt lasted 400 years) compared with Ps. 90:15:

“Make us glad according to the days wherein Thou hast afflicted us and the years wherein we have seen evil.” Thus the time of happiness is to last as long as the time of affliction. A different calculation is presupposed in the Revelation, the duration being stated at 1000 years, according to the saying in the Psalm, that one day is with God as a thousand years (Rev. 20:4-6). This computation also is mentioned in the Talmud. We see then, that wherever only a temporal duration is ascribed to the kingdom of the Messiah, a renovation of the world and the last judgment are expected at the end of this period.

9. Renovation of the world. The hope of a renovation of heaven and earth is chiefly based on Isa. 65:17, 66:22 (comp. also Matt. 19:28; Rev. 21:1; 2 Pet. 3:13). Accordingly a distinction is made between a present and a future world, הָעוֹלָם הַזֶּה and הָעוֹלָם הַבָּא, in the New Testament frequently: ὁ αἰὼν οὗτος and ὁ αἰὼν ὁ μέλλων or ὁ ἐρχόμενος (e.g. Matt 12:32; Mark 10:30; Luke 18:30). But a difference of view arose, inasmuch as some made the new world appear with the beginning of Messiah’s reign, while others placed it after its conclusion. The former is found e.g. in the figurative discourses of the Book of Enoch (c. 45:4, 5), “And at that day I will let my elect dwell among you and will change the heaven and make it an eternal blessing and light. And I will transform the earth and make it a blessing, and cause my elect to dwell in it” (comp. also 91:16). The latter in the fourth Book of Ezra, according to which, after the conclusion of the Messianic period, a deathlike silence of seven days takes place upon earth, which is followed by the dawn of the new and the setting of the old world (7:30, 31). According to these different views the Messianic period is either identified with the future or reckoned as belonging to the present world. The former, e.g. in the Targum of Jonathan on 1 Kings 4:33: “The future world of the Messiah” (עַלְמָא דְאָתֵי דְמְשִׁיחָא), and Mishna, Berachoth i. 5, where the present world (הָעוֹלָם הַזֶּה) and the days of the Messiah (יְמוֹת הַמָּשִׁיחַ) are opposed to each other, and therefore the latter identified with הָעוֹלָם הַבָּא. In the fourth Book of Ezra, on the contrary, the days of the Messiah are reckoned to the present world, and the future world does not begin till the last judgment, which follows the close of the Messianic period (see especially 7:42, 43, with which indeed 6:9 is not easily reconcilable). The book Sifre also distinguishes between “the days of the Messiah” and “the future world.” The older and original view is in any case, that which identifies the days of Messiah with the future עוֹלָם. For the “future course of the world” is in the first place nothing else than the future happy Messianic period (so too in the New Testament). It was not till a higher, a heavenly happiness was hoped for after the close of the Messianic kingdom, that the Messianic period was reckoned as belonging to the present Olam, and the renovation of the world not expected to take place till that period had ended. In later Jewish theology this view became the prevailing one (for particulars, see the literature named note 7 Sometimes a position between this world and the world to come is assigned to the Messianic period. This is already found in the Apocalypse of Baruch, 74:2, 3: Tempus illud (the Messianic time) finis est illius quod corrumpitur, et initium illius quod non corrumpitur. … Ideo longe est a malis, et prope iis quae non moriuntur.

10. The general resurrection. A general resurrection of the dead is to take place before the last judgment. So great a variety of views with respect to this point, however, prevails in Jewish theology, that it would lead us too far to enter into details. Only the chief points can here be alluded to. The belief in a resurrection or reanimation of the dead (תְּחִיַּת הַמֵּתִים), which is clearly and decidedly expressed for the first time in the Book of Daniel (12:2), was during our period already firmly established (comp. e.g. 2 Macc. 7:9, 14, 23, 36, 12:43, 44; Enoch 51:1; Psalt. Salom. 3:16, 14:2 sqq.; Joseph. Antt. xviii. 1. 3; Bell. Jud. ii. 8. 14; Apoc. Baruch 30:1-5, 50:1, 51:6; 4 Ezra 7:32; Testam. XII. Patriarch. Judae, 25.; Benjamin 10.; Shemoneh Esreh, 2 Berachah; Mishna, Sanhedrin x. 1; Aboth iv. 22; comp. also Berachoth v. 2; Sota ix. 15, fin.). At

least this applies with respect to all circles influenced by Pharisaism, and these formed by far the majority. Only the Sadducees denied the resurrection, while the Alexandrian theology placed in its stead the immortality of the soul. A separation between the just and unjust in the intermediate state between death and the resurrection was a rule accepted, a preliminary state of happiness or torment being allotted to departed souls (see especially Enoch 12 and in 4 Ezra the section rejected in the usual Latin text, c. 6:49–76, according to the computation of the Ethiopic translation, ed. Fritzsche, pp. 607–611). The same expectation lies at the root of the parable of the rich man and Lazarus (Luke 16:22). In the Apocalypse of Baruch and the fourth Book of Ezra, receptacles (promptuaria), into which the souls of the righteous are received after death, are frequently spoken of (Apoc. Baruch 30:2; 4 Ezra 4:35, 41, 7:32; in the rejected section, c. 6:54, 68, 74, 76, in Bensly, vv. 80, 95, 101). In many passages of the New Testament the hope comes forward, that immediately after death the removal to the state of supreme and heavenly happiness will take place (Luke 23:43; 2 Cor. 5:8; Phil. 1:23; Acts 7:59; Rev. 6:9 sqq., 7:9 sqq.), and this is not without analogy in the Jewish view, since here also the same is expected, at least for eminent men of God (not only for Enoch and Elijah, but e.g. also for Ezra and such as him, 4 Ezra 14:9: tu enim recipieris ab hominibus et converteris residuum cum filio meo et cum similibus tuis usquequo finiantur tempora). Established and generally accepted views on this point were not however formed. The Apocalypse of Baruch gives detailed disclosures on the resurrection body (50:1–51:6. Comp. also 4 Ezra 6:71 in the rejected section; in Bensly, ver. 97). One main difference in the doctrine of the resurrection consists in the expectation of a resurrection of the righteous only, for the purpose of participating in the Messianic kingdom, or of a general resurrection (of the righteous and the ungodly) to judgment; and that at one time before the commencement of Messiah's reign, at another after its conclusion. The oldest form is certainly that first named (comp. note 6 It is found e.g. in Psalt. Salom. 3:16, 14:2 sqq., but is also mentioned by Josephus as an average Pharisaic opinion (Antt. xviii. 1. 3; Bell. Jud. ii. 8. 14). The expectation of a general resurrection to judgment, is the extension of this older resurrection hope. So Daniel, Enoch. Apoc. Baruch, 4 Ezra, Testam. XII. Patriarch., and the Mishna in the above-cited places. Here again the distinction arises, as to whether the resurrection and judgment are expected before the commencement, or after the close of the Messianic period. The former view represented Dan. 12:2, and Enoch 51., is certainly the more ancient, for originally the object of the judgment was to inaugurate the Messianic period. Not till the Messianic blessedness ceased to be regarded as ultimate and supreme, was the judgment also, as the decision on man's final destiny, transferred to the close of the Messianic age. So especially Apoc. Baruch and 4 Ezra. In the New Testament Apocalypse the expectation of a resurrection of the just before the appearance of the Messianic kingdom is combined with that of a general resurrection after its close. The awakening itself takes place by the sounding of the trump of God (1 Cor. 15:52; 1 These. 4:16. Comp. Matt. 24:31; 4 Ezra 6:23).

11. The Last Judgment. Eternal Salvation and Condemnation. A last judgment at the close of the Messianic period can only be spoken of, when limited duration is ascribed to the Messianic kingdom. Hence among the older authorities it is only the Apocalypse of Baruch and the fourth Book of Ezra which need here be considered, In the rest the judgment coincides with the destruction of the hostile powers, which takes place before the commencement of Messiah's reign (see above, No. 5). In the Apocalypse of Baruch, the judgment is but briefly alluded to (50:4). The fourth Book of Ezra (7:33–35 and the rejected section, c. 6:17, in Bensly, pp. 55–58) gives more detail. We here learn that it is God Himself who sits in judgment. Nor can there be any doubt from these two books, that on the day of judgment sentence will be passed not only on the people of Israel, but on the whole race of mankind (Baruch 51:4, 5; Ezra 6:2, in Bensly,

p. 55 sq.). It holds good as a general principle, that all Israelites are to share in the world to come (Sanhedrin x. 1: כָּל יִשְׂרָאֵל יֵשׁ לָהֶם חֵלֶק לָעוֹלָם הַבָּא). It is self-evident however, that all the sinners of Israel (who are carefully catalogued in the Mishna, Sanhedrin x. 1–4) are excluded. Since sentence is to be passed upon each individual exactly in proportion to his works, the deeds of men are, during their lifetime, written in heavenly books (Enoch 48:7, 8, 54:7, also 89–90. Book of Jubilees in Ewald's Jahrb. iii. 38, and elsewhere. Test. XII, Patr. Aser 7. Mishna, Aboth ii. 1. Luke 10:20; Phil. 4:3; Rev. 3:5, 13:8, 20:15. Hermas, Vis. i. 3. 2), and sentence is passed according to the contents of these books. The ungodly are cast into the fire of Gehenna (Baruch 44:15, 51:1, 2, 4, 6; Ezra 6:1–3, 59, in Bensly, pp. 55 sq., 64). This condemnation is as a rule regarded as everlasting. But the view is also met with of a temporal duration to the punishments of hell, giving them only the signification of a purgatory. The righteous and godly are received into Paradise, and dwell in the high places of that world, and see the glory of God and of His holy angels. Their countenance will shine like the sun, and they will live for ever (Dan. 12:3; Baruch 51:3, 7–14; Ezra 6:1–3, 68–72, in Bensly, pp. 55 sq., 69 sq. Comp. also Assumptio Mosis 10:9, 10).

12. Appendix. The suffering Messiah. So far we have had no occasion to speak of the sufferings, or of any atoning death of the Messiah. For the prediction in the fourth Book of Ezra, that the Messiah should die after reigning 400 years (4 Ezra 7:28, 29), has evidently nothing in common with the idea of an atoning death. But the question, whether Judaism in the age of Christ expected a suffering Messiah, and indeed a Messiah suffering and dying as an atonement for the sins of men, must not be left undiscussed. According to what has been said, the question seems answered, as indeed it has been by many (especially after the most thorough investigation by De Wette), in the negative. Others, on the contrary, as e.g. Wünsche, think it may be as decidedly answered in the affirmative. Certainly the sufferings of the Messiah are repeatedly spoken of in the Talmud. From the word וְהַרִיחוֹ, Isa. 11:3, it is inferred that God loaded the Messiah with commands and sorrows like mill-stones (במצות ויסורין כרחים). In another passage Messiah is described as sitting at the gates of Rome and binding and unbinding His wounds. More important is it, that in Justin's Dialogus cum Tryphone it is repeatedly admitted, nay asserted as self-evident by the representative of the Jewish standpoint, that the Messiah mast suffer. "When we name to them (relates Justin, c. 68) the passages of Scripture, which clearly prove that the Messiah must suffer, and is to be worshipped, and is God, they admit unwillingly indeed, that the Messiah is there spoken of; but nevertheless they venture to maintain, that this (Jesus) is not the Messiah. On the contrary, they believe that He will first come and suffer and rule and be a God worthy of adoration." Still more decidedly does Trypho express himself in another passage, c. 89: Παθητὸν μὲν τὸν Χριστὸν ὅτι αἱ γραφαὶ κηρύσσουσι, φανερόν ἐστιν• εἰ δὲ διὰ τοῦ ἐν τῷ νόμῳ κεκατηραμένου πάθους, βουλόμεθα μαθεῖν, εἰ ἔχεις καὶ περὶ τούτου ἀποδεῖξαι. Here indeed only sufferings in general, and not atoning sufferings, are spoken of, and the idea of death by crucifixion is decidedly rejected. But passages are also found, in which, in conformity with Isa. 53:4 sqq., a suffering for the sake of the human race is spoken of. Thus among other names that of Chulja (חוליא the sick, or according to another reading חִיוָרָא, the leper) is at one time attributed to the Messiah, and this is justified by an appeal to Isa. 53:4: "Surely He has borne our sicknesses and taken upon Himself our sorrows; but we esteemed Him one stricken, smitten of God and afflicted." According to the book Sifre, R. Joses the Galilean says: "King Messiah has been humbled and made contemptible on account of the rebellious, as it is said, He was wounded for our transgressions, etc. (Isa. 53:5). How much more will He make satisfaction therefore for all generations, as it is written, 'And the Lord laid on Him the iniquity of us all (Isa. 53:6).' " The

latter passage already shows, that in the second century after Christ Isa. 53:4 sqq. was in many circles explained of the Messiah. This is confirmed by the saying of Trypho, in Justin's Dial. c. Tryph. c. 90: Παθεῖν μὲν γὰρ καὶ ὡς πρόβατον ἀχθήσεσθαι οἴδαμεν• εἰ δὲ καὶ σταυρωθῆναι κ.τ.λ. Thus the Jewish opponent of Justin admitted that Isa. 53:7 is to be referred to the Messiah. Consequently it cannot be disputed, that in the second century after Christ the idea of a suffering Messiah, and indeed of a Messiah suffering as an atonement for human sin, was, at least in certain circles, a familiar one. In this respect a thought, which in itself was quite current in Rabbinic Judaism, was applied to the Messiah, viz. the thought that the perfectly righteous man not only fulfils all the commandments, but also atones by sufferings for sins that may have been committed, and that the overplus suffering of the righteous man is of service to others. But however much the idea of a suffering Messiah is from these premises conceivable on the soil of Judaism, just as little did it become the prevailing view of Judaism. The, so to speak official, Targum Jonathan allows indeed the reference of Isa. 53 to the Messiah to remain on the whole, but denies the application to him of just those verses, which treat of the sufferings of the servant of God. In not one of the numerous works discussed by us have we found even the slightest allusion to an atoning suffering of Messiah. That the Jews were far from entertaining such an idea, is abundantly proved by the conduct of both the disciples and opponents of Jesus (Matt. 16:22; Luke 18:34, 24:21; John 12:34). Accordingly it may well be said, that it was on the whole one quite foreign to Judaism in general.

THE ESSENES

THE LITERATURE

Triglandius, Trium scriptorum illustrium de tribus Judaeorum sectis syntagma, 2 vols., Delphis 1703.

Job. Gottlob Carpzov, Apparatus historico-criticus antiquitatum sacri codicis (1748), pp. 215–240.

Ugolini, Trihaeresium, etc., in his Thesaurus antiquitatum sacrarum, vol. xxii.

Bellermann, Geschichtliche Nachrichten aus dem Alterthume über Essäer und Therapeuten, Berlin 1821.

Credner, Ueber Essäer und Ebioniten und einen theilweisen Zusammenhang derselben, in Winer's Zeitschr. für wissenschaftl. Theol. vol. i. No. 2 (1827), pp. 211–264, and No. 3 (1829), pp. 277–328.

Gfrörer, Philo und die alexandrinische Theosophie, vol. ii. (1831) pp. 299–356.

Dähne, Geschichtliche Darstellung der jüdisch-alexandrinischen Religions-Philosophie, vol. i. (1834) pp. 439–497. The same, art. "Essäer," in Ersch and Gruber's Allg. Encyklop. § 1, vol. xxxviii. (1843) pp. 173–192.

Frankel, Die Essäer. A Sketch (Zeitschr. für die religiösen Interessen des Judenthums, 1846, pp. 441–461).

Frankel, Die Essäer nach thalmudischen Quellen (Monatsschr. für Gesch. und Wissensch. des Judenth. 1853, pp. 30–40, 61–73).

Lutterbeck, Die neutestamentlichen Lehrbegriffe, vol. i. (1852) pp. 270–322.

Uhlhorn, art. "Essener," in Herzog's Real-Enc. vol. iv. (1855) pp. 174–177 (2nd ed. iv. 341–344).

Zeller, Die Philosophie der Griechen, Pt. 3, Div. ii. (1st ed. 1852), 2nd ed. 1868, pp. 234–292 (3rd ed. 1881, pp. 277–338). The same, Ueber den Zusammenhang des Essäismus mit dem Griechenthum (Theol. Jahrbb 1856, pp. 401–433).

Ritschl, Ueber die Essener (Theol. Jahrbb. 1855, pp. 315–356). The same, Die Entstehung der altkathol. Kirche (2nd ed. 1857), pp. 179–203.

Mangold, Die Irrlahrer der Pastoralbriefe (1856), pp. 32–60.

Hilgenfeld, Die jüdische Apokalyptik (1857), pp. 243–286. The same, Zeitschr. für wissensch. Theol. vol. i. 1858, p. 116 sqq.; iii. 1860, p. 358 sqq.; x. 1867, p. 97 sqq.; xi. 1868, p. 343 sqq.; xiv. 1871, p. 50 sqq.; xxv. 1882, p. 257 sqq.

Herzfeld, Gesch. des Volkes Jisrael, vol. iii. pp. 368 sqq., 388 sqq., 509 sqq.

Jost, Geschichte des Judenthums und seiner Secten, vol i. pp. 207–214.

Grätz, Geschichte der Juden (3rd ed.), vol. iii. pp. 99 sqq., 657–663 (note 10).

Ewald, Geschichte des Volkes Israel, vol. iv. p. 483 sqq.

Harnischmacher, De Essenorum apud Judaeos societate, Bonn 1866 (Gymnasialprogramm).

Keim, Geschichte Jesu, vol. i. pp. 282–306.

Holtzmann in Weber and Holtzmann's Gesch. des Volkes Israel, vol. ii pp. 74–89.

Derenbourg, Histoire de la Palestine (1867), pp. 166–175, 460–462.

Hausrath, Neutestamentliche Zeitgeschichte, vol. i. 2nd ed. pp. 132–146.

Tidemann, Het Essenisme, Leiden 1868. The same, Esseners en Therapeuten (Theologisch Tijdschrift, 1871, pp. 177–188). The same, De apocalypse van Henoch en het Essenisme (Theol. Tijdschrift, 1875, pp. 261–296).

Westcott, art. "Essenes," in Smith's Dictionary of the Bible. Abbot gives additional literature in the American edition.

Ginsburg, art. "Essenes," in Kitto's Cyclopaedia of Biblical Literature. The same, The Essenes, their history and doctrines, London 1864.

Benamozegh, Storia degli Esseni, Firenze 1865.

Lauer, Die Essäer und ihr Verhältniss zur Synagoge und Kirche. Wien, Braumüller 1869 (a separate reprint from the Austrian Quarterly Paper for Catholic Theology, 7th year, no. 4).

Lipsius, art. "Essäer," in Schenkel's Bibellex. vol. ii. pp. 181–192.

Clemens, Die Quellen für die Geschichte der Essener (Zeitschr. für wissenschaftl. Theol. 1869, pp. 328–352).

Geiger, Jüdische Zeitschr. für Wissensch. und Leben, vol. ix. 1871, pp. 30–56.

Clemens, Die essenischen Gemeinden (Zeitschr. für wissenschaftl Theol. 1871, pp. 418–431).

Sieffert, Christus und die Essäer (Beweis des Glaubens, 1873, pp. 481–508).

Hamburger, Real-Enc. für Bibel und Talmud, ii. 172–178 (art. "Essäer").

Delaunay, Moines et sibylles dans l'antiquité judéo-grecque, Paris 1874.

Lightfoot, St. Paul's Epistles to the Colossians and to Philemon (2nd ed. London 1876), pp. 82–98, 349–419.

Pick, Die englische Literatur über die Essäer (Zeitschr. für die lutherischs Theologie, 1878, pp.

397-399).

Demmler, Christus und der Essenismus (Theologische Studien aus Würtemberg, 1st annual course, 1880, pp. 29 sqq., 122 sqq.).

Bestmann, Geschichte der christlichen Sitte, vol. i. (1880) p. 308 sqq.

Lucius, Der Essenismus in seinem Verhältniss zum Judenthum, Strassburg 1881.

Reuss, Gesch. der heiligen Schriften Alten Testaments, §, 547.

Klöpper, Der Brief an die Colosaer (1882), pp. 76-95.

Kuenen, Volksreligion und Weltreligion (German ed. 1883), pp. 197-206.

Hilgenfeld, Ketzergeschte des Urchristenthums (1884), pp. 87-149.

Apart from the great high road of Jewish life, there lived in Palestine in the time of Christ a religious community which, though it grew up on Jewish soil, differed essentially in many points from traditional Judaism, and which, though it exercised no powerful influence upon the development of the people, deserves our attention as a peculiar problem in the history of religion. This community, the Essenes or Essaeans, is generally, after the precedent of Josephus, placed beside the Pharisees and Sadducees as the third Jewish sect But it scarcely needs the remark, that we have here to deal with a phenomenon of an entirely different kind. While the Pharisees and Sadducees were large political and religious parties, the Essenes might far rather be compared to a monastic order. There is indeed much that is enigmatical in them as to particulars. Even their name is obscure. Josephus generally calls them Ἐσσηνοί, but also Ἐσσαῖοι. In Pliny they are called Esseni, in Philo always Ἐσσαῖοι. When Philo asserts that their name is identical with ὅσιοι, this is but etymological trifling. In truth it is in any case of Semitic origin, though but very little has with any certainty been ascertained concerning it. The explanation formerly accepted by many, אָסַיָּא, "Physicians," too little suits the peculiarity of the order, and has no support in the Greek θεραπευταί, the Essenes being never called "physicians," but only θεραπευταὶ θεοῦ (servants of God). The derivation, advocated e.g. by Ewald, Hitzig, Lucius and others, from חָסֵא, pious, in the plural stat. absol. חָסִין, stat. emphat. חָסַיָּא, which though not indeed occurring in either Hebrew or Chaldee, is only the more usual in Syrian, is that which is most suitable. The form Ἐσσηνοί corresponds with the former, Ἐσσαῖοι with the latter. The origin of the Essenes is as obscure as their name. Josephus first mentions them in the time of Jonathan the Maccabee, about 150 B.C., and speaks expressly of one Judas an Essene in the time of Aristobulus I. (105-104 B.C.). According to this, the origin of the order would have to be placed in the second century before Christ. But it is questionable whether they proceeded simply from Judaism, or whether foreign and especially Hellenistic elements had not also an influence in their organization. To answer this question, we must first of all bring forward the accounts of our authorities, viz. Philo, Josephus, and Pliny, for the purpose of making upon these foundations some approximation to the origin and nature of Essenism.

I. THE FACTS

1. Organization of the community. Philo and Josephus agree in estimating the number of the Essenes in their time at above 4000. As far as is known, they lived only in Palestine, at least

there are no certain traces of their occurrence out of Palestine. According to Philo, they lived chiefly in villages, avoiding towns because of the immorality of their inhabitants. Yet he himself says, in another passage, that they also dwelt in many of the towns of Judaea, while according to Josephus they were to be found in every town (of Palestine). Hence we should be much mistaken if we were, according to Pliny's description, to seek them only in the desert of Engedi on the Dead Sea. On the contrary, the settlement there can only have been distinguished above others on account of its numbers. For the sake of living as a community, they had special houses of the order in which they dwelt together. Their whole community was most strictly organized as a single body. At the head were presidents (ἐπιμεληταί), whom the members were bound unconditionally to obey. Whoever desired to enter the order received three badges (the naming of which will hereafter be seen): a pickaxe (ἀξινάριον), an apron (περίζωμα), and a white garment (λευκὴν ἐσθῆτα). He was not, however, immediately received into the order, but had first to undergo a probation of one year, after which he was admitted to the lustrations. Then followed a further probation of two years. And not till this was ended was he allowed to participate in the common meals, and to become a full member after first taking a fearful oath. In this oath he had to bind himself both to absolute openness towards the brethren, and to secrecy concerning the doctrines of the order to non-members. Only adults were admitted as members. But children were also received for the purpose of training in the principles of Essenism. When Josephus says that the Essenes were divided into four classes according to their time of entrance, such children are to be understood by the first class, the two stages of the novitiate by the second and third, and the members proper by the fourth. Transgressions of members of the order were decided upon by a tribunal of at least one hundred of their fellow-members. Those who had grievously transgressed were expelled from the community.

The strongest tie by which the members were united was absolute community of goods. "The community among them is wonderful, one does not find that one possesses more than another. For it is the law, that those who enter deliver up their property to the order, so that there is nowhere to be seen, either the humiliation of poverty or the superfluity of wealth, but on the contrary one property for all as brethren, formed by the collection of the possessions of individuals." "They neither buy nor sell among each other; but while one gives to another what he wants, he receives in return what is useful to himself, and without anything in return they receive freely whatever they want." "The managers (ἐπιμεληταί) of the common property are chosen; and each is selected by all for administration of the possessions of the community." "They choose fitting persons as receivers of revenues (ἀποδέκτας τῶν προσόδων) and of the produce of the earth, and priests for the preparation of bread and food." So Josephus. And in accordance with this Philo declares "none desires to have any kind of property of his own, neither a house, nor a slave, nor an estate, nor flocks, nor anything at all that constitutes wealth. But by putting everything together without distinction, they enjoy the common use of all." "The wages which they earn by different kinds of work, they give to a chosen manager (ταμίας). He receives them and buys what is wanted, and dispenses abundant provision and whatever else human life requires." "Not only have they food, but also clothing in common. Thick cloaks are ready for winter, and light overalls for summer, so that each may use them at his pleasure. For what one has is regarded as the property of all; and what all have as that of each individual." "There is but one purse for all, and common expenses, common clothes and common food in common meals. For community of dwelling, of life and of meals is nowhere so firmly established and so developed as with them. And this is intelligible. For what they receive daily as wages for their labour, they do not keep for themselves, but put it together, and thus make the profits of their work common for those who desire to make use of it. And the sick are without anxiety on account of their inability to earn, because the common purse is in readiness for the care of

them, and they may with all certainty meet their expenses from abundant stores."

As already intimated in the above quoted passages, it is self-evident, that in this strictly communistic life all the needy of the order would be cared for. If any one was sick, he was tended at the common expense. The old enjoyed a happy old age under the care of the younger, just as if they had had many and excellent children about them. Every one had the right to help the needy from the common purse, according to his discretion. Only when relatives were in question, had he to obtain the consent of the managers (ἐπίτροποι). Travelling members of the order found hospitality everywhere. Nay a special officer (κηδεμών) was appointed in every town, to care for the wants of travelling brothers.

The daily labour of the Essenes was under strict regulation. It began with prayer, after which the members were dismissed to their work by the presidents. They reassembled for purifying ablutions, which were followed by the common meal. After this they again went to work, to assemble again for their evening meal. The chief employment of members of the order was agriculture. They likewise carried on, however, crafts of every kind. On the other hand, trading was forbidden as leading to covetousness, and also the making of weapons or of any kind of utensils that might injure men.

2. Ethics. Manners and Customs. The Essenes are described by both Philo and Josephus as very connoisseurs in morality. Josephus calls them Βέλτιστοι ἄνδρες τὸν τρόπον. And Philo competes with him in sounding their praise. Their life was abstemious, simple and unpretending. "They condemn sensual desires as sinful, and esteem moderation and freedom from passion as of the nature of virtue." They only take food and drink till they have had enough; abstaining from passionate excitement, they are "just dispensers of wrath." At their meals they are "contented with the same dish day by day, loving sufficiency and rejecting great expense as harmful to mind and body." They do not cast away clothes and shoes until they are utterly useless. They do not collect treasures of gold and silver, nor earn them from the desire to acquire large estates, but only what is needed for the wants of life.

Beside these general features of simplicity and moderation however, we meet in their moral principles, in their usages and customs, a series of special points, which we shall here simply enumerate, reserving the explanation of them for a later occasion. (1) There is not a slave among them, but all are free, mutually working for each other. (2) "All that they say is more certain than an oath. They forbid swearing, because it is worse than perjury. For that which does not deserve belief without an appeal to God, is already condemned." (3) They forbid anointing with oil. And if one has been anointed against his will, he wipes it off. "For they regard a rough exterior as praiseworthy." (4) Before every meal they bathe in cold water. They do the same after performing the functions of nature. Nay even mere contact with a member of the order of a lower class requires a purifying bath. (5) They esteem it seemly to wear white raiment at all times, on which account a white garment is delivered to each member on entrance. (6) They behave with special modesty in performing natural functions. They dig with the pickaxe (σκαλίς, ἀξινάριον), which each member receives, a hole of a foot deep, cover themselves with a mantle, that they may not offend the brightness of God (ὡς μὴ τὰς αὐγὰς ὑβρίζοιεν τοῦ θεοῦ), relieve themselves into the hole, and throw in again the earth that had been dug out. They choose the most solitary place for the purpose, and bathe afterwards as the unclean are accustomed to do. On the Sabbath they entirely abstain from the act. Their modesty is also shown in other ways. In bathing they bind an apron about their loins. They also avoid spitting forwards or to the right hand. (7) They entirely condemned marriage. Josephus indeed knew of a branch of Essenes who permitted marriage. But these must at all events have formed a small

minority. For Philo says expressly: Ἐσσαίων οὐδεὶς ἄγεται γυναῖκα. (8) They sent gifts of incense to the temple, but offered no animal sacrifices, because they esteemed their own sacrifices more valuable. They were on this account excluded from the temple at Jerusalem. (9) Lastly, a chief peculiarity of the Essenes was their common meals, which bore the character of sacrificial feasts. The food was prepared by priests, with the observance probably of certain rites of purification; for an Essene was not permitted to partake of any other food than this. The meals are described as follows by Josephus: "After the bath of purification they betake themselves to a dwelling of their own, entrance into which is forbidden to all of another faith. And being clean they go into the refectory as into a sanctuary. And after they have quietly taken their seats, the baker lays down the bread in order, and the cook sets before each a vessel with a single kind of food. The priest prays before the meal, and none may eat before the prayer. After the meal he prays again. At the beginning and end they honour God as the giver of food. Then they put off their garments as sacred and go back to their work till evening. Returning, they feed again in the same manner." (10) The wide-spread opinion, that the Essenes abstained from the use of meat and wine, has no support from the older authorities, and has lately been rightly opposed by Lucius. As indirect arguments are usually adduced (a) their rejection of animal sacrifices, the reason of which was, that the Essenes regarded the slaughter of animals in general as objectionable; and (b) the refusal of the kindred sects of the Therapeutae Pythagoreans and Ebionites to partake of meat and wine. It cannot however be proved, that their repudiation of animal sacrifices proceeded from the motives mentioned, and the degree of affinity between Essenism and the above-named tendencies respectively must first be ascertained from established facts. Jerome certainly ascribes to the Essence an abstinence from flesh and wine. But his assertion can be proved to rest only upon gross carelessness in rendering the words of Josephus.

3. Theology and Philosophy. The view of the world held by the Essenes was fundamentally the Jewish. When Josephus ascribes to them belief in an unalterable fate, by which human freedom was absolutely abolished, this must undoubtedly be understood only in the sense of an absolute belief in Providence. And when he says that the Essenes make everything, the Sadducees nothing dependent on fate, while the Pharisees occupy a middle position between the two, thus much may be true, that the Essenes were particularly decided in their adherence to that belief in Providence, which they held in common with the Pharisees. The Essenes are in this point only decided Pharisees, as they are also in a high esteem for the Law and the Lawgiver. "Next to God, the name of the Lawgiver is with them an object of the greatest reverence, and whoever blasphemes it is punished with death." "Their pursuit of ethic is especially thorough, since they take for instructors the laws of their fathers, which no human soul could possibly have conceived without Divine inspiration." In their worship, as well as in that of other Jews, the Holy Scriptures were read and explained; and Philo remarks, that they specially delighted in allegorical interpretation. They were extraordinarily strict in the celebration of the Sabbath. They did not venture on that day to move a vessel from its place, nor even to perform the functions of nature. In other respects too they showed themselves to be Jews. Though they were excluded from the temple they sent gifts of incense (ἀναθήματα) there. And they seem to have kept to the priesthood of the house of Aaron.

On this decidedly Jewish foundation, it is self-evident, that any real worship of the sun is out of the question. When therefore Josephus declares that "daily before the rising of the sun, they address to it old traditional prayers, supplicating it, as it were, to rise," this cannot be meant in the sense of an adoratio, but only in that of an invocatio (observe the εἰς αὐτόν). Certainly such an invocatio is of itself striking in Jewish monotheists, as being apparently founded on the idea

(so alien to Jewish consciousness), that the sun is the representative of the Divine light? That they did proceed upon the latter conception must be assumed from the motive stated by them for their caution in the performance of their needs, viz. that they might not offend the brightness of God.

An intermingling of heterogeneous elements is here already found, and much that is peculiar and alien to traditional Judaism appears in their teaching in general, When indeed Josephus says, that whoever entered their order had to swear not to teach any of their ordinances (δόγματα) otherwise than he had himself received them, it may, by reason of the extensiveness of the notion of δόγμα, be doubtful whether special doctrines are meant thereby. At any rate however the order was in possession of special books, the careful preservation of which was made the duty of the members. And with respect to their doctrines certain peculiarities are at least known to us. They searched the writings of the ancients (it is not clear whether the books of the sect or the canonical Scriptures are meant) to discover what would profit the soul and the body, the sanatory powers of roots, and the properties of stones. They must have highly estimated their angelology. The novice had to swear carefully to preserve the names of the angels. By reason of their study of Scripture and their purifications they ensured a knowledge of the future, and Josephus asserts that they were seldom mistaken in their predictions, and gives several examples of correct prophecies by Essenes, e.g. by one Judas in the time of Aristobulus I., one Menahem in the time of Herod, and one Simon in the time of Archelaus. Concerning their doctrine of the soul and of its immortality, Josephus expresses himself most fully. If we may trust his account, they taught that bodies are perishable, but souls immortal, and that the latter dwelt originally in the subtlest aether, but being debased by sensual pleasures united themselves with bodies as with prisons; but when they are freed from the fetters of sense they will joyfully soar on high, as if delivered from long bondage. To the good (souls) is appointed a life beyond the ocean, where they are troubled by neither rain, nor snow, nor heat, but where a gentle Zephyr is ever blowing. But to the bad (souls) is appointed a dark cold region full of unceasing torment.

II. NATURE AND ORIGIN OF ESSENISM

Full as are the descriptions of our authorities, especially Josephus, the question from what point of view these various phenomena are to be explained, and from what general views and motives they proceed, remains to this day undecided. Some (and they now form the majority) insist on explaining Essenism wholly from Judaism, regarding it either as virtually identical with Pharisaism, or at least deriving it (with all its divergences) from Chasidaic or Pharisaic Judaism. So especially the Jewish scholars Frankel, Jost, Grätz, Derenbourg, Geiger, and among Christian scholars, Ewald, Hausrath, Tideman, Lauer, Clemens, Reuss, and Kuenen. Ritschl advocates this standpoint in a peculiar manner. He regards Essenism as only a consistent carrying out of the idea of the universal priesthood (Ex. 19:6). He endeavours to explain all the single facts from one, viz. that the Essenes desired to be a nation of priests. Similarly Bestmann, only he does not see in Essenism the carrying out of the idea of the universal, but of the Aaronic priesthood. Lucius also esteems Essenism as a purely Jewish formation, and explains its origin from the exclusively “pious” having in the Maccabaean period renounced the Jerusalem temple-worship, because they regarded it as illegitimate. From this renunciation of the temple-worship, all the peculiarities of Essenism are to be explained. In another manner again did Hilgenfeld formerly derive Essenism purely from Judaism. He thought (in his work on Jewish Apocalypse, 1857, p. 243 sqq.), that the Essenes must be regarded as merely a school of Jewish apocalyptics. The object of their asceticism (as in Dan. 10:2, 3; Enoch 83:2, 85:3, 4;

Ezra 9:24–26, 12:51) was, he says, solely that of making themselves worthy and capable of receiving revelations. “It was the higher illumination, the reception of revelations especially by dream-visions, which they sought in this way to attain” (p. 253). Hilgenfeld, after defending this view in his Zeitschrift for 1858, p. 116 sqq., hinted already in that for 1860 at the possibility of Persian influence. Subsequently, in that for 1867, p. 97 sqq., he sought decidedly to prove, that not only Parseeism, but also Buddhism had exercised essential influence upon the formation of Essenism, to which view he adhered for a longer time (1868, p. 343 sqq.; 1871, p. 50 sqq.). In his more recent publications he again insists upon the Jewish foundation and admits only Parsee influences (Zeitsehr. 1882, p. 299; Ketzergeschichte des Urchristenthums, pp. 141–149); he thinks the Essenes were originally Rechabites, who settled in a place called Essa, westward of the Dead Sea (Zeitschr. 1882, pp. 268 sqq., 286 sqq.; Ketzergeschichte des Urchristenthums, pp. 100 sqq., 139 sqq.). Lightfoot also (St. Paul’s Epistles to the Colossians and to Philemon, 2nd ed. pp. 355–396) adopts the opinion of a virtual Jewish foundation, with secondary Parsee influence. Lipsius too declares the origin of Essenism to be chiefly Jewish; he however concedes the co-operation of foreign influences, only not on the part of Greek philosophy or Parseeism, and still less of Buddhism, but on that of Syro-Palestinian heathenism. The development of Essenism “took place entirely on Palestinian soil” (Bibellexikon, ii. 189, 190). While all the above-named regard Essenism as exclusively or chiefly a Jewish product, Lutterbeck, Zeller, Mangold and Holtzmann, following the precedent of Baur and Gfrörer, explain some more, some fewer, of the peculiarities which distinguish Essenism from traditional Judaism, by the influence of Pythagoreanism, with which Josephus (Antt. xv. 10. 4) had already compared Essenism. It was especially Zeller, who in his discussions with Ritschl sought, on the basis of his comprehensive acquaintance with Greek philosophy, to point out parallels with Pythagoreanism in nearly all points. Herzfeld occupied a medium position, by finding that in Essenism “a Judaism of quite peculiarly blended ultra-Pharisaic and Alexandrinian views appears in alliance with Pythagoreanism and with many rites of Egyptian priests” (iii. 369). Keim too is of opinion, that while all the peculiarities of Essenism might he derived from Judaism, the parallels between Pythagoreanism and Essenism are too numerous and striking to suffer us to dispute the influence of the former upon the latter (Gesch. Jesu, i. 300 sqq.).

It is not easy to find a way out of this labyrinth of views. The question will be simplified by first subjecting to an examination the peculiar hypotheses of Ritschl, Lucius, and Hilgenfeld. 1. The hypothesis of Ritschl is tempting, inasmuch as the Essenes certainly desire to exhibit, like the Israelitish priests, a condition of special purity and holiness. Hence the parallels between the two are very numerous. On the other hand however it leaves essential points unexplained, especially their rejection of animal sacrifices, marriage, the oath, and the anointing oil. It is impossible to deduce all these phenomena satisfactorily from a single standpoint. 2. And still less is this the case if the point is that chosen by Lucius. His attempt to explain all the singularities of the Essenes by their rupture with the illegitimate worship at Jerusalem may be designated a failure. For how should they have thus arrived at their rejection of marriage, oaths, slavery, trading, and their peculiarly puritanical tendency in general? In other respects too this starting-point is unfortunately chosen. For if the Essenes agreed, as Lucius admits, with the Pharisees in their legalistic tendencies, they had, at least after the time of Alexandra, no longer any reason for withdrawing from the temple-worship, since all sacred rites were then performed in a thoroughly correct manner. 3. The same objections as those against Ritschl and Lucius virtually apply to Hilgenfeld’s earlier view of the Essenes as a community of Apocalyptics. Here too several peculiarities are left unexplained. If Essenism in general can be regarded as a purely Jewish formation, it is certainly most simple to view it as a climax of the Pharisaic

tendency, for its starting-point and many of its peculiarities are identical with those of the latter. Hence the question may be simplified to: Is JEssenism nothing more than a peculiar offshoot of Pharisaism, or did foreign and alien influences co-operate in its origin and development? And if the latter question be answered in the affirmative, what were these influences, Buddhism (as in Hilgenfeld's earlier view), Parseeism (Hilgenfeld and Lightfoot), Syro-Palestinian heathenism (Lipsius), or lastly, the Orpheo-Pythagorean tendency of the Greeks (Zeller and others)?

It cannot be denied that very many, nay, most particulars may be explained from the Judaeo-Pharisaic basis. Two main features especially, the rigid legalism and the punctilious care for ceremonial cleanness, are genuinely Pharisaic. Their high regard for the great lawgiver Moses and for the Holy Scriptures, their strict, nay, rigorous Sabbath-keeping, place them completely on the soil of Judaism. Their non-observance of certain precepts of the law, those especially concerning animal sacrifices, may have been the result either of some case of necessity or of an allegorical interpretation of the laws in question. In any case, it is not inconsistent with their unconditional acknowledgment of the formal authority of the law. Then their punctilious care for purity is essentially Pharisaic. The value attributed to Levitical purity, and to the baths and lustrations by which this was restored when defilement had been incurred, is a characteristic of Pharisaism. Especially is the Essenian bathing before meals analogous to practices of Pharisaic Judaism, and is at most an increase of the Pharisaic custom. Bathing after the performance of natural functions was required at least of officiating priests. If then this was required by the Essenes of all the members of their association, it only shows that they desired to realize in themselves the highest degree of purity according to Jewish notions. We are also vividly reminded of Pharisaic views by the Essenian custom of bathing even after contact with a member of the order of a lower grade (i.e. a novice). For just what the unclean Am-haarez was to the Pharisees, was the novice not actually admitted into the society to the Essenes. Essenism then is in the first place merely Pharisaism in the superlative degree. From the effort to carry out completely the purity of life thus required may be explained also the Essenian separation, their organization in narrow and exclusive communities. If the Pharisee avoided as much as possible all intercourse with the unclean Am-haarez, the Essene completely separated himself from the multitude and formed exclusive societies, in which similarity of disposition and endeavour afforded the possibility of realizing the ideal of a life of absolute ceremonial cleanness. The common meals of these societies, the food for which was prepared by the priests, were a guarantee to the Essene that only clean food would be set before him. This close brotherly connection led to community of goods. The strict requirements made from members of the order made it necessary to admit new members into the society only after a long and strict novitiate. The purity and holiness which the Essenes strove to realize were indeed different, more exalted and special than those of the Pharisees. But almost all their peculiarities had at least their starting-point in Pharisaism. Their white raiment corresponded with the official dress of Israelitish priests, and therefore only shows, that the Essenes desired to manifest the highest degree of Jewish purity and holiness.… Their caution in bathing, and even their custom of not spitting forwards or to the right has its analogues in the Talmud. Their repudiation of marriage is indeed a matter quite heterogeneous to genuine Judaism. But even this may be explained from Jewish premises. For since the act of marriage as such made an individual unclean and necessitated a Levitical bath of purification, the effort to attain to the highest degree of purity might well lead to the entire repudiation of marriage. In all these points a surpassing of ordinary Judaism is apparent, and this is also the case in the strongly puritanical trait, by which the Essenian mode of life is characterized. They saw in many of the social customs and institutions, which the development of culture entailed, a perversion of the primitive and simple ways of life prescribed by nature. They thought therefore that they

manifested true morality by a return to the simplicity of nature and of natural ordinances. Hence their rejection of slavery, oaths, anointing oil, and of luxury in general; hence their principle of living a simple life and allowing themselves only so much food and drink as nature required. It cannot be shown that they practised actual asceticism by fastings and mortifications, by abstinence from flesh and wine. It was only the exceeding what nature required that they condemned. Their rejection of trade is quite in accordance with this ethic radicalism; they desired a communistic state, in which each worked for the whole body, and none enriched himself at the expense of others.

If the bounds of ordinary Judaism are exceeded by the traits already depicted, this is still more the case in the extremely striking fact of the repudiation of animal sacrifices. That the point of view set up by Lucius in explanation of this fact does not load to the goal, has been already remarked. The sole point of contact for it, on Jewish ground, seems to me, on the contrary, to be the contention of many of the prophets against the over-estimation of sacrifice. As the prophets insist, that God does not take pleasure in sacrifices, but in purity of intention, so, according to the Eesenian view, not the slaughter of beasts, but the sanctification of the body is true worship.

This also is based upon a certain amount of moral radicalism. But the rejection of animal sacrifices involves a complete breach with Judaism proper, which is not done away with by the fact, that the Essenes used to send gifts of incense to the temple at Jerusalem. A still stranger phenomenon presented on Jewish soil is their peculiar conduct with respect to the sun. It is quite impossible that their εὐχὴ εἰς τὸν ἥλιον can be only the Jewish Shema repeated before sunrise; on the contrary, they turned towards the sun while praying, because they saw in it the representative of the Divine light. This is proved especially by the circumstance, that in doing their needs they carefully avoided uncovering themselves towards the sun. The information too of Epiphanius, that the Ossaians (who are certainly identical with the Essenes) had united with the Sampsitae, i.e. adorers of the sun, leads to the conclusion, that they were in real earnest in their religious estimation of the sun. However this may be, the very turning to the sun in prayer was contrary to Jewish customs and notions, which on the contrary required the turning to the temple, and expressly repudiated the direction towards the sun as heathenish.

Thus are we more and more driven to the view, that foreign influences co-operated in the formation of Essenism. And this becomes undoubted, if the account given of its Anthropology by Josephus is even in the main trustworthy. For if it really taught the pre-existence of the soul and regarded the body as only the soul's prison, this is of itself a proof of the influence of foreign philosophemes. Thus the question concerning the origin of Essenism is changed into the question concerning the trustworthiness of Josephus. This is not indeed utterly above suspicion, and we have already seen (above, p. 16 sq.), that he has given a Greek tinge to the teaching of the Pharisees and clothed their Jewish doctrine in a Greek garment. But we also saw that all that he says of them is in substance true, and that it is only the form which is derived from without. If then only one sentence which he says concerning the anthropology of the Essenes is true, it is certain that their doctrine of man is dualistic, i.e. non-Jewish. And there is the less ground for doubting this, since from this point of view many of their peculiarities, especially their efforts after purity, surpassing as they did even those of Phariseeism, are most simply and naturally explained.

But what foreign influences have we then to consider? No less than four different factors have been proposed, viz. Buddhism, Parseeism, Syrian heathenism, and Pythagoreanism. Each of these factors may in fact have exerted an influence upon intellectual life in Palestine during the

last centuries before Christ; and for this very reason an answer to the above question must remain an uncertain one. Buddhism seems the most far-fetched. But when we consider, that an acquaintance with India had already been opened to the Western nations by the victories of Alexander the Great, that afterwards Megasthenes, in the time of Seleucus I. Nicator, i.e. about 300 B.C., furnished, on the ground of his own observations during a prolonged sojourn in India, a thorough description of the country and its inhabitants, and that a regular commercial intercourse with India by way of the Red Sea probably existed during the Graeco-Roman period, when also the striking parallel in some instances between Buddhism and Essenism is considered, the possibility at least of an actual connection cannot be disputed. It is true, that the still very scanty intercourse between India and the West in pre-Christian times makes this connection improbable. It is more obvious to think of Parseeism or Pythagoreanism; for the points of contact with Syrian heathenism are but very general, and affect at most only individual details. In Parseeism, on the other hand, we find a whole series of the characteristic peculiarities of the Essenes: the lustrations, the white garments (for the Magi), the adoration of the sun, the repudiation of animal sacrifices proper (i.e. the presentation of the flesh to the Deity), and especially their angelology and magic. Since too ordinary Judaism seems to have been affected by Parseeism (see vol. i. p. 350), the assumption of Parsee influence is a very obvious one, since it would be only somewhat stronger in Essenism than in the latter. But other points again are not at all Parseeistic, especially celibacy and the entire anthropology. Hence all things considered, the hypothesis adopted especially by Zeller, that the peculiarities of Essenism are to be explained from Pythagorean influences, has the largest amount of probability in its favour. For Pythagoreanism, of all the hitherto named tendencies, shows the greater number of parallels with Essenism. It shares its aspirations for bodily purity and sanctity, its lustrations, its simple habits of life apart from all sensual enjoyments, its high estimation (if not exactly its requirement) of celibacy, its white garments, repudiation of oaths, and especially its rejection of bloody sacrifices, also the invocation of the sun and the scrupulosity with which all that was unclean (such as human excrements) was hidden from it; and lastly, the dualistic view of the relation of soul and body. All these belong equally to the ideal of both the Essenes and Pythagoreans. If an actual connection between the two is by reason of this far-reaching accordance, to say the least, very probable, this probability is increased by the fact, that a new light is thus cast upon even those peculiarities of Essenism, which may be explained from a Jewish foundation. They thus become, not the result of a spontaneous development, but of a fertilization of Judaism by new factors. These latter exercised a power of attraction over Judaism, because they found therein a series of points of contact for their own elective affinity.

Such an influence of Pythagoreanism upon a Jewish circle, leading to the formation of this separate sect upon Jewish soil, is historically easy of explanation. Essenism is met with at the earliest about the middle of the second century before Christ. But Pythagoreanism, if not as a settled school of philosophy, still as a view of life and a practice of morals, is far more ancient. As then Greek culture must have had a powerful influence upon Palestine since the time of Alexander the Great, – it was not repressed until the Maccabaean rising, – it is only natural, if we find actual proof of this influence of Hellenism in the circle of the Essenes. Thus Essenism would be a separation from the soil of Judaism proper, which was perhaps effected in the second century before Christ, under Greek influences, with the view of realizing an ideal akin to Pythagoreanism, but with an adherence to its Jewish foundation.

One thing alone prevents our establishing this result with certainty, and this is the enigmatical form of Pythagoreanism itself. Just those peculiarities, which it has in common with Essenism, are themselves not genuinely Greek, but very probably of Oriental origin. May not then their

coincidence be explained by the fact, that each of the two has independently drawn from a common Oriental source? This would again lead to a derivation of Essenism mainly from Parsee influences. The possibility of this cannot be denied. But possibly both Parsee and Pythagorean influences were in operation. The different currents of culture frequently cross each other on the soil of Western Asia in so chequered and manifold a manner that it is impossible to answer such questions with certainty. Two things however may be established as the result of our investigation: (1) That Essenism is first and mainly a Jewish formation; and (2) that in its non-Jewish features it has most affinity with the Pythagorean tendency of the Greeks.

JUDAISM IN THE DISPERSION. PROSELYTES

THE LITERATURE

Remond, Versuch einer Geschichte der Ausbreitung des Judenthums von Cyrus bis auf den gänzlichen Untergang des Jüdischen Staats, Leipzig 1789.

Gieseler, Lehrbuch der Kirchengeschichte, vol. i. Div. i. (4th ed. 1844) p. 53 sqq.

Winer, RWB., art "Exil" (i. 357-860) and "Zerstreuung" (ii. 727-730). Also the articles on separate cities, as "Alexandria," "Antiochia," "Cyrene," "Rom," etc.

J. G. M(üller), art. "Alexandrinische Juden," in Herzog's Real-Enc., 1st ed. vol. i. (1854) pp. 235-239.

Reuss, art. "Hellenisten," in Herzog's Real-Enc., 1st ed, v. 701-705 (2nd ed. v. 738-741).

Lutterbeck, Die neutestamentlichen Lehrbegriffe, vol. i. (1852) pp. 89-120.

Frankel, Die Diaspora zur Zeit des zweiten Tempels (Monatsschr. für Gesch. und Wissensch. des Judenth. 1853, pp. 409-429, 449-463).

Frankel, Die Juden unter den ersten römischen Kaisern (Monatsschr. 1854, pp. 401-413, 439-450).

Jost, Gesch. der Israeliten, vol. ii. pp. 239-344. The same, Gesch. des Judenthums und seiner Secten, vol. i. pp. 336 sqq., 344-361, 367-379.

Herzfeld, Gesch. des Volkes Jisrael, vol. iii. pp. 425-579. The same, Handels-geschichte der Juden des Alterthums, 1879.

Grätz, Gesch. der Juden, vol. iii. 3rd ed. (1878), pp. 26-54.

Champagny, Rome et la Judée au temps de la chute de Néron, vol. i. (Paris 1865) pp. 107-154.

Ewald, Gesch. des Volkes Israel, vol. iv. p. 305 sqq., v. 108 sqq., vi. 396 sqq.

Holtzmann in Weber and Holtzmann's Gesch. des Volkes Israel, vol. ii. pp. 38-52, 258-273.

Hausrath, Neutestamentliche Zeitgeschichte, 2nd ed. vol. ii. 91-145, iii. 389-392.

Friedländer, Darstellungen aus der Sittengeschichte Roms, vol. iii. (1871) pp. 504-517. The same, De Judaeorum coloniis. Regimonti Pr. 1876 (Progr.).

Deutsch, art. "Dispersion," in Kitto's Cyclopaedia of Biblical Literature.

Westcott, art. “Dispersion,” in Smith’s Dictionary of the Bible.

Weizsäcker, art. “Zerstreuung,” in Schenkel’s Bibellex. v. 712-716.

Huidekoper, Judaism at Rome B.C. 76 to A.D. 140, New York 1876 (comp Theol. Litztg. 1877, p. 163).

Hamburger, Real-Encyclapädie für Bibel und Talmud, Div. ii. (1883) art, “Zehn Stämme,” “Zerstreuung,” also “Alexandria,” “Antiocbia,” “Rom,” etc.

I. EXTENSION

The history of the Jews during the times of Christ is not confined to the narrow limits of the Holy Land. Jewish communities of greater or less magnitude and importance had settled in almost all the countries of the then civilised world. These remained, on the one hand, in constant communication with the mother country, and on the other, in active intercourse with the non-Jewish world, and thus became of great importance both in respect of the internal development of Judaism and its influence upon other civilised nations. The causes of this dispersion were of very different kinds. In former times the Assyrian and Babylonian conquerors of Israel violently deported large masses of the nation into their eastern provinces. This occurred again, though to a less extent, when Pompey e.g. carried off hundreds of Jewish captives to Rome. Of greater importance however were the voluntary emigrations of Jewish settlers during the Graeco-Roman period to the countries bordering on Palestine, and to all the chief towns of the then civilised world for the sake chiefly of trade. It was especially at the commencement of the Hellenistic period, that these migrations were most numerous. The Diadochoi and their successors, for the sake of consolidating their kingdoms, promoted to the uttermost of their power the intermingling of the different nationalities, and consequently migrations from one province to another. They were also frequently in need of great masses of settlers for their newly founded towns. And in both of these interests the rights of citizenship or other privileges were in many places granted without further ceremony to immigrants. Attracted by these circumstances, large numbers of Jews also were induced to settle in other lands. Adverse events at home may also have contributed their part, and especially the exposed situation of Palestine, which in all complications between Egyyt and Syria became the scene of war. This induced many thousand Jews to emigrate to the neighbouring countries of Syria and Egypt, where, especially in the capitals Antioch and Alexandria, and in all the newly founded Hellenistic cities, valuable privileges were bestowed upon them. They next resorted to Asia Minor, particularly the towns of the Ionic coast, as well as to all the more important ports and commercial cities of the Mediterranean Sea.

Hence the Sibyllist was able, about the year 140 B.C., to say of the Jewish people, that every land and every sea was filled with them. About the same time (139-138 B.C.) the Roman Senate despatched a circular in favour of the Jews to the kings of Egypt, Syria, Pergamos, Cappadocia and Parthia, and to a great number of provinces, towns and islands of the Mediterranean Sea (1 Macc. 15:16-24). It may hence be safely inferred, that there was then already a greater or less number of Jews in all these lands. Strabo, speaking of the time of Sulla, says (about 85 B.C.), that the Jewish people had already come into every city, and that it was not easy to find a place in the world which had not received this race, and was not occupied by them. Josephus too and Philo express themselves incidentally in a similar manner. The extent of the Jewish dispersion is most amply described in the epistle of Agrippa to Caligula, given by Philo. Jerusalem – it is here said – is the capital not only of Judaea, but of most

countries, by reason of the colonies which it has sent out on fitting occasions into the neighbouring lands of Egypt, Phoenicia, Syria, Coelesyria, and the still more remote Pamphylia and Cilicia, into most parts of Asia as far as Bithynia, and into the most distant corners of Pontus; also to Europe, Thessaly, Boeotia, Macedonia, Etolia, Attica, Argos, Corinth, and the most and best parts of Peloponnesus. And not only is the continent full of Jewish settlements, but also the more important islands, — Euboea, Cyprus, Crete, — to say nothing of the lands beyond the Euphrates. For all, with the exception of a small portion of Babylon and those satrapies which embrace the fertile land lying around it, have Jewish inhabitants. The Acts of the Apostles also mention Jews and their associates from Parthia, Media, Elam, and Mesopotamia, from Cappadocia, Pontus and Asia, Phrygia and Pamphylia, Egypt and Cyrene, from Rome, Crete and Arabia (Acts 2:9–11).

In Mesopotamia, Media, and Babylonia lived the descendants of those members of the kingdom of the ten tribes and of the kingdom of Judah who had once been carried away thither by the Assyrians and Chaldeans. The "ten tribes" never returned at all from captivity, and even in the times of Akiba there were disputes as to whether they would ever do so. Nor must the return of the tribes of Judah and Benjamin be conceived of as complete. Nay, these exiles subsequently received fresh accessions. For the Persian king Artaxerxes Ochus, on his return from his Egyptian campaign (about 340 B.C.), brought with him Jewish captives also, and planted them in Hyrcania on the Caspian Sea. These Jewish settlements may also have been increased by voluntary additions. From all these causes the Jews in those provinces were numbered, not by thousands, but by millions. Since they dwelt on the eastern borders of the Roman Empire, — till Trajan, as subjects of the Parthians, and subsequently as inhabitants of those eastern provinces which could never be securely maintained by the Romans, — their attitude was always of political importance to the empire. P. Petronius, legate of Syria, esteemed it dangerous in the year 40 B.C. to excite in them a hostile disposition towards Rome. During the Vespasian war the insurgents sought to incite their coreligionists beyond the Euphrates to hostilities against Rome. It was a great peril for Trajan in his advance against the Parthians to be menaced in his rear by the insurrection of the Mesopotamian Jews (see § 21). Josephus names the strong cities of Nehardea (Νάαρδα) and Nisibis, the former on the Euphrates, the latter in its valley, as the chief dwelling places of the Babylonian and Mesopotamian Jews. Both cities were in subsequent centuries chief seats of Talmudic Judaism, and are therefore frequently mentioned in the Babylonian Talmud.

Josephus names Syria as the country in which was the largest percentage of Jewish inhabitants, and its capital, Antioch, was especially distinguished in this respect. Other cities of Syria also numbered their Jewish inhabitants by thousands; this was the case with Damascus, where, according to the statement of Josephus, 10,000 or (according to another passage) 18,000 Jews are said to have been assassinated at the time of the war. Philo tells us of Asia also, as of Syria, that Jews dwelt in large numbers in every city. Aristotle, during his sojourn in Asia Minor (348–345 B.C.), had a meeting with an educated Jew, who had come thither, who Ἑλληνικὸς ἦν οὐ τῇ διαλέκτῳ μόνον ἀλλὰ καὶ τῇ ψυχῇ. Clearchus, a disciple of Aristotle, gives in his book on sleep further particulars concerning this meeting. Antiochus the Great settled 2000 Jewish families from Mesopotamia and Babylonia in Phrygia and Lydia. And to mention nothing else, the Roman edicts in favour of the Jews communicated by Josephus (Antt. xiv. 10, xvi. 6), and the entire history of the Apostle Paul, show how widely the Jews had spread over the whole of Asia Minor. The statement of Agrippa in his epistle cited above, that Jews had settled in Bithynia and in the most distant corners of Pontus, is abundantly confirmed by the Jewish inscriptions in the Greek language found in the Crimea.

But most important with regard to the history of civilisation was the Jewish Dispersion in Egypt and especially in Alexandria. Long before the time of Alexander the Great Jewish immigrants were already found there. Psammetichus I. is said to have had Jewish mercenaries in his army in his war against the Ethiopians, 650 B.C. In the time of Jeremiah a large train of Jewish emigrants went into Egypt, for fear of the Chaldees and in opposition to the will of the prophet (Jer. 42, 43; for the occasion, see Jer. 41). They settled in various parts of Egypt, in Migdol, Tahpanhes, Noph and Pathros (Jer. 44); and though many of them embraced the religion of Egypt and many were extirpated by war, still a remnant was left. A forcible deportation of Jewish colonists to Egypt is said to have taken place in the time of the Persian supremacy. Their most flourishing period however does not begin till the time of Alexander the Great. As early as the foundation of Alexandria, Jewish settlers were attracted to it by the bestowal upon them of the rights of citizenship, Large numbers of Jews afterwards came to Egypt chiefly under Ptolemy I. Lagos, some as prisoners of war and some as voluntary immigrants. They were employed by Ptolemy as mercenaries, especially for garrisoning fortified places. In Alexandria a special quarter apart from the rest of the city was, in the times of the Diadochoi, assigned to the Jews, "that they might lead a purer life by mingling less with foreigners." This Jewish quarter lay on the harbourless coast, in the neighbourhood of the royal palace, and therefore in the north-eastern part of the town. This severance was not afterwards strictly maintained. For according to Philo there were Jewish houses of prayer in all parts of the city, and many Jews dwelt scattered through all its quarters. But even Philo says also, that of the five districts of the town, which were named after the first, five letters of the alphabet, two were called "the Jewish," because they were chiefly inhabited by Jews. The separation was however on the whole maintained, and we shall find the Jewish quarter still in the same place, viz. in the east of the town, in Philo's time. According to an incidental notice in Josephus, the Jews dwelt chiefly in the " so-called Delta," i.e. in the fourth district of the town. Philo estimates the entire number of the Jewish inhabitants of Egypt at about a million in his days. The Jews of Alexandria and Egypt took, in conformity with their large numbers and importance, a prominent part in all the chief conflicts between the Jewish and the heathen world, in the great persecution under Caligula (see § 17c) and in the insurrections in the times of Nero, Vespasian and Trajan (see § 21). The very history of these conflicts is at the same time a proof of the continued importance of the Egyptian Jews in the Roman period also. But besides the Jews properly so called, there were also Samaritans dwelling in Egypt. Ptolemy I. Lagos, when he conquered Palestine, carried away with him many captives, not only from Judaea and Jerusalem, but also "from Samaria and Mount Gerizim," and settled them in Egypt. In the time of Ptolemy VI. Philometor the Jews and Samaritans are said to have brought their dispute, as to whether Jerusalem or Gerizim was the true place of worship, before the tribunal of the king. Hadrian in his letter to Servianus says of the Samaritans in Egypt as well as of the Jews and Christians dwelling there, that they were all of them "astrologers, haruspices and quacks." In a work of one Bishop Eulogius we are told of a synod held by him against the Samaritans. If we are to understand, that he is Eulogius of Alexandria, elsewhere spoken of, the flourishing condition of the Samaritans in Egypt during the sixth century after Christ would be proved.

The Jewish Dispersion penetrated from Egypt farther westward. It was very numerously represented in Cyrenaica. Ptolemy I. Lagos had already sent Jewish settlers thither. According to Strabo, the inhabitants of the city of Cyrene were in Sulla's time (about 85 B.C.) divided into four classes: 1. citizens, 2. agriculturists, 3. metoikoi, 4. Jews. At that time the Jews were already playing a prominent part in the disturbances in Cyrene, which Lucullus had to allay during his accidental presence there. The Jews at Cyrene seem to have been at all times quite specially disposed to insurrection. In the time of Vespasian the after-piece of the war was

played out here, and in the time of Trajan Cyrenaica was a main seat of the great Jewish revolt (see above, § 21). We may also safely assume, that Jewish settlements likewise existed still farther westward. Only single traces of such are however to be discovered with any certainty.

The diffusion of the Jews in Greece is already evident from the history of the Apostle Paul, who found Jewish synagogues in Thessalonica, Beroea, Athens and Corinth (Acts 17:1, 10, 17, 18:4, 7). This is confirmed by the expressions of Agrippa in the above-mentioned epistle to Caligula. There were also Jews in almost all the islands of the Grecian Archipelago and the Mediterranean Sea, and in some of these in large numbers, In the epistle Euböa, Cyprus and Crete are decidedly mentioned. And if we only know this expressly in a smaller measure of the smaller islands, the reason lies in the scantiness of our sources of information.

In Italy Rome was the seat of a Jewish community numbered by thousands. The first appearance of Jews in Rome dates from the time of the Maccabees. Judas Maccabaeus sent an embassy to the Senate to conclude an alliance with Rome, or, to speak more correctly, to obtain an assurance of its friendship and assistance (1 Macc. 8:17–32). His brother and successor Jonathan followed his example (1 Macc. 12:1–4, 16). Of greater importance was the embassy, which Simon the third of the Maccabaean brothers sent to Rome in the year 140–139 B.C. It effected an actual offensive and defensive alliance with the Romans (1 Macc. 14:24, 15:15–24). During their prolonged sojourn at Rome the envoys or their retinue seem also to have attempted a religious propaganda. For it is this that is alluded to in the certainly somewhat confused notice in Valerius Maximus, i. 3. 2: Idem (viz. the praetor Hispalus) Judaeos, qui Sabazi Jovis cultu Romanos inficere mores conati erant, repetere domos suas coegit). Jupiter Zabazius is indeed a Phrygian deity. Since however Judaeos is certified by the text, his appellation in our passage undoubtedly rests upon a confusion of the Jewish Sabaoth (Zebaoth) with Sabazius. The event here related happened however (according to the immediately preceding words in Valerius Maximus) during the consulate of Popilius Laenas and L. Calpurnius Piso (B.C. 139), i.e. exactly at the time of Simon's embassy, to which it is most probably to be referred. It may also be inferred from it, that no Jews then dwelt permanently in Rome. The settlement there of a great number of Jews dates only from the time of Pompey. After his conquest of Jerusalem in the year 63 B.C., he brought numerous Jewish prisoners of war with him to Rome. They were then sold as slaves; but many of them were soon set at liberty, their strict adherence to their Jewish customs being inconvenient to their masters. Endowed with the privileges of Roman citizenship, they settled beyond the Tiber and formed an independent Jewish community. From that time onwards the Jewish colony in Trastevere formed no unimportant factor in Roman life. When Cicero, in the year 59 B.C., made his oration in defence of Flaccus, we find many Jews present among the auditors. At the death of Caesar, the great protector of the Jews, a multitude of the latter made lamentation at his bier during whole nights. In the time of Augustus they were already numbered by thousands. Josephus at least tells us that 8000 Roman Jews joined the deputation which came from Palestine to Rome in the year 4 B.C. In the time of Tiberius repressive measures commenced. According to Josephus, the whole Jewish population was banished from Rome A.D. 19, because a few Jews had swindled a noble female proselyte named Fulvia of large sums of money under the pretext of sending them to the temple at Jerusalem. Four thousand Jews capable of bearing arms were on this account deported to Sardinia to fight against the brigands in that island; the rest were banished from the city. Such are the accounts of Tacitus, Suetonius, and Josephus, whose statements essentially agree. According to the contemporary narrative of Philo, these measures were chiefly carried out by the then powerful Sejanus. After his overthrow, A.D. 31, Tiberius perceived that the Jews had been slandered without cause by Sejanus, and commanded the

authorities (ὑπάρχοις) in all places not to molest the Jews, nor to prevent the practice of their customs. It may here be assumed that a return to Rome was also allowed them; and this explains the fact that Philo should, so early as the time of Caligula, again take for granted the existence of the Jewish community. The reign of Claudius began with a general Edict of Toleration in favour of the Jews. But this emperor also subsequently found himself obliged to take measures against them. According to the short accounts in the Acts and Suetonius, an actual expulsion of the Jews took place under Claudius. According however to the evidently more accurate account of Dio Cassius, Claudius only prohibited the assemblies of the Jews, because their expulsion could not be carried out without great tumult. This prohibition was indeed equal to a prohibition of the free exercise of their religion, and would certainly have the result of inducing many to leave the city. Its date cannot be accurately determined; it was probably promulgated in the later times of Claudius. From the words of Suetonius it might indeed be inferred, that it was occasioned by the disturbances, which arose within Judaism in consequence of the preaching of Christ. This edict of Claudius had also but transient consequences. Such measures were not capable of extirpating the firmly rooted Jewish community, or of even permanently weakening it. It was already, chiefly by means of its numerous proselytes, too much intertwined with Roman life for its complete suppression to be successful. The Jews, when expelled from the city, emigrated to the neighbourhood, perhaps to Aricia, soon to return thence to their old abodes. Their history in Rome may be summed up in the words of Dio Cassius: Often suppressed, they nevertheless mightily increased, so that they achieved even the free exercise of their customs. The aristocratic Roman indeed looked down upon them with contempt. But the numerous lampoons of the satirists are just so many evidences of the notice they attracted in Roman society. Even from the time of Augustus direct relations of Jews to the imperial court are not lacking; nay, in the reign of Nero the Empress Poppaea seems herself to have been inclined to Judaism. By degrees they spread farther in the city also. The quarter in Trastevere was no longer their only one. We find them subsequently in the Campus Martins, and in the midst of the Roman commercial world in the Subura (see below, No. 2). Juvenal jests at the fact, that the sacred grove of Egeria, before the Porta Capena, was leased to Jews and swarmed with Jewish beggars (Sat. iii. 12–16). The settlement of Jews in various quarters of the town, and their continued prosperity down to the later imperial times, are also especially evidenced by Jewish burying grounds, some of them the discovery of recent times. Of these, the five following are now known: (1) A somewhat insignificant cemetery before the Porta Portuensis, discovered by Bosio in the year 1602. This was certainly the burial-place of the Jews in Trastevere. The knowledge of the locality was afterwards lost, and all efforts for its re-discovery have hitherto been unsuccessful. (2) A large cemetery, discovered in the beginning of the sixth decade of this century, on the Via Appia in the Vigna Randanini (somewhat farther out than the catacomb of Callistus). To it we owe our acquaintance with a large number of Romano-Jewish inscriptions. (3) In the year 1867 (or 1866) a Jewish cemetery, of which de Rossi gives a short account, was discovered in the vineyard of Count Cimarra, also on the Via Appia, nearly opposite the catacomb of Callistus. (4) A Jewish cemetery on the Via Labicana, therefore in the neighbourhood of the Esquinal and Viminal, of perhaps the date of the Antonines, was pointed out by Marucchi in the year 1883. (5) There was also in Porto (at the mouth of the Tiber) a Jewish cemetery, from which are derived many of the Jewish epitaphs with which we have for a long time been acquainted. The antiquity of this cemetery, and of the inscriptions contained in it, can only be approximately determined. They may date chiefly from the second to the fourth centuries after Christ.

Besides Jews properly so called, there were in Rome (as in Alexandria) Samaritans also. A Samaritan of the name of Thallus, a freedman of the Emperor Tiberius, once lent a large sum to

Agrippa I. in Rome. The existence of a Samaritan community in Rome, in the time of the Ostrogoth king Theodoric, is evidenced by a letter of this king to the knight Arigernus, which is embodied in the collection of letters of Cassiodorus. That the Samaritans were by no means without importance in the Roman Empire in later imperial times, is shown by the frequent reference to them in imperial legislation.

After the Jewish community in Rome, that of Puteoli (Dikäarchia) is presumably the most ancient in Italy. In this chief trading port of Italy with the East, we find Jews so early as B.C. 4, immediately after the death of Herod the Great. Their presence cannot be pointed out in other parts of Italy till later imperial times; this does not however permit any negative inference as to the date of their settlement. Much material in the way of inscriptions has recently been furnished especially by the discovery of the catacomb of Venosa (Venusia in Apulia, the birthplace of Horace). Its inscriptions in Greek, Latin and Hebrew are, according to Mommsen's judgment, of the sixth century after Christ. We likewise meet with Jewish communities in various parts of Gaul and Spain in later imperial times. In respect of dates, what has been said with regard to Italy holds good here also.

II. CONSTITUTION OF THE JEWISH COMMUNITIES

1. Their Internal Organization

There was of course but one way by which those of the Jewish people that were scattered over the whole earth could possibly maintain their native religion and usages, and that was by organizing themselves into independent communities, within which they might cherish the faith and practise the observances of their fathers in a foreign land and in the heart of the Gentile world, just as though they were living in the Holy Land itself. And that this is what, as a rule, they were in the habit of doing, and that from an early period, at all events from the commencement of the Hellenistic era, it is impossible to doubt. The nature of the organization may have varied according to time and place, and above all in so far as those communities had sometimes the character of purely private associations, while at others they were to a greater or less extent in the enjoyment of political privileges; but, be this as it may, it is certain that wherever any considerable number of Jews happened to be living together, there an independent organization was always to be met with as well.

It is with regard to the eastern diaspora that our information on this point is most scanty; nay, so far as the diaspora dwelling in the countries bordering on the Euphrates is concerned we have none at all, at least none dating farther back than Talmudic times. Nor are matters much better as regards Asia Minor and Syria. The most noteworthy item of information that can be gleaned in connection with these latter is the incidental reference on one occasion to an ἄρχων τῶν Ἰουδαίων in Antioch.

In Alexandria, where the Jews formed a large portion of the entire population, their community enjoyed very extensive political privileges. According to Strabo, they were presided over by an ἐθνάρχης, "who governs the people and administers justice among them, and sees that they fulfil their obligations and obey orders just like the archon of an independent city." Consequently, although the Jews who lived here enjoyed the rights of citizenship (see No. 3 below), they nevertheless formed an independent municipal community within or co-ordinate with the rest of the city, precisely as in the case of Cyrene. This independent position they also succeeded in maintaining in imperial times, and that very much owing to the circumstance that Alexandria, unlike almost all other Hellenistic towns, had no civic council. The constitution of the

Jewish community in Alexandria would seem to have undergone a certain change in the time of Augustus. At least Philo informs us that, after the death of the γενάρχης, Augustus instituted a γερουσία, to which the direction of Jewish affairs was entrusted. No doubt this appears to be at variance with the fact that in an edict of Claudius it is stated, that after the death of the ἐθνάρχης Augustus did not forbid the further appointment of ethnarchs. But probably this latter is only a repetition in a less accurate form of the fact mentioned by Philo, all that Claudius meant to say being simply this, that the Jews also continued as before to be governed by their own rulers (ἐθνάρχαι). The more accurate version of the matter is that of Philo, who states that ever since the time of Augustus the single ἐθνάρχης had been superseded by a γερουσία, over which a certain number of ἄρχοντες presided. Both the γερουσία and the ἄρχοντες are frequently mentioned by this writer. These latter are identical with the πρωτεύοντες τῆς γερουσίας that occur in Josephus. As bearing on the question of the number of members composing the γερουσία, we may mention the fact that on one occasion Flaccus caused thirty-eight of them to be dragged into the theatre and there scourged. It is a very common error to identify the Jewish ethnarch with the Egyptian alabarch. The office of this latter was of a purely civil character, but of course it was often held by distinguished Jews (see No. 3 below).

That the Jews living in Cyrene in like manner formed a separate political community is evident from the notice of Strabo already referred to, from which we learn that the inhabitants of this town were divided into four classes: (1) citizens; (2) tillers of the ground; (3) settlers; and (4) Jews. But notwithstanding this separate existence the Jews enjoyed equality of civic rights (ἰσονομία).

A very important light is thrown upon the constitution of the Jewish communities of the diaspora by a Jewish inscription found in Berenice, a town in Cyrenaica, and, according to Böckh's calculation, dating from the year 13 B.C. From that inscription we find that the Jews of Berenice formed a distinct πολίτευμα by themselves (lin. 17 f., 21 f.) with nine (and these of course Jewish) archons at its head (lin. 2–8, 21–25).

But it is with regard to the constitution of the Jewish communities of Rome and of Italy generally that we are most thoroughly informed, and that owing to the great amount of light thrown on the subject by the large number of Jewish epitaphs that have been found in the cemeteries of Rome and Venosa. These further show us, among other things, that here the same arrangements continued to subsist for centuries running without any material alteration. For the inscriptions of Venosa, dating from the sixth century after Christ, still present us with substantially the same picture as those of Rome, the oldest of which probably belong to one of the earliest centuries of our era. From the Roman inscriptions we gather, in the first place, that the Jews living in Rome were divided into a large number of separate and independently organized communities (συναγωγαί), each having its own synagogue, gerousia, and public officials. Of the existence of anything in the shape of a corporate union of the whole Jews of Rome under one γερουσία there is no trace whatever. While therefore the Jews of Alexandria formed a great political corporation, those of Rome had to be contented with the more modest position of separate religious societies. Those various communities called themselves by special names, of which the following are mentioned on the inscriptions: (1) a συναγωγὴ Αὐγουστησίων; (2) a συναγωγὴ Ἀγριππησίων; (3) a synagoga Bolumni (I. Volumni). These three took their names from certain distinguished personages. And seeing that along with Αὐγουστήσιοι we also meet with Ἀγριππήσιοι, there can hardly be a doubt that the former derived their name from the first Augustus, while the latter derived theirs from his friend and adviser M. Agrippa. The designation may be accounted for either by the fact that Augustus and Agrippa were patrons, the one of the

one community and the other of the other, or from the circumstance that those communities were for the most part composed of slaves and freedmen of Augustus on the one hand, or of Agrippa on the other (comp. οἱ ἐκ τῆς Καίσαρος οἰκίας, Phil. 4:22). Other communities again took their names from the particular quarter of the city in which their members happened to reside, as, for example, (4) the Καμπήσιοι from the Campus Martins, and (5) the Σιβουρήσιοι from the Subura, one of the busiest quarters of ancient Rome, and a centre of trade and industry. Besides these we also hear (b) of a συναγωγὴ Αἰβρέων, probably that of such of the Jews as spoke Hebrew, in contradistinction to those of them who had ceased to speak it, and (7) a συναγωγὴ Ἐλαίας, so called from the symbol of the olive. Of the officials who are mentioned on those inscriptions we would notice above all the γερουσιάρχης and the ἄρχοντες. (1) A γερουσιάρχης occurs not only upon the Roman inscriptions, but likewise on those at Venosa and elsewhere. This title cannot have been intended to refer to any other than the president or head of the γερουσία. But from the designation γερουσιάρχης συναγωγῆς Αὐγουστησίων it is evident, as has been already pointed out above, that each of the Roman communities had its own γερουσία, with its own officials. In view of this fact it is highly instructive to find, that upon the Roman inscriptions we nowhere meet with the title πρεσβύτερος (or any other like it, by which to denote the member of the γερουσία as such; for the ἄρχοντες were certainly not ordinary members, but the committee of the γερουσία). This fact can only be accounted for from the circumstance that it is only the offices properly so called that are mentioned by name upon the epitaphs, whereas the “elders” were not looked upon as officials in the technical sense of the word. They were the representatives and advisers of their community, but not officials with specific functions entrusted to them. (2) The title ἄρχων is of very frequent occurrence in the Roman inscriptions. We have already met with it elsewhere, viz. in Antioch, Alexandria, and Berenice. It also occurs sometimes upon epitaphs found outside of Rome, and we may add that Tertullian classes the priest, Levite, and archon together as Jewish offcials. According to all analogy elsewhere (comp. especially Alexandria and Berenice) it may be taken for granted, in the case of the Roman communities as well, that each of them would have several ἄρχοντες, who would act as the managing committee of the γερουσία. It would appear from the title δὶς ἄρχων, which is repeatedly met with, that the archons were appointed for a definite period; and in a Homilia in S. Johannis Natalem, ascribed to Chrysostom, and which has specially in view the state of matters in Italy during the imperial times, we are expressly informed that the archons were always elected in September, the beginning of the civil year of the Jews. The following are the ipsissima verba of this interesting passage: Inter haec intuendae sunt temporum qualitates et gesta morum; et primum perfidia Judaeorum, qui semper in Deum et in Mosem contumaces exstiterunt, qui cum a Deo secundum Mosem initium anni mensem Martium acceperint, illi dictum pravitatis sive superbiae exercentes mensem Septembrem, ipsum novum annum nuncupant, quo et mense magistrates sibi designant, quos Archontas vocant. But besides the appointments for a definite period, there seem also to have been cases in which the appointment was for life. At least it is probable that the enigmatical title διὰ βίου, which is repeatedly met with, is to be understood as referring to archons who were elected for life.

As in Palestine so also in Rome and Italy, and in fact through the diaspora generally, we meet with the office of the ἀρχισυνάγωγος. We have already (§ 27, p. 64) said all that is necessary to say regarding the difference between this office and that of the γερουσιάρχης and the ἄρχοντες. The archisynagogus is not simply the president of the community, but he is entrusted with the special task of conducting and supervising the meetings for religious purposes. Of course he may have been chosen from among the ἄρχοντες, so that the same person might thus be an archon and an archisynagogus at one and the same time. But at the inscriptions

plainly show, the two offices were in thers selves quite distinct. On the later use of the title ἀρχισυνάγωγος by women and children, and that merely as a title and nothing more, see above, p. 65. Besides the archisynagogus there was also another who had certain functions to discharge in connection with the meetings for public worship, and that was the synagogue officer (ὑπηρέτης), an official who is also once mentioned upon a Roman inscription. Lastly, the titles pater synagogae and mater synagogae are pretty often met with on the inscriptions. The circumstance of the title occurring also in this last-mentioned form should of itself render it probable that it was not intended to denote by it an office in the proper sense of the word, but simply an honourable position in the community. It was one that was applied, above all, to aged members, and to such of them as the community was indebted to for some good service or other.

2. Their Political Position

The Jewish communities are by no means a unique phenomenon within the circle of the Graeco-Roman world. In the Hellenistic period all the larger seaports of the Mediterranean came to be closely connected with each other in consequence of the brisk trade that was carried on between them, the result of which was that not only Jews, but also Phoenicians, Syrians, Egyptians and inhabitants of Asia Minor settled in larger or smaller numbers in many of the principal towns of Greece and Italy. All the settlers belonging to the same nation were naturally led by a community of temporal and spiritual interests, above all by their common worship, to band themselves together for, mutual help, and consequently to unite themselves under a common organization. Wherever a considerable number of them happened to be living together, there they formed themselves into a separate society, and that principally for the purpose of maintaining their native worship in their midst. Consequently, just as there were diaspora communities composed of Jews, so in like manner there were those composed of Phoenicians, Egyptians, and so on. As early as the year 333 B.C. the Athenians issued a decree granting permission to the merchants from Citium (ἔμποροι Κιτιεῖς) to erect a temple to Aphrodite in the Piraeus, it being mentioned at the same time that the Egyptians (οἱ Αἰγύπτιοι) had already built a temple to Isis in the same place (Corp. Inscr. Attic, ii. 1, n. 168). At the beginning of the second century B.C. we find a community of Tyrian merchants in the island of Delos (Corp. Inscr. Graec. 2271: ἡ σύνοδος τῶν Τυρίων ἐμπόρων καὶ ναυκλήρων). Then we learn from an inscription belonging to the year 174 A.D. that at that date there lived in Puteoli a community of Tyrians who requested assistance from home to enable them to carry on the observance of their native worship (Corp. Inscr. Graec. 5853: οἱ ἐν Ποτιόλοις κατοικοῦντες scil. Τύριοι). In Puteoli there were also cultores lovis Heliopolitani Berytenses qui Puteolis consistunt (Orelli, Inscr. Lat. 1246 = Corp. Inser. Lat. vol. x. n 1634). But these Orientals, when they came to the West, were not contented with merely forming themselves into such communities as we have just referred to, but exactly like the Jews they endeavoured to win converts to their religion among the Greeks and Romans, and that sometimes with great success. We know in fact that even in early times the Greek religion owed not a little to the influence of the East. In the Hellenistic period again Oriental worships came to be more and more in vogue. Then as early as the latter days of the Republic we find the worship of the Egyptian gods already naturalized in Rome, while this was followed by the establishment in imperial times of the Syrian and Persian worships, above all that of Mithras (for more on this point, see No. 5, below). With the view of cultivating those worships, where they did not happen to be established and maintained directly by the State itself, the adherents of them also formed themselves into religious associations which. as regards their internal organization and their political position, are to be conceived of as being in every respect analogous to the corporations of foreign merchants

mentioned above. Both in Greece and in Rome the law of the land contained express legal provisions for the benefit of those associations under the shelter of which it became possible for them to attain to a highly flourishing condition. In Greece these associations are met with from the beginning of the fourth century B.C. downwards, and that under the name of θίασοι or ἔρανοι. And notwithstanding their diversity otherwise, they are all characterized by certain common features, as might be expected from their being all of them so far under State regulation. In Rome again, and that from an early period, there were collegia for a great variety of purposes, sometimes for objects chiefly religious, sometimes for those of a political character (but forbidden since the time of Caesar and Augustus), sometimes with a view to the mutual help of their members, above all for the purpose of securing them honourable burial (collegia tenuiorum, collegia funeraticia). The main distinction between these and the sacerdotia publica populi Romani lay in this, that while recognised by the State they were not publicly endowed, but had to depend for their support upon the voluntary contributions of their members.

The position of voluntary religious associations as we have here described it, was precisely that which the Jewish communities also occupied now both in Greece and Rome, except in those instances in which, as in Alexandria, they enjoyed political privileges of a still more extensive character, which however was certainly not the case in Greece proper nor in Rome. In the dominions of the Ptolemies and the Seleucidae the toleration of the Jewish communities and their religion was simply a matter of course. Indeed the first of the Ptolemies and the Seleucidae conferred important political privileges upon the Jews who resided within their kingdoms (see below, paragraph 3). Ptolemy II. is said to have gone even the length of causing the Jewish law to be translated into Greek, and Ptolemy III. to have gone so far as to offer sacrifice in Jerusalem. No doubt when it was becoming more and more evident that the Jews were disposed to treat Hellenism rather contemptuously, and that unlike all other nations they insisted in maintaining a strong wall of partition, so far as religious matters were concerned, between themselves and every other people, several kings such as Antiochus Epiphanes for example tried to break down this opposition – tried to suppress the Jewish religion by force. But history teaches us that every attempt to do this only proved a failure, and we find that on the whole the toleration of former days continues to be enjoyed in later times as well. One of the foremost among the friends of the Jews was Ptolemy VL (Philometor), who went so far as to sanction the erection of a Jewish temple in Egypt (see paragraph 4, below). And if Ptolemy VII. (Physcon) assumed an attitude of hostility toward the Jews, he did so not because of their religious, but their political partisanship. In a similar way the legislation of the Romans expressly conceded to the Jews the free observance of their own religion, and extended its protection to them when sundry attempts were made to suppress it. But it was Caesar and Augustus to whom they were chiefly indebted for their formal recognition within the Roman Empire. Josephus (Antt. xiv. 10, xvi. 6) has transmitted to us a large number of public enactments, partly decrees of the Senate, partly edicts of Caesar and Augustus, and partly those of certain Roman officials or municipal authorities of that period – all of which have as their object the securing to the Jews of the free observance of their own religion, and the further confirmation of their privileges. As a rule the policy of Caesar was peculiarly unfavourable to those free unions, because at that time they were often made use of for political purposes, and so for this reason the emperor found it necessary to prohibit all collegia except those of ancient standing. But the Jewish communities were expressly exempted, it being further ordained that in future they were not to be forbidden to have a common fund of their own, and to hold meetings or gatherings. And accordingly on one occasion we find a Roman official appealing to this decree when issuing instructions to the authorities of Paros not to interfere with the Jews in the practice of their religious observances. In like manner the four public enactments, which Josephus has

brought together in Antt. xiv. 10. 20-24, are doubtless to be traced to the influence of Caesar. They all of them serve directly or indirectly to guarantee to the Jews of Asia Minor the undisturbed exercise of their own religious observances. After the death of Caesar the two contending parties vied with each other in maintaining the privileges of the Jews. On the one side we find Dolabella, the warm supporter of Antony, and who in the year 43 B.C. took possession of Asia Minor, ratifying the privilege of exemption from military service, and of observing their own religious worship conferred upon the Jews of that province by previous governors, and sending a communication to the authorities of Ephesus to apprize them of this. On the other again we find Marcus Junius Brutus, who in Asia Minor was preparing in the spring of the year 42 B.C. to march against Antony and Octavianus, prevailing upon the people of Ephesus to issue a public edict declaring that the Jews were not to be interfered with in the observance of the Sabbath and their other sacred usages. In consequence of all this, Judaism acquired such a legal standing that it came to be treated as a religio licita throughout the whole extent of the Roman Empire. That the Jews living in the city of Rome also shared in these legal privileges is specially vouched for by Philo with regard to the time of Augustus. At the same time, if we may judge from what we know to have been the case in regard to other foreign worships, it must be assumed that down to the second century of our era the Jews of Rome were not at liberty to celebrate their religious observances within the pomaerium.

In the recognition of the Jewish communities and their worship on the part of the State two important privileges are virtually included: the right of administering their own funds and jurisdiction over their own members. To the former of these prominence had already been given over and over again in the edicts issued in Caesar's time. This was a matter of special importance to the Jews, as otherwise they would have been unable to fulfil their obligations to the temple at Jerusalem and to send thither the tribute prescribed by the law. But it was precisely this draining away of money from the provinces that seemed peculiarly offensive in the eyes of the Gentile authorities. We learn from Cicero's speech in behalf of Flaccus, that this latter, during his administration of Asia, in several places confiscated the money thus collected by Jews with the view of forwarding it to Jerusalem. Further, the municipal authorities in Asia would seem to have gone on acting in a similar manner even after the edicts of Caesar's time and actually in defiance of them. Consequently the public documents belonging to the time of Augustus refer principally to this point. As Augustus had sanctioned the remitting of these sums of money from Rome itself, so the municipalities of Asia Minor and Cyrene are enjoined not to interpose any obstacle in the way of the Jews in regard to this matter. Further, the appropriation of all such monies was to be punished as sacrilege. And that those decrees were still in force in the time of the Vespasian war is evident from an incidental utterance that on one occasion fell from the lips of Titus. It was a matter of no less importance to the Jews to be allowed to exercise jurisdiction over the members of their own community. For, as the Mosaic law concerned itself not only with acts of worship but with the affairs of ordinary life as well, these latter being also subjected to the regulative principles of a divine law, it was utterly repugnant to Jewish ideas of things that they should be tried by any other than Jewish law. Wherever the Jews went they took their own law along with them, and in accordance with it they administered justice among the members of their community. Evidences of this are to be found above all in the New Testament. The Apostle Paul, for example, obtains a warrant from the Sanhedrim in Jerusalem for the arrest of certain converts to Christianity among the Jews living in Damascus (Acts 9:2). In other places again he causes such converts to be put in prison and scourged (Acts 22:19, 26:11). Subsequently he himself was scourged by the Jews five times for being a Christian (2 Cor. 11:24), on which occasions it is doubtless Jewish communities living abroad that are in question and not those of Palestine. In Corinth the proconsul Gallio directs the Jews to carry

their complaint against Paul before their own authorities, on the ground that he would be prepared to interfere only if Paul had been charged with a criminal offence, but not if it was merely a question of transgressing the Jewish law (Acts 18:12–16); and then he quietly looks on and allows the Jews to maltreat Sosthenes, the ruler of the synagogue, under his very eyes (Acts 18:17). From all this it will be seen that practically at all events the Jews exercised not only civil, but even criminal jurisdiction over the members of their communities. But whether they were actually warranted in doing so is open to question. In any case the foreign communities would doubtless be subject to certain restrictions in this respect, similar to those imposed upon the Jews in Palestine in the time of the procurators. But it is certain that in civil causes they enjoyed an independent jurisdiction, not merely in Alexandria (see above, p. 244), but elsewhere as well. Even before the time of Caesar we find such jurisdiction expressly conceded to the Jews of Sardes in a communication addressed to the authorities of that town by Lucius Antonius (governor of the province of Asia in 50–49 B.C.). And we see from the legislation of the Christian emperors that in later times as well the Jewish communities were everywhere left in the enjoyment of this privilege (see below at the close of the present paragraph).

As the requirements of Jewish legalism might easily bring the Jews of the dispersion into collision with the arrangements of civil life, they could hope to enjoy the absolutely free exercise of their own religion only in those cases where the civil legislation and government did not require of them anything that was incompatible with their own law. But even in this respect Roman tolerance made largo concessions to the Jews. One of the most important of them was exemption from military service. For Jews to perform such service in any but a Jewish army would be simply impossible, for on the Sabbath they were forbidden either to bear arms or to march farther than 2000 cubits. This matter assumed a somewhat practical character when, at the breaking out of the civil war between Caesar and Pompey in the year 47 B.C., Pompey's party endeavoured to raise large levies of troops throughout the whole of the East. In the province of Asia alone the consul Lentulus raised as many as two legions of Roman citizens. Now if it was the case, as precisely on this very occasion we are informed it was, that in that quarter there was also a large number of Jews who enjoyed the rights of Roman citizenship, then they too would be liable to this conscription. But at their own request Lentulus granted them the privilege of exemption from military service, and issued instructions to this effect to all the authorities everywhere who had charge of the conscription. Then six years after this (43 B.C.) Dolabella confirmed the Jews of this same province in their privilege of ἀστρατεία, and in doing so he expressly appealed to the previous edicts. In Palestine also was this same privilege conceded to them by Caesar. Among the other privileges that were conceded to them in deference to the requirements of Jewish legalism, we might further mention that, in pursuance of an order to that effect by Augustus, the Jews were not to be compelled to appear in a court of law on the Sabbath; that when a public distribution of money or corn took place and the day of the distribution fell on a Sabbath, then in pursuance of a similar order by the same emperor, their share of the money or the corn was to be delivered to them on the day following; and lastly, that instead of the oil furnished by the provinces and which Jews were forbidden to make use of, they were to receive an equivalent in money, — a usage the continuance of which was confirmed to the Jews of Antioch, for example, by the governor Mucianus in the time of the Vespasian war.

This whole position of the Jews with regard to their enjoyment of public rights was never materially or permanently altered at any subsequent period. Sometimes no doubt the imperial legislation introduced certain restrictions, and Judaism was also subjected now and then to

temporary persecution. But nothing of the nature of a lasting or material change took place in the existing state of things till down toward later imperial times. The measures used by Tiberius against Roman Jews were confined exclusively to the city of Rome. No doubt a serious crisis arose in the time of Caligula. But it was precisely in such a crisis that it was seen how important it was for the Jews to be able to take their stand upon the public rights they had now so long enjoyed. For nothing was more calculated seriously to endanger the religious freedom of the Jews than the introduction and gradual diffusion of the worship of the emperors. The more that such worship was being promoted by public authority, it would necessarily have more and more the appearance of an act of disloyalty on the part of the Jews when they refused to join in it. And so at a time when Caligula was everywhere peremptorily insisting upon the observance of that worship, which, ever since Augustus, had been introduced again and again by people from the provinces in the heat of their own zeal (see § 22, vol. i. p. 16), the religious freedom of the Jews would have been irretrievably lost had the demand been consistently enforced in their case as well. As long as Caligula lived the attempt to do so was actually made, and history can tell what frightful storms were conjured up for the Jews in consequence (see § 17). But fortunately for them the reign of Caligula was but of short duration. Claudius his successor lost no time in simply restoring the previous state of matters by issuing a decree of universal toleration. Since then the idea of forcing the Jews to take part in emperor worship has never been seriously thought of. Their title to exemption was regarded as an ancient privilege, a circumstance which placed them in a much more favourable position than the Christians enjoyed. The subsequent treatment of the Roman Jews by Claudius was confined, like that of Tiberius, to Rome itself, and did not lead to any permanent result. Even the reign of Nero, thanks to the Empress Poppaea, was on the whole favourable to the Jews (comp. note 7 The result of the great Vespasian war and the destruction of Jerusalem, so far as the Jews of the dispersion were concerned, was this, that the tax of two drachmae previously paid to the temple at Jerusalem was from that time forward to be given to the temple of Jupiter Capitolinus. No doubt to have to do this was a thing somewhat repugnant to the feelings of a Jew. But in no other respect did Vespasian do anything to prejudice the religious freedom of the Jews. Their political rights are expressly safeguarded by him even in Alexandria and Antioch for example. Domitian insisted in the most rigorous manner possible upon the payment of the two drachmae tax, and visited with severe punishment such of the Romans as became converts to Judaism. But the existing rights of the Jews were not rescinded. Under Nerva again certain alleviations were granted with regard to both the points just mentioned. As for the two-drachmae tax, though not abolished, it was imposed in a less offensive form, and it was no longer allowable to prosecute any one on the charge of having adopted “Jewish modes of life.” A violent disturbance of the existing state of things, nay the most violent that the Jews had ever experienced since Caligula’s time, was brought about by the serious struggles that took place in the reign of Trajan and Hadrian. Hadrian had gone so far – and this was the cause of the insurrection in his time – as to issue a formal prohibition of the rite of circumcision, a prohibition that was hardly revoked after the successful quelling of the rising. But his successor Antoninus Pius granted permission to circumcise in the case of native Jews, and confined the prohibition to Gentiles. In like manner Septimius Severus contented himself with merely prohibiting conversions to Judaism, and this continued to be also the standpoint of several Christian emperors who were not otherwise favourably disposed toward the Jewish religion. It will be seen therefore that the whole of the repressive measures aimed merely at preventing the further spread of Judaism. As far as native Jews were concerned, their existing public rights were not interfered with to any appreciable extent As showing this, there are three points that are worth noting. (1) As in earlier, so also in later times the Jewish worship continued to enjoy the formal protection of the State. On one occasion when Callistus, subsequently a bishop (in the time of Bishop Victor, 189–199 A.D.),

ventured to disturb Jewish worship in Rome, the Jews prosecuted him for doing so before Fascianus the prefect of the city, who sentenced the offender to be banished to the mines of Sardinia. Of the Christian emperors, even those of them who were unfavourably disposed toward the Jews, and who had forbidden the building of new synagogues, had nevertheless no objection to place the existing ones under the protection of the Jaws of the empire. (2) The Jewish communities continued to enjoy to quite the same extent as in former times the right of administering their own, funds. Above all were they still permitted as much as ever (till toward the end of the fourth century of our era) to send their sacred tribute to the patriarchate in Palestine (the new central authority of the Jewish people after the destruction of Jerusalem). This tribute was collected every year by the apostoli sent out by the patriarchs for the purpose, and when thus collected it was conveyed to Palestine. It was not till towards the close of the fourth century of our era that the civil authority began gradually to put a stop to this. (3) In later imperial times the Jews were also permitted still to enjoy independent jurisdiction over the members of their own community, but of course exclusively in civil causes and only when the two parties in the case agreed to have the matter disposed of by a Jewish tribunal. Powers of a very extensive character must have been in the hands of the Jewish ethnarch or patriarch in Palestine, who after the destruction of the Jewish state formed the supreme head of the people. The whole of the communities of the dispersion seem to have submitted to his jurisdiction without any hesitation. And so full were the prerogatives he exercised, that the Fathers of the Church felt themselves under the necessity of taking very considerable pains in order to show that, notwithstanding those prerogatives, the sceptre had been taken from Judah as far back as the time of Christ. But there is perhaps nothing that indicates better the secure basis on which those political privileges of the Jews just described were found to rest, than the circumstance that in the time of the persecution of the Christians we even find instances of these latter becoming converts to Judaism for their own safety.

III. Their Equality in Regard to the Rights of Citizenship

There can be no question that, in the majority of the older cities of Phoenicia, Syria, and Asia Minor, as well as in Greece proper, the Jews who went to live in them occupied the position of settlers (as opposed to citizens). We no doubt hear of occasional instances in which individual Jews have the rights of citizenship conferred upon them. Paul, for instance, who was a citizen of Tarsus (Acts 21:39), is a case in point. But, as a rule, the Jewish communities in those cities are to be regarded in the light of private associations of settlers, which were recognised by the State and on which certain rights were conferred, but the members of which did not enjoy the rights of citizenship and consequently were also debarred from having a voice in the direction of the affairs of the city. Still there was after all a pretty large number of towns in which the Jews enjoyed the rights of citizenship. This was true above all of the towns more recently built in the Hellenistic period, and pre-eminently of the foremost amongst them, viz. Antioch and Alexandria, the capitals of the kingdoms of the Seleucidae and the Ptolemies respectively. Seleucus I. Nicator († 280 B.C.) conferred the rights of citizenship upon the Jews living in all the towns founded by himself in Asia Minor and Syria, rights which they were all found to be still enjoying in the time of Josephus. The most important of these towns was Antioch, where the rights of the Jews were inscribed upon tablets of brass. They also continued to enjoy their rights of citizenship there at a later period, not only under the Seleucidae after Antiochus Epiphanes, but under the Romans as well Even in the time of the great Vespasian war Titus declined to accede to the urgent request of the people of Antioch to deprive the Jews of the rights of citizenship by simply appealing to their ancient privileges. In like manner in Alexandria the Jews obtained citizen rights when the city was founded. Alexander the Great conferred upon them

“equal rights with the Macedonians” (who are no other than just the regular citizens of Alexandria), while the Diadochoi granted them permission to call themselves Macedonians. Nor did any change take place with regard to those rights in the time of the Romans. They were expressly confirmed by Julius Caesar, as might be seen from what was inscribed upon a pillar set up in Alexandria, and which was still standing in Josephus’ day. It is true that, during the persecution in Caligula’s time, the rights of the Alexandrian Jews were trampled under foot. But as soon as Claudius succeeded to the throne he lost no time in guaranteeing the continued existence of Jewish rights. And as in Antioch so here too they were not curtailed in the slightest degree, even after the war of the year 70 of our era.

Nor did the Jews enjoy the rights of citizenship merely in the towns newly founded in the Hellenistic period, but also in those on the coast of Ionia as well, and above all in Ephesus, in which towns those rights had been conferred upon them by Antiochus II. Theos (261–246 B.C.). When, in the time of Augustus, the municipal authorities in that quarter petitioned that the Jews should either be excluded from the enjoyment of the rights of citizenship, or be compelled to renounce their separate worship and conform to that of the native divinities, Agrippa, who happened to have the administration of the eastern provinces, maintained intact the ancient privileges of the Jews, whose interests on this occasion were represented by Nicolaus Damascenus, deputed to do so by Herod (in the year 14 B.C.). We learn incidentally that the Jews also possessed the rights of citizenship in Sardes for example, and not less so outside of Asia Minor as in the case of Cyrene.

The position thus created for the Jews in consequence of possessing all those privileges was one involving an internal contradiction. On the one hand, they formed when living in Gentile cities a community of foreigners who, for the furtherance of their religious concerns, had organized themselves into an independent body, and whose religious views were hopelessly at variance with every species of Gentile worship. And yet, on the other, they participated as citizens in all the rights and duties of municipal life, they had seats and the right of voting in the civic councils, and had a share in the direction of the affairs of the city. This must of necessity have led to incessant collision. For the idea of separating religious from political concerns was, so long as it remained true to itself, altogether foreign to classical antiquity; it looked upon the worship of the native divinities as also forming an essential part of the public affairs of the city. And so how it must have been felt to be a standing contradiction to see in the very heart of the municipality, and enjoying all the rights of citizenship, a body of people who not only persisted in worshipping their own God alongside those of the city, but who assailed every form of Gentile worship whatever as an abomination. Such a thing as the toleration of various worships alongside of each other was really possible only within the cosmopolitan circle of the Roman Empire. For there was realized in all its fulness the fundamental thought for which Hellenism paved the way, that every man is free to be happy after his own fashion. Consequently there was room here for Jews as well. In the municipal towns, on the other hand, which clung to the ancient modes of life in matters of religion as well, the Jews must have been felt to be a continual thorn in the sides of their fellow-citizens. It is therefore not to be wondered at – rather should we say that it entirely accords with the historical development of things, that the Jews should have been persecuted by the municipal towns, whereas the higher authority of the Roman Empire took them under its wing. In those towns there were outbursts of hatred against the Jews on every occasion, and that above all in those of them in which they enjoyed the rights of citizenship, such as Alexandria, Antioch, many of the towns of Asia Minor, and also Caesarea in Palestine where the ἰσοπολιτεία was conferred upon Jews and Gentiles by Herod the Great. One of the principal accusations against the Jews on those occasions was precisely this, that

they refused to worship the gods of the city. But the Roman authorities always came to the rescue and safeguarded the religious freedom of the Jews in so far as these latter did not themselves forfeit their rights by showing revolutionary tendencies. It is well worth noting how, in the address in which Nicolaus Damascenus pleads for the rights of the Jews being respected, it is pointed out as something quite new, as a boon which the Romans, with their orderly system of government, were the first to create, viz. that everywhere every one was at liberty "to live and worship his own gods."

The more that the attitude of the Romans, with their world-wide power, was on the whole favourable to Judaism, it was of but the greater consequence to the Jews of the dispersion that so many of them possessed the rights of Roman citizenship, not only in Rome, but elsewhere as well. According to the testimony of Philo, the majority of the Jews living in Rome enjoyed such rights, and that in the capacity of descendants of freedmen. Of the Jews taken captive in war, and whom Pompey had once brought to Rome and there sold as slaves, many were set free by their own master, and on obtaining their freedom they were at the same time invested with the rights of citizenship, which rights their descendants continued to enjoy ever after. It would even appear that some of those libertini must have quitted Rome and gone back to Jerusalem again, where they had founded a community by themselves. For the Λιβερτῖνοι mentioned in the Acts of the Apostles (6:9) can hardly have been other than Roman freedmen and their descendants. Consequently there would be Jews living in Jerusalem too who possessed the rights of Roman citizenship. But we also find such in large numbers elsewhere, and above all in Asia Minor. Hence there is nothing at all strange in the circumstance that the Apostle Paul, a native of Tarsus in Cilicia, was found to be in the enjoyment of the rights of Roman citizenship (Acts 16:37 sqq., 22:25-29, 23:27). It is true we have no means of knowing how the Jews of Asia Minor attained to this position. But the fact itself is all the less open to question, that it is well known otherwise that as early as the first century B.C. there were many thousands of Roman citizens living in Asia Minor. The advantages that accompanied the possession of the rights of Roman citizenship were very considerable. For those living in the provinces it was of consequence above all that a Roman was subject only to the jurisdiction of Roman courts, the civil causes being disposed of by a jury composed of Roman citizens, and those of a criminal character by the Roman procurator or governor. It was only in the civitates, recognised as liberae, that the Roman citizens as well were subject to the jurisdiction of other than Roman authorities. Of the various privileges the following may be further mentioned as worthy of special note: (1) Exemption from every kind of degrading punishment, such for example as scourging and crucifixion; and (2) the jus provocationis or appellationis, both which phrases were used synonymously in the imperial age, and were employed to denote the right of appealing against any sentence to the emperor himself. This right held good in the case of civil as well as criminal causes. We must beware of confounding with this appeal against a sentence already pronounced the claim that might be put in at the very commencement of the process to have the whole matter referred to the emperor in Rome. According to the usual though not altogether indisputable view, Roman citizens charged with capital offences were also at liberty to urge this claim.

In many Hellenistic cities the Jews, in virtue of their possessing the rights of citizenship, were on a level with the rest of the inhabitants. Of course in those communes they failed on an average to attain to a leading position. We should rather say that, as we have already seen, it was precisely this possessing of the rights of citizenship that led to the hostility and persecution to which they were so often exposed. At the same time there were many places, Egypt in particular, where at certain periods Jews also have been found to play a prominent part in public

life. The first of the Ptolemies were on the whole favourably disposed toward them. Under some of the later Ptolemies again very important appointments were entrusted to them. Ptolemy VI. (Philopater) and his consort Cleopatra "committed the care of their entire kingdom to the hands of Jews, while it was the Jewish generals Onias and Dositheus that had command of the whole army." Another Cleopatra, the daughter of the two royal personages just mentioned, when carrying on war against her son Ptolemy Lathurus, also appointed two Jewish generals, Chelkias and Ananias, to the chief command of her army. Likewise in the Roman period many wealthy Jews were still found to be playing a prominent part in public life in Alexandria. In particular we happen to know that the office of aldbarch, probably chief collector of customs on the Arabian side of the Nile, was repeatedly held by wealthy Jews, as for example by Alexander the brother of Philo the Philosopher, and later on by a certain person called Demetrius. With reference to this Josephus informs us that the Romans had allowed the Jews of Alexandria "to retain the responsible position that had been entrusted to them by the kings, namely the duty of watching the river." There was a distinguished Alexandrian Jew of the name of Tiberius Alexander, a son of Alexander the alabarch just mentioned, who even rose to some of the highest positions in the Roman army, though at the sacrifice of the religion of his fathers. No doubt the Jews had grown to be an influential element in society even in Rome itself. But here they never succeeded in gaining the position they had attained in Egypt, the contrast between the Roman and Jewish natures being too strong and abrupt for that.

IV. Their Religious Life

The constant contact of the Judaism of the dispersion with Gentile culture could not fail to influence its internal development as well. Above all, in those places where, from their wealth and social standing, the Jews were in a position to avail themselves of the educative agencies of their time – as in Alexandria in particular – did the Judaism of the dispersion follow a direction essentially different from that of Palestine. In the dispersion the cultured Jew was not only a Jew, but a Greek as well, alike in respect of language, education, and habits, and by the sheer force of circumstances he was impelled to find ways and means of harmonizing and combining Jewish and Hellenistic idiosyncrasies (for more on this point see § 33 and 34). But strictly speaking this can only be said with regard to the more highly educated among them, while even in their case it was always the original Jewish element of their character that predominated. This latter was true, in a still higher degree, of the great mass of the Jewish people. However much those of the dispersion may have adopted the Greek language as their vernacular, however defective and lax their observance of the law might have seemed in the eyes of the Pharisees, however much they may have given up as unimportant what to the Pharisee appeared both essential and necessary, still in the depths of their heart they were Jews notwithstanding, and felt themselves to be in all essential respects in unison with their brethren in Palestine.

One of the principal means employed for preserving and upholding the faith of their fathers among the communities of the dispersion was the regular meetings for worship in the synagogues on the Sabbath. There cannot be a doubt that in the dispersion as well those meetings took place wherever an organized community of Jews was found to exist. We learn from Philo that "in all the towns thousands of houses of instruction were open where discernment and moderation and skill and justice and all virtues generally were taught." In the course of his travels through Asia Minor and Greece the Apostle Paul everywhere met with Jewish synagogues; as for example in Antioch of Pisidia (Acts 13:14), Iconium (Acts 14:1), Ephesus (18:19, 26, 19:8), Thessalonica (17:1), Berea (17:10), Athens (17:17), Corinth (18:4,

7). Josephus mentions synagogues as being in Caesarea and Dora on the Phoenician coast. Jewish προσευχαί are met with even upon inscriptions in the Crimea. Then in those towns in which the Jews were rather more numerous there were several synagogues. This was so in the case of Damascus (Acts 9:20), of Salamis in Cyprus (Acts 13:5), while in Alexandria there was quite a multitude of them. Josephus singles out as being particularly elegant the synagogue at Antioch (i.e. the chief synagogue there, for in any case there was a considerable number of them in that town as well). To this latter the successors of Antiochus Epiphanes had presented the sacred vessels of brass (and these alone, not the valuable gold and silver ones) which Antiochus had carried off from the temple at Jerusalem, while the Jews of Antioch themselves were at the expense of providing cups of a more valuable kind in order still more to enhance the beauty of their sanctuary (τὸ ἱερόν). In Rome there was a large number of synagogues as early as the time of Augustus, as Philo testifies throughout his works generally. Further, the names of the various syuagogal communities have been handed down to us through the medium of the inscriptions. Consequently wherever Jews were found to be living, there the law and the prophets were read and expounded every Sabbath and the religious ordinances observed. The language employed in public worship was, as a rule, undoubtedly the Greek. The truth is Hebrew was so little current among the Jews of the dispersion that not a single instance, has been met with of its use upon a tombstone. At all events the inscriptions in the Roman catacombs (dating from the first centuries of our era) are composed almost exclusively in Greek or Latin (the latter less frequently), or at most with short postscripts in Hebrew. It is not till we come down to the epitaphs of Venosa (dating from somewhere about the sixth century of our era) that we see how Hebrew begins to come gradually into use. But among these too it is Greek or Latin that is still most frequently met with. If even for such monumental purposes Hebrew was not in use, then much less likely is it to have been so in the oral addresses at the meetings for public worship. The Rabbinical authorities in Palestine have expressly sanctioned the use of any language whatever in repeating the Shemah, the Shemoneh Esreh, and the grace at meals; while it is only in the case of the priestly benediction, and a few special passages of Scripture, such as the formula repeated in connection with the offering of the firstlings and with the chaliza that the use of Hebrew is absolutely insisted upon. A certain R. Levi bar Chaitha once heard the Shemah repeated in Greek (אליניסתין) in Caesarea. Then the writing of the Holy Scriptures in Greek is expressly sanctioned, while here too, as before, it is only in the case of several passages composed for certain specific purposes, such as the tephillin and mesusoth, that the use of Hebrew is insisted on. If therefore, in oral address or written compositions, the use of Hebrew was obligatory only in the case of certain passages, then one should say that, according to the Rabbinical view, it must also have been considered legitimate to read the Scriptures at the meetings for public worship in some other language, say in Greek. But several of the Fathers have distinctly assured us that, as matter of fact, it was the Greek translation of the Bible that was used in the synagogues, and therefore during public worship. At the same time it is quite possible that on such occasions the Scriptures were read in Hebrew as well as in Greek, as was subsequently the case in the time of the Emperor Justinian. But if we reflect how the Apostle Paul for example was familiar only with the Greek translation of the Old Testament, we can hardly suppose it probable that there was any such simultaneous use of both the Hebrew and the Greek text.

Considering how rigidly Jewish worship was centralized in Jerusalem, the existence of the Jewish temple at Leontopolis cannot but strike us as a somewhat remarkable phenomenon. In the time of Antiochus V. Eupater (164–162 B.C.), Onias IV., the son of the high priest Onias III., finding that there was no prospect of his succeeding to the high-priesthood in Palestine, came to Egypt where he was cordially welcomed by Ptolemy VI. Philometer and his consort

Cleopatra. The king placed at his disposal in Leontopolis in the province of Heliopolis a dilapidated temple which had previously been dedicated to the ἀγρία Βούβαστις. This ruin Onias proceeded to rebuild, and transformed it into a Jewish sanctuary after the model of the temple in Jerusalem, though smaller and plainer and with numerous deviations in regard to details. Now as there also happened to he a sufficient number of priests already at hand a regular Jewish temple service was at once instituted, a service which continued without interruption from that date (therefore from somewhere about 160 B.C.) till the destruction of Jerusalem, after which, like its prototype, it was closed by the Romans (73 A.D.). Of course the learned doctors of Palestine never looked upon the services of this temple as legitimate worship, nor did they recognise the sacrifices offered in it as valid except to a very limited extent. But even the Egyptian Jews themselves were not satisfied merely with the worship in their adopted country, but still kept up their connection with Jerusalem. In common with all other Jews they made pilgrimages to Jerusalem, while their priests on getting married always had their wife's pedigree authenticated in the Holy City.

In common with the law generally, the prescriptions regarding the temple tribute and the pilgrimages to Jerusalem on festival occasions were as far as possible complied with by the Jews of the dispersion. This was particularly the case with respect to the tribute. Apropos of the plundering of the temple by Crassus, Josephus remarks that it was not to be wondered at that such a large amount of treasure should have accumulated there, for from an early date every Jew and every proselyte throughout the world, in Europe and Asia alike, had been paying tribute to the temple. Philo gives us the following details as to the way in which the temple tribute was collected and remitted to Jerusalem: "The revenue of the temple is derived not merely from a few lands, but from other and much more copious sources which can never be destroyed. Because as long as the human race endures so long will the sources of the temple revenue continue to exist, seeing that they will last as long as the world itself. For it is prescribed that every Jew who is over twenty years of age is to pay so much tribute annually.... But as might be expected in the caso of so numerous a people, the amount thus contributed is very large. In almost every town there is an office for the collection of the sacred funds and into which the tribute is paid. Then at particular seasons these funds are entrusted to men of good standing whose duty it is to convey them to Jerusalem. For this purpose it is always those of the highest rank that are chosen, as a kind of guarantee that that which is every Israelite's hope may reach the Holy City untampered with." That the withdrawal of those sums from the Roman provinces was frequently objected to we have already had occasion to mention. Flaccus for example had ordered the sums thus collected in Apamea, Laodicea, Adramyttium, and Pergamum to be confiscated. From the time of Caesar onwards however the withdrawal of this money has everywhere been sanctioned, even from Rome itself no less than from Asia Minor and Cyrenaica, and of course from Egypt also, as we have seen from the words of Philo already quoted. But there was no quarter from which the money poured in so abundantly as from Babylon and the districts beyond the Euphrates. Here the system of collecting and remitting was of a thoroughly organized kind. The head offices into which in the first instance the tribute (namely τό τε δίδραχμον ... καὶ ὁπόσα ἄλλα ἀναθήματα) was paid were in the two cities of Nisibis and Nehardea. Then at a particular date they were conveyed from these places to Jerusalem, many thousands of people being entrusted with this task so as to secure the sacred treasury against the attacks of the Parthian bandits. After the destruction of the temple the sacred tribute had necessarily to undergo at least some modification or other. The didrachmon was converted into a Roman tax, while the other items of tribute could from the nature of the case be no longer payable (comp. § 24, notes 9 and 10 But even in the altered state of things the Jews continued to evince their internal union by imposing a voluntary tax upon themselves.

A new central authority, viz. the patriarchate, was created, and to this a portion at least of the sacred tribute required by their law was handed over year by year. Under this new arrangement the money was collected by individuals sent out by the patriarchate for the purpose, viz. the so-called apostoli (see above, p. 269).

But there was nothing that contributed so much to cement the bond of union between the dispersion and the mother country as the regular pilgrimages which Jews from all quarters of the world were in the habit of making to Jerusalem on festival occasions. “Many thousands of people from many thousands of towns made pilgrimages to the temple at every festival, some by land, some by sea, and coming from the east and the west, from the north and the south.” The number of Jews that were usually assembled in Jerusalem at the time of the feasts has been estimated by Josephus at as high a figure as 2,700,000, the inhabitants of Jerusalem being of course included.

V. The Proselytes

As forming an essential element in the physiognomy of the Judaism of the dispersion, we must also mention that numerous body of adherents who in every quarter joined themselves to the Jewish communities and were known under the designation of proselytes.

On a mere cursory glance it seems strange that Jewish propagandism should have been at all crowned with anything like success among Gentile populations, for the feeling on the part of the Graeco-Roman world toward the Jews was by no means of a sympathetic character. We have already seen how, in the Hellenistic towns, the Jews were everywhere regarded with disfavour, how not only the mass of the people but the authorities themselves made repeated attempts to interfere with them in the free observance of their own religion (see above, pp. 260 sq., 275 sq.). Again, the opinions expressed regarding them in Greek and Roman literature are for the most part of a highly disparaging kind. By the majority of the educated people of that time the Jewish religion was looked upon as a barbara superstitio. Men did not hesitate to believe and circulate against them the most ridiculous and most abominable stories, stories that had been hatched above all by the literati of Alexandria. Many of the wretched allegations in question were of course due only to ignorance and not to malevolence. It was so for example when some inferred from the appellation Judaei that they belonged originally to Crete and derived their name from Mount Ida, or when others, in consequence of the famous golden vine in the temple and certain observances at the feast of Tabernacles, were betrayed into supposing that they worshipped Bacchus, a view about which there is a somewhat protracted discussion in Plutarch, while Tacitus scouts it by simply remarking that: Liber festos laetosque ritus posuit, Judaeorum mos absurdus sordidusque. But the majority of the things alleged against the Jews were wicked slanders which for the most part owed their origin to the prolific soil of Alexandria. We find that the exodus from Egypt above all had, in the course of time, been worked up into a complete romance. The foundation of this had been already laid by Manetho (or an interpolator), and, after being further developed by the Alexandrian literati Chäremon, Lysimachus, Apion, it was taken up by Tacitus and Justin and retailed with sundry alterations and additions. The substance of this story is that a number of persons suffering from leprosy had been expelled from the country by an Egyptian king – sometimes called Amenophis and sometimes Bocchoris – and sent to the stone quarries or into the wilderness. Among them there happened to be a priest of Heliopolis of the name of Moses (whose real name, according to Manetho, was Osarsiph). This Moses prevailed upon the lepers to renounce the worship of the gods of Egypt and to adopt a new religion which he offered them. Under his leadership they then quitted the country, and after many vicissitudes and the perpetration of numerous

disgraceful acts they reached the district around Jerusalem, which they proceeded to subdue and take permanent possession of. To the various incidents with which this exodus was accompanied, Tacitus has no difficulty in tracing the origin of pretty nearly all the habits and usages of the Jews, whether of those that are real or of those that are only imputed. Apion the grammarian had already maintained that the Jews were in the habit of paying divine honours to an ass's head. Tacitus retails this as though he believed it to be true (notwithstanding the fact that immediately after he alludes to the absence of images in connection with their worship), and attributes it to the circumstance that, while in the wilderness, the Jews were indebted to a herd of wild asses for drawing their attention to some copious springs of water. The abstinence from the use of swine's flesh he accounts for by the fact that this animal is peculiarly liable to the itch, therefore to that very disease on account of which the Jews were once so severely maltreated. The frequent fasting is alleged to have been by way of commemorating the starvation from which they suffered during their journey through the wilderness. The use of unleavened bread, again, is supposed to be an evidence of the fact of their having stolen corn at the time of the exodus. And lastly, it is assumed that their observance of the seventh day of the week is due to the circumstance that this was the day on which their toils came to an end, and that, as they found it so pleasant to have nothing to do, they also consecrated the seventh year to idleness.

There were three things in particular which the educated world of the time made the butt of its jeers, viz. the abstinence from the use of swine's flesh, the strict observance of the Sabbath, and the worship without images. While in Plutarch it is seriously debated whether the abstinence from the use of swine's flesh may not be due to the fact of divine honours being paid to this animal, Juvenal again jokes about the land where "the clemency of the days of old has accorded to pigs the privilege of living to a good old age," and where "swine's flesh is as much valued as that of man." Then as for the observance of the Sabbath, the satirist can see nothing in it but indolence and sloth, while he looks upon Jewish worship as being merely an adoring of the clouds and the skies. It would appear again that contemporaries with a philosophical training had, in like manner, no appreciation whatever of the worshipping of God in spirit. It was not merely the literary swashbucklers of Alexandria who delighted in urging against the Jews the charge of refusing to worship the native divinities and the emperors, but we even find a man like Tacitus observing with singular coolness and not without a touch of censure, that: Judaei menti sola unumque numen intelligunt: profanes qui deum imagines mortalibus materiis in species hominum effingant; summum illud et aeternum neque imitabile neque interiturum. Igitur nulla simulacra urbibus suis, nedum templis sistunt; non regibus haec adulatio non Caesaribus honor. And lastly, Pliny speaks of the Jews as a gens contumelia numinum insignia.

But there was nothing that did so much to awaken the dislike of the Graeco-Roman world as that wall of rigid separation which the Jew had erected between himself and all the rest of mankind. And just at a time when the worldwide rule of the Romans and the levelling influences of Hellenism were pulling down more and more the ancient barriers that separated nation from nation, it must have been felt to be doubly annoying that the Jews should be the only people who insisted on holding aloof from this process of universal amalgamation. Apud ipsos fides obstinata, misericordia in promptu, sed adversus omnes alios hostile odium, says Tacitus; while Juvenal alleges against them, and not altogether without reason, that if asked to show the way to any place they always refused to do so except to those of their own faith, and that if any one happened to be looking for a well they would not take him to it unless he had been circumcised. When it was commonly alleged in Alexandria that the Jews had taken an oath never to show kindness to a stranger (Gentile), or that they even went the length of offering a Greek in

sacrifice every year, these were no doubt ridiculous slanders. But still there is an element of truth underlying the statement of Tacitus, in which he affirms that the first things Jewish proselytes are taught to do are to despise the gods, to repudiate their nationality, and to disparage parents, children and brothers. The truth is, it was just this that formed the bright as well as the dark side of Judaism, the fact namely that, as a religious community, it maintained its exclusiveness with such uncompromising rigour.

The feelings cherished toward the Jews throughout the entire Graeco-Roman world were not so much those of hatred as of pure contempt. The prevailing tone that runs through the whole estimate of Judaism, as given by Tacitus, is that of the profoundest contempt, the contempt of the proud Roman for this despectissima pars servientium, for this teterrima gens. Those feelings have found their bitterest expression in the words of Marcus Aurelius as recorded by Ammianus Marcellinus: Ille enim cum Palaestinam transiret Aegyptum petens, Judaeorum faetentium et tumultantium saepe taedio percitus dolenter dicitur exclamasse: O Marcomanni, O Quadi, O Sarmatae, tandem alios vobis inertiores inveni.

It may be asked, and that not without reason, how it was possible, if such were the feelings of the Graeco-Roman world, that Jewish propagandism should have met with any success at all. In order to understand this, three things must be borne in mind. (1) In the course of their missionary efforts the Jews to all appearance understood above all things how to present Judaism in a form calculated to recommend it even to a Greek or a Roman. They took care to keep in the background, as not being of the nature of an essential, whatever was certain at first to appear odd or to have a repelling effect, while they laid most stress upon those points in regard to which they felt they could reckon on a sympathetic appreciation of them in the case of many at least; this they did above all with respect to their idea of God. Judaism is the truly rational religion, rejecting as it does the notion of a multiplicity of gods with circumscribed spheres of action, and worshipping the one Lord and Creator of all things and Him only, even that Almighty and righteous God who is omnipotent, and who recompenses every one strictly according to his moral conduct. Nor, like a shortsighted heathenism, does it represent the Divine Being in the finite form of a man or even of an animal, but it rejects every material representation of Him, and makes the invisible Lord of heaven and earth, who rules over all and who transcends all the limits of the material world, the sole object of its worship. That it was upon these points that the greatest stress was laid, and that it was in this form that, in the first instance, Judaism was presented by the Hellenistic Jews to their Gentile fellow-citizens, is what any one may be convinced of who will only give a cursory glance at the writings of Philo and the Jewish Sibylline books. Those people (the Jews) are proudly conscious that they are the truly enlightened ones of the earth, who, as regards religious matters at least, rank highest in the scale of civilisation. And it was surely impossible that such a consciousness should not ultimately produce its due effect. Hence one can understand how Strabo for example should be found to speak of Moses with a certain degree of sympathy; for the Jewish source – whether written or oral – on which his narrative is based, has obviously presented the Jewish legislator to him in the light of a genuine Stoic philosopher. Moses taught, he informs us, “that the Egyptians had erred in making the divinity to resemble animals; that such a thing was not done by the Libyans, nor even by the Greeks, who represented Him under a human form. For that alone is God which embraces us all as well as the earth and the sea, which we name heaven, and world, and the nature of things (εἴη γὰρ ἓν τοῦτο μόνον θεὶς τὸ περιέχον ἡμᾶς ἅπαντας καὶ γῆν καὶ θάλατταν, ὃ καλοῦμεν οὐρανὸν καὶ κόσμον καὶ τὴν τῶν ὄντων φύσιν). But what man in his senses would venture to make an image of that, an image only resembling something around us? Rather must the making of images be given up altogether, and a worthy temple

being consecrated to Him, let Him be worshipped without any image whatever. It is true that for all that Strabo did not become a Jew, for he knew too well that the Jewish religion had subsequently deteriorated owing to so many superstitious elements having been mixed up with it. But if Jewish apologists now knew, as they did, how to give a profounder meaning and import even to those "superstitious" elements, may it not be that many a one felt himself attracted by them ? (2) A further circumstance which was well calculated to win adherents to Judaism was the fact that the Jewish religion aimed at the practical realization of a moral and happy life. Strictly speaking, there was no religion from which such an aim could be said to be entirely absent. But in the case of Judaism it assumed a much more definite, more complete, and more satisfactory form than in any of the ancient heathen religions. The Greek and Roman gods could help their worshippers neither to a truly moral nor to a truly happy life. Now Judaism, through its sacrifices and purifications, its complicated system of religious prescriptions and the promise given to those who observed them, held out the certain prospect of both those things. And if deliverance from sin and sorrow be the deepest longing of the human heart, is it possible that a religion which seemed to afford a more certain prospect of such deliverance than those of heathendom could pretend to do, could fail to have its attractions even in spite of the seeming repulsiveness of many of its externals? (3) Lastly, it was also an advantage to Judaism as well, that it happened to be so much the fashion of the time to patronize Oriental religions generally The religions of classical antiquity no longer exercised the same absolute power of attracting the minds of men as once they did. On all hands people were itching for something new, and they eagerly clutched at those mysterious Oriental worships which, owing to increased intercourse and more extended commercial relations, were every day becoming more widely known. We find that in Greece, and more particularly in Athens, the Phrygian worships of Sabazius (Bacchus) and the great mother of the gods had got a footing even at so early a period as the end of the fifth century B.C. The Egyptian and other Oriental ones followed not long after. In the year 333 B.C. the Athenians issued a decree giving permission to the merchants from Citium (Cyprus) to build a temple to Aphrodite, therefore to the Semitic Astarte, in the Piraeus; while on this occasion reference is made to the fact that the Egyptians already had a temple of Isis in the same place. This latter therefore must have been built about the middle of the fourth century B.C. A century farther on, viz. about 250 B.C., we also find a collegium of worshippers of Serapis (Σαραπιασταί) in the Piraeus. In the last-mentioned case it is obvious that the association is now no longer composed merely of foreigners, but, as the Greek names of the members serve to show, of natives as well. And so we find that since the third century B.C. Egyptian cults had come to be very widely practised throughout Greece generally. Besides these, other Oriental worships, and that in strange admixture, are also to be met with particularly in the islands of Greece and in Asia Minor. In Rome again it was in like manner the Egyptian worships above all that, at an early period, gained a firm footing. Even so far back as the second century B.C. they had begun to make their appearance here, and although repeatedly forbidden by the senate and put down by force, still they always sprang up afresh. In the year 43 B.C. the triumvirs themselves built a temple of Serapis and Isis for public worship. Consequently by this time the worship of the gods of Egypt must have been no longer an affair merely of private associations, but carried on under the auspices of the state itself. In the time of Augustus there were already several temples in Rome for the Egyptian sacra, though of course outside the pomaerium as yet. In the reign of Tiberius an attempt was made to suppress them entirely. But many of the succeeding emperors only favoured them so much the more. During the whole imperial age they were disseminated to an unusual degree throughout the provinces especially. At a somewhat later period the Egyptian worships were followed by those of Asia Minor, Syria, and Persia, which also found a footing in Rome. Here their palmy days did not begin till the second century of our era. The worship of the Syrian sun-god was the

one to which the Antonines showed special favour. But that of the Persian Mithras, with its dark mysteries, was in still greater favour, and that throughout the entire Roman Empire. Upon the inscriptions in almost every province of the empire there is no Oriental worship that we so frequently meet with in imperial times as this. The secret of the attraction which all those worships possessed lay essentially in two characteristic features common to them all. In the first place, in all of them there is a touch of monotheism in some form or other. No matter whether the divinity was known under the designation of Isis, or Serapis, or Mithras, or any other, there was, as a rule, bound up with this designation – at least at the time now in question – the idea now more and now less plainly indicated, that this supreme divine being had no equal, nay that the different names were but different designations for one and the same God. The other characteristic feature was the practical tendency connected with that putting away of sin and that moral purity which, though only in the form it might be of an external, often an absurd asceticism, were, in the case of almost the whole of those worships, demanded of those who embraced them, and in return for which they had the promise of deliverance from sin and misery. But in those two leading features it is impossible not to recognise an actual superiority of the Oriental cults over those of the rest of antiquity. For however absurd and repugnant their mode of expressing it might be, they nevertheless answered to a genuine religious need in laying, as they did, the chief stress upon those two points. Now it may be confidently affirmed that Judaism answered this need in a much more perfect manner. If so, where was the wonder that even this teterrima gens should yet have found so many who were prepared to embrace its religion? The results in this respect would doubtless have been much more favourable still, if the despised social position of the Jews, and the somewhat non-aesthetic character of the worship, and the load of oppressive and seemingly meaningless and nonsensical ceremonies and observances, had not proved a formidable obstacle. In the Hellenistico-Roman period Jewish propagandism seems to have been carried on with great activity. One should have thought that, strictly speaking, orthodox Pharisaic Judaism could hardly have been justified in making any effort whatever to obtain converts to the religion of Israel beyond the circle of its own countrymen. For if it be true that the promise applied only to the children of Abraham, then what, in that case, were the Gentiles to gain by their conversion to the Jewish faith? But here the natural impulse – so characteristic of all active religionists – to impart to others the blessings which they themselves possess, proved too powerful for dogmatic preconceptions. If by his conversion to Judaism the Gentile would not acquire all the privileges of the true Israelite, still he would thereby be snatched from the mass of those doomed to perdition, and have some connection at least with the people of the promise. Consequently we find that even the Pharisees in Palestine developed an active zeal for conversions. “They compassed sea and land to make one proselyte” (Matt. 23:15). Matters however were in a totally different position in the dispersion. For Hellenistic Judaism descent from Abraham was, as may be seen from Philo, only a secondary matter after all, while the true worship of God was regarded as of paramount importance. Here then the desire to convert heathendom from its blindness and folly would of necessity assert itself far more strongly than in Palestine. And hence it is that a portion of the Judaeo-Hellenistic literature is essentially devoted to the promotion of this object (see § 33). How active they were in their labours is sufficiently proved by the way in which Horace satirizes the proselytizing zeal of the Jews.

The success with which those efforts were crowned was in any case something very considerable. If we may judge from the numerous hints we come across, it may be assumed that, in the Hellenistico-Roman period, the number of those who allied themselves more or less closely with the Jewish communities, took part in Jewish worship, and observed the Jewish ordinances with a greater or less degree of strictness, was a very large one, although not quite

equal to that of the worshippers of Isis and Mithras. “Many of the Greeks,” as Josephus boasts, “have been converted to the observance of our laws; some have remained true, while others, who were incapable of stedfastness, have fallen away again.” “Likewise among the mass of the people,” he remarks in another passage, “there has for a long time now been a great amount of zeal for our worship; nor is there a single town among Greeks or barbarians or anywhere else, not a single nation to which the observance of the Sabbath as it exists among ourselves has not penetrated; while fasting and the burning of lights, and many of our laws with regard to meats, are also observed.” Seneca and Dio Cassius bear testimony to precisely the same effect, though from a different standpoint. For the purpose of accounting for the large amount of treasure in the temple at Jerusalem, Josephus appeals not merely to the copious tribute sent in by Jews in every part of the world, but also to that contributed by the “God-fearing,” i.e. the proselytes. In stating the number of Jews of every nationality that were living in Jerusalem, the Acts (2:9–11) does not forget to mention the proselytes along with the Jews (2:10: Ἰουδαῖοί τε καὶ προσήλυτοι). And we find that those general testimonies are corroborated by numerous details of one kind or another. In Antioch “the Jews always got a large number of Greeks to come to their religious services when they treated them as, in a certain sense, a part of themselves,” In Antioch of Pisidia Paul addressed those assembled in the synagogue as: ἄνδρες Ἰσραηλεῖται καὶ οἱ φοβούμενοι τὸν θεόν (Acts 13:16), ἄνδρες ἀδελφοί, υἱοὶ γένους Ἀβραὰμ καὶ οἱ ἐν ὑμῖν φοβούμενοι τὸν θεόν (Acts 13:26). After the service was concluded there followed him πολλοὶ τῶν Ἰουδαίων καὶ τῶν σεβομένων προσηλύτων (Acts 13:43; comp, also 13:50). In Thessalonica there was converted by Paul τῶν σεβομένων Ἑλλήνων πλῆθος πολύ (Acts 17:4). In Athens Paul preaches in the synagogue τοῖς Ἰουδαίοις καὶ τοῖς σεβομένοις (Acts 17:17). Consequently we find that wherever there was a Jewish community there was also a body of proselytes attached to it. That in Rome too Jewish propagandism must have been attended with some measure of success, is evident from the satires of a Horace or a Juvenal. Then, as in the case of every religious movement, so also in the case of Jewish propagandism, it was found that it was the female heart that was most impressionable. In Damascus nearly the whole female portion of the inhabitants was devoted to Judaism. And not unfrequently it was precisely women of rank who showed those leanings. We also read of at least several instances of the conversion of men occupying distinguished positions. But the most notable triumph of the proselytizing zeal of the Jews was the conversion of the royal house of Adiabene, to which Josephus recurs again and again with manifest pride (Antt. xx. 2–4; Bell. Jud. ii. 19. 2, iv. 9. 11, v. 2. 2, 3. 3, 4. 2, 6. 1, vi. 6. 3, 4). The kingdom of Adiabene, situated on the confines of the Roman and Parthian Empires, and standing towards the latter in a certain relation of dependence, was in the time of Claudius under the rule of a monarch called Izates, who, with his mother Helena, became a convert to Judaism, and subsequently induced his brother Monobazus and all the rest of his kindred to follow his example. Owing to its conversion this family came to have numerous relations of one kind or another with Jerusalem. Izates sent five of his sons to be educated there. Helena made a pilgrimage thither, and during the famine in the time of Claudius she gave away large quantities of the necessaries of life to be distributed among the people. According to a Rabbinical tradition, she is said to have been a Nazarite for fourteen, or as some others allege, even for twenty-one years. Both Helena and Monobazus (who succeeded his brother as king) had a palace in Jerusalem. They both presented valuable cups to the temple there. When Izates and his mother died, Monobazus caused them to be buried in Jerusalem in a magnificent tomb which had been built by Helena herself. During the Jewish wars some relatives of Monobazus fought on the side of the Jews against the Romans.

The form which the adhesion of Gentiles to Judaism assumed, and the extent to which they observed the ceremonial law of the Jews, was of a very varied character. Tertullian speaks of

Gentiles who, while observing several Jewish ordinances, continued notwithstanding to worship their own deities (see note 27 On the other hand, such of them as submitted to circumcision thereby bound themselves to observe the whole law to its fullest extent (Gal. 5:3: μαρτύρομαι παντὶ ἀνθρώπῳ περιτεμνομένῳ ὅτι ὀφειλέτης ἐστὶν ὅλον τὸν νόμον ποιῆσαι). Between those two extremes there would be, as we may well suppose, a manifold series of gradations. There is something very instructive, in this connection, in the fourteenth satire of Juvenal, where the poet enlarges on the thought as to the way in which children are injuriously affected by the evil example of their parents. The bad practices of the former, he tells us, are transmitted to the latter, and that, as a rule, in an intensified form. By way of giving an example of this in the domain of superstition, he mentions the penchant for Judaism. If the father spends every seventh day in indolence, and looks upon swine's flesh as being quite as precious as the flesh of man, then not only does the son do the same thing, but he even goes the length of submitting to be circumcised, and despises the Roman laws, and studies and reverently observes the Jewish law that has come down from Moses, and which teaches that they are never to point out the way to any but those of their own faith, nor show any one where to find a well, unless he is circumcised. From this it is plain that there must have been varying degrees of strictness on the part of Gentiles in regard to their observance of the Jewish law. For the proselytizing zeal of the Jews had just to content itself with what it could get. It was felt that much had been gained if any one could be so far converted as to worship the only true God, and that without the use of images. As regards the ceremonial law, only certain leading points were insisted on in the first instance. Thus the fourth book of the Sibylline oracles, for example, which was composed about the year 80 of our era, and is in all probability of Jewish origin, contains an address to the Gentiles, in which prominence is given only to the worship of the true God and the belief in a future judgment, while instead of requiring the converted Gentile to be circumcised, all that is asked is a bath of purification. The history of the conversion of King Izates is also very instructive. This monarch was himself animated by a burning zeal for the Jewish law, and wanted to be circumcised. But a Jew of the name of Ananias ventured to interpose, and in the most urgent way possible tried to dissuade him. The Jew apprehended some danger to himself if the idea should get abroad that he had been the occasion of the king's being circumcised. Consequently he represented to this latter that he could worship God without being circumcised, provided he simply observed in a general way the ordinances of the Jews, this being of more importance than circumcision. He further pointed out to him that if, in deference to the feelings of his subjects, he were to omit this rite, God would certainly forgive him. Yet for all that Izates insisted on being circumcised; while unquestionably the views of the merchant Ananias were not those of an orthodox Jew. But there were evidently many who thought very much as he did in regard to those matters. The result of this was, that to almost every one of the Jewish communities of the dispersion there was attached a following of "God-fearing" Gentiles who adopted the Jewish (i.e. the monotheistic and imageless) mode of worship, attended the Jewish synagogues, but who, in the observance of the ceremonial law, restricted themselves to certain leading points, and so were regarded as outside the fellowship of the Jewish communities. It is God-fearing Gentiles of this description that are undoubtedly to be understood by the φοβούμενοι τὸν θεόν or the σεβόμενοι τὸν θεόνso often mentioned in Josephus, and above all in the Acts of the Apostles. Now if we ask ourselves what those points of the ceremonial law were which these Gentiles observed, we will find them plainly enough indicated in the passages already quoted from Josephus, Juvenal, and Tertullian (see notes 27 and 28 All three agree in this, that it was the Jewish observance of the Sabbath and the prescriptions with regard to meats that were in most general favour within the circles in question. And those are precisely the two points which Juvenal specially mentions in connection with the father of the son who outdoes his father by becoming a thoroughpaced Jew

(metuentem sabbata patrem … carne suillam qua pater abstinuit). Then again compliance even with these would sometimes be of a more and sometimes of a less rigid character; it is hardly likely that here any hard and fast line would be observed. From these φοβούμενοι or σεβόμενοι τὸν θεόν we must now distinguish the גֵּרִים or προσήλυτοι, strictly so called. For with these latter expressions later Judaism meant to designate those Gentiles who, through circumcision and the observance of the law, became completely incorporated with the Jewish people. In the Old Testament, in its Hebrew and Greek form alike, the גֵּרִים or the προσήλυτοι exactly correspond to the μέτοικοι in the Attic state – that is to say, they are regarded as strangers who have their permanent abode in the land of Israel, but without belonging to the fellowship of Israel (advenae incolae). But subsequent usage uniformly employed both terms, and that without further qualification, to denote those Gentiles who, through circumcision and the observance of the law, had been admitted into full religious fellowship with Israel. How great the number of those may have been we have no means of knowing. But one cannot be far wrong in estimating it to have been considerably smaller than that of the σεβομενοι.

With those two classes, the σεβόμενοι on the one hand and the προσήλυτοι properly so called on the other, Christian scholars are uniformly in the habit of identifying two categories of an apparently kindred character that are met with in Rabbinical literature. It is quite usual to say (as was also done in the first edition of the present work), that the σεβόμενοι correspond to what in Rabbinical language are called "proselytes of the gate" (גֵּרֵי הַשַּׁעַר), and the προσήλυτοι, on the other hand, to what in the same language are known as "proselytes of righteousness" (גֵּרֵי הַצֶּדֶק). In point of fact however it is only this latter part of the statement that is correct, the σεβόμενοι and the גרי השער having nothing whatever to do with each other. Those Rabbinical designations are as yet entirely foreign to the usage of the Mishna, where the only distinction met with is that between the גֵּר pure and simple and the גֵּר תּוֹשָׁב. The former means a Gentile who has been converted to Judaism, the latter again corresponds to what in the Old Testament is understood by a גֵּר, namely a stranger dwelling in the land of Israel (see note 29 But with a view to greater clearness and precision it afterwards came to be the practice to substitute for גר the expression גר צדק (a righteous stranger, i.e. a stranger who observes the law), and for גר תושב the words גר שער, a stranger dwelling in the gates or in the land of Israel (according to Ex. 20:10; Deut. 5:14, 14:21, 24:14). The latter therefore corresponds exactly to what in the Old Testament is simply called a גר. It would appear however that the expression גר שער is as yet no less foreign to Talmudic usage. At least in all the passages from the Talmud that are quoted in any of the literature with which I happen to be acquainted, the only expression ever used is גֵּר תּוֹשָׁב. It is not till we come down to the Rabbinical writers of the Middle Ages that we meet with the expression גר שער as well. If then we confine ourselves to Talmudic usage the question is simply reduced to this, whether the σεβόμενοι are to be regarded as identical with the גרי תושב. Now with regard to these latter the Talmud states that they were those who had come under an obligation to observe "the seven precepts of the children of Noah." Under this designation the Talmudic doctors include all those precepts that were already binding upon mankind at large before Abraham and outside of his family (in other words, the "children of Noah"). If then compliance with these latter was what was demanded of the גֵּר תּוֹשָׁב, this can only mean that one who was not a Jew, but who lived permanently in the land of Israel, had at least to observe those precepts that were equally binding on the whole human race. Of course this proved to be nothing more than a barren theory. For it is hardly likely that the Greeks and Romans who lived in Palestine would trouble themselves much about those Jewish regulations. So far then as practical life is concerned the so-called precepts for proselytes have no significance. They only represent a casuistical theory which was never reduced to actual practice. From this therefore it is evident that the גרי תושב have no connection with the σεβόμενοι τὸν θεόν, just as it is further

certain that what we know from history regarding these latter is utterly incompatible with the Rabbinical requirements in regard to the גריתושב.

It would appear, according to the Talmud, that on the occasion of admitting proselytes strictly so called into the Jewish communion three things were necessary: (1) מִילָה, circumcision; (2) טְבִילָה, baptism, i.e. a bath with a view to Levitical purification; and (3) הַרְצָאַת דָּמִים, a sacrifice (literally, a gracious acceptance of blood). In the case of women only the last two were required. After the destruction of the temple, as a matter of course the sacrifice was discontinued also. In the Mishna all three are presupposed as being already of long standing; nay for Rabbinical Judaism they are so much matters of course that, even apart from any explicit testimony, we should have had to assume that they were already currently practised in the time of Christ. For as no Jew could be admitted into fellowship with Israel except through circumcision, so it was quite as much a matter of course that a Gentile, who as such was unclean, seeing that he was not in the habit of observing the regulations with regard to Levitical purity, should be required, on entering into such fellowship, to take the bath of Levitical purification. But similarly, a Gentile as such was also מְחֻסַּרכַּפָּרָה "in need of atonement," and continued to be so "until blood was sprinkled for him." Strange to say, with regard to one of the things here in question, namely the baptism or washing with water, the view has prevailed among Christian scholars since the beginning of the eighteenth century, that it was not observed as yet in our Lord's time. Originally it was for dogmatic reasons that this was maintained, while in modern times nothing but an imperfect acquaintance with the facts of the case can account for the way in which the once dominant prejudice has been allowed to linger on. Surely every one in the least acquainted with Pharisaic Judaism must know how frequently a native Jew was compelled, in accordance with the enactments of Lev. 11-15 and Num. 19, to take a bath with a view to Levitical purification. As Tertullian justly observes, "Judaeus quotidie lavat quia quotidie inquinatur." But a Gentile, not being in the habit of observing those regulations with regard to Levitical purity, would as such be unclean and that as a simple matter of course. In that case how was it possible that he could be admitted into Jewish communion without his having first of all subjected himself to a סְבִילָה (a Levitical "bath of purification")? This general consideration is of itself so conclusive that is no need to lay any very great stress upon individual testimonies. But we may further add, that it is an unmistakeable fact that, in the Mishna, the taking of the "bath" by the proselyte is already presupposed as an established and authoritative practice. In like manner the celebrated passage from Arrian (first half of the second century of our era) cannot, in my opinion, be otherwise understood than as referring to the baptism of proselytes. Again, the fourth book of the Sibylline Oracles, the Jewish origin of which is at least probable, insists on converted Gentiles being baptized as an outward token of their conversion. The two last-mentioned testimonies are specially noteworthy on this account, that they speak only of the baptism and say nothing whatever about the circumcision. From this it follows that even in those cases where full admission to the fellowship of Israel had not taken place, the baptism at least was regarded as necessary. In presence of all those arguments the silence of Philo and Josephus on which so much stress has been laid is of no consequence whatever. For as yet no one has ever been able to point out a single passage in which those writers were necessarily called upon to mention the matter. Then in modern times some have gone the length of admitting that proselytes, on joining the Jewish communion, had to take a bath of Levitical purification. But this they think was something different from "baptism," Unfortunetely, however, no one is able to say wherein the difference lies. The truth is, it lies only in the German expression. For in Hebrew they are, as regards both the name and the thing, one and the same, namely a טְבִילָה, and, so far as the essence of this latter is concerned, it mattered very little whether it was accompanied with a larger or a smaller amount of liturgical ceremonial.

The obligation and rights of the proselytes have been defined with great minuteness and detail by the Jewish doctors. Speaking generally it was regarded, according to orthodox Pharisaic views, as a simple matter of course that they should observe the whole law (Gal. 5:3), and so also in particular with regard to the sacred tribute. But the doctors have here taxed their ingenuity in the way of carefully laying down certain limitations, especially in regard to the terminus a quo at which the obligation comes to be in force. Only those portions of the proselyte's earnings were liable for tribute which fell under the category of liability after his conversion. Brothers who were born previous to their mother's conversion were not subject to the law regarding levirate marriage. Then maidens who were born before their mother's conversion were not to be bound by the law given in Deut. 22:13-21. This latter regulation may of itself serve to show how, along with the limitation of obligations, there was also at the same time a limitation of rights. Then again it was only such female proselytes as were less than three years and a day old at the time of the mother's conversion that, with respect to numerous matrimonial rights, were on a footing of equality with native Jewish women. Further, female proselytes were on no account to be at liberty to contract marriage with priests, nor were the daughters of proselytes to be allowed to do so except in those instances in which one of the parents happened to be an Israelite by birth, in which case the privilege extended to the tenth generation. On the other hand, proselyte women might marry a person that had been emasculated or mutilated, a thing which, according to Deut. 23:2, native Jwessses were debarred from doing. Then the legal enactment to the effect that, if any one through carelessness happened to strike a woman in such a way as to cause abortion he was to give compensation, did not apply to the case of proselyte women, But, on the other hand, the law with reference to the drinking of the jealousy water (Num. 5:11 sqq.) applied to female proselytes as well.

It is precisely the care with which those restrictions have been framed that is so well calculated to show that, in regard to obligations and rights, proselytes were regarded as being in all essential respects on an equality with native Israelites. At the same time the gulf that lay between a born Gentile and a genuine descendant of Abraham could never be bridged over. A proselyte was never allowed to call the fathers of Israel "his" fathers; while, in the order of rank in the theocracy, a proselyte occupies a lower place even than a nathin. Although with characteristic humaneness the Jewish law, appealing to Ex. 22:20, forbids any one ever to be so unkind as to remind the son of a proselyte of the past ways of his fathers, still, on the whole, proselytes were never held in the same estimation as native Jews. What Rabbi Judah presupposes with respect to the proselytes in Rekem, that they must have been remiss in the observance of the law, probably represented, and that not altogether without reason, the average opinion held regarding them, and accordingly there are frequent complaints about them in the Talmud.

According to the Deuteronomic legislation there were two nations, the Ammonites and the Moabites, that were never to be admitted into communion with Israel, no, not even in the tenth generation (Deut. 23:4), It is said that, apropos of this enactment, the question was once debated in the time of Gamaliel II., whether an Ammonitish proselyte who might wish to join the communion of the Jews should be allowed to do so. Gamaliel decided in the negative, while R. Joshua took the affirmative view on the ground that the Ammonites had long ceased to exist. The view of R. Joshua was homologated by the learned doctors.

VOLUME III: THE INTERNAL CONDITION OF PALESTINE AND OF THE JEWISH PEOPLE IN THE TIME OF JESUS CHRIST

THE PALESTINIAN JEWISH LITERATURE

Preliminary Observations.

UNQUESTIONABLE as it is on the one hand that zeal for the law of God and the hope of a better future constituted the two distinctive marks of the Judaism of the period now under consideration still it must not be forgotten on the other that those interests sought to express themselves in a great variety of forms and that in the sphere of the spiritual life there were yet other aims that claimed to rank along with them though having no immediate connection with them. How far this was the case may be seen from a glance at the Jewish literature of our period. The aspect which that literature presents is of so diversified a character that it is difficult to combine all the different elements into one connected whole. And if this be true of the literature of Palestinian Judaism alone it becomes much more so if we take into account the literature of Hellenistic Judaism as well. In that case there will be seen to stretch before us a field of so extensive and varied a character that it is scarcely any longer possible to make out the internal connection between all the various products of this literature.

In this strangely varied mass two leading groups may in the first instance be distinguished the Palestinian and the Hellenistic. We select those designations for want of better; and to correspond with them we also divide our subject into two leading sections. But at the same time it must be distinctly borne in mind that the line of demarcation between those two groups is of a somewhat fluctuating and indefinite character and that the designations applied to them are to be taken very much cum grano salis. By the Palestinian Jewish literature we mean that which in all essential (but only essential) respects represents the standpoint of Pharisaic Judaism as it had developed itself in Palestine; while by the Hellenistic Jewish literature again we mean that which either as regards form or matter bears traces; to any noticeable extent of Hellenistic influences. The products belonging to the first-mentioned group were for the most part composed in Hebrew; but the fact of their having been so composed must not be regarded as a decisive criterion and that for the simple reason that in numerous instances it is no longer possible to make out whether it was Hebrew or Greek that was the original language but further because in the case of several compositions the circumstance of their being written in Greek is a thing purely external and accidental. And hence it is that we also include in this group several writings that possibly nay probably were composed in Greek at the very first while reserving for the other group only those that show pretty evident traces of Hellenistic influence either in the form or the matter. But the line of demarcation between the two cannot be sharply defined there being in fact some writings that have almost as much title to be included in the one group as in the other. And just as the distinction we have adopted is not intended to imply that those

belonging to the one group were written in Hebrew and those belonging to the other in Greek so as little do we intend it to be understood by our use of the term “Palestinian” that all the compositions included under this designation were written in Palestine. For there was Palestinian Judaism outside of Palestine just as conversely there was Hellenistic Judaism within it.

In the period now under consideration literary efforts as such were essentially foreign to “Palestinian” Judaism. One might almost venture to say that it had no literature at all. For the few literary productions of which it could boast had for the most part a purely practical aim and had but a very slender connection with each other. It is precisely from these writings themselves that we can see how true it is that zcal for the law and for the faith of the fathers eclipsed every other interest. When any one took to writing he did so as a rule for the purpose of in one form or another exhorting his readers to keep firm hold of those precious blessings or of indirectly helping to increase and strengthen a spirit of faithful devotion to the law. Literary pursuits as such and the cultivation of literature in the interests of culture generally were things quite unknown to genuine Judaism. Its “culture” consisted in the knowledge and observance of the law.

Looked at from this standpoint it was a somewhat extraordinary thing to find that in the palmy days of the Hasmonaean dynasty works of native history had been composed (the First Book of Maccabees the Chronicles of Hyrcanus). This presupposed the existence of a patriotic self-consciousness for which native history as such was a thing of some value. Later on after the Hasmonaean dynasty had been overthrown we no longer meet with any further traces of Jewish historiography such as those now referred to; and so for his information with regard to this period Josephus had to depend on other than Jewish sources. We already begin to notice indications of an intimate connection with the aims of legal Judaism in those Psalms that were composed during this period in imitation of the older models (the Maccabaean Psalms the Psalter of Solomon). The whole of those compositions were written with a view to religious edification and therefore – for at that time religion meant simply a firm adherence to the law – more or less with the view of fostering and quickening a spirit of faithful devotion to the law. In our period what is known as gnomic wisdom exercised a direct influence in the way of promoting the spirit in question. For notwithstanding the very diversified character of the wisdom of life exhibited in the proverbs of Jesus the son of Sirach their alpha and omega is simply this: fear God and keep His commandments. Then in the maxims of the scribes of the time of the Mishna and which have been collected in the Pirke Aboth we hear from beginning to end and in every variety of tone the exhortation to a strict observance of the law. But there was a species of literature of a totally different character that also served precisely the same end viz. the hortatory narrative (Judith Tobit). When in compositions of this class we have brought before us in a somewhat imaginative fashion the doings and the fortunes of persons who had been distinguished for their heroic faith or their exemplary piety and who had at the same time been sustained by the divine help the object of the story is not to entertain the reader but to inculcate the truth that the fear of God is the highest wisdom and that a fear of God in the sense of legal Pharisaic Judaism. But in our period a more favourite kind of literature still than the hortatory narrative was the genuine prophetic exhortation i.e. exhortations based upon alleged special revelations with regard to the future destinies of the people. It was a favourite practice to put such revelations in the mouths of the recognised authorities of the olden time with the view of thereby giving peculiar weight to the exhortations and the consolations based upon them. The object therefore of those pseudepigraphic prophetic compositions (Daniel Enoch The Ascension of Moses The Apocalypse of Baruch The Apocalypse of Ezra The Testaments of the Twelve

Patriarchs and others) was always of an eminently practical kind viz. consolation amid the sufferings of the present and encouragement to maintain a stedfast adherence to the law by pointing to the certainty of future rewards and punishments. None of those literary productions could be said to have had any direct connection with the professional labours of the scribes. No doubt they served to promote a spirit of faithful devotion to the law but they had no concern with the law and the Holy Scriptures as such; we should rather regard them as free literary productions of a very diversified character and composed for the most part in imitation of the older models. In the period now in question the habours of the scribes labours which concerned themselves with the text of the Holy Scriptures and with the work of forming new adaptations of that text either on its legal or its historical and dogmatic side were as yet chiefly of an oral kind. This holds true above all with regard to the process of adaptation as applied to the law. It was not till toward the close of our period in the time of R. Akiba that the results of these learned adaptations of the law began to be committed to writing (see). On the other hand however there undoubtedly existed as early as our period literary adaptations or reconstructions of sacred history framed in the spirit of scribism. The Book of Chronicles may be taken as a case in point inasmuch as it treats the earlier history of Israel in such a way as to make it accord with the ideals of later Judaism (see). But we have a classical example of the Haggadic Midrash in the Book of Jubilees which in any case falls within the period with which we are here dealing. It reconstructs the history of the canonical Book of Genesis entirely after the fashion of the Rabbinical Midrash. Other literary productions which in all probability fall no less within our period select certain episodes or personages from sacred history around which they seek to shed a halo of glory by means of fictitious legends (the Books of Adam the History of Jannes and Jambres and others). It would appear however that at first Hellenistic did more in this way than Rabbinical Judaism. For this latter the palmy days of haggadean fiction did not begin till the Talmudic age. The object of those modifications or embellishments of sacred history was now no longer of so directly practical a character as it had been in the case of the majority of the writings previously mentioned. They owed their origin in the first instance to the universal interest that was taken in the sacred history generally to the desire to have as exact and complete and accurate an acquaintance with it as possible in connection with which however the tendency to embellish it also began at once to assert itself. And yet this tendency again had now in like manner an ulterior practical aim. In thus throwing around the sacred history as bright a halo as possible the object was to show to what an extent Israel had from time to time been enjoying the miraculous protection of its God but above all how by their exemplary conduct and wonderful exploits the holy patriarchs had proved themselves to be true men of God.

Thus we see then that it was objects chiefly of a practical kind that the literary efforts of Palestinian Judaism sought to serve. This was at least true of the department of history with the consideration of which we will now enter upon our present subject.

I. HISTORIOGRAPHY

1. The First Book of Maccabees

Short notices of the Maccabaean rising and of the brothers Judas Jonathan and Simon Maccabaeus who played so prominent a part in it must have been committed to writing shortly after the events themselves. For it is simply impossible that any writer living two generations after could have been so well informed with regard to those events as we find the author of the First Book of Maccabees to be unless he had been able to avail himself of existing written sources. Those sources of the First Book of Maccabees – though we know nothing further of their origin and nature – are therefore entitled to foremost mention in any complete list of the

historical literature of our period.

Our First Book of Maccabees itself gives a connected minute and graphic narrative of the events that led to the Maccabaean rising then of the course of the rising itself particularly of the exploits and fortunes of Judas Maccabaeus. It then proceeds to give the further history of the patriotic enterprises of the Jews under the leadership of Jonathan the brother of Judas and of the institution of the Hasmonaean high priesthood and the founding of Jewish independence by the former. Then lastly we have an account of Simon Jonathan's brother and successor who by establishing the combined office of priest and prince and making it hereditary in the family of the Hasmonaeans on the one hand and by the complete emancipation of the Jewish people from Syrian supremacy on the other completed on both its sides the work undertaken by Jonathan. The narrative is brought down to the death of Simon so that altogether it embraces a period of forty years (175–135 B.C.). The standpoint of the author is that of orthodox rigidly legal Judaism. But yet it is somewhat remarkable that the successes with which the Maccabaean enterprises were crowned are almost nowhere attributed to any immediate supernatural intervention on the part of God but are represented throughout as the result of the military skill and political wisdom of the Maccabaean princes. Of course those princes always act with an unshaken trust in the powerful protection and help of God. It would therefore be a mistake to suppose that the author is not animated by a religious spirit. But still his way of putting things is at the same time rather different from that of the earlier historical works of the Old Testament. His style is the plain narrative style being similar to that adopted in Old Testament historiography. The author has at his disposal such a fund of details that it is impossible to entertain any doubt as to the credibility of his narrative as a whole. His book is one of the most valuable sources we possess for the history of the Jewish people. Nor is its value in this respect in any way affected by the fact that the author shows himself to be very imperfectly informed with regard to the state of things among foreign nations. We see in this only the simple standpoint of the observer who following his sources confines his view exclusively to the circle of Jewish affairs. Again the freedom with which numbers are dealt with and discourses put in the mouths of leading personages can scarcely be regarded as telling against the author. In matters of this sort ancient historians generally were never particularly scrupulous. It is a singularly fortunate circumstance that the dates of all the more important events are duly fixed in accordance with a definite era namely the Seleucidian era of the year 312 B.C. (on the question as to whether in the present instance this era was made to date from the usual starting-point or from another somewhat different from it see § 3). As regards the date of composition it is admitted on all hands that this work must have been written previous to the Roman conquest and therefore previous to the year 63 B.C. For as yet the Romans are known to the author merely as friends and protectors of the Jewish people in contrast to the Syrian kings. On the other hand he is already acquainted with a chronicle referring to the history of John Hyrcanus so that he must have written at the soonest toward the close of that prince's reign probably not till after its close. According to this the work would be composed during the first decades of the first century before Christ. It was written originally in Hebrew (or Aramaic) as may be confidently Inferred from its grammatical peculiarities and as is further confirmed by the testimony of Origen and Jerome. The Hebrew (or Aramaic) title Σαρβὴθ Σαβαναιέλ handed down by Origen still continues to be as much as ever an unsolved enigma. The work has come down to us only in the form of a Greek translation which was probably in existence as early as the time of Josephus. That it is still extant is due to the circumstance of its having been incorporated with the Greek Bible and as forming part of this latter read in the Christian Church.

At the close of his account of the Hebrew canon Origen adds (as quoted in Euseb. Hist. eccl. vi.

25. 2): Ἔξω δὲ τούτων ἐστὶ τὰ Μακκαβαϊκὰ ἅπερ ἐπιγέγραπται Σαρβὴθ Σαβαναιέλ. Consequently he was acquainted with the First Book of Maccabees (for unquestionably it is it that is meant) in its Hebrew form but as not belonging to the Hebrew canon. Jerome Prologus galeatus to the Books of Samuel (Opp. ed. Vallarsi ix. 459 sq.): Machabaeorum primum librum Hebraicum reperi. Secundus Graecus est quod ex ipsa quoque φράσει probari potest. An endless variety of hypotheses have been advanced with the view of explaining the meaning of the title mentioned by Origen (see Fabricius-Harles Biblioth. graec. iii. 745; Grimm Exeget. Handbuch to 1 Macc. p. xvii.; Keil Commentar über die Bücher der Makkabäer p. 22; Curtiss The Name Machabee 1876 p. 30; and the general literature mentioned below). But nearly all of them are based upon the reading Σαρβὴθ Σαρβανεέλ so generally adopted since Stephanus whereas according to the testimony of the manuscripts the only reading that can claim to be recognised is Σαρβὴθ Σαβαναιέλ (so also Josephus the Christian Hypomnest. c. xxv. in Fabricius' Codex pseudepigr. Vet. Test. vol. ii. p. 48 of Appendix).

The acquaintance of Josephus with the First Book of Maccabees is generally regarded as beyond a doubt; his acquaintance on the other hand with our Greek text has been questioned. In his German translation of 1 Maccabees (1778) Michaelis has propounded the view that Josephus made use of the Hebrew text. His arguments however are not of a cogent nature. The conjecture has recently been hazarded by Destinon (Die Quellen des Flavius Josephus 1882 pp. 60-91) that Josephus (or rather as Destinon thinks the anonymous writer whose work Josephus has merely remodelled) had an older redaction of 1 Maccabees before him which on the one hand was in regard to many points rather fuller than our book while on the other it wanted as yet the whole of the last section chaps. xiv.-xvi. which is to be regarded as a subsequent addition. But the first point cannot be sufficiently substantiated; for the extra matters found in Josephus were either drawn from other sources or had their origin in the historian's own imagination. As for the other question again whether Josephus was acq uainted with the concluding section of the book it is one that of course deserves consideration in view of the singular brevity with which the historian disposes of the reign of Simon. As favouring the view that Josephus was acquainted with our Greek text see Grimm Exeget. Handbuch to 1 Macc. p. xxviii. Bloch Die Quellen des Flavius Josephus 1879 pp. 80-90.

In the Christian Church our book has been read from the very first. See Tertullian Adv. Judaeos c. iv.: Nam et temporibus Maccabaeorum sabbatis pugnando fortiter fecerunt etc. (comp. 1 Macc. 2:41 sqq.). Hippolytus in narrating the history of the Maccabean rising in his Comment. in Daniel c. xxxi.-xxxii. (Opp. ed. Lagarde p. 163) adheres closely to our book quoting 1 Macc. 2:33 sqq. almost word for word. Origen (besides the passage in Euseb. Hist. eccl. vi. 25. 2 already mentioned) particularly Comment. in epist. ad Rom. book viii. chap. i. (in Lommatzsch vii. 193): Sicut Mathathias de quo in primo libro Machabaeorum scriptum est quia "zelatus est in lege Dei" etc. (1 Macc. 2:24). Observe the designation of our book as the First Book of Maccabees precisely as in the case of Jerome in the passage already quoted and in that of Ensebius Demonstr. evang. viii. 2. 72 ed. Gaisford. Cyprian quotes several passages from the book in his Testimonia and always with the formula in Machabaeis (Testimon. iii. 4 15 53). For the further history of the book in the Christian Church see the various works and dissertations on the history of the Old Testament canon also Jahn's Einleitung in die göttl. Bücher des Alten Bundes 2nd ed. Part ii. § 3 and 4 (1803) 1st and 2nd supplements and likewise my article "Apokryphen des A. T." in Herzog's Real-Enc. 2nd ed. i. 485-489. As is well known it has been the practice in the Protestant Church to follow Jerome in applying the designation "Apocrypha" to such books as are not included in the Hebrew canon and it so happens that our book is one of them.

From the history of the book just given it will be seen that the Greek text has been transmitted to us only through the manuscripts of the Greek Bible. The Books of Maccabees being omitted in Codex Vaticanus 1209 the most important manuscripts here are the Codex Sinaiticus (quoted in Fritzsche's edition of the Apocrypha as x.) and the Codex Alexandrinus (known in Fritzsche as in Holmes and Parsons before him as No. iii.); next to these comes a Codex Venetus (known in the critical apparatuses as No. 23). All the other manuscripts are minusculi. For more precise information on this point see my article "Apocrypha" in Herzog's Real-Enc. 2nd ed. i. pp. 489-491. The text of our book in common with that of the so-called Apocrypha generally is to be found in the majority of the editions of the Septuagint. The received text is borrowed from the Sixtine edition (Vetus Testamentum juxla Septuaginta ex auctoritate Sixti v. Pont. Max. editum Romae 1587). The most copious critical apparatus we have is to be found in the Vetus Testamentum Graecum edd. Holmes et Parsons 5 vols. Oxonii 1798-1827 (the whole of the Apocrypha are given together in the fifth volume). We have a handy portable edition in the shape of the Vetus Testamentum Graece juxta LXX. interpretes ed. Tischendorf 2 vols. Leipz. 1850 (6th ed. 1880). Tischendorf as well as Holmes and Parsons follow the Sixtine text. Among the separate editions of the Apocrypha we may mention the Libri Vet. Test. Ap cryphi textum graecum recognorit Augusti Lips. 1804 and the Libri Vet. Test. apocryphi graece accurats recognitos ed. Apel Lips. 1837. The latest and best of such editions although even it fails as yet to satisfy every requirement is the Libri apocryphi Veteris Testamenti graece recensuit et cum eommentario critico edidit Fritzsche Lips. 1871 (Fritzsche gives a recension of his own based upon the materials furnished by Holmes and Parsons and upon the recently acquired Codex Sinaiticus as well as the fragments in the Codex Ephraemi). So far as some of the books are concerned Fritzsche had not as yet collated them with the most important of the manuscripts the Codex Vaticanus there being no complete collation in Holmes and Parsons. It is true no doubt that this manuscript had been already made use of for the Sixtine edition so that so far it helped to shape the received text. But the text of the Vaticanus could not be said to be known to any trustworthy extent till the issue of the new Roman edition (Bibliorum Sacrorum Graecus Codex Vaticanus edd. Vercellone et Cozza 6 vols. Rome 1868-1881; comp. Theol. Litztg. 1882 p. 121). The edition of Mai (Vetus et Novum Testamentum ex antiquissimo codice Vaticano 5 vols. Rome 1857) is unreliable. Nestle has added to the latest edition of Tischendorf's Septuagint a collation based upon the edition of Vercellone and Cozza (also published separately under the title Veteris Testamenti codices Vaticanus et Sinaiticus cum textu recepto collati ab E. Nestle Lips. 1880). For more on the editions see Herzog's Real-Enc. 2nd ed. vol. i. 494 sq.

Of the early translations the following are of interest in connection with the history of the transmission of the text: (1) The Latin of which there are two (a) the one that was incorporated with the Vulgate and (b) another which as far as chap. xiii. has been preserved in a Codex Sangermanensis both being given in Sabatier Bibliorum sacrorum Latinae versiones antiquae vol. ii. Remis 1743. (2) The Syriac in the Peshito (separate edition Libri Vet. Test. apocryphi Syriace ed. Lagarde Lips. 1861). In the great Peshito manuscript of Milan reproduced in photo-lithograph by Ceriani (Translatio Syra Pescitto Veteris Testamenti ex codice Ambrosiano ed. Ceriani 2 vols. Milan 1876-1883) we have as far as chap. xiv. a Syriac translation which deviates from the printed received text; see Ceriani's prolegomena; and Nestle Theol. Literaturztg. 1884 col. 28. For more on the early translations see Herzog's Real-Enc. i. 491-494. Also the texts in the London Polyglot vol. iv.

Exegetical Aids. (1) Special lexicon: Wahl Clavis librorum Veteris Testamenti apocryphorum philologica Lips. 1853. (2) Modern versions: the German translations of De Wette (Die heil.

Schrift des A. und N. T.'s übersetzt 4th ed. 1858) and of Holtzmann (in Bunsen's Bibelwerk für die Gemeinde vol. vii. Leipzig 1869) the latter with short notes. Versions in other modern languages: Dijserinck De apocriefe boeken des ouden verbonds uit het grieksch opnieuw vertaald en met opschriften en eenige aanteekeningen voorzien Haarlem 1874. Reuss La Bible traduction nouvelle avec introductions et commentaires Ancien Testament VI partie Philosophie religieuss et morale des Hebreux Paris 1879 (containing among others Sirach Wisdom Tobit the appendices to Daniel Baruch the Prayer of Manasseh); VII partie of the same work Literature politique et polemique Paris 1879 (containing among others the Books of Maccabees Judith Bel and the Dragon Epistle of Jeremiah). Bissell The Apocrypha of the Old Testament with historical introductions a revised translation and notes critical and explanatory New York 1880. On Luther's translation see Grimm Luthers Uebersetzung der ATl. Apokr. (Stud. u. Krit. 1883 pp. 375-400). (3) Commentaries: J. D. Michaelis Deutsche Uebersetzung des ersten Buchs der Maccabäer mit Anmerkungen 1778. Grimm Das erste Buch der Maccabäer erklärt (Exegetisches Handbuch zu den Apokryphen des A. T.'s 3 parts) Leipzig 1853 (by far the most sterling work on the subject which we possess). Keil Commentar über die Bücher der Maccabäer Leipzig 1875. For additional exegetical literature see Grimm p. xxxiv. sq. Fürst Bibliotheca Judaica ii. 317 sq. and Herzog's Real-Enc. vol. i. 496.

Works of critical inquiry: Frölich Annales compendiarii regum et rerum Syriae Viennae 1744. E. F. Wernsdorf De fontibus historiae Syriae in libris Maccabaeorum prolusio Lips. 1746. Frölich. De fontibus historiae Syriae in libris Maccabaeorum prolusio Lipsiae edita in examen vocata Viennae 1746. Gottl. Wernsdorf Commentatio historico-critica de fule historica librorum Maccabaicorum Wratislav. 1747. (Khell) Auctoritas utriusque libri Maccabaici canonico-historica adserta Viennae 1749. Rosenthal Das erste Maccabäerbuch Leipzig 1867. Schnedermann Ueber das Judenthum der beiden ersten Maccabäerbücher (Zeitschr. für kirchl. Wissensch. und kirchl. Leben 1884 pp. 78-100). Critical material is also to be found in the early and the more recent polemical treatises on the value of the Apocrypha by Rainold Keerl Stier Hengstenberg Vincenzi and others; see Herzog's Real-Enc. i. p. 489.

For the circumstances under which our book and the Apocrypha generally were written see Jahn Einleitung in die göttl Bücher des A. B. 2nd ed. second part 3rd and 4th secs. Wien 1803. Eichhorn Einleitung in die apokryphischen Schriften des A. T. Leipzig 1795. Bertholdt Historisch-kritische Einl. in die sämtl. kanon. und apokr. Schriften des A. und N. T.'s 6 vols. Erlangen 1812-1819. Welte Specielle Einleitung in die deutero-kanonischen Bücher des A. T.'s Freiburg 1844 (also under the title Einl. in die heil. Schriften des A. T.'s von Herbst 2 parts 3 divisions). Scholz Einleitung in die heil. Schriften des A. und N. T.'s 3 vols. Köln 1845-1848. Nöldeke Die Alttestamentltche Literatur in einer Reihe von Aufsätzen dargestellt Leipzig 1868. De Wette Lehrbuch der hist.-krit. Einleitung in die kanonischen und apokryphischen Bücher des A. T.'s 8th ed. bearb. von Schrader Berlin 1869. Reusch Lehrb. der Einl. in das A. T. 4th ed. Freiburg 1870. Keil Lehrb. der hist.-krit. Einleitung in die kanon. und apokryph. Schriften des A. T.'s 3rd ed. 1873. Kaulen Einleitung in dis heil. Schrift A. und N. T.'s 2 divisions 1st part Besondere Einl. in das A. T. Freiburg 1881. Kleinert Abriss der Einkitung zum A. T. in Tabellenform Berlin 1878. Reuss Geschichte der heil. Schriften Alten Testaments Brauntohweig 1881. Geiger Urschrift und Uebersetzungen der Bibel 1857 p. 200 sqq. Ewald Gesch. des Volkes Israel iv. 602 sqq. Fritzsche in Schenkel's Bibellex. iv. 89 sqq.

2. The History of John Hyrcanus

We have probably a work similar to that of the First Book of Maccabees in the History of John Hyrcanus to which reference is made at the close of the former where it is said 1 Macc. 16:23

24: καὶ τὰ λοιπὰ τῶν λόγων Ἰωάννου καὶ τῶν πολέμων αὐτοῦ καὶ τῶν ἀνδραγαθιῶν αὐτοῦ ὧν ἠνδραγάθησε καὶ τῆς οἰκοδομῆς τῶν τειχέων ὧν ᾠκοδόμησε καὶ τῶν πράξεων αὐτοῦ ἰδοὺ ταῦτα γέγραπται ἐπὶ βιβλίῳ ἡμερῶν ἀρχιερωσύνης αὐτοῦ ἀφ' οὗ ἐγενήθη ἀρχιερεὺς μετὰ τὸν πατέρα αὐτοῦ. Apart from this notice we have no further information regarding this work. As the reign of John Hyrcanus did not possess the same interest for subsequent generations as the epoch in which Jewish independence was established through the achievements of the Maccabees the book would have but a limited circulation and could not fail soon to be lost altogether. It is evident that Josephus knew nothing of it in his time for the supposition that he made use of it in his Antiquities is more than improbable. What few notices he has regarding the reign of John Hyrcanus at all are either borrowed in so far as they refer to external political history from Greek historians or in so far as they refer to internal affairs are of a purely legendary character. No trace can be detected of the use of any contemporary Jewish source. Considering then at how early a period the history of Hyrcanus dropped out of sight it is inconceivable that it should still have existed in manuscript in the sixteenth century as following Sixtus Senensis many have assumed.

In his Bibliotheca sancta (Venetiis 1566) Sixtus Senensis gives an account at p. 61 sq. of a Fourth Book of Maccabees which he saw in the library of Santes Pagninus at Lyons and which began as follows: Καὶ μετὰ τὸ ἀποκτανθῆναι τὸν Σίμωνα ἐγενήθη Ἰωάννης υἱὸς αὐτοῦ ἀρχιερεὺς ἀντ αὐτοῦ. Judging from the enumeration of the contents as given by Sixtes this book simply narrates the history of John-Hyrcanus and that precisely as in Josephus (the same facts and in the same order). With regard to this he himself observes: Historiae series et narratio eadem fere est quae apud Josephum libro Antiquitatum decimo tertio; sed stylus hebraicis idiotismis abundans longe dispar. Consequently he ventures to conjecture that it may have been a Greek translation of the history of Hyrcanus mentioned at the end of the First Book of Maccabees. Many modern writers have concurred in this conjecture and hence their regret that the manuscript should have perished soon after when the library just mentioned was destroyed by fire (see Fabricius-Harles Biblioth. graeca iii 748. Grimm Exeget. Handbuch note on 1 Macc. 16:24). But in view of the enumeration of the contents given by Sixtus it seems to me there can hardly be a doubt that the book was simply a reproduction of Josephus the style being changed perhaps for a purpose.

3. Josephus' History of the Jewish War

In post-Hasmonaean times the fondness for writing histories seems to have died away. At least we nowhere come across any hint to the effect that the writing of anything like connected historical narratives had been undertaken by any one. It was not till the important events of the war extending from the year 66 to 70 B.C. that the occasion for such histories once more presented itself. The Jewish priest Joseph son of Matthias better known under the name of Flavius Josephus wrote the history of this war of which he himself had personal knowledge whether as a passive observer or as playing an active part in it. He composed the work in his own vernacular therefore in the Aramaic tongue and intended it chiefly for the benefit of the ἄνω βάρβαροι i.e. the Jews of Mesopotamia and Babylon. Of this work we know nothing beyond what he himself mentions in his Greek version of the history of the Jewish war Bell. Jud. prooem. 1 where he says: προυθέμην ἐγὼ τοῖς κατὰ τὴν Ῥωμαίων ἡγεμονίαν Ἑλλάδι γλώσσῃ μεταβαλών ἃ τοῖς ἄνω βαρβάροις τῇ πατρίῳ συντάξας ἀνέπεμψα πρότερον ἀφηγήσασθαι. The Greek version of this work in common with the extant works of Josephus generally belongs to the department of Hellenistico-Jewish literature and will therefore fall to be mentioned in the next section.

II. THE PSALMODIC LITERATURE

1. The Psalms of the Maccabaean Age

It had been already observed by Calvin with reference to the 44th Psalm that: Querimoniae quas continet proprie conveniunt in miserum illud et calamitosum tempus quo grassata est saevissima tyraunis Antiochi. Ever since the question whether psalms belonging to the Maccabaean age are also to be found in our canon has been mooted and more and more answered in the affirmative. It was Hitzig Lengerke and Olshausen above all that referred a large number of the psalms to the time of the Maccabaean struggles and to a still later period (embracing the reign of the Hasmonaean princes down to the second century B.C.). Others have limited the number of Maccabaean psalms to only a very few. But the fact that we have psalms belonging to Maccabaeau times in the canon at all is being more and more recognised. Nor is it possible to allege any plausible reason for thinking otherwise. For the assertion that that was an age but little calculated to develope religious fervour or poetical genius is a mere petitio principii while as little can be said in favour of the Other assertion that at that time the canon had been already closed. for this is just a point about which we simply know nothing whatever unless we ought rather to say that the Book of Daniel alone is sufficient proof to the contrary. If therefore the possibility of the existence of psalms belonging to Maccabaean times be beyond question then it can only be shown from the contents of the different psalms themselves how far that possibility is also a reality. Accordingly there is a wide consensus of opinion in favour of the view that the 44th 77th 79th and 83rd Psalms above all contain within themselves the most powerful reasons possible for ascribing their origin to the Maccabaean age. It was only then that it could be rightly and fairly asserted as is done in Ps. 44 that the people had faithfully adhered to the covenant made with Jehovah and had not deviated from it and that it was just for this very reason therefore for their religion that they were being persecuted (Ps. 44:18 19 23). It is only to such a time as that that we could well refer the complaints that the “houses of God” (מוֹעֲדֵי־אֵל) i.e. the synagogues had been burnt in the land and that there is no longer any prophet there (Ps. 74:8 9). There is no age except the Maccabaean to which all that could so well apply which in Ps. 79 is said about the desecration but not the destruction of the temple and the laying waste of Jerusalem and in Ps. 83 on the persecution of Israel. But if these four psalms had their origin in Maccabaean times then there are many more of a kindred nature that must be referred to the same period. The real point at issue then can only be not “whether” there are any such psalms at all but only “how many of them” there are. And this will always remain a disputed point for there are but few of the psalms that bear such evident traces of the date and circumstances of their origin as those just mentioned. Meanwhile let it suffice to have pointed out the fact that the holy Church of the Maccabaean time has given proof of its creative powers in the department of sacred lyrics as well through those new psalms in which it pours out its wail of distress before God and cries for protection and help from the Almighty.

For the literature of this question see the various introductions to the Old Testament for example De Wette-Schrader Einleit. in die kanon. und apotr. Bücher des A. T.’s (1869) § 334; Kleinert Abriss der Einl. zum A. T. (1878) p. 45.

The following authorities have expressed themselves in favour of the view that there are Maccabaean psalms in our canon: Rüdinger (1580). Venema (1762-67). E. G. Bengel Dissertatio ad introductiones in librum Psalmorum supplementa quaedam exhibens Tübing. 1806. Hitzig Begriff der Kritik am A. T. praktisch erörtert Heidelb. 1831. Idem Die Psalmen 2 vols. Heidelb. 1835 1836. Idem Ueber die Zeitdauer der hebräischen Psalmenpoesie (Züricher

Monatschr. 1856 pp. 436–452). Hesse De psalmis Maccabaicis Vratisl. 1837. Lengerke Die fünf Bücher der Psalmen 2 vols. Königsberg 1847. Olshauaen Die Psalmen erklärt Leipzig 1853 (being the fourteenth number of the Exegetical Handbook to the Old Testament). De Jong Disquisitio de Psalmis Maccabaicis Lugd. Bat. 1857. Steiner art. "Psalmen" in Schenkel's Bibellex. vol. v. pp. 1-9. Reuse Gesch. der heil Schriften Alten Testaments (1881) § 481. Comp. further Reuse La Bible Ancien Testament 5th part Paris 1875. Giesebrect Ueber die Abfassungszeit der Psalmen (Stade's Zeitsch. für die alttestamentl. Wissensch. vol. i. 1881 pp. 276–332). Delitzsch in the more recent editions of his commentary on the psalms also admits the existence of several Maccabaean psalms.

The following authorities again take an opposite view: Gesenius in No. 81 of the supplements to the Allgemeinen Literaturzeitung 1816. Hassler Comment. crit. de psalmis Maccab. 2 vols. Ulm 1827–1832. Ewald Jahrb. der bibl. Wissensch. vi. 1854 pp. 20–32 viii. 1857 p. 165 sqq. Dillmann Jahrbb. für deutsche Theol. 1858 p. 460 sqq. Hupfeld Die Psalmen übersetzt und ausgelegt 4 vols. Gotha 1855–1862. Ehrt Abfassungszeit und Abschluss des Psalters zur Prüfung der Frage nach Makkabäerpsalmen historisch-kritisch untersucht Leipzig 1869. Wanner Etude critique sur les Psaumes 44 74 79 et 83 considéres par plusieurs théologiens comme provenant de l'époque des Maccabées Lusanne 1876 (comp. the reviews in the Revue de théologie et de philosophie 1877 p. 399 sq.).

2. The Psalms of Solomon

In the list of books as given in several copies of the Christian canon of the Old Testament the ψαλμοὶ Σολομῶντος are also included and that in some instances under the category of ἀντιλεγόμενα along with the Books of Maccabees the Wisdom of Solomon Jesus the Son of Sirach Judith Tobit etc. (as in the case of the so-called Stichometria of Nicephorus and in the Synopsis Athanasii) and in others under the category of ἀντιλεγόμενα along with Enoch the Patriarchs Apocalypses of Moses and Ezra etc. (as in the case of anonymous list of the canon still extant in various manuscripts). From its first-mentioned position we can see that in the Christian Church this book was in many quarters regarded as canonical. It is included under the category of ἀπόκρυφα simply because not being in the Hebrew canon it was not acknowledged to be canonical by those who made that the standard. Besides this there are still in existence several Greek manuscripts of the Bible in which the Psalms of Solomon find a place precisely in accordance with the lists just mentioned; and it is just possible that if the manuscripts of the Septuagint were carefully searched there might be found to be still more of them than are already known to us. These psalms amount to eighteen in number. They were first printed from an Augsburg manuscript by de la Cerda (1626) and subsequently by Fabricius (1713) while in our own time an edition collated with a Vienna manuscript has been published by Hilgenfeld whose text is also followed in the editions of Geiger Fritzsche and Pick.

The ascribing of these psalms to Solomon is simply due to the later transcribers. The work itself does not lay the slightest claim to such authorship; on the contrary it betrays very distinct traces of the date of its composition. That certainly was not as Ewald Grimm Oehler Dillmann (at one time) Weiffenbach and Anger would have us believe the time of Antiochus Epiphanes nor as Movers Delitzsch and Keim suppose the time of Herod but as is now universally admitted – for example by Langen Hilgenfeld Nöldeke Geiger Carriere Wellhausen Reuss Dillmann (now) – the period shortly after the conquest of Jerusalem by Pompey. That the psalms were composed at that time may be regarded as absolutely certain from the various explicit indications of this in the second eighth and seventeenth psalms. The contemporary state of things which these psalms presuppose is somewhat as follows: A family to which the promise of ruling over Israel

had not been given seized the reins of government by force (17:6). They did not give God the glory but of themselves assumed the king's crown and took possession of the throne of David (17:7 8). In their time the whole of Israel fell into sin. The king despised the law the judge was unfaithful to truth and the people lived in sin (17:21 22). But God overthrew those princes by raising up against them a man from a strange land and who was not of the race of Israel (17:8 9). From the ends of the earth God brought one who could strike with a mighty blow who declared war against Jerusalem and all its territory. The princes of the land in their blindness went out to meet him with joy and said to him: "Thy approach has been longed for come hither enter in peace." They opened the gates to him so that he entered like a father into the house of his sons (8:15-20). But after he had securely established himself in the city he also seized the battlements and threw down the walls of Jerusalem with the batteringram (8:21 2:1). Jerusalem was trodden under foot by the heathen (2:20); nay the strange peoples ascended the altar of God itself (2:2). All the leading men and every wise man in the council were put to death; and the blood of the inhabitants of Jerusalem was poured out like unclean water (8:23). The inhabitants of the land were carried away captive into the West and its princes insulted (17:13 14 2:6 8:24). But at last the dragon that had conquered Jerusalem (2:29) was itself put to death on the mountains of Egypt by the sea-shore. But his body was allowed to lie unburied (2:30 31). It can scarcely require any further commentary to prove that we are here dealing with the time of the conquest of Jerusalem by Pompey and that it is to it alone that the circumstances presupposed can be said to apply. The princes who had been so arrogant as to assume the rule over Jerusalem and take possession of the throne of David are the Hasmonaeans who ever since Aristobulus L. had taken the title of king. The last of the princes of this house Alexander Jannaeus and Aristobulus II. openly favoured the Sadducean party so that in the eyes of our author with his Pharisaic leanings they appeared in the light of sinful and lawless men. The "man of the strange land" and "of powerful blows" whom God summons from the end of the earth is no other than Pompey. The princes who go out to meet him are Aristobulus II. and Hyrcanus II. The supporters of this latter opened the gates of the city to Pompey who then proceeded to take by storm (ἐν κριῷ 2:1) the other portion of the town in which those belonging to Aristobulus's party had entrenched themselves. All the rest that follows the contemptuous treading of the temple by the conquerors the mowing down of the inhabitants the execution of the leading men among them the carrying away of the captives to the West and of the princes to be mocked (εἰς ἐμπαιγμόν 17:14 i.e. for the triumphal procession in Rome) corresponds with what actually took place. But it is above all the circumstance of the captives being carried away to the West (17:14) that proves that the taking of Jerusalem by Pompey is alone to be thought of. For the only other case besides this that might possibly be in view is the conquest of Jerusalem by Titus but to this none of the other circumstances are found to apply. But if there could be any doubt before it utterly vanishes when finally we are told that the conqueror was killed on the coast of Egypt on the sea-shore (ἐπὶ κυμάτων) and that his body was left lying without being buried (2:31). For this is precisely what actually took place in the case of Pompey (in the year 48 B.C.). Consequently the second psalm was undoubtedly composed soon after this event while the eighth and seventeenth as well as most of the others may be assumed to have been written between the years 63-48. There exists no reason whatever for coming down so late as to the time of Herod. For "the man from the strange land" who according to 17:9 rose up against the Hasmonaean princes is as the context makes it impossible to doubt the same personage who according to 17:14 carries away the captives to the West and therefore not Herod as Movers Delitzsch and Keim would have us suppose but Pompey.

The spirit which the psalms breathe is entirely that of Pharisaic Judaism. They are pervaded by an earnest moral tone and a sincere piety. But the righteousness which they preach and the

dearth of which they deplore is all through the righteousness that consists in complying with all the Pharisaic prescriptions the δικαιοσύνη προσταγμάτων (14:1). The fate of man after death is represented as depending simply upon his works. It is left entirely in his own option whether he is to decide in favour of righteousness or unrighteousness (comp. especially 9:7). If he does the former he will rise again to eternal life (3:16); if the latter eternal perdition will be his doom (13:9 sqq. 14:2 sqq. 15) As a contrast to the unlawful rule of the Hasmonaeans which had been put an end to by Pompey the author cherishes the confident expectation of that Messianic king of the house of David who is one day to lead Israel to the promised glory (17:1 5 23–51 18:6–10. Comp. further 7:9 11).

The view previously held by Grätz that our psalms are of Christian origin seems to have been abandoned by that writer himself and in any case does not call for serious refutation. But neither have we any right to assume that they contain even Christain interpolations. For the sinlessness and holiness which the author ascribes to the Messiah expected by him (17:41 46) is not sinlessness in the sense of Christian dogmatics but simply rigid legalism in the Pharisaic sense.

Despite Hilgenfeld's view to the contrary it is almost universally allowed that the psalms were originally composed in Hebrew. And undoubtedly not without good reason. For the diction of the psalms is so decidedly Hebrew in its Character that it is impossible to suppose that they were written originally in Greek. And for this reason it is no less certain that they were not written in Alexandria but in Palestine. It may not be amiss to mention further the correspondence to some extent a verbal one between Psalm 11. and the fifth chapter of Baruch. If we are correct in supposing that the psalms were written originally in Hebrew then the imitation must be regarded as being on the part of Baruch.

The place assigned to our psalms in the Christian canon: I. Among the ἀντιλεγόμενα: (1) in the Stichometria of Nicephorus as given in Credner Zur Geschichte des Kanons (1847) p. 120 Nicephori opuscula ed. de Boor (Lips. 1880) p. 134. (2) In the Synopsis Athanasii as given in Credner Zur Gesch. des Kanons p. 144. II. Among the ἀπόκρυφα in an anonymous list of canonical books which has been printed (1) from a certain Codex Coislinianus as given in Montfaucon's Bibliotheca Coisliniana Paris 1715 p. 194; (2) from a Parisian manuscript as given in Cotelier's Patrum apost. Opp. vol. i. 1698 p. 196; (3) from a certain Codex Baroccianus at Oxford and as given in Hody's De Bibliorum textibus 1705 p. 649 col. 44; (4) from a Vatican codex as given in Pitra's Juris ecclesiastici Graecorum historia et monumenta vol. i. 1864 p. 100 (on the relation of those four texts to each other see No. V. below the chapter on the lost Apocalypses). III. In his scholia to the decrees of the Council of Laodicea Zonoras observes in connection with the 59th canon (Beveregius Pandectae canonum Oxon. 1672 vol. i. p. 481): ἐκτὸς τῶν ρν′ ψαλμῶν τοῦ Δαβὶδ εὑρίσκονται καί τινες ἕτεροι λεγόμενοι τοῦ Σολομῶντος εἶναι καὶ ἄλλων τινῶν οὓς καὶ ἰδιωτικοὺς ὠνόμασαν οἱ πατέρες καὶ μὴ λέγεσθαι ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ διετάξαντο. Similarly Balsamon (in Beveregius i. 480). IV. In the Codex Alexandrinus of the Greek Bible the Psalms of Solomon as is shown by the list of contents prefixed to the codex found a place in the Appendix to the New Testament after the Epistles of Clement (see Credner Gesch. des neutestamentl. Kanons 1860 p. 238 sq.). In the Vienna manuscript on the other hand where the Psalms are still extant they come in between the Wisdom of Solomon and Jesus the Son of Sirach.

Up to the present time the manuscripts that have been found are five in number: (1) The manuscript from which the editio princeps of de la Cerda was printed; it was brought from Constantinople in the year 1615 was in the possession of David Höschel and then found its way to the Augsburg library (Fabricius Cod. pseudepigr. i. 973 914 sq.) but it has now disappeared.

(2) A Vienna codex (cod. gr. theol. 7) Haupt's collation of which Hilgenfeld made use of in his edition of the Psalms. (3) A Copenhagen manuscript an account of which is given by Graux in the Revue Critique 1877 No. 46 pp. 291-293. (4) A Moscow manuscript and (5) a Parisian one both of which were discovered and collated by Gebhardt (see Theol. Literaturzeitung 1877 p. 627 sq.). The three last-mentioned MSS. have not yet been made use of in any edition of our Psalms.

Editions: (1) De la Cerda Adversaria sacra Lyons 1626 Appendix. (2) Fabricius Codex pseudepigraphus Veteris Testamenti vol. i. 1713 pp. 914-999. (3) Hilgenfeld Zeitschrift für wissenschaftl. Theologie 1868 pp. 134-168. Idem Messias Judaeorum Lips. 1869 pp. 1-33. (4) Eduard Ephräm Geiger Der Psalter Salomo's herausgegeben und erklärt Augsburg 1871. (5) Fritzsche Libri apocryphi Veteris Testamenti graece Lips. 1871 pp. 569-589. (6) Pick Presbyterian Review 1883 Oct. pp. 775-812. A new edition was prepared by Gebhardt for the "Texte und Untersuchungen" edited by himself and Harnack.

German translations with explanatory notes have been published by Geiger as above. Hilgenfeld Die Psalmen Salomo's deutsch übersetzt una anfs Neue untersucht (Zeitschr. für wissenschaftl. Theologie 1871 pp. 383-418). Wellhausen Die Pharisäer und die Sadducäer (1874) pp. 131-164. There is an English translation by Pick as above.

On the circumstances under which our Psalms were written: I. Ewald Geschichte des Volkes Israel iv. 392 sq. (subsequently Ewald hit upon the idea of dating the Psalms back to the time of Ptolemy Lagus; see the reviews of the writing of Geiger and Carriere in the Göttinger gel. Anzeigen 1871 pp. 841-850 and 1873 pp. 237-240). Grimm Exeget. Handbuch zu 1 Makk. p. 27. Oehler art. "Messias" in Herzog's Real-Enc. 1st ed. ix. 426 sq. Dillmann art. "Pseudepigraphen" in Herzog's Real-Enc. 1st ed. xii. 305 sq. Weiffenbach Quae Jesu in regno coelesti dignitas sit synopticorum sententia exponitur (Gissae 1868) p. 49 sq. Anger Vorlesungen über die Geschichte der messianischen Idee (1873) p. 81 sq. II. Movers in Wetzer und Welte's Kirchenlex. 1st ed. i. 340. Delitzsch Commentar über den Psalter 1st ed. ii. 381 sq. Keim Geschichte Jesu von Nazara i. 243. III. Langen Das Judenthum in Palästina (1866) pp. 64-70. Hilgenfeld Zeitschr. 1868 Messias Judaeorum proleg. Zeitschr. 1871. Nöldeke Die alttestamentl. Literatur (1868) p. 141 sq. Hausrath Neutestamentl. Zeitgesch. 2nd ed. i. pp. 157 sq. 168. Geiger in his edition of our Psalms. Fritzsche prolegom. to his edition. Wittichen Die Idee des Reiches Gottes (1872) pp. 155-160. Carriere De psalterio Salomonis Argentorati 1870. Well-hausen Die Pharisäer und die Sadducäer p. 112 sqq. Stähelin Jahrb. für deutsche Theol. 1874 p. 203. Drummond The Jewish Messiah (1877) pp. 133-142. Kaulen in Wetzer und Welte's Kirchenlex. 2nd ed. i. 1060 sq. Lucius Der Essenismus (1881) pp. 119-121. Reuss Gesch. der heil. Schriften A. T.'s § 526. Dillmann in Herzog's Real-Enc. 2nd ed. vol. xii. 1883 p. 346. Pick The Psalter of Solomon (Presbyterian Review 1883 Oct. pp. 775-812).

III. THE GNOMIC WISDOM

1. Jesus the Son of Sirach

There is nothing that shows so clearly the practical character of the Palestinian Jewish literature of our period as the fact that even in the merely theoretical speculations of the time there was always an eye to the practical aims and tasks of life. A theoretical philosophy strictly so called was a thing entirely foreign to genuine Judaism. Whatever it did happen to produce in the way of "philosophy" (= wisdom חָכְמָה) either had practical religious problems as its theme (Job Ecclesiastes) or was of a directly practical nature being: directions based upon a thoughtful

study of human things for so regulating our life as to ensure our being truly happy. The form in which those contemplations and instructions were presented was that of the מָשָׁל the apothegm which contained a single thought expressed in concise and comprehensive terms and in a form more or less poetical and in which there was nothing of the nature of discussion or argument. A collection of aphorisms of this sort had already found a place among the canonical writings of the Old Testament in the shape of the so-called proverbs of Solomon. We have a collection of a similar character in the book known as Jesus the Son of Sirach and which we now proceed to consider. This book takes that older collection as its model not only as regards the form but the matter as well though it contributes a large number of new and original thoughts. The fundamental thought of the author is that of wisdom. For him the highest and most perfect wisdom resides only in God who has established and who continues to govern all things in accordance with His marvellous knowledge and understanding. On the part of man therefore true wisdom consists in his trusting and obeying God. The fear of God is the beginning and end of all wisdom. Hence it is that the author living as he did at a time when the fear of God and the observance of the law were already regarded as one and the same thing inculcates above all the duty of adhering faithfully to the law and keeping the commandments. But besides this he also points out in the next place how the truly wise man is to comport himself in the manifold relationships of practical life. And accordingly his book contains an inexhaustible fund of rules for the regulation of one's conduct in joy and sorrow in prosperity and adversity in sickness and in health in struggle and temptation in social life in intercourse with friends and enemies with high and low rich and poor with the good and the wicked the wise and the foolish in trade business and one's ordinary calling above all in one's own house and family in connection with the training of children the treatment of men-servants and maid-servants and the way in which a man ought to behave toward his own wife and the fair sex generally. For all those manifold relationships the most precise directions are furnished directions that are prompted by a spirit of moral earnestness which only now and then degenerates into mere worldly prudence. The counsels of the author are the mature fruit of a profound and comprehensive study of human things and of a wide experience of life. In entering as they do into such a multiplicity of details they at the same time furnish us with a lively picture of the manners and customs and of the culture generally of his time and his people. How far the thoughts expressed as well as the form in which they are expressed were the author's own and how far he only collected what was already in current and popular use it is of course impossible in any particular instance to determine. To a certain extent he may have done both. But in any case he was not a mere collector or compiler the characteristic personality of the author stands out far too distinctly and prominently for that. Notwithstanding the diversified character of the apothegms they are all the outcome of one connected view of life and the world.

At the close of the book chap. 50:27 the author calls himself Ἰησοῦς υἱὸς Σιρὰχ ὁ Ἱεροσολυμίτης. Many manuscripts insert Ἐλεάζαρ after Σιράχ; but this despite the strong testimony in its favour must be regarded as a gloss (see Fritzache's edition and commentary). The name Σιράχ is equivalent to the Hebrew סִירָא "a coat of mail" (the accent being on the final syllable as in ἀκελδαμάχ Acts 1:19). The singular mistake of Syncellus (Chron. ed. Dindorf i. 525) who alleges that he was a high priest can only have arised from the fact that in the chronicle of Eusebius which Syncellus makes use of our Jesus the Son of Sirach is mentioned after the high priest Simon the son of Onias II. though not as a high priest but only as the author of the book now under consideration (Euseb. Chron. ad Ol. 137–38 ed. Schoene ii. 122). Again the notion that he was an ordinary priest is also entirely without foundation notwithstanding the fact that it has found expression in the text of the cod. Sinaiticus 50:27. The time at which he lived may be determined with tolerable precision. His grandson who translated the book into

Greek states in the prologue prefixed to it that he (the grandson) came to Egypt ἐν τῷ ὀγδόῳ καὶ τριακοστῷ ἔτει ἐπὶ τοῦ Εὐεργέτου βασιλέως. By the "thirty-eighth year" he of course does not mean that of his own age but the thirty-eighth year of the reign of Euergetes. Now seeing that of the two Ptolemys who bore this surname the one reigned only twenty-five years it is only the second that can be intended and whose full name was Ptolemaeus VII. Physcon Euergetes II. This latter in the first instance shared the throne along with his brother (from the year 170 onwards) and subsequently reigned alone (from the year 145 onwards). But he was in the habit of reckoning the years of his reign from the former of those dates. Consequently that thirty-eighth year in which the grandson of Jesus the son of Sirach came to Egypt would be the year 132 B.C. That being the case his grandfather may be supposed to have lived and to have written his book somewhere between 190 and 170 B.C. This further accords with the fact that in the book (50:1-26) he pays a respectful tribute to the memory of the high priest Simon the son of Onias by whom we are to understand not Simon I. (in the beginning of the third century see Joseph. Antt. xii. 2. 4) but Simon II. (in the beginning of the second century see Joseph. Antt. xii. 4. 10). Jesus the son of Sirach passes an encomium upon the meritorious character of this personage who had just passed away from the world and the thought of whom was still so fresh in his memory.

The book has come down to us only in the form of the Greek translation which according to the prologue was executed by the author's grandson. We further learn from this prologue what is also confirmed by the character of the diction that the work was originally composed in Hebrew by which we are to understand Hebrew strictly so called and not Aramaic (see Fritzsche Exeget. Handbuch p. 18). The Hebrew text was still in existence in the time of Jerome who tells us that he had seen it see Praef. in vers. libr. Salom. (Vallarsi ix. 1293 sq.): Fertur et πανάρετος Jesu filii Sirach liber et alius ψευδεπίγραφος qui Sapientia Salomonis inscribitur. Quorum priorem Hebraicum reperi non Ecclesiasticum ut apud Latinos sed Parabolas praenotatum cui juncti erant Ecclesiastes et Canticum Canticorum ut similitudinem Salomonis non solum librorum numero sed etiam materiarum genere coaequaret.

The fact that a Hebrew text was still extant in the time of Jerome is evidence of itself that the book was also prized within the circle of Rabbinical Judaism. Not only so but quotations from it are repeatedly met with in Talmudic literature. But it was prized far more highly still within the Christian Church. It is frequently quoted as γραφή by the Greek and the Latin Fathers alike and that too in the form in which it has come down to us in the manuscripts of the Bible. The restricting of the Christian canon to precisely the same number of books as was in the Hebrew Bible was in the early Church and that of the Middle Ages almost always a pure matter of theory and was only practically recognised and acted upon for the first time in the Protestant Church.

On the quotations from בן סירא in Talmudic literature see Wolf Bibliotheca Hebraea i. 257 sqq. Zunz Die gottesdienstlichen Vorträge der Juden p. 101 sqq. Delitzech Zur Geschichte der jüdischen Poesie pp. 20 sq. 204 sq. Dukes Rebbinische Blumenlese p. 67 sqq. Fritzsche Exeget. Handbuch p. xxxvii. Joel Blicke in die Religionsgeschichte (1880) p. 71 sqq. Strack in Herzog's Real-Enc. 2nd ed. vii. 430 sq. We must beware of confounding with those quotations the very late and apocryphal Alphabet of Ben Sira a collection of 44 (2 × 22) sayings arranged in alphabetical order. On this see Wolf Bibliotheca Hebraea i. 260 sqq. iii. 156 sq. Fabricius-Harles Biblioth. grace. iii. 726 sq. Steinschneider Catalogus librorum Hebraeorum in bibliotheca Bodleiana (1852-1860) col. 203-205. Fürst Biblioth. Judaica iii. 341. Modern edition Alphabetum Siracidis utrumque ed. Steinschneider Berlin 1858.

On the title of our book see in particular the passage from Jerome quoted above. In the

manuscripts it runs thus: Σοφία Ἰησοῦ υἱοῦ Σιράχ. In the Greek Church the designation ἡ πανάρετος σοφία which according to Euseb. Hist. eccl. iv. 22. 8 was in the first instance usually applied to the proverbs of Solomon came to be extended to our book as well. So for the first time Eusebius Chron. ed. Schoene ii. 422 (where the conformity on the part of Syucellus and Jerome with the Armenian text serves to show that the expression is peculiar to Eusebius himself). Demonstr. evang. viii. 2.71 ed. Gaisford: Σίμων καθ' ὃν Ἰησοῦς ὁ τοῦ Σιρὰχ ἐγνωρίζετο ὃ τὴν καλουμένην πανάρετον Σοφίαν συντάξας. This designation does not occur as yet in connection with any of the numerous quotations in Clement and Origen. In the Latin Church Ecclesiasticus came to be adopted as the regular title of the book (Cyprian Testimon. ii. 1 iii. 1 35 51 95 96 97 109 110 111). Comp. the Latin translation of Origen In Numer. homil. xviii. 3 (ed. Lommatzsch x. 221): In libro qui apud nos quidem inter Salomonis volumina haberi solet et Ecclesiasticus dici apud Graecos vero sapientia Jesu filii Sirach appellatur.

The use of the book in the Christian Church begins with the New Testament itself. In the Epistle of Jamce above all there are unmistakeable reminiscences of it. See in general Bleek Stud. u. Krit. 1853 pp. 337 sq. 344-348. Werner Theol. Quartalschr. 1872 p. 265 sqq. The express quotations begin with Clement of Alexandria who quotes our book times without number and on most occasions using either the formula ἡ γραφὴ λέγει φησίν and such like (thirteen times: Paedag. i. 8. 62 8. 68 ii. 2. 34 5. 46 8. 69 8. 76 10. 98 10. 99 iii. 3.17 3. 23 4. 29 11. 58 11. 83) or ἡ σοφία λέγει φησίν and such like (nine times: Paedeg. i. 8. 69 8. 72 9. 75 ii. 1. 8 2. 24 7. 54 7. 58 7. 59; Strom. v. 3. 18); or further quoting passages now and again as the words of the παιδαγωγός (Paedag. ii. 10. 99 101. 109). He speaks of the book as the σοφία Ἰησοῦ only twice (Strom. i. 4. 27 10. 47). On one occasion he appears to call Solomon the author (Strom. ii. 5. 24); the quotation however is somewhat uncertain. In one instance again an expression in our σοφία is described as Sophoclean (Paedag. ii. 2. 24). It is very much the same with regard to the quotations in Origen only here it is impossible in many instances to make out the exact formulae made use of seeing that the majority of Origen's writings are extant only in Latin translations. Like Clement he also appears to have quoted the book most frequently as γραφή. In the Latin text Solomon is several times spoken of as the author (In Numer. homil. xviii. 3 = Lommatzsch x. 221; In Josuam homil. xi. 2 = Lommatzsch xi. 108; In Samuel. homil. i. 13 = Lommatzsch xi. 311). But that this cannot be taken as representing the opinion of Origen himself in proved by the following passage in contra Cels. vi. 7 (ed. Lommatzsch xix. 312): παραδείξωμεν ἀπὸ τῶν ἱερῶν γραμμάτων ὅτι προτρέπει καὶ ὁ θεῖος λόγος ἡμᾶς ἐπὶ διαλεκτικήν• ὅπου μὲν Σολομῶντος λέγοντος....ὅπου δὲ τοῦ τὸ σύγγραμμα τὴν σοφίαν [l. τῆς σοφίας] ἡμῖν καταλιπόντος Ἰησοῦ υἱοῦ Σειρὰχ φάσκοντος. Cyprian uniformly quotes our book as being a work of Solomon's quite as much as any of the rest of his writings (Testimon. ii. 1 iii. 6. 12 35 51 53 95 96 97 109 113; Ad Fortunatum chap. ix.; De opere et eleemosynis chap. v.; Epist. iii. 2). Similarly other Latin writers. See especially the passage quoted above from the Latin version of Origen In Numer. homil. xviii. 3 (Lommatzsch x. 221) and also Jerome who in his Comment. in Daniel. chap. ix. (Opp. ed. Vallarsi v. 686) reproduces the passage from Euseb. Demonstr. evang. viii. 2. 71 as follows: Simon quo regente populum Jesus filius Sirach scripsit librum qui Graece παναρετός appellatur et plerisque Salomonis falso dicitur. On the further history of the use of the book in this way comp. the works and dissertations devoted to the history of the Old Testament canon also Jahn's Einleitung in die goal Bücher des A. B. 2nd ed. vol. ii. § 3 and 4 (1803) 1st and 2nd appendices as well as my article in Herzog's Real-Enc. i. 485-489.

The most important manuscripts are: (1) The Vaticanus 1209 i.e. the famous Vatican manuscript of the Bible which however if we except the eclectic use made of it in the Sixtine

edition has not as yet been made available for the criticism of the text in connection with any edition of our book not even that of Fritzsche (comp. p. 10). (2) The Sinaiticus in Fritzsche's edition marked No. x. (3) The Alexandrinus in Fritzsche as in Holmes and Parsons before him marked No. iii. (4) The fragments of the Codex Ephraemi in Fritzsche = C. (5) A Venetian codex in Fritzsche who following Holmes and Parsons marks it No. xxiii. For further information regarding these manuscripts see Herzog's Real-Enc. 2nd ed. i.489-491.

On the editions see p. 10 and Herzog's Real-Enc. i. 494 sq. Separate edition: Liber Jesu Siracidae Graece ad fidem codicum et versionum emendatus et perpetua annotatione illustratus a C. G. Bretschneider Ratisb. 1806. For further separate editions see Herzog's Real-Enc. i. 495.

Of the early translations the following may be specially mentioned: (1) The old Latin one which Jerome did not revise (praef. in edit. librorum Salmonis juxta Sept. interpretes [Vallarsi x. 436]: Porro in eo libro qui a plerisque Sapientia Salomonis inscribitur et in Ecclesiastico quem esse Jesu filii Sirach nullus ignorat calamo temperavi tantummodo canonicas scripturas vobis emendare desiderans). It found its way into the Vulgate and hence it came to be printed in all subsequent editions of this latter. The variations of four manuscripts (for Jesus the Son of Sirach as well as for the Wisdom of Solomon) are given by Sabatier in his Bibliorum sacrorum versiones antiquae vol. ii. Remis 1743. The text of the Codex Amiatinus has been published (for those two books also) by Lagarde in his Mitthelungen 1884. (2) The two Syrian versions: (a) The Peschito or the Syrian received text on the editions of which comp. p. 11; (b) the Syrus hexaplaris which for our book as well as for the Wisdom of Solomon was edited for the first time from a Milan manuscript by Cerini Codex Syro-Hexaplaris Ambrosianus photolithographice editus Mediol. 1874 (forming vol. vii. of the Monum. Sacra et prof.). For more on the early versions see Herzog's Real-Enc. i. 491-494. Also texts in the London Polyglot vol. iv.

For the exegetical aids generally see p. 11. Commentaries: Bretschneider in the separate edition previously mentioned. Fritzeche Die Weisheit Jesus Sirach's erklärt und übersetzt (Exegetisches Handbuch zu den Apokryphen 5 Thl.) Leipzig 1859. For the earlier literature see Fabricius Biblioth. graec. ed. Harles iii. 718 sqq. Fürst Biblioth. Judaica iii. 341 sq. Fritzsche p. xl. Herzog's Real-Enc. i. 496.

Special disquisitions: Gfrörer Philo vol. ii. (1831) pp. 18-52. Dähne Geschichtl. Darstellung der jüdisch-alexandrinischen Religionsphilosophie vol. ii. (1834) pp. 126-150. Winer De utriusque Siracidae aetate Erlang. 1832. Comp. also Winer's Realwörtb. art. "Jesus Sirach." Zunz Die gottesdienstl. Vorträge der Juden (1832) pp. 100-105. Ewald "Ueber das griech. Spruchbuch Jesus' Sohnes Sirach's" (Jahrbb. der bibl. Wissensch. vol. iii. 1851 pp. 125-140). Bruch Weisheitslehre der Hebräer 1851 pp. 266-319. Geiger Zeitschr. der deutschen morgenländ Gesellsch. xii. 1858 pp. 536-543. Ewald Gesch. des Volkes Israel iv. 340 sqq. Horowitz Das Buch Jesus Sirach Breslau 1865. Fritzsche in Schenkel's Bibellex. iii. 252 sqq. Grätz Monatsschr. für Gesch. und Wissensch. des Judenth. 1872 pp. 49 sqq. 97 sqq. Merguet Die Glaubens- und Sittenlehre des Buches Jesus Sirach Königsberg 1874. Seligmann Das Buch der Weisheit des Jesus Sirach (Josua ben Sira) in seinem Verhältnis zu den salomonischen Sprüchen und seiner historischen Bedeutung Breslau 1883. The various introductions of Jahn Eichhorn Bertholdt Welte Scholz Nöldeke De Wette-Schrader Reusch Keil Kaulen Kleinert Reuss (see p. 12).

2. The Pirke Aboth

Nor did the gnomic wisdom become extinct in the period following that of Jesus the son of

Sirach. Jesus Christ Himself indeed frequently clothed His teaching in this aphoristic form. But besides the work we have just been considering there is still extant and that in Hebrew a collection of such proverbial sayings as we have referred to above and which so far at least as its substratum is concerned belongs to our period we mean the so-called Pirke Aboth (פִּרְקֵי אָבוֹת sayings of the fathers) known also under the abbreviated form of Aboth. This collection was inserted among the tractates of the Mishna (among those of the fourth division) though strictly speaking it is quite out of place there. For while the rest of the Mishna is simply a codification of Jewish law our tractate contains a collection of aphorisms after the manner of Jesus the son of Sirach. The only difference is that the Pirke Aboth is not the work of a single individual like that book but a collection of sayings by some sixty learned doctors who are mentioned by name. The majority of these latter are also otherwise known as distinguished doctors of the law. As a rule each doctor is represented in the work by a couple or more of his characteristic maxims such as he had been in the habit of inculcating upon his disciples and contemporaries as rules of life well worthy of special consideration. Many of those maxims are of a purely utilitarian character but the most of them are related in some way or other to the domain of religion; and it is extremely significant as regards the characteristic tendency of this later age that here the importance and necessity of the study of the law are inculcated with quite a special emphasis (comp. the specimens given at). The authorities whose utterances were collected in this fashion belong for the most part to the age of the Mishna i.e. to the period extending from the year 70 to 170 A.D. Besides these a few but only a few of the authorities belonging to earlier times are also taken notice of. The tractate consists of five chapters. In many editions a sixth chapter is added but it is of much later origin.

Our tractate is given in every edition of the Mishua (on this see § iii. above). In the edition of the Mishna published under Jost's supervision by Lewent in Berlin 1832–1834 there is an excellent German translation printed in the Hebrew character. There is also a Latin version in Surenhusius Mishna etc. vol. iv. 1702 pp. 409–484. Of the numerous separate editions (some of them accompanied with translations) the following may be specially mentioned: P Ewald Pirke Aboth oder Sprüche der Vater übersetzt und erklärt Erlangen 1825. Cahn Pirke Aboth sprachlich und sachlich erläutert erster Perek (all that has been published) Berlin 1875. Taylor Sayings of the Jewish Fathers comprising Pirke Aboth and Pereq R. Meir in Hebrew and English with critical and illustrative notes etc. Cambridge 1877 (where the text is given exactly in accordance with a Cambridge manuscript University Addit. 470. 1). Strack פרקי אבות Die Sprüche der Väter ein ethischer Mischna-Traktat mit kurzer Einleitung Anmerkungen und einem Wortregister 1882 (where additional literature is to be found in the introduction).

IV. HORTATORY NARRATIVE

1. The Book of Judith

The hortatory narrative was a peculiar species of literature which was frequently cultivated during our period. Stories of a purely fictitious character were composed which the author no doubt intended to be regarded as founded on fact though at the same time the object in view was not so much to impart historical information as to use these stories as a vehicle for conveying moral and religious lessons and exhortations. From the incidents narrated – and which are taken from the history of the Jewish people or from the life of certain individuals – the readers are expected to learn the truth that the fear of God is after all the highest wisdom for God always delivers His children in some wonderful way in the end although for a little He may bring them into circumstances of trouble and danger.

The history of Judith is a narrative of this description. The following is an outline of the story. Nebuchadnezzar the king of Assyria (sic!) calls upon the peoples of Asia Minor and among them the inhabitants of Palestine to furnish him with troops to help him in the war he was waging against Arphaxad the king of Media. As those who received this summons did not think proper to comply with it Nebuchadnezzar as soon as he had vanquished Arphaxad sent his general Holofernes with a large force against the nations of the West with the view of chastising them for their disobedience. Holofernes executes his orders devastates the various countries one after another and demolishes their sanctuaries in order that Nebuchadnezzar alone might receive the worship due to God (1-3). When he got as far as the plain of Esdrelon the Jews who had just returned from the captivity and had newly re-established their worship (sic! in Nebuchadnezzar's time) prepare to offer resistance. By order of Joakim the high priest they intercept Holofernes on his way to Jerusalem at Fort Betylua (Βετυλούα; Latin Bethulia) opposite the plain of Esdrelon (4-6). Now when Holofernes was besieging Betylua and the distress within the town had reached a climax a wealthy beautiful and pious widow called Judith resolved to save her people by an act of daring (7-9). Richly attired and having no one with her but a bondwoman she betakes herself to the enemy's camp and there under the pretext of wishing to show him how to get to Jerusalem she contrives to obtain an interview with Holofernes. This latter reposes confidence in her and is charmed with her beauty. After spending three days in the camp she is called upon to be present at a banquet at the conclusion of which she is left alone with Holofernes in his tent. But the general is so intoxicated with wine that Judith now finds an opportunity for carrying out her design. She accordingly takes Holofernes's own sword and cuts off his head with it. She then manages to get away from the camp without being observed while the slave brings away the head of Holofernes in a bag. Having thus accomplished her object she returns to Betylua where she is welcomed with grest rejoicings (10-13). When the enemy discovered what had been done they fled in all directions and were without difficulty mown down by the Jews. But Judith was extolled by all Israel as their deliverer (14-16).

As our book happens to have found a place in the Christian Bible not only Catholic but also many Protestant theologians have felt it to be their duty to defend the historical character of the narrative (as was still done on the Protestant side above all by O. Wolff 1861). But the historical blunders are so gross and the hortatory purpose so obvious that one cannot venture to assume even a nucleus of fact. The book is a piece of fiction composed with the view of encouraging the people to offer a brave resistance to the enemies of their religion and their liberties. The standpoint of the author is already entirely that of Pharisaic legalism. It is precisely the scrupulous care with which she observes the laws regarding purifications and meats that is so much admired in Judith while it is plainly enough intimated that it was just for this reason that she had had God upon her side. But the story points to a time when danger threatened not only the people themselves but their religion as well. For Holofernes demands that Nebuchadnezzar should be worshipped instead of God. This is suggestive of Daniel and the Maccabaean age. Consequently the origin of the book may with great probability be referred to this period (so also Fritzsche for example and Ewald Hilgenfeld 1861 Nöldeke). Seeing that the author appears to be quite as deeply interested in political as in religious liberty probably we ought to understand him as referring not to the earlier days of the insurrection but to a somewhat later period. It would hardly be advisable to come so far down as the Roman age for the political background (the high priest as supreme head of the Jewish commonwealth the Hellenistic cities as independent towns and subject to the suzerain only to the extent of having to furnish troops in time of war) corresponds far more with the Greek than the Roman period. It is entirely out of the question to refer the composition of the book to the time of Trajan (so Hitzig Grätz and above all

Volkmar who finds in it a disguised account of Trajan's campaigns); for the story of Judith was already known to Clement of Rome (toward the end of the first century of our era).

Jerome had the book before him in a Chaldee text (see below). How far this agreed with or differed from our Greek text we are not in a position to say exactly for we have no means of knowing to what extent Jerome followed the Chaldee text when he was preparing the Latin one. In any case judging from internal grounds it is tolerably certain — and moreover almost universally acknowledged — that our Greek text is a translation of a Hebrew (or Aramaic) original (see Movers in the article mentioned below and Fritzsche Handb. p. 115 sq.).

In the time of Origen the book was not in use among the (Palestinian) Jews nor was any Hebrew text of it known to exist for in Epist. ad African. chap. xiii. he says: Ἑβραῖοι τῷ Τωβίᾳ οὐ χρῶνται οὐδὲ τῇ Ἰουδήθ: οὐδὲ γὰρ ἔχουσιν αὐτὰ ἐν ἀποκρύφοις ἑβραϊστί• ὡς ἀπ' αὐτῶν μαθόντες ἐγνώκαμεν. It may therefore be conjectured that the Hebrew original was lost at an early period and that the Chaldee text with which Jerome was acquainted was a later version based upon the Greek one. For yet later Jewish versions see Zunz Die gottesdienstl. Vorträge der Juden p. 124 sq. Lipsius "Jüdische Quellen zur Judithsage" (Zeitschr. für wissenschaftl. Theol. 1867 pp. 337-366).

Use in the Christian Church: Clement of Rome chap. lv.: Ἰουδὶθ ἡ μακαρία. Tertullian De monogam chap. xvii.: Nec Joannes aliqui Christi spado nec Judith filia Merari nec tot alia exempla sanctorum (!). Clement of Alexandria Strom. ii. 7. 35 iv. 19. 118 (Judith being expressly mentioned in the latter passage). Origen Fragm. ex libro sexto Stromatum in Jerome adv. Rufin. Book I. (Lommatzsch xvii. 69 sq.): Homo autem cui incumbit necessitas mentiendi diligenter attendat ut sic utatur interdum meudacio quomodo condimento atque medicamine; ut servet mensuram ejus ne excedat terminos quibus usa est Judith contra Holophernem et vicit eum prudenti simulatione verborum. Further quotations in Origen are to be found: Comm. in Joann. vol. ii. chap. xvi. (Lommatzsch xi. 279). In Lib. Judicum homil. ix. 1 (Lommatzsch xi. 279); De Oratione chap. xiii. (Lommatzsch xvii. 134); De Oratione chap. xxix. (Lommatzsch xvii. 246). For the further history of the use see the history of the canon.

The Greek text exists in three different recensions: (1) The original text which is that given in the majority of manuscripts and among others also in the Codex Vaticanus (marked in the critical apparatuses as No. ii.) Alexandrinus (No. iii.) and Sinaiticus (No. x.). (2) A revised text viz. that of Codex 58 (according to numbering of the manuscripts in Holmes and Parsons). It is on this text also that the Latin and Syriac versions are based. (3) Another recension though akin to the one just mentioned is to be found in Codices 19 and 108. On the editions see p. 10.

Of the early versions the following call for special mention in the case of our book as well: (1) The Latin and that (a) the Vetus Latinus (previous to Jerome) for which Sabatier collated five manuscripts in which the deviations from each other are found to be so great as entirely to corroborate what Jerome says about the multorum codicum varietas vitiosissima in his day (Sabatier Bibliorum sacrorum Latinae versiones antiquae vol. i. Remis 1748 pp. 744-790). On the relation of the texts to one another and to the Greek text see Fritzsche's Commentar p. 118 sqq. (b) Jerome's translation (= Vulgata) on the origin of which he himself says in the preface (Opp. ed. Vallarsi x. 21 sq.): Apud Hebraeos liber Judith inter apocrypha (al. hagiographa) legitur … Chaldaeo tamen sermone conscriptus inter historias computatur. Sed quia hunc librum Synodus Nicaena in numero sanctarum scripturarum legitur computasse acquievi postulationi vestrae immo exactioni et sepositis occupationibus quibus vehementer arctabar huic unam lucubratiunculam dedi magis sensum e sensu quam ex verbo verbum transferens. Multorum

codicum varietatem vitiosissimam amputavi: sola ea quae intelligentia integra in verbis Chaldaeis invenire potui Latinis expressi. According to this his own confession the work is a free rendering and one too that was executed somewhat hurriedly. It was based upon the old Latin version. Comp. Fritzsche's Commentar p. 121 sq. For the criticism of the text see Thielmann Beiträge zur Textkritik der Vulgata insbesondere des Buches Judith a school program Speier 1883. (2) The Syriac Version on which and its editions see p. 11. The London Polyglot gives in addition to the Greek text only the Latin Vulgate and the Syriac version.

For the exegetical aids generally see p. 11. Commentaries: Fritzsche Die Bücher Tobi und Judith erklärt (Exegetisches Handbuch zu den Apokryphen 2 vols.) Leipzig 1853. O. Wolff Das Buch Judith als geschichtliche Urkunde vertheidigt und erklärt Leipzig 1861. The older literature in Fabricius Biblioth. graec. ed. Harles iii. 736-738. Fürst Biblioth. Judaica ii 51 (under "Jehudit"). Volkmar Handb. der Einl. in die Apokryphen i. 1 (1860) pp. 3-5. Herzog's Real-Enc. 2nd ed. i. 496.

Special disquisitions: Montfaucon La vérité de l'histoire de Judith Paris 1690. Movers "Ueber die Ursprache der deuterokanonischen Bücher des A. T." (Zeitschr. für Philos. und kalhol. Theol. Part 13 1835 p. 31 sqq. [on Judith exclusively]). Schoenhaupt Etudes historiques et critiques sur le livre de Judith Strasb. 1839. Reuss art. "Judith" in Ersch and Gruber's Allg. Enc. § ii. vol. xxviii. (1851) p. 98 sqq. Nickes De libro Judithae Vratislav. 1854. Journal of Sacred Literature and Biblical Record vol. iii. 1856 pp. 342-363 vol. xii. 1861 pp. 421-440. Volkmar "Die Composition des Buches Judith" (Theol. Jahrbb. 1857 pp. 441-498). Hilgenfeld Zeitschr. für wissenschaftl. Theol. 1858 pp. 270-281. R. A. Lipsius ibid. 1859 pp. 39-121. Hitzig ibid. 1860 pp. 240-250. Volkmar Handbuch der Einleitung in die Apokryphen Part 1 Div. 1 Judith 1860. Hilgenfeld Zeitschr. f. wissensch. Theol. 1861 pp. 335-385. K. H. A. Lipsius "Sprachliches zum Buche Judith" (Zeitschr. f. wissensch. Theol. 1862 pp. 103-105). Ewald Gesch. des Volkes Israel vol. iv. (3rd ed. 1864) p. 618 sq. Grätz Gesch. der Juden vol. iv. (2nd ed. 1866) note 14 p. 439 sqq. R. A. Lipsius "Jüdische Quellen zur Judithsage" (Zeitschr. f. wissenschaftl. Theol. 1867 pp. 337-366). Fritzsche in Schenkel's Bibellex. iii. 445 sqq. The introductions of Jahn Eichhorn Bertholdt Welte Scholz Nöldeke De Wette-Schrader Reusch Keil Kaulen Kleinert Reuss (see p. 12).

2. The Book of Tobit

The Book of Tobit is a work of a similar character to that of Judith only it does not move in the domain of political history but in that of biography though like it it addresses its exhortations not to the people at large but to the individual reader. Tobit the son of Tobiel of the tribe of Naphtali who in the days of Shalmaneser king of Assyria had been taken captive to Nineveh relates how both before and after going into captivity even under the succeeding kings Sennacherib and Esarhaddon he and his wife Anna and his son Tobias had always lived in strict accordance with the requirements of the law. Besides this he had been particularly in the habit of interring the bodies of such of his countrymen as had been put to death by the Assyrians and allowed to lie unburied. One day after performing a kind service of this sort he lay down to sleep in the open air (in order that denied as he was by contact with a dead body he might not communicate the defilement to his house) when some sparrow's dung fell upon his eyes in consequence of which he lost his sight (1-3:6). At the same time there was living in Ecbatana in Media a pious Jwesss called Sarah the daughter of Raguel who already had had seven husbands but all of whom had been put to death on the marriage night by the evil spirit Asmodeus (3:7-17). Meanwhile the aged Tobit remembered in the midst of his distress that on one occasion he had left ten talents of silver at Rages in Media in charge of one Gabael a member of his own tribe. Consequently

when he saw that his end was approaching he sent his son Tobias to Rages with instructions to get the money which he was to retain as his patrimony. Tobias sets out taking with him a fellow-traveller this latter however being in reality no other than the angel Raphael (4-5). On his way Tobias bathes in the Tigris and while doing so he catches a fish. At the angel's behest he takes out the fish's heart liver and gall and carries them away with him. Having now reached Ecbatana they take up their quarters at the house of Raguel. This latter recognises in Tobias one of her own relations and gives him her daughter Sarah to be his wife. As soon as the new-married couple had entered the bride-chamber Tobias acting on the instructions of the angel raises a smoke by burning the heart and the liver of the fish which had the effect of expelling the demon Asmodeus who was bent on disposing of him too precisely as he had disposed of the former husbands of Sarah. Thus the fourteen days of marriage festivity were allowed to pass by without disturbance or interruption the angel having meanwhile taken the opportunity to go to Rages to get the money from Gabael (6-9). After the marriage celebrations were over Tobias returns to Nineveh to his parents accompanied by Sarah his wife and there he contrives to cure his father's blindness by anointing his eyes with the gall of the fish (10-12). Full of gratitude to God Tobit chants a song of praise and continues to live for nearly a hundred years longer. Tobias also lives to the age of 127 years (13-14).

The plot of the story is well contrived there is great variety of details and the various threads joined on at different points in the narrative are skilfully interwoven with each other. Consequently as a literary product our book is decidedly superior to that of Judith. But the religious standpoint is exactly the same. Here too as in Judith the whole stress is laid upon the strict observance of the law of which the practice of deeds of kindness also forms a part. And in connection with this we at the same time get some instructive glimpses of the superstition of the time. As the whole story centres in the dispersion it would seem from this that the author wrote mainly for the Jews of the dispersion. By holding up those patterns of excellence before the eyes of his readers he hopes to produce such an impression upon the minds of those of his countrymen scattered among the Gentiles as may lead them to adhere no less faithfully to the law and to observe it in an equally strict and conscientious manner. In consequence of the purpose of the book being as here described it is impossible to determine whether it had it? origin in Palestine or in the dispersion.

The date of the composition of the work can only be fixed within tolerably wide limits. Comparatively speaking it may be regarded as most certain of all that the book was written previous to the building of the temple of Herod. No doubt Hitzig thought (Zeitschr. für wissenschaftl. Theol. 1860 p. 250 sqq.) that we were bound to assume that it was written after the destruction of the temple by Titus because among the predictions at the close of the book it is above all foretold that the temple will be rebuilt again with great magnificence (13:16 f. 14:4 5). But on more careful consideration we will find it probable that the author wrote when the temple of Zerubbabel was still standing. He places himself at the standpoint of the Assyrian age and from this he predicts first of all the destruction of the temple by the Chaldaeans and then its reconstruction where however he distinguishes between two things: (1) the restoration of an unpretending structure till the lapse of a definite period; and (2) the rebuilding with extraordinary magnificence and splendour that is to take place at the expiry of this period (14:5: καὶ οἰκοδομήσουσι τὸν οἶκον οὐχ οἷος ὁ πρότερος ἕως πληρωθῶσι καιροὶ τοῦ αἰῶνος• καὶ μετὰ ταῦτα ἐπιστρέψουσιν ἐκ τῶν αἰχμαλωσιῶν καὶ οἰκοδομήσουσιν Ἰερουσαλὴμ ἐντίμως• καὶ ὁ οἶκος τοῦ θεοῦ ἐν αὐτῇ οἰκοδομηθήσεται εἰς πάσας τὰς γενεὰς τοῦ αἰῶνος οἰκοδομῇ ἐνδόξῳ καθὼς ἐλάλησαν περὶ αὐτῆς οἱ προφῆται). The historical structure with which the author is acquainted is therefore more unpretending than the former one the temple of Solomon (οὐχ

οἷος ὁ πρότερος). For surely he could hardly have expressed himself as he does if he was already acquainted with the temple of Herod. If this latter then forms the terminus ad quem for the composition of our book the safest course would he to say that it was written in the course of the last two centuries before Christ. For we are precluded by the whole spirit of the book from going farther back.

In preparing his Latin version of our book Jerome made use of a Chaldee text precisely as in the case of the Book of Judith (see below). Such a text is still extant in the shape of a manuscript that only at a comparatively recent date found its way into the Bodleian library at Oxford from which Neubauer took his edition (The Book of Tobit a Chaldee text etc. ed. by Neubauer Oxford 1878). Both texts the Latin of Jerome and the Chaldee one are marked by a singular peculiarity common to themselves and to themselves alone. The peculiarity in question is this that while according to the Greek text and the other versions Tobit in the first section (1:1-3:6) tells his story in the first person and only changes to the third after Sarah makes her appearance in the narrative Jerome and the author of the Chaldee text on the other hand make use of the third person from beginning to end. From this it is highly probable that Jerome had before him if not exactly our Chaldee text at all events one very much akin to it (that our Chaldee text is only the reproduction of an older one is probable for other reasons see below). But the peculiarity just referred to also serves to prove at the same time that our Chaldee text is not based upon the Greek one. For the inserting of the third person all through is clearly an afterthought while the transition from the first to the third correctly represents the original text. But there is no ground whatever for supposing that our Greek text is a version based upon a Semitic original. For the two Hebrew texts which were printed in the sixteenth century are also later products (see below). On the other hand there are numerous peculiarities of diction (for example the phrase καλὸς καὶ ἀγαθός 7:7) which serve to confirm the view that the Greek must have been the original text.

It would appear from what Origen asserts that in his time our book was not in use among the (Palestinian) Jews and that a Hebrew text was unheard of (Origen Epist. ad African. chap. xiii.; for the terms of the passage see p. 35. Idem De oratione chap. xiv. = Lommatzsch xvii. 143: τῇ δὲ τοῦ Τωβὴτ βίβλῳ ἀντιλέγουσιν οἱ ἐκ περιτομῆς ὡς μὴ ἐνδιαθήκῳ). But that it came to be received with favour not long after is proved by the existing Semitic manuscripts with one of which Jerome was already acquainted.

Its use in the Christian Church is already evidenced by the apostolic Fathers. Comp. 2 Clem. xvi. 4 = Tobit 12:8 (on which see Harnack's notes to 2 Clem.). Epist. Polycarp. x. 2 = Tobit 4:10. According to Irenaeus i. 30. 11 the Ophites included Tobias among the Old Testament prophets. Clement of Alexandria repeatedly quotes the book as γραφή (Strom. ii. 23. 139 vi. 12. 102). Hippolytus in his commentary on the story of Susannah brings in the story of Tobit by way of parallel (Hippolyt. ed. Lagarde p. 151). Origen in his Epist. ad African. refers at some length to the story of Tobias and adds quite in a general way: χρῶνται τῷ Τωβίᾳ αἱ ἐκκλησίαι. Consequently he in like manner frequently quotes it as γραφή (Comment. in epist. ad Rom. book viii. chap. xi. fin. = Lommatzsch vii. 272; De oratione chap. xi. = Lommatzsch xvii. 124; comp. besides De oratione chaps. xiv. and xxxi. = Lommatzsch xvii. 143 284; contra Cels. v. 19 = Lommatzsch xix. 196). Cyprian makes frequent use of the book (Testimon. iii. 1 6 62; Ad Fortunatum chap. xi.; De opere et eleemosynis chaps. v. and xx.). For more on this subject see the works on the history of the Canon; also Jahn's Einleit. in die göttl. Bücher des Alten Bundes 2nd ed. vol. ii. § 3 and 4 (1803) 1st and 2nd appendices.

Of the Greek text there are three recensions in existence: (1) The one found in the majority of

manuscripts and among others also in Codex Vaticanus (No. ii.) and Alexandrinus (No. iii.). To it the Syrian version adheres as far as chap. vii. 9. (2) The text of the Codex Sinaiticus (No. x.) which deviates very much from the ordinary text. To it again the old Latin version adheres though not entirely yet chiefly. (3) The text of Codices 44 106 and 107 (according to the numbering of Holmes and Parsons) which is akin to that of the Codex Sinaiticus. However this latter appears to have been adhered to by the manuscripts just mentioned only from vi. 9 to xiii. 8 while in all that precedes and follows they conform to the ordinary recension. This text again is that on which from vii. 10 onwards the Syrian version is based. Whether the ordinary text or that of the Codex Sinaiticus is the original one it is difficult to determine for the claims of both admit of being well supported. Fritzsche (Proleg. to his edition) and Nöldeke (Monatsberichte der Berliner Akademie) 1879 p. 45 sqq. decide in favour of the ordinary text while Reusch (in his separate edition; comp. also Theol. Literaturzeitung 1878 p. 333 sq.) upholds the claims of the Codex Sinaiticus. In Fritzsche's edition of the Apocrypha the whole three texts are printed alongside of each other. The text of the Codex Sinaiticus has been published separately by Reusch (Libellus Tobit e codice Sinaitico editus et recensitus Bonnae 1870). Comp. further on the editions p. 10.

Of the early versions we may mention: (1) The Latin and that (a) the old Latin one the text of which shows very considerable variations in the four manuscripts collated by Sabatier though it substantially agrees with that of the Codex Sinaiticus (Sabatier Bibliorum sacrorum Latinae versiones antiquae vol. i.). Sabatier's four manuscripts represent two recensions the one of which is contained in three of them and the other in the remaining one (Vat. 7). Fragments of a third recension are furnished by the quotations given in the Speculum Augustini (on which see Reusch Das Buch Tobias 1857 p. xxvi.) edited by Mai. The text of a certain Codex Ambrosianus has not yet been inspected. Ceriani contemplates preparing an edition of it for the Monum. sacra et profana but so far as I am aware it has not as yet appeared. The same may be said of a Münich codex which Ziegler purposes editing (Neubauer The Book of Tobit p. 10 note 6). See in general Ilgen Die Geschichte Tobt's p. 183 sqq. Fritzsche Handb. p. 11 sq. Reusch Das Buch Tobias p. 25 sqq. Sengelmann Das Buch Tobit pp. 49–56. (b) Jerome's version (= Vulgata) which was executed in circumstances similar to those under which that of Judith was prepared see Praef. in vers. libri Tob. (Vallarsi x. 1 sq.): Exigitis ut librum Chaldaeo sermone conscriptum ad Latinum stilum traham librum utique Tobiae quern Hebraei de catalogo divinarum scripturarum secantes his quae apocrypha [al. hagiographa] memorant manciparunt. Feci satis desiderio vestro.… Et quia vicina est Chaldaeorum lingua sermoni Hebraico utriusque linguae peritissimum loquacem reperiens unius diei laborem arripui et quidquid ille mihi Hebraicis verbis expressit hoc ego accito notario sermonibus Latinis exposui. A comparison of this version with the old Latin one will show that Jerome based his translation upon this latter giving a somewhat free rendering of it however much he may at the same time have kept the Chaldee text in view. Comp. Ilgen p. cxliv. sqq. Fritzsche p. xii. sq. Reusch p. xxxii. Sengelmann pp. 56–61. We have no further means of verification notwithstanding the recovery of the Chaldee text for this latter is itself simply a reproduction with greater or less accuracy of the original one. (2) The Syriac text which has come down to us (printed for the first time in the London Polyglot vol. iv.) is composed of the fragments of two different versions one of which (as far as vii. 9) followed the ordinary Greek text while the other (from vii. 10 onwards) followed the text of Codices 44 106 107. See Ilgen pp. cxxxvii. sq. clxix. sqq. Reusch p. ix. sq. Sengelmann p. 47 sq. On the editions see p. 11. The Book of Tobit is not given in the large Peschito manuscript of Milan.

(3) The Chaldee text (see p. 40 above) edited by Neubauer agrees substantially with the Greek recension of the Codex Sinaiticus on which it was probably based. But the text as we now have

it is in all likelihood only an abridged and modified form of an older Chaldee text. See besides Neubauer's edition Bickell Zeitschr. für kathol. Theol. 1878 pp. 216-222 and especially Nöldeke Monatsberichte der Berliner Akademie 1879 pp. 45-69.

(4) Lastly we have further to mention two Hebrew versions which have been frequently printed since the sixteenth century namely: (a) The so-called Hebraeus Fagii a Hebrew version based upon the ordinary Greek text published first of all at Constantinople in 1517 and then by Fagius in 1542. On this see Ilgen p. cxxxviii. sqq. Fritzsche p. 9 sq. Reusch p. xlvii. Sengelmann p. 63 sq. (b) The Codex Hebraeus Münsteri a free Hebrew version which (according to Neubauer p. 12) was published first at Constantinople in 1516 and then by Sebastian Münster in 1542. Until the discovery of the Chaldee text it was supposed that the old Latin version was based upon it (so Ilgen p. ccxvii. sqq.; Fritzsche p. 14; Reusch p. xlvii. eq.; Sengelmann p. 61 sqq.). After seeing the Chaldee text we cannot but regard it as certain that the Codex Hebraeus Münsteri is based upon it though not on that text as it has come down to us but on an older form of it. See especially Nöldeke as above; also Bickell as above. As in the Greek text so also in this older form the first person was made use of in the first three chapters and this has also been retained in the Codex Heb. Münst. Neubauer has published an excellent edition of this codex based upon a collation of two manuscripts and accompanied with an English translation (The Book of Tobit a Chaldee text etc. ed. by Neubauer Oxford 1878). Both the Hebrew texts along with a Latin translation have also found a place in the London Polyglot vol. iv. On the earlier editions comp. Wolf Bibliotheca Hebraea i. 391 sqq. ii. 413 sq. iii. 275 iv. 154. Fabricius-Harles Biblioth. graec. iii. 738 sq. Steinschneider Catalogus librorum Hebraeorum in Bibliotheca Bodleiana (1852-1860) cols. 200-202. Fürst Biblioth. Judaica iii. 425.

For the exegetical aids generally see p. 11 above. Commentaries: Ilgen Die Geschichte Tobi's nach drei verschieden Originalen dem Griechischen dem Lateinischen des Hieronymus und einem Syrischen übersetzt und mit Anmerkungen exegetischen und kritischen Inhalts auch einer Einleitung versehen Jena 1800. Fritzsche Die Bücher Tobi und Judith erklärt (Exeget. Handb. su den Apokryphen vol. ii.) Leipzig 1853. Reusch Das Buch Tobias übersetzt und erklärt Freiburg 1857. Sengelmann Das Buch Tobit erklärt Münster 1877. For the older literature consult Fabricius-Harles iii. 738 sq. Fürst Bibl. Jud. iii. 425 sq. Fritzsche p. 20. Herzog's Real-Enc. 2nd ed. i. 496.

Special disquisitions: [Eichhorn] "Ueber das Buch Tobias" (Allgem. Biblioth. der bibl. Literatur ii. 410 sqq.) Reusch. "Der Dämon Asmodäus im B. Tobias" (Theol. Quartalschr. 1856 pp. 422-445). Idem Review of Sengelmann in the Theol. Quartalschr. 1858 pp. 318-332. Journal of Sacred Literature and Biblical Record iv. 1857 pp. 59-71 vi. 1858 pp. 373-382. Hitzig Zeitschr. für wissenschaftl. Theol. 1860 pp. 250-261. Hilgenfeld ibid. 1862 pp. 181-198. Ewald Gesch. des Volkes Israel vol. iv. (3rd ed.) p. 269 sqq. Grätz Gesch. der Juden vol. iv. (2nd ed.) p. 466 sq. note 17. Kohut "Etwas über die Moral und die Abfassungszeit d. B. Tobias" (Geiger's Jüdische Zeitschr. für Wissenschaft u. Leben x. 1872 pp. 49-73; also in a separate form). Fritzsche in Schenkel's Bibellex. v. 540 sqq. Renan L'église chrétienne (1879) pp. 554-561. Gräte Monatsschr. f. Gesch. und Wissensch. des Judenth. 1879 pp. 145 sqq. 385 sqq. 433 sqq. 509 sqq. Grimm Zeitschr. f. wissenschaftl. Theol. 1881 pp. 33-56. Preiss Zeitschr. f. wissenschaftl. Theol. 1885 pp. 24-51. The introductions of Jahn Eichhorn Bertholdt Welte Scholz Nöldeke De Wette-Schrader Reusch Keil Kaulen Kleinert Reuse (see p. 12).

V. PSEUDEPIGRAPHIC PROPHECIES

The whole of the literary products hitherto mentioned were fashioned more or less after the

models of the older and by that time the canonical literature to which moreover they made the closest approximation both in point of spirit and matter. We have now a new species of literature and one that in our period was more popular and influential than any other namely the pseudepigraphic prophecies. The old prophets in their teachings and exhortations addressed themselves directly to the people and that first and foremost through their oral utterances and then but only as subordinate to these by means of written discourse as well. But now when men felt themselves impelled at any time by their religious enthusiasm to try to influence their contemporaries through their teaching and exhortations instead of directly addressing them in person like the prophets of old they did so by a writing purporting to be the work of some one or other of the great names of the past in the hope that in this way the effect would be all the surer and all the more powerful. We may venture to regard the predilection shown for the kind of medium here in question as evidence of the somewhat degenerate character of the age. It shows that there were natures of a highly religious cast who nevertheless had no longer the courage to confront their contemporaries with the proud claim to have their words listened to as the words of God Himself but who rather seemed to think it necessary to conceal themselves under the guise of some one or other of the acknowledged authorities of the olden time. And so for this reason all the writings of a prophetic character that make their appearance in our period are pseudepigraphic. They are given to the world bearing the name of an Enoch a Moses a Baruch an Ezra or of the twelve patriarchs but we do not know who the real author is of any one of them. Then the standpoint of the pseudonymous author to whom the work is ascribed is as a rule skilfully maintained throughout. The writings are composed in such a way as to make it appear as though they had actually been intended for the contemporaries of the respective personages whose names they bear. But what is addressed to those assumed contemporaries is in reality of such a nature that it concerns rather more the contemporaries of the real author himself. From his artificially assumed standpoint the writer looks on into the future and predicts often with considerable detail the future history of Israel and the world but always taking care to see that predictions stop short at his (the real author's) own time and so to arrange matters as to make it appear that this was also to be the time of judgment and of the dawn of redemption alike and all this for the purpose of serving as a warning to sinners on the one hand and to comfort and encourage the godly on the other. The fact that the alleged predictions are seen to have been already fulfilled in the previous history of Israel and the world serves at the same time to inspire confidence in the prophet so that there will now be a readier disposition to believe him when he predicts what (from the standpoint of the real contemporaries) still lies in the future.

The contents of those pseudepigraphic prophecies are of a very varied description. As in the older prophetic writings so also in these two things were as a rule combined with each other viz. instruction and exhortation. Prominence is given sometimes to the one and sometimes to the other to the former for example in the Book of Enoch to the latter in the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs. But in no case is one or other of them found to be entirely absent. The exhortation is uniformly based upon the previous instruction while the religious instruction thus imparted always aims at stimulating the reader to a behaviour of a corresponding nature. But the character of the writings varied very much according as one or other of those elements happened to predominate in them. At one time they give one more the impression of moral sermons (as for example the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs) at another they are more concerned with the unveiling of divine mysteries (as in the case of the Book of Enoch). Yet however much they may thus differ from one another they all belong so far as their essential character is concerned to one and the same category. The revelations given in them in due keeping with their hortatory purpose have reference first of all to the history of the Jewish

people and of mankind in general but they also concern themselves though only in a more subordinate way with certain theological problems such as the question regarding the connection between sin and calamity on the one hand and righteousness and prosperity on the other. But besides this they also seek to enlighten the reader with regard to the mysteries of nature the supernatural and heavenly background of the operations of the natural world. On all those matters which are more or less remotely connected with the religious life they claim to give authentic information.

The form in which those communications are clothed is that of apocalypse. They claim throughout to be supernatural revelations given to mankind by the mouth of those men of God in whose names the various writings appear. The peculiarity of this later "apocalyptic" medium as distinguished from the older genuine prophecy is this that it imparts its revelations not in clear and plain language but in a mysterious enigmatical form. The thing intended to be communicated is veiled under parables and symbols the meaning of which can only be guessed at. However the extent to which this veiling is carried is not always the same. At one time it only goes the length of the author's abstaining from mentioning the names of persons that are otherwise plainly enough indicated while at another again the whole thing is symbolical from begininng to end. Persons are represented under the symbolism of animals events in the history of the human race under that of the operations of nature. And if as sometimes happens the interpretation is added this latter again is only a less obscure form of the enigma and not a solution of it.

The majority of those writings were occasioned by times of trouble and distress or by the depressed circumstances of the people generally. It is the contradiction that is found to exist between the ideal and the actual between the promises which God has given to His people and the existing bondage and persecution which they had to endure at the hands of Gentile powers – it was this contradiction I say that impelled their authors to write those works. And where no present trouble or persecution actually existed the motive for writing may be looked for in the pessimistic view of things which they were cherishing at the time. The existing state of matters the present condition of the chosen people was felt to be a glaring contradiction to its true destiny. Such a state of things could not last an entire revolution must of necessity take place and that ere long. Such is the conviction to which expression is given in the whole of the writings now in question. They therefore owe their origin on the one hand to a pessimistic view of the present and on the other to an intense faith in the glorious future of the people. And the object at which their authors aim is to awaken and quicken the same faith in others as well. They insist that there must be no such thing as doubting but rather a clinging with all stedfastness to the belief that God will conduct His people safely through all the afflictions which He has been sending upon them in order to test and purify them and bring them at length to greatness and glory. This belief must meanwhile comfort and encourage the people in the midst of their present sufferings. But inasmuch as the revelation in question is represented as being near at hand the wicked are meant at the same time to take warning from this and repent so long as there is an opportunity to do so. For the coming judgment will be a right stern one bringing salvation to the godly and perdition to the wicked. The actual effect of those enthusiastic predictions appears to have been both powerful and lasting. Through them the Messianic hope was quickened through them the people were confirmed in the belief that they were called not to serve but to rule. But it is for this very reason that this apocalyptic literature has played so important a part in developing the political sentiments of the people. If we find that from the date of the tax imposed by Quirinius whereby Judaea was placed directly under Roman administration revolutionary tendencies among the people grew stronger and stronger

year by year till they led at last to the great insurrection of the year 66 then there cannot be a doubt that this process was essentially promoted if not exclusively caused by the apocalyptic literature.

The standpoint of the whole of those writings is essentially that of orthodox Judaism. They exhort to a God-fearing behaviour in accordance with the regulative principles of the law and deplore the tendency to disregard the law that was manifesting itself here and there. But at the same time it is not the official Judaism of the Pharisaic scribes to which expression is give here. The principal stress is laid not on what the people have to do but on what they have to expect. In regard to the former of these viz. conduct matters are treated more in their general aspect without any special stress being laid exactly upon scholastic correctness in details. We should further add that neither are these writings without numerous individual peculiarities as is only to be expected in the case of the products such as these are of an intense religious enthusiasm. However we cannot feel warranted in specifying the particular circle from which any one of those writings may be supposed to have emanated. The Essenes above all have been thought of in this connection. But what points of contact there are are far too slender to admit of our speaking even of one of the writings in question as an Essenian product. The most we can say is that they are not the product of the school but of a free religious individuality.

1. The Book of Daniel

The oldest and most original of the kind of writings now under consideration — and the one that at the same time served as a model for those of a later date — is the canonical Book of Daniel The unknown author of this apocalypse originated with creative energy those modes of representation of which the subsequent authors of similar works knew how to avail themselves. The book is the direct product of the Maccabaean struggles in the very heart of which it came into existence. With the conflict actually raging around him the author aims at encouraging and comforting his co-religionists by assuring them of speedy deliverance.

The book is divided into two parts. The first part (1-6) contains a series of hortatory narratives; the second (7-12) a series of prophetic visions. Chap. 1 rehearses how young Daniel and his three companions were brought up at the court of Nebuchadnezzar king of Babylon. We are told how in order to avoid defiling themselves by partaking of Gentile food the four young men refused to eat of the meat provided for them by the king and preferred pulse and water instead. Notwithstanding this as we further learn they seemed to thrive better than the other young men who partook of the royal fare. The hortatory object of this narrative is obvious at a glance. In chap. 2 Nebuchadnezzar the king dreams a dream and calls upon the magi not only to interpret it but also to tell him what the dream itself was. Not one however of the magi of the country is found able to do this. Daniel alone shows himself capable of performing such a feat and for this he is abundantly rewarded by the king and appointed to the office of chief of all the magi of Babylon. In the course of the interpretation of the dream it is intimated that the kingdom of Nebuchadnezzar would be succeeded by yet three other kingdoms the last of which (the Greek one) would be “split up” (into that of the Ptolemies on the one hand and that of the Seleucidae on the other) and crushed to pieces by the hand of God. In chap. 3 Nebuchadnezzar causes a golden image to be set up and orders it to be worshipped. For refusing to comply with this order Daniel’s three companions are cast into a fiery furnace but when it is found that they were not in the least injured by the flames Nebuchadnezzar sees his own folly and promotes the three young men to positions of high distinction. In chap. 4 Nebuchadnezzar publishes an edict in which he confesses how as a punishment for his impious presumption he was smitten with insanity; and how after he had duly given God the glory he is restored once more to his former

greatness. In chap. 5 Belshazzar king of Babylon and son of Nebuchadnezzar makes a great feast at which the vessels which his father had taken from the temple at Jerusalem are made use of as drinking-cups. To punish Belshazzar for this he loses both his kingdom and his life together that very night. In chap. 6 Darius king of the Medes and the conqueror and successor of Belshazzar in order to punish Daniel for praying to his own God in defiance of the king's prohibition causes him to be cast into a den of lions where however he does not sustain the slightest injury. The result of this is that Darius comes to see his own folly and issues a decree to the effect that Daniel's God is to be worshipped throughout the whole kingdom. It is no less obvious that a hortatory purpose pervades the last four of those narratives (3-6) as well while at the same time the contemporary historical background is also plainly discernible. By the three kings we are in every instance to understand Antiochus Epiphanes as being the person meant who with impious arrogance assumed such lofty airs (4) who carried off the sacred vessels from the temple at Jerusalem (5) who forbade the Jews to worship their own God (6) and commanded them to pay divine honour to the gods of the Gentiles (3). We are shown how as a judgment for his misdeeds he is given over to destruction and how on the other hand the Jews whom he persecuted are miraculously delivered. While therefore all those narratives are meant to stimulate to unfailing stedfastness the faithful people whom Antiochus was persecuting we are introduced in the second part of the book (7-12) to a series of visions in which from the standpoint of the Chaldaean period the future development of the events of the world is foretold. The whole of the visions agree in this that the monarchy which they foretell as being the last is the Greek one which ultimately resolves itself into the godless rule of Antiochus Epiphanes who though not mentioned by name is plainly enough indicated. We have above all in the last vision (from 10 to 12) a prediction of a highly detailed character in which are foretold the history of the kingdoms of the Ptolemies and the Seleucidae respectively (for it is these that are meant by the kingdom of the south and the kingdom of the north) and their manifold relations to one another. Here the most remarkable thing is that the prediction becomes more and more minute and detailed the nearer it approaches to the time of Antiochus Epiphanes. Precisely the history of this monarch is here related with the utmost minuteness without his name being once mentioned (11:21 sqq.). It is still the suppression of the Jewish worship the desecration of the temple and the erection of the heathen altar for sacrifice as well as the commencement of the Maccabaean insurrection (11:32-35) that are predicted. But at this point the predictions suddenly stop and the author now cherishes the expectation that immediately after the struggles connected with the rising in question the consummation will come and the kingdom of God begin to appear. Nor is it merely in the eleventh chapter that the predictions stop at this period but in no other part of the book does the horizon of the author ever stretch beyond it not even in the visions of the four monarchies (2 and 7). For the fourth is not the Roman Empire but the Greek monarchy as any one who candidly considers the matter will readily admit (the first being the Babylonian the second that of the Medes the third the Persian and the fourth the Greek). In presence of these facts it is admitted by all the expositors of the present day – by all that is who are not hampered by dogmatic pre-dilections – that our book was composed at the time of the Maccabaean rising or to speak more precisely between 167 and 165 B.C. that is to say before the re-consecrating of the temple for as yet this latter event lies beyond the horizon of the author. It is only as viewed in the light of this period that the book can be said to have either sense or meaning. From beginning to end it is framed with the view of exercising a practical influence precisely in such a time as this. With its various narratives and revelations it seeks on the one hand to encourage the hosts of faithful Israelites to maintain a stedfast adherence to the law and on the other to console them with the certain prospect of immediate deliverance. It is even at this very moment – such is the author's thought – when the distress is at its height that the deliverance is also nearest at hand. The days of the Gentile monarchies

are drawing to a close. The last and at the same time the most godless and criminal of them all is on the point of being annihilated through the impending miraculous breaking in on the part of God upon the current of the world's history whereupon the sovereignty of the world will be committed to the "saints of the Most High" the faithful Israelites. They will inherit the kingdom and possess it for ever and ever. That is what those who are just now so sorely oppressed and persecuted are to bear in mind for their comfort and encouragement.

The book was composed partly in Hebrew and partly in Aramaic (Chaldee) the Aramaic portion being that extending from 2:4 to 7:28. And so from this we can see that it was just then that the Aramaic came to be the prevailing dialect of Palestine while the Hebrew fell more and more into desuetude. In the course of two centuries after this viz. in the time of Jesus Christ we find that the process which at this point is thus beginning has been already fully completed (see).

The high estimation in which from the first this book was held by believing Israelites is best shown by the fact that it always continued to retain its place in the canon. Even that somewhat older work the Wisdom of Jesus the Son of Sirach was ultimately excluded from the Hebrew canon and that although in point of form and contents it approximates more closely to the early Hebrew literature than the Book of Daniel. Obviously the reason of both those facts is this that the work of Jesus the son of Sirach was published under the author's real name whereas the Book of Daniel appeared under the name of one of the older authorities. It is in fact the only literary product of its time that retained a place in the canon with the exception of a number of psalms which happened to have been previously embodied in the Psalter. We already find evidence of acquaintance with our book in the oldest of the Sibyls (Orac. Sibyll. 3:396–400 only a few decades later than Daniel); further in 1 Macc. 2:59 60 and Baruch 1:15–18.

The exegetical and critical literature of the Book of Daniel is enumerated in De Wette-Schrader's Einleitung in die kanon. und apokr. Bücher des A. T. (1869) p. 485 sq. Kleinert Abriss der Einleitung zum A. T. (1878) pp. 59–61. Reuss Gesch. der heil. Schriften Alten Testaments (1881) § 464. Graf art. "Daniel" in Schenkel's Bibellex. i. 564.

Perhaps we may be allowed in passing to offer here a small contribution toward the exposition of chap. 9:24–27. In that passage the author endeavours to explain the seventy years of Jeremiah (Jer. 25:11 12) by taking them to mean seventy weeks of years (70×7) And this number again he proceeds to break up into 7+62+1. Then as the context makes it well-nigh impossible to doubt he reckons the first seven weeks of years (therefore 49 years) at the period that would elapse between the destruction of Jerusalem and the accession of Cyrus which pretty nearly coincides with the actual number of years embraced in that period (588–537 B.C.). The subsequent sixty-two weeks of years he reckons and that with rather more nicety than before as being the period extending from the time of Cyrus to his (the author's) own day: till "an anointed one shall be cutoff" by which we have probably to understand the murder of the high priest Onias III. in the year 171. But the number of years between 587 and 171 is only 366 whereas 62 weeks of years would be equal to 434. Consequently the author has miscalculated to the extent of 70 years. Some have supposed that this is impossible and have therefore tried in various ways to evade the only interpretation of which the context will permit. But that such an error as this is actually possible is proved most conclusively by the circumstance that Josephus for example likewise falls into an error of a similar kind as may be seen from the three following passages: (1) Bell. Jud. vi. 4. 8 where he gives 639 as the number of years that elapsed between the second year of Cyrus's reign till the destruction of Jerusalem by Titus (70 A.D.). In that case the second year of Cyrus's reign would have to be the year 569 B.C. (2) Antt. xx. 10 where he makes out that there was a period of 414 years between the return from the captivity

(in the first year of Cyrus's reign) and the time of Antiochua V. Eupator (164-162). (3) Antt. xiii. 11. 1 where he calculates that 481 years elapsed between the return from the captivity (in the first year of the reign of Cyrus) and the time of Aristobulus (105-104). Consequently according to (1) the accession of Cyrus must have taken place in the year 570 B.C.. according to (2) somewhere about 578 B.C. and according to (3) in 586 B.C. whereas in point of fact it took place in 537 B.C. Josephus therefore has miscalculated to the extent of from forty to fifty years too many. A somewhat nearer approach to the numbers of Daniel is made by the Jewish Hellenist Demetrius who reckons that 573 years elapsed between the carrying away of the ten tribes into captivity and the time of Ptolemy IV. (222 B.C.) and so precisely like Daniel putting it at some seventy years too many (see the passage as given in Clement of Alexand. Strom. i. 21. 141; for more about Demetrius see § 33 below). Therefore in estimating the length of the period in question at some seventy years too much Daniel is obviously following some current view on the matter. Just at the time now under consideration there was as yet an absence of the necessary means for determining the correct chronology. In Daniel's case however the error is all the less to be wondered at that his estimating the length of the period referred to at sixty-two year weeks was simply a consequence of his interpretation of Jeremiah's prophecy.

2. The Book of Enoch

Enoch (in common with Elijah) occupies this singular position among the Old Testament men of God that when removed from the earth he was carried directly to heaven. A man of this stamp could not but appear peculiarly well fitted to serve as a medium through which to communicate to the world revelations regarding the divine mysteries seeing that he had even been deemed worthy of immediate intercourse with God. Accordingly at a somewhat early period probably as far back as the second century before Christ an apocalyptic writing appeared purporting to have been composed by Enoch which work was subsequently issued in an enlarged and revised form. This Book of Enoch was already known to the author of the Book of "Jubilees" and of the "Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs" and was afterwards a great favourite in the Christian Church. As is well known it is quoted in the Epistle of Jude (14 15) while many of the Fathers use it without hesitation as the genuine production of Enoch and as containing authentic divine revelations although it has never been officially recognised by the Church as canonical. We still find the Byzantine chronicler George Syncellus (about 800 A.D.) quoting two long passages from it (Syncell. Chron. ed. Dindorf i. 20-23 and 42-47). But after that the book disappeared and was looked upon as lost till in the course of last century the discovery was made that an Ethiopic version of it was still extant in the Abyssinian Church. In the year 1773 Bruce the English traveller brought three manuscripts of it to Europe. But it was not till the year 1821 that the whole work was given to the world through the English translation of Laurence. A German translation was issued by Hoffmann which from chap. 1 to 55 (1833) was based upon the English version of Laurence and from chap. 56 to the end (1838) on the Ethiopic version collated with a new manuscript. The Ethiopic text was published first by Laurence in 1838 and subsequently by Dillmann in 1851 after having collated it with five manuscripts. Dillmann likewise issued (1853) a new German translation in which there were material emendations and on which all disquisitions connected with this book have been based ever since. It seemed as though there were reason to hope that more light would be thrown upon this book when a small fragment of it in Greek (extending from ver. 42 to ver. 49 of chap. 89) taken from a Codex Vaticanus (cod. gr. 1809) written in tachygraphic characters was published in facsimile by Mai (Patrum Nova Biblioth. vol. ii.) and deciphered by Gildmeister (Zeitschr. der DMG. 1855 pp. 621-624). For from what was stated by Mai one was led to suppose that there was still far more in the codex than had yet been published. But alas! a fresh examination by Gebhardt revealed

the fact that the deciphered fragment was all of the Book of Enoch that it contained (Merx' Archiv vol. ii. p. 243).

But in order to be able to form something like a clear idea of the origin and character of this remarkable book it will be necessary to present to the reader a brief outline of its contents.

Chap. 1:1: Title. Enoch's benediction on the elect and the righteous. Chaps. 1-4: Introduction. Enoch rehearses the fact that he saw a vision in heaven which was shown him by the angels who communicated to him the history of all the future generations of men telling him that the wicked would be sentenced to everlasting damnation while the righteous would obtain eternal life. Chaps. 6-9 contain an account of the fall of the angels based upon the sixth chapter of Genesis though in a much more elaborate form. God ordains the kind of punishment to which the fallen angels are to be condemned and appoints the mode in which the earth is to be purged of their evil-doing and wickedness. The angels are entrusted with the task of executing both those behests. in chaps. 12-16 Enoch who mingles among the angels in heaven is commissioned by these latter to betake himself to the earth for the purpose of announcing to the fallen angels the impending judgment (here Enoch resumes the use of the first person). When he has fulfilled his commission the fallen angels prevail upon him to intercede with God in their behalf. But God refuses to entertain the intercession of Enoch who in a new and imposing vision receives a fresh commission to go and announce once more their approaching destroction. In 17-36 Enoch relates (in the first person) how he was carried over mountains water and rivers and shown everywhere the secret divine origin of all the objects and operations of nature. He also tells how he was shown the ends of the earth and the place to which the evil angels were banished; and the abode of departed spirits of the just as well as the unjust; and the tree of life which is in store for the elect righteous; and the place of punishment for the condemned; and the tree of knowledge of which Adam and Eve had eaten. Chaps. 37 to 71 record "the second vision of wisdom which Enoch the son of Jared saw" consisting of three allegories. Chaps. 38 to 44 contain the first allegory. Enoch sees in a vision the dwellings of the righteous and the resting-places of the saints. He also sees the myriads upon myriads who stand before the majesty of the Lord of spirits and the four archangels Michael Raphael Gabriel and Phanuel. He is further permitted to look upon the mysteries of heaven to see the places where the winds are kept and the receptacles for the sun and moon and lastly to behold the lightning and the stars of heaven all of which have their own special names and which names they respectively answer to. Chaps. 44 to 57 contain the second allegory. Enoch is favoured with information regarding the "Chosen One" the "Son of man" i.e. regarding the Messiah His nature and mission how He is to judge the world and establish His kingdom. Chaps. 58 to 69 contain the third allegory treating of the blessedness of the righteous and the elect; of the mysteries of the thunder and lightning; of the day on which the Chosen One the Son of man is to sit in judgment upon the world. Here several portions are inserted which interrupt the continuity and plainly show that they are interpolations by another hand. Chaps. 70-71 contain the conclusion of the allegories. In chaps. 72-82 we have "the book concerning the revolutions of the lights of heaven" or the astronomical book. Here Enoch favours us with all sorts of astronomical information which he himself had obtained from the angel Uriel. Chaps. 83 to 90 contain two visions. (a) In 83 to 84 Enoch sees in a dreadful vision the destruction (by the flood) which is awaiting the sinful world and prays God not to annihilate the whole human family (b) In 85 to 90 we have the vision of the cattle sheep wild beasts and shepherds; under the symbolism of which the whole history of Israel is predicted down to the commencement of the Messianic era. As this historical vision is the only part of the book which enables us with anything like approximate certainty to determine the date of its composition we will devote more special attention to its contents at a subsequent

stage. In chap. xci. we have Enoch's exhortation to his children to lead a righteous life (by way of conclusion to what goes before). Chap. 92 forms the introduction to the next section. In 93 and 94:12-17 Enoch enlightens us "out of the books" regarding the world-weeks. In the first week Enoch lives in the second Noah in the third Abraham in the fourth Moses in the fifth the temple is built at the end of the sixth it is destroyed again in the seventh an apostate generation arises and at the end of those weeks the righteous are instructed in the mysteries of heaven; in the eighth righteousness receives a sword and sinners are given into the hands of the righteous and a house is built for the great King; in the ninth the judgment is revealed; in the tenth and in the seventh part of it the final judgment will take place. Chaps. 94 to 105 contain woes upon the wicked and the ungodly the announcement of their certain destruction and an exhortation to cherish joyful expectations addressed to the righteous (very diffuse and full of mere repetitions). In chaps. 106 and 107 we have a narrative of the birth of Noah and what took place at it The wonderful appearance of this personage gives Enoch occasion to predict the flood. Chap. 108 contains "a further writing by Enoch" in which he tells hows he had got certain information from an angel regarding the fire of hell to which the souls of the wicked and the blaspheming are to be consigned as well as regarding the blessings that are in store for the humble and the righteous.

As may be seen from this outline of its contents this book purports to be a series of revelations with which Enoch was favoured in the course of his peregrinations through heaven and earth and of his sojourn among the heavenly spirits. These revelations he committed to writing for the benefit of mankind and transmitted them to posterity. The contents are of an extremely varied character. They embrace the laws of nature no less than the organization and history of the kingdom of God. To impart information regarding the whole of those matters is the purpose and object of this mysterious book. The work furnishes but few data that can be turned to account in the way of enabling us to make out the circumstances under which it was composed. Consequently the views that have been expressed relative to this are of a widely divergent order. Still a certain consensus of opinion has grown up with regard to at least a few leading points. In the first place we may say that the view of J. Chr. K. von Hofmann Weisse and Philippi to the effect that the entire book is the work of a Christian author (Hofmann holding that the interpolations are but of a trifling character) is confined pretty much to those writers themselves. In the case of the whole three of them the entertaining of such a view is essentially due to dogmatic reasons while in the case of Hofmann and Philippi in particular it is to be attributed to a desire to get rid of the fact that our book is quoted in the Epistle of Jude (for they would have us believe that conversely it was that passage in the Book of Jude that first suggested the writing of the book now under consideration). But speaking generally it may be affirmed that there is scarcely any modern scholar who holds that the whole work was composed by one and the same author. Even Dillmann who in his translation and exposition still continued to assume a substantial unity of authorship (the interpolations being only trifling although tolerably numerous) has – in spite of Wittichen's almost entire concurrence in it – long ago abandoned this view. He is now at one with almost all the critics in holding that the book consists of several pieces and all of them entirely different from one another. On this assumption it is almost universally admitted that the so-called "allegories" chaps. 37-71 are above all to be ascribed to a separate author (so for example Krieger Lücke 2nd ed. Ewald Dillmann latterly Köstlin Hilgenfeld Langen Sieffert Reuss Volkmar). Likewise in the case of the other leading sections of the book (1-36 and 72-108) interpolations more or less numerous are almost universally acknowledged to exist although there is considerable diversity of opinion as to where in each instance they begin and end. Again there is comparatively speaking a high degree of unanimity with regard to the date of the composition of each of those leading sections above all of the one

containing the visions (83-90). Volkmar alone has found his predilection for the time of Barcocheba too much for him in this instance as well preferring as he does to regard the portions in question as having been written by one of Akiba's disciples. All the others are agreed in holding that they belong to the second century B.C. either limiting the date to the earlier years of the Maccabaean period (so Krieger Lücke 2nd ed. Langen) or finding it further on viz. in the days of John Hyrcanus (so Ewald Dillmann Köstlin Sieffert Reuss likewise Wittichen) or even so late as the time of Alexander Jannaeus (so Hilgenfeld). But it is with respect to that section which as regards its contents is the most important of any viz. the allegories chaps. 36-71 that opinion fluctuates most of all. Here Hilgenfeld and Volkmar agree with Hofmann Weisse and Philippi thus far that in common with these latter they ascribe the section in question to a Christian author (Hilgenfeld to a Gnostic writer). All other critics refer it to some pre-Christian period Langen to the earlier days of the Maccabaean age in common with the rest of the book Ewald to somewhere about 144 B.C. Köstlin Sieffert and Dillmann (Herzog's Real-Enc. 2nd ed. xii. 351 sq.) to some date previous to 64 B.C. Krieger and Lücke to the early part of Herod's reign while Reuss refrains from suggesting any date at all.

Such unanimity as has thus far been secured may serve at the same time to give us an idea how far we can here hope to obtain results of a trustworthy character. If there is one thing more certain than another it is this that the book is not all the production of one and the same author. Not only is the section containing the allegories chaps. 37-71 undoubtedly a perfectly independent portion of the book but all the rest of the work is composed of very heterogeneous elements and obviously interspersed with a great number of longer or shorter interpolations. Confining ourselves to the leading portions of the work the following groups may be distinguished: –

1. The original writing i.e. the leading portion consisting of 1-36 72-90 but with the restriction just referred to. The only clue we get to the date of its composition is that furnished by the historical vision in chaps. 85-90. Here we have a representation of the entire history of the theocracy from Adam down to the author's own day and that under the symbolism of cattle and sheep. In a vision presented to him in a dream Enoch saw how a white ox (Adam) once sprung out of the earth; and then a white cow (Eve); and along with this latter yet other cattle a black ox (Cain) and a red one (Abel). The black ox gored the red one which thereupon vanished from the earth. But the black ox begat many other black cattle. Thereupon the cow just referred to (Eve) gave birth to a white ox (Seth) from which sprung a great many other white cattle. But stars (angels) fell from heaven and after having had intercourse with the cows of the black cattle (the daughters of Cain) they begat elephants camels and asses (the giants). And so in this way the history is proceeded with the theocratic line being always represented by the white cattle. From Jacob onwards white sheep are substituted for the white cattle. The symbolic character of the representation is patent all through while it presents hardly any difficulty in the way of interpretation till we come to the point where the sheep are attacked by wild animals i.e. till the hostile powers of Assyria and Babylon come upon the stage. For in 89:55 it is narrated how the Lord of the sheep delivered them into the hand of the lions and tigers and wolves and jackals and into the hand of the foxes and all manner of wild beasts; and how the wild beasts began to tear the sheep to pieces. And the Lord forsook their house (Jerusalem) and their tower (the temple) 89:56 i.e. He withdrew His gracious presence from them (for there is no question of the destruction of these till a much later stage). And He appointed seventy shepherds to feed the sheep and charged them to allow as many to be torn to pieces by the wild beasts as He would order them but not more (89:59 60). And he summoned "another" and commanded him to write down the number of sheep destroyed by the shepherds (89:61-64). And the shepherds fed them

“each his time” and delivered the sheep into the hand of the lions and tigers. And these latter burnt down that tower (the temple) and destroyed that house (Jerusalem 89:65 66). And the shepherds delivered to the wild beasts far more sheep than they had been ordered to do (89:68–71). And when the shepherds had fed the flock twelve hours three of those sheep came back and began to rebuild the house (Jerusalem) and the tower (the temple) chap. 89:72 73. But the sheep were so blinded as to mingle with the beasts of the field; and the shepherds did not rescue them from the hand of the beasts (89:74 75). But when five-and-thirty shepherds had fed them all the fowls of the air the eagles the hawks the kites and the ravens came and began to prey upon those sheep and to peck out their eyes and to devour their flesh (90:1 2). And again when three-and-twenty shepherds had tended the flock and eight-and-fifty times in all were completed (90:5) then little lambs were born of the white sheep and they began to cry to the sheep; but these pay no heed to them (90:6 7). And the ravens swooped down upon the lambs and seized one of them and tore and devoured the sheep till horns grew upon the lambs and above all a large horn shot out to which all the young ones betake themselves (90:8–10). And the eagles and the hawks and the kites still continue to tear the sheep to pieces. And the ravens sought to break to pieces the horn of that young sheep and struggled with it; and it strove with them. And the Lord came to the help of that young one; and all the beasts flee and fall before him (90:11–15). Here the narrative breaks off. For what follows seems for the author to lie in the future. It is only further remarked that the twelve last shepherds had destroyed more than those who had preceded them (90:17).

In their endeavours to interpret this narrative so clear and perspicuous in all the leading points the expositors seem almost to have vied with each other in trying who would misunderstand it most. Strangely enough all the earlier expositors down to Lücke inclusive have taken the first thirty-seven shepherds to mean the native kings of the kingdoms of Israel and Judah ! It is true no doubt that in the present day all are agreed that the seventy shepherds are intended to represent the period during which Israel was subjected to the away of the Gentile powers. But it is a strange misapprehension into which almost all the expositors have been betrayed when they suppose that the seventy shepherds are intended to represent a corresponding number of Gentile rulers. The whole narrative leaves no room whatever to doubt that the shepherds are rather to be understood as angels who are entrusted with the duty of seeing that only as many of the sheep are torn to pieces as God intends and no more. So far as I am aware up till the publication of the first edition of the present work Von Hofmann was the only writer who recognised this (Schriftbeweis i. 422). It is as it is impossible to doubt the wild beasts and the birds of prey that represent the Gentile rulers. Consequently the shepherds must have some other meaning altogether. But they certainly cannot be taken as representing human beings for throughout the entire vision these latter are without exception represented under the symbolism of animals whereas the angels appear even in chap. 87 under that of men. And that the shepherds are as matter of fact intended to represent angels is still further confirmed by what follows: (1) Before they commence to tend the flock they all appear before God at one and the same time and from Him receive their commission to feed the flock one after the other (89:59). How could this apply to Gentile rulers? Or are we to think of them as in a pre-existent state? (2) At the judgment they are classed along with the fallen angels (90:20 sqq.). (3) The angel that is summoned to write down the number of sheep that are destroyed is in 89:61 briefly spoken of as “another” which would surely justify us in assuming that the shepherds mentioned immediately before belong to precisely the same category as this “other.” (4) Nor can the shepherds be identified with the Gentile rulers for this further reason that according to 89:75 they are also entrusted with the duty of protecting the sheep from the wild beasts. Consequently they are evidently an impartial power placed over the sheep and the wild beasts alike or they

are meant to be so at least. The thought in the author's mind then is this that from the moment that in accordance with the divine purpose Israel was assailed and subjugated by the Gentile powers God appointed angels whose duty it was to see that these powers executed upon Israel the judgment with which He intended them to be visited; and not only so but also to see that they did not oppress and persecute Israel unduly. But the watchers neglect their duty; they allow the wild beasts to destroy a greater number than they ought to have done and as is predicted toward the conclusion they are for this to be cast into hell-fire along with the fallen angels.

It would lead to too great a digression were we to do more in the way of refuting the misapprehensions here in question. We must content ourselves with briefly stating what — following Dillmann and Ewald above all — we conceive to be the correct interpretation. The numbers in the text serve to show that the author divides the time of the duration of the Gentile supremacy into four periods arranged thus: 12 + 23 + 23 + 12 which are simply intended to denote in a general way two shorter periods (at the beginning) and two longer ones (in the middle). For every calculation pretending to chronological exactness must be radically erroneous whether with Hilgenfeld we take year-weeks or with Volkmar take decades as our basis. Nor can there be any doubt as to where the different periods are intended to begin and end. The first begins with the time when the Gentile powers (consequently that of Assyria in the first instance) began to turn against Israel and extends to the time of the return of the exiles in the reign of Cyrus the only difficulty here being as to who are meant by the three returning sheep (89:72). Probably the author here alludes to Zerubbabel Ezra and Nehemiah the less prominent colleague of Zerubbabel viz. Joshua being left out of account. The second period extends from Cyrus to Alexander the Great. For the substitution of the birds of prey for the wild beasts (90:2) plainly marks the transition from the Persians to the Greeks. The third extends from Alexander the Great to Antiochus Epiphanes. Nothing but stubborn prejudice can prevent any one from seeing that by the symbolism of the lambs (90:6) the Maccabees are to be understood. Lastly the fourth period extends from the commencement of the Maccabaean age on to the author's own day. That everything considered this latter coincides with the time of the Hasmonaean princes it is impossible to doubt. And it is very likely that by the great horn which is mentioned last it is John Hyrcanus that is referred to. Only we feel bound to agree with Gebhardt who owing to the uncertain character of the Ethiopic text warns us against being too detailed in our interpretation. But (seeing that from the beginning of the Maccabaean age onwards the times of twelve shepherds had elapsed) this may be regarded as certain that the author wrote some time in the last third of the second century B.C. If we compare the 12 + 23 + 23 + 12 times that are put down to represent the four periods with the actual duration of those periods we will find that for the eye of the author looking backwards the length of the time is foreshortened. He represents the third period (333–175 B.C.) as being of precisely the same length as the second whereas in point of fact this latter was considerably longer (537–333 B.C.). And for his eye the first period dwindles down still more. All this is exactly what we might expect in the case of one who is looking back upon the events of the past.

If we were to be allowed to assume that the author of the historical vision is in the main the author of chaps. 1–36 72–105 as well then the date of the composition of the whole of those sections would thereby be determined at the same time.

2. The allegories chaps. 37–71 (with the exception of the Noachian portions). Even on a hasty perusal one cannot fail to notice that the allegories form one distinct whole and that they are different from the remaining portions of the book. In fact there cannot be the slightest doubt but that they are the production of a different author. The use of the names of God the angelology

the eschatology and the doctrine of the Messiah differ essentially from those of the rest of the book (comp. especially Köstlin pp. 265–268). And as little can there be any room to doubt that they are of a later date than the original work. For the favourite notion of Ewald that they rank first in point of time has been sufficiently refuted by Köstlin (pp. 269–273). Among the peculiarities of the allegories we notice this in particular that a decided prominence is given in them to the Messianic hope and the person of the Messiah whereas in the other parts of the book those are matters that are touched on once or twice at the most. This again is connected with a further peculiarity to which Köstlin in particular has directed attention namely that here instead of its being the wicked and the ungodly in general who appear in contrast to the pious as is the case in the rest of the book it is rather the Gentile rulers the kings and the powerful ones of the earth (chaps. 38:4 5 46:7 8 48:8–10 53:5 54:2 55:4 62:1 3 6 9–11 63:1–12). This circumstance serves to explain why it is that precisely in these allegories such decided prominence is given to the Messianic hope. But when it may now be asked were they composed? The only passage which furnishes any clue to the date is chap. 56 where it is predicted that in the closing period the Parthians and Medes would come from the east and invade the Holy Land but that they would encounter obstacles at the holy city when they would turn upon and destroy each other (56:5–7). When Köstlin would have us infer from this passage that the writing here in question must have been composed previous to the year 64 B.C. as otherwise we should have expected that the Romans would have been mentioned as Well we may reply that such an expectation is absolutely groundless and unwarrantable. It would be much nearer the truth to conclude with Lücke that this passage presupposes what had already taken place viz. the Parthian invasion of Palestine (40–38 B.C.) the recollection of which would have some influence in shaping the author's eschatological hopes so that according to this the allegories would be composed at the very soonest in the time of Herod. On the other hand the prediction to the effect that the Parthian power would collapse outside the walls of Jerusalem presupposes that the city was still standing as otherwise it would surely have been necessary first of all to predict its restoration. But the main question now is this are the allegories of pre- or of post-Christian origin? An answer to this question is all the more desirable that it is precisely in these that we find so many points of contact with the Christology and eschatology of the Gospels. But unfortunately it is extremely difficult to arrive at any positive decision. However this much at least ought to be admitted that the view of the Messiah presented in the part of the book at present under consideration is perfectly explicable on Jewish grounds and that to account for such view it is not necessary to assume that it was due to Christian influences. Nothing of a specifically Christian character is to be met with in any part of this section. But supposing the reverse to have been the case it is to say the least of it quite incredible that a Jew would have been likely to have borrowed it and so there would be nothing for it but to pronounce at once in favour of a Christian origin. And this is what has actually been done by all those who cannot see their way to admit the pre-Christian origin of the writing (Hofmann Weisse Hilgenfeld Volkmar Philippi). But no sooner is such a view seriously entertained than the difficulties begin to accumulate. An anonymous Christian author would scarcely have been so reserved as to avoid making any allusion to the historical personality of Jesus. Surely if the writer had any object in view at all it would be to win converts to the faith. But how could he hope to accomplish this object if he always spoke merely of the coming of the Messiah in glory merely of "the Chosen One" as the Judge of the world without making the slightest reference to the fact that in the first place He would have to appear in His estate of humiliation? Surely any one who candidly weighs the arguments on the one side and on the other must feel constrained to admit that the pre-Christian origin is decidedly more probable than the Christian one. Further the objection based upon the circumstance that according to Matt. 16:13–16 John 12:34 the expression "Son of man" was not as yet a current designation for the Messiah in the time of

Christ whereas it is of frequent occurrence in this sense in the allegories is without force. For we are by no means at liberty to infer from those passages that the expression “Son of man” was not at that time currently in use as a Messianic title. In the case of the passage in John this inference is based simply upon false exegesis (see on the other hand Meyer for example). The passage in Matthew again is disposed of by the circumstance that in its original form as preserved in Mark 8:27 = Luke 9:18 the expression “Son of man” does not occur at all.

3. The Noachian portions. The investigations of Dillmann Ewald and Köstlin have already sufficiently proved that the passages 54:7-55:2 60:65-69:25 break the sequence and were only inserted among the allegories at a later period. And if further proof were needed we have it in the fact that in chap. 68:1 “The Book of the Allegories of Enoch” is expressly quoted. Those portions have been called Noachian partly because they treat of Noah and his time and partly because they purport to have been written by him. Probably chaps. 106 107 should also be included among them. Chap. 108 is an independent addition inserted at a later period. It is utterly impossible to say at what dates those various interpolations were made.

The whole Book of Enoch which was gradually put together in the way we have just stated undoubtedly owes its origin to Palestine (comp. Dillmann Einleitung p. 51). But as our present Ethiopic version is taken from the Greek it becomes a question whether this latter was the original or whether it was in turn a translation from the Hebrew or Aramaic. Certainly the numerous Hebrew names of the angels point to this latter as probable to say nothing of the fact that in the Hasmonaean age Greek was hardly ever used for literary purposes. Consequently it has been almost universally assumed that the original was composed in Hebrew or Aramaic. The only exceptions are Volkmar (Zeitschr. der DMG. 1860 p. 131) and Philippi (p. 126) who feel compelled to adopt the view that Greek was the language of the original.

For the Enoch-legend generally comp. (next to Gen. 5:18-24) Jesus the Son of Sirach 44:16 49:14; Heb. 11:5; Irenaeus v. 5. 1; Tertullian De anima chap. 1.; Hippolyt. De Christo et Antichristo chaps. xliii.-xlvii.; Evang. Nicodemi (= Acta Pilati) chap. xxv.; Historia Josephi (apoer.) chaps. xxx.-xxxii. Thilo Codex apocr. Nov. Test. p. 756 sqq. Rud. Hofmann Das Leben Jesu nach den Apokryphen p. 459 sqq. Winer Realwörtb. art. “Henoch.” Hamburger Real-Encycl. für Bibel und Talmud Part ii. art. “Henochsage.” The Bible dictionaries generally. The expositors on Revelation xi. For a great number of earlier dissertations consult Fabricius Cod. pseudepigr. Vet. Test. i. 222 sq.

To an acquaintance with our book is perhaps to be traced so early a notice as that of a Jewish or Samaritan Hellenist (probably not Eupolemus but some person unknown see § xxxiii.) which has been transmitted to us by Alexander Polyhistor and after him by Eusebius to the effect that Enoch was the inventor of astrology (Euseb. Praep. evang. ix. 17. 8 ed. Gaisford: τοῦτον εὑρηκέναι πρῶτον τὴν ἀστρολογίαν). In the Book of Jubilees not only is our book largely drawn upon but expressly mentioned (see Ewald’s Jahrbb. der bibl. Wissensch. ii. 240 sq. iii. 18 sq. 90 sq. Rönsch Das Buch der Jubiläen p. 403 sqq.). In the following nine passages in the Test. XII. Patr. express reference is made to Enoch’s prophetical writings: Simeon 5; Levi 10:14 16; Judah 18; Zebulon 3; Dan 5; Naphtali 4; Benjamin 9. Further the mention of the ἐγρήγορες (watchers = angels) in Reuben 5 Naphtali 3 may also be said to point to Enoch.

Christian testimonies: Epist. of Jude 14: ἐπροφήτευσεν δὲ καὶ τούτοις ἕβδομος ἀπὸ Ἀδὰμ Ἐνὼχ λέγων κ.τ.λ. Epist. of Barnabas iv.: τὸ τέλειον σκάνδαλον ἤγγικεν περὶ οὗ γέγραπται ὡς Ἐνὼχ λέγει. Ibid. xvi.: λέγει γὰρ ἡ γραφή (then follows a quotation from the Book of Enoch). Irenaeus iv. 16. 2: Sed et Enoch sine circumcisione placens Deo cum esset homo Dei legatione ad

angelos fungebatur et tranelatus est et conservator usque nunc testis justi judicii Dei. Tertullian De cultu feminarum i. 3: Scio scripturam Enoch quae hunc ordinem angelis dedit non recipi a quibusdam quia nec in armarium Judaicum admittitur. Opinor non putaverunt illam ante cataclysmum editam post eum casum orbis omnium rerum abolitorein salvam esse potuisse…. Tertullian then goes on to point out how this vas still quite possible after which he proceeds as follows: Sed cum Enoch eadem scriptura etiam de domino praedicarit a nobis quidem nihil omnino rejiciendum est quod pertineat ad nos. Et legimus omnem scripturam aedificationi habilem divinitus inspirari. A Judaeis potest jam videri propterea rejecta sicut et cetera fere quae Christum sonant…. Eo accedit quod Enoch apud Judam apostolum testimonium possidet. Comp. besides the whole of the introduction to chap. ii. the subject of which is taken from Enoch. Idem De cultu feminarum ii. 10: (iidem angeli) damnati a deo sunt ut Enoch refert. Idem De idololatr. iv.: Antecesserat Enoch praedicens etc. Idem De idololatr. xv.: Haec igitur ab initio praevidens spiritus sanctus (!) etiam ostia in superstitionem ventura praececinit per antiquissimum propheten Enoch. Clemens Alex. Eclogae prophet. chap. ii. (Dindorf iii. 456): "Εὐλογημένος εἶ ὁ βλέπων ἀβύσσους καθήμενος ἐπὶ Χερουβίμ" ὁ Δανιὴλ λέγει ὁμοδοξῶν τῷ Ἐνὼχ τῷ εἰρηκότι "καὶ εἶδον τὰς ὕλας πάσας." Idem Eclogae prophet. chap. liii. (Dindorf iii. 474): ἤδη δὲ καὶ Ἐνώχ φησιν τοὺς παραβάντας ἀγγέλους διδάξαι τοὺς ἀνθρώπους ἀστρονομίαν καὶ μαντικὴν καὶ τὰς ἄλλας τέχνας. Celsus in Origen Contra Cels. v. 52 endeavours to show that Christians would contradict themselves were they to maintain that Christ was the only ἄγγελος sent down into the world by God. As evidence of this he quotes the following words: ἐλθεῖν γὰρ καὶ ἄλλους λέγουσι πολλάκις καὶ ὁμοῦ γε ἑξήκοντα ἢ ἑβδομήκοντα• οὓς δὴ γενέσθαι κακοὺς καὶ κολάζεσθαι δεσμοῖς ὑποβληθέντας ἐν γῇ• ὅθεν καὶ τὰς θερμὰς πηγὰς εἶναι τὰ ἐκείνων δάκρυα κ.τ.λ. In commenting on this passage Origen (Contra Cels. v. 54 55) remarks that it is taken from the Book of Euoch. He thinks however that Celsus did not read it there himself but heard it from somebody or other for he does not mention the author's name. Origen Contra Cels. v. 54: ἐν ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις οὐ πάνυ φέρεται ὡς θεῖα τὰ ἐπιγεγραμμένα τοῦ Ἐνὼχ βιβλία (observe the plural). Idem De principiis i. 3. 3: Sed et in Enoch libro his similia describuntur. Idem De principiis iv. 35: Sed et in libro suo Enoch ita ait: "Ambulavi usque ad imperfectum" … scriptum namque est in eodem libello dicente Enoch: "Universas materias perspexi." Idem In Numer. homil. xxviii. 2 (de la Rue ii. 384 = Lommatzsch x. 366): De quibus quidem nominibus plurima in libellis qui appellantur Enoch secreta continentur et arcana: sed quia libelli isti non videntur apud Hebraeos in suctoritate haberi interim nunc ea quae ibi nominantur ad exemplum vocare differamus. Idem In Joannem vol. vi. chap. xxv. (de la Rue iv. 142 = Lommatzsch i. 241): ὡς ἐν τῷ Ἐνὼχ γέγραπται εἴ τω φίλον παραδέχεσθαι ὡς ἅγιον τὸ βιβλίον. Anatolius in Eusebius Hist. eccl. vii. 32. 19: Τοῦ δὲ τὸν πρῶτον παρ' Ἑβραίοις μῆνα περὶ ἰσημερίαν εἶναι παραστατικὰ καὶ τὰ ἐν τῷ Ἐνωχ μαθήματα. Jerome De viris illustr. chap. iv.: Judas frater Jacobi parvam quae de septem catholicis est epistolam reliquit. Et quia de libro Enoch qui apocryphus est in ea assumit testimonia a plerisque rejicitur etc. Idem Comment. in Epist. ad Titum i. 12 (Vallarsi vii. 1. 708): Qui autem putant totum librum debere sequi eum qui libri parte usus sit videntur mihi et apocryphum Enochi de quo apostolus Judas in epistola sua testimonium posuit inter ecclesiae scripturas recipere. In the so-called stichometry of Nicephorus and in the Synopsis Athanasii the Book of Enoch is classed with the Apocrypha (Credner Zur Geschichte des Kanons pp. 121 145). So also in the anonymous list of the canonical books which has been edited by Montfaucon Cotelier Hody and Pitra respectively (see v. 7 below). Constit. apostol. vi. 16: καὶ ἐν τοῖς παλαιοῖς δέ τινες συνέγραψαν βιβλία ἀπόκρυφα Μωσέως καὶ Ἐνὼχ καὶ Ἀδὰμ Ἠσαΐου τε καὶ Δαβὶδ καὶ Ἠλία καὶ τῶν τριῶν πατριαρχῶν φθοροποιὰ καὶ τῆς ἀληθείας ἐχθρά. For yet other testimonia patrum consult Fabricius Codex pseudepigr. Vet. Test. i. 160-223 ii 55-61. Philippi Das Buch Henoch p. 102 sqq. Also the two large fragments from Syncellus in Dillmann Das

Buch Henoch pp. 82-86.

Editions of the Ethiopic text: Laurence Libri Enoch versio Aethiopica Oxoniae 1838. Dillmann Liber Henoch Aethiopice ad quinque codicum fidem editus cum variis lectionibus Lipsiae 1851.

Versions: (1) English ones: Laurence The Book of Enoch an apocryphal production supposed to have been lost for ages but discovered at the close of the last century in Abyssinia now first translated from an Ethiopic MS. in the Bodleian Library Oxford 1821. Schodde The Book of Enoch translated with Introduction and Notes Andover 1882. (2) German ones: Hoffmann (Andreas Gottlieb) Das Buch Henoch in vollständiger Uebersetzung mit fortlaufendem Commentar ausführlicher Einleitung und erläuternden Excursen 2 vols. Jena 1833-1838. Dillmann Das Buch Henoch übersetzt und erklärt Leipzig 1853.

Critical inquiries: Laurence in his English translation. Hoffmann (Andr. Gottl.) art. "Henoch" in Ersch and Gruber's Encycl. § 2 vol. v. (1829) pp. 399-409. Idem in his German translation. Gfrörer Das Jahrhundert des Heils (also under the title Gesch. des Urchristenthums vol. i-ii 1838) i. 93-109. Wieseler Die 70 Wochen und die 63 Jahrwochen des Propheten Daniel 1839 p. 162 sqq. Krieger (Lützelberger) Beiträge zur Kritik und Exegese Nürnberg 1845. Lücke Einleitung in die Offenbarung des Johannes (2nd ed. 1852) pp. 89-144; comp. 1171-1173. Hofmann (J. Chr. K.) "Ueber die Entstehungszeit des Buch Henoch" (Zeitschr. der deutschen morgenländ. Gesellsch. vol. vi. 1852 pp. 87-91). Idem Schriftbeweis (2nd ed.) i. 420-423. Idem Die heil. Schrift N. T.'s zusammenhängend untersucht vii. 2 p. 205 sqq. Dillmann in his German translation. Idem in Herzog's Real-Enc. 1st ed. xii. 308-310. Idem Zeitschr. DMG. 1861 pp. 126-131. Idem in Schenkel's Bibellex. iii. (1871) pp. 10-13. Idem in Herzog's Real-Enc. 2nd ed. xii. (1883) pp. 350-352. Ewald "Abhandlung über des äthiopischen Buches Henókh Entstehung Sinn und Zusammensetzung" (Abhandlungender königl. Gesellsch. der Wissensch. zu Göttingen vol. vi. 1853-1855 Historico-philosoph. section pp. 107-178. Also separate reprint). Idem Gesch. des Volkes Israel 3rd ed. iv. 451 sqq. Weisse Die Evangelienfrage (1856) pp. 214-224. Köstlin "Ueber die Entstehung des Buchs Henoch" (Theol. Jahrbücher 1856 pp. 240-279 370-386). Hilgenfeld Die jüdische Apokalyptik (1857) pp. 91-184. Idem Zeitschr. für wissenschaftl. Theol. vol. iii. 1860 pp. 319-334; iv. 1861 pp. 212-222; v. 1862 pp. 216-221; xv. 1872 pp. 584-587. Volkmar "Beiträge zur Erklärung des Buches Henoch nach dem äthiopischen Text" (Zeitschr. der DMG. vol. xiv. 1860 pp. 87-134 296). Idem in Der Zeitschr. für wissensch. Theol. vol. iv. 1861 pp. 111-136 422 sqq.; v. 1862 p. 46 sqq. Idem Eine Neutestamentliche Entdeckung und deren Bestreitung oder die Geschichte-Vision des Buches Henoch im Zusammenhang Zürich 1862. Geiger Jüdische Zeitschr. für Wissensch. und Leben for year 1864-65 pp. 196-204. Langen Das Judenthum in Palästina (1866) pp. 35-64. Sieffert Nonnulla ad apocryphi libri Henochi originem et compositionem nec non ad opiniones de regno Messiano eo prolatas pertinentia Regimonti Pr. 1867 (the same work under the title De apocryphi libri Henochi origine et argumenta Regimonti Pr. s. a.). Hallévi "Recherches sur la langue de la redaction primitive du livre d'Enoch" (Journal asiatique 1867 April-May pp. 352-395). Philippi Das Bach Henoch sein Zeitalter und sein Verhältniss zum Judasbriefe Stuttg. 1868. Wittichen Die Idee des Menschen (1868) pp. 63-71. Idem Die Idee des Reiches Gottes (1872) pp. 118-133 145-148 149 sq. Gebhardt "Die 70 Hirten des Buches Henoch und ihre Deutungen mit besonderer Rücksicht auf die Barkochba-Hypothese" (Merx' Archiv für wissenschaftl. Erforschung des A. T. vol. ii. part 2 1872 pp. 163-246). Tideman "De apocalypse van Henoch en het Essenisme" (Theol. Tijdschrift 1875 pp. 261-296). Drummond The Jewish Messiah (1877) pp. 17-73. Lipsius art. "Enoch." in Smith and Wace's Dictionary of Christian Biography vol. ii. (1880) pp. 124-128. Reuss Gesch. der heil. Schriften A. T.'s § 498-500. Wieseler "Zur

Abfassungszeit des Buchs Henoch" (Zeitschr. der DMG. 1882 pp. 185-193).

3. The Assumptio Mosis

It had long been known from a passage in Origen (De princip. iii. 2. 1) that the legend referred to in the Epistle of Jude (ver. 9) regarding a dispute between the archangel Michael and Satan about the body of Moses was taken from an apocryphal book entitled the Ascensio Mosis. Some little information regarding this Ἀνάληψις Μωυσέως had also been gleaned from quotations found in the Fathers and subsequent writers (see below). But it was not till somewhat recently that a large portion of this work in an old Latin version was discovered in the Ambrosian Library at Milan by Ceriani and published by him (1861) in the first part of his Monumenta. It is true the fragment bears no title but its identity with the old Ἀνάληψις Μωυσέως is evident from the following quotation (Acta Synodi Nicaenae ii. 18 in Fabricius i. 845): Μέλλων ὁ προφήτης Μωυσῆς ἐξιέναι τοῦ βίου ὡς γέγραπται ἐν βίβλῳ Ἀναλήψεως Μωυσέως προσκαλεσάμενος Ἰησοῦν υἱὸν Ναυὴ καὶ διαλεγόμενος πρὸς αὐτὸν ἔφη• Καὶ προεθεάσατό με ὁ θεὸς πρὸ καταβολῆς κόσμου εἶναί με τῆς διαθήκης αὐτοῦ μεσίτην These same words also occur in Ceriani's fragment i. 14: Itaque excogitavit et invenit me qui ab initio orbis terrarum praeparatus sum ut sim arbiter testamenti illius. Since its publication by Ceriani this writing has been edited by Hilgenfeld (clementis Romani Epist. 1866 2nd ed. 1876) Volkmar (Latin and German 1867) Schmidt and Merx (Merx' Archiv 1868) and Fritzsche (Libri apocr. 1871). A rendering back into the Greek from which the Latin version had been taken was executed by Hilgenfeld (Zeifsckr. 1868 and Messias Judaeorum 1869).

The following is an outline of the contents of the writing (and here we adopt Hilgenfeld's division of the chapters which is also adhered to by Schmidt-Merx and Fritzsche and departed from by Volkmar alone): —

Chap. 1:1-9. The introduction in which we are given to understand that what follows was an address which Moses gave to Joshua when he appointed him to be his successor at Ammon beyond Jordan. In 1:10-17 Moses discloses to Joshua the fact that the course of his life has come to an end and that he is on the point of departing to his fathers. By way of legacy he hands over to Joshua certain books of prophecies which he is requested to preserve in a place appointed by God for the purpose. In chap. 2 Moses reveals to Joshua in brief outline the future history of Israel from the entrance into Palestine down to the destruction of the kingdoms of Israel and Judah. In chap. 3 it is stated that a king (Nebuchadnezzar) will come from the east and destroy the city and the temple with fire and carry away the inhabitants into his own domains. The captives will then remember that all this had been already foretold by Moses. Chap. 4. In answer to the prayers of a man who is over them (Daniel) God will again take pity upon them and raise up a king (Cyrus) who will allow them to return to their native land. A few fragments of the tribes will return and will rebuild the holy place and will remain stedfast in their allegiance to the Lord only sad and sighing because they cannot sacrifice to the God of their fathers. Chap. 5. And judgment will overtake their kings (their Gentile rulers). But they themselves (the Jews) will be divided in regard to the truth. And the altar will be defiled by men who are not (true) priests but slaves born of slaves. And their scribes (magistri [et] doctores eorum) will be partial and will pervert justice. And their land will be full of unrighteousness. Chap. 6. Then kings will arise among them and priests of the Most High God will be appointed who will nevertheless commit wickedness even in the very holy of holies itself (plainly alluding to the Hasmonaeans). And these will be succeeded by an insolent monarch not belonging to the family of the priests an arrogant and ungodly man. And he will deal with those who have preceded him as they deserve. He will cut off their proud ones with the sword and bury their

bodies in secret places so that nobody will know where they have been laid. He will put to death old and young alike and will not spare. Then there will be great dread of him among them throughout the land and he will sit in judgment upon them as did the Egyptians for four-and-thirty years (all which obviously points to Herod the Great). And he will beget sons who will reign though for shorter periods as his successors. Cohorts of soldiers will come into their land and a powerful monarch of the West (Quintilius Varus) who will conquer them and take them captive and destroy a part of their temple with fire while some of them he will crucify around their city. Chap. 7. After this will come the end of the times. Their course will have run after the expiry of yet four hours … (then follow several lines in the manuscript that are hardly legible). And there will reign among them wicked and ungodly men who say that they are righteous. They are deceitful men who will live only to please themselves dissemblers in all their concerns and at every hour of the day lovers of feasts mere gluttons … (here again follows a hiatus). They devour the possessions of the poor and declare that they do this out of pity. Their hands and their minds indulge in impurity and their mouth utters high-sounding things; and further they say "touch me not lest thou defile me." … Chap. 8. Vengeance and wrath will come upon them such as has never been among them from the beginning till the time when he will raise up to them the king of kings (Antiochus Epiphanes) who will crucify those who profess circumcision and will cause them to get their children uncircumcised again and to carry about the impure idols in public and to contemn the word. Chap. 9. Then in obedience to the command of that king there will appear a man of the tribe of Levi whose name will be taxo who will have seven sons to whom he will say: Behold my sons vengeance has once more come upon the people a cruel vengeance without one touch of pity. For what nation of the ungodly has ever had to endure anything equal to what has befallen us? Now listen my sons and let us do this: Let us fast three days and on the fourth let us go into a cave which is in the field and die there rather than transgress the commandments of our Lord the God of our fathers. Chap. 10. And then will His kingdom appear throughout His whole creation. Then will the devil have an end and sorrow will disappear along with him. For the Heavenly One will rise up from His throne. And the earth will tremble the sun will withhold its light and the horns of the moon will be broken. For God the Most High will appear and He will punish the Gentiles. Then wilt thou be happy O Israel and God will exalt thee. And now Joshua (and here Moses turns again to address his successor) keep these words and this book. As for me I am going to the resting-place of my fathers. Chap. 11 then goes on to relate how after this address was ended Joshua turned to Moses and lamented over the prospect of his departure and regretted that in consequence of his own weakness and incompetency he would not be equal to the great task that had been imposed upon him. Thereupon chap. 12 proceeds to tell how Moses exhorted Joshua not to under-estimate his ability and not to despair of the future of his people seeing that however much they might be punished for their sins they could never be utterly destroyed.

Here the manuscript ends. But all that has gone before leads us to expect what the fragments tend to confirm that in the subsequent portion of the book it had gone on to give an account of how Moses was taken away from the earth the scene from which the whole work obtained the title of the Ἀνάληψις Μωυσέως. It is also in this concluding part of the work that the dispute between the archangel Michael and Satan about the body of Moses must have occurred which dispute as is well known is also mentioned in verse 9 of the Epistle of Jude.

Opinion is very much divided regarding the date of the composition of this book. Ewald Wieseler Drummond and Dillmann refer it to the first decade after the death of Herod; Hilgenfeld calculates that it may have been written in the course of the year 44–45 A.D.; Schmidt and Merx say some time between 54 and 64 A.D.; Fritzsche and Lucius trace it to the sixth decade of the

first century A.D.; Langen thinks it must have been shortly after the destruction of Jerusalem by Titus (chap. 8 being erroneously interpreted as referring to this event); Hausrath prefers the reign of Domitian; Philippi the second century of our era (the latter fixing on this date solely with the object of his being able to ascribe the authorship to a Christian and of reversing the relation in which our book and ver. 9 of the Epistle of Jude stand to each other; see in particular pp. 177 182); while Volkmar (in accordance with his well-known predilection for the time of Barcocheba) thinks the date would be some time in the course of the year 137–138 A.D. Almost the whole of the critics just mentioned base their calculation upon the well-nigh illegible fragments of numbers in chap. 7. But surely one may fairly question the propriety of trying to found anything whatever upon lines so mutilated as those are; and if we had no other data but these to help us to fix the date in question we would have nothing for it but to abandon the attempt altogether. Still I cannot help thinking that there are two such data at our disposal. (1) Toward the end of chap. 6 it is plainly stated that the sons of Herod are to reign for a shorter period (breviora tempora) than their father. Now it is well known that Philip and Antipas reigned longer than their father; and one cannot help seeing the embarrassment to which those words have led in the case of all those critics who refer the composition of our book to a latish date. They are capable of being explained solely on the assumption that the work was written toward the commencement of the reign of the last-mentioned princes. (2) It is as good as universally admitted that the concluding sentences of chap. 6 refer to the war of Varus in the year 4 B.C. When therefore chap. 7 goes on to say: Ex quo facto finientur tempora surely there can hardly be room for any other inference than this that the author wrote subsequent to the war of Varus. In that case the enigmatical numbers that follow in this same chapter cannot be supposed to be a continuation of the narrative but are to be regarded as a calculation added by way of supplement after the narrative has been brought down to the date at which the author was writing. Only considering how mutilated those numbers are every attempt to explain them must prove a failure. Consequently the view of Ewald Wieseler Drummond and Dillmann with regard to the date of the composition of our book is substantially correct.

Some light is thrown upon the author's party leanings partly by chap. 7 and partly by chap. 10. The homines pestilentiosi against whom he inveighs in chap. 7 are by no means the Herodian princes (so Hilgenfeld) nor the Sadducees (so Volkmar p. 105; Geiger p. 45 sq.; Lucins p. 116 sqq.). nor the Sadducees and Pharisees (so Wieseler p. 642 sq. who refers vv. 3 4 to the former and vv. 6–10 to the latter); bat the Pharisees and the Pharisees alone to whom every word is unmistakably applicable (so Ewald Gesch. v. 81; Schmidt-Merx p. 121; Philippi p. 176). Our author then was inimical to the Pharisees though at the same time he was neither an Essene for as such he would not have jeered as he does in chap. 7 at the Pharisaical purifications (Joseph. Bell. Jud. ii. 8. 10) nor a Sadducee for according to chap. 10 he looks forward with the most fervent longings for the advent of the kingdom of God and that too a kingdom accompanied with outward pomp and circumstance. Wieseler is perhaps nearest the truth in seeking him among the Zealots who notwithstanding their kinship to the Pharisees had still an intense dislike to them because they looked upon them as being too dogmatic and formal as regards the law and too undecided with respect to their politics. That the book was written in Palestine may to say the least of it be accepted as the most obvious and natural supposition. Hilgenfeld and Hausrath have suggested Rome without however alleging any ground for doing so. On the assumption that it was composed in Palestine it becomes further probable that it was written originally in Hebrew or Aramaic. But we are not in a position positively to assert this. Only this much is certain that our old Latin version was taken from the Greek.

Of the legend regarding the death of Moses extensive and varied use has been made in Jewish

literature. Besides our book there fall to be mentioned: Philo (Vita Mosis) Josephus (Antt. iv. fin.) Midrash Tanchuma debarum (translated into German by Wünsche 1882) and a Midrash which treats specially of the departure of Moses (פטירת משה Petirath Moshe). This latter has been frequently published in two recensions among others by Gilb. Gaulminus Paris 1629 with a Latin translation; then this Latin translation was published by itself by John Alb. Fabricius Hamburg 1714 and by Gfrörer Prophetae veteres pseudepigraphi Stuttg. 1840 (see Wolf Bibliotheca Hebraea ii. 1278 sq. 1395. Zunz Die gottesdienstliches Vorträge der Juden p. 146. Steinschneider Catal. librorum Hebraeorum in Biblioth. Bodl. p. 630 sq.). For one of these two recensions see also Jellinek Beth ha-Midrash vol. i. 1853. Also a third which Jellinek regards as the oldest in his Beth ha-Midrash vol. vi. 1877. Comp. in general on these legends: Bernard's edition of Josephus note on Antt. iv. fin. Fabricius Cod. pseudepigr. Vet. Test. i. 839 sqq. Beer Leben Moses nach Auffassung der jüdischen Sage Leipzig 1863. Benedetti Vita e morte di Mosé leggende ebr. tradotte illustrate e comparate Pisa 1879 (on which see Magazin für die Wissensch. des Judenth. 1881 pp. 57-60). Leop. v. Ranke Weltgeschichte vol. iii. 2nd part (1883) pp. 12-33.

Care must be taken not to confound our Assumptio Mosis with the Christian Apocalypse of Mosis in Greek which has been edited by Tischendorf (Apocalypses apocryphae Lips. 1866); similarly from a Milanese manuscript by Ceriani Monumenta sacra et profana v. 1. This work belongs to the class of Adamic books for it records the history of the life and death of Adam as it had been revealed to Moses. On this comp. Tischendorf Stud. u. Krit. 1851 p. 432 sqq. Le Hir Etudes Bibliques (1869) ii. pp. 110-120. Rönsch Das Buch der Jubiläen p. 470 sqq. According to Euthalius and others Gal. 6:15 (οὔτε περιτομή τι ἐστιν οὔτε ἀκροβυστία ἀλλὰ καινὴ κτίσις) found a place in an Apocryphum Mosis where of course it could only have been borrowed from the Epistle to the Galatians (Euthalius in Zaccagni's Collectanea monumentorum veterum 1698 p. 561 = Gallandi Biblioth. patr. x. 260. Similarly Syncellus ed. Dindorf i. 48 and an anonymous list of the quotations in the New Testament given in Montfaucon Bibliotheca Bibliothecarum i. 195 = Diarium Italicum p. 212 and in Cotelier Patr. apost. note on Const apost. vi. 16). Now seeing that Euthalius also makes use of precisely the same formula of reference (Μωυσέως ἀποκρύφου) as in the case of verse 9 of the Epistle of Jude (Zaccagni p. 485) we may perhaps venture to assume that he had before him a Christian version of the Assumptio Mosis in which Gal. 6:15 had been inserted. Syncellus and the author of the anonymous list just referred to have clearly drawn upon Euthalius. Gnostic Books of Moses are mentioned as being in use among the Sethites by Epiphan. Haer. xxxix. 5. For Apocrypha Mosis generally see Const. apost. vi. 16. Fabricius Cod. pseudepigr. Vet. Test. i. 825-849 ii. 111-130. Lücke Einleitung in die Offenbarung Johannis pp. 232-235. Dillmann art. "Pseudepigraphen" in Herzog's Real-Enc. 2nd ed. xii. 352 sqq. (Nos. 4 18 26 29 35).

Use of the Assumptio Mosis in the Christian Church: Epistle of Jude ver. 9. Clement of Alexandria Adumbrat. in epist. Judae (in Zahn's Supplementum Clementinum 1884 p. 84): Hic confirmat assumptionem Moysi. Other legends in Clement of Alexandria regarding the death and ascension of Moses have in all probability been borrowed no less from our writing (Strom. i. 23. 153 vi. 15. 132. Comp. Zahn p. 96 sq.). Origen De principiis iii. 2. 1: Et primo quidem in Genesi serpens Evam seduxisse describitur de quo in Adscensione Mosis cujus libelli meminit in epistola sua apostolus Judas Michael archangelus cum diabolo disputans de corpore Mosis ait a diabolo inspiratum serpentem causam exstitisse praevaricationis Adae et Evae. Idem In Josuam homil. ii. 1 (ed. Lommatzsch xi. 22): Denique et in libello quodam licet in canone non habeatur mysterii tamen hujus figura describitur. Refertur enim quia duo Moses videbantur: unus vivus in spiritu alius mortuus in corpore. Didymus Alex. In epist. Judae enarratio (in

Gallandi Biblioth. patr. vi. 307) finds in Jude ver. 9 evidence in favour of the view that even the devil is not evil by nature or substantialiter and alleges that the adversarii hujus contemplationis praescribunt praesenti epistolae et Moyseos assumptioni propter eum locum ubi significatur verbum Archangeli de corpore Moyseos ad diabolum factum. Acta Synodi Nicaen. ii. 20 (in Fabricius i. 844): Ἐν βιβλίῳ δὲ Ἀναλήψεως Μωυσέως Μιχαὴλ ὁ ἀρχάγγελος διαλεγόμενος τῷ διαβόλῳ λέγει κ.τ.λ. For another passage from these same Acts see p. 74 above. Evodii epist. ad Augustin. (Augustin. epist. cclix. in Fabricius i. 845 sq.): Quanquam et in apocryphis et in secretis ipsius Moysi quae scriptura caret auctoritate tunc cum ascenderet in montem ut moreretur vi corporis efficitur ut aliud esset quod terrae mandaretur aliud quod angelo comitanti sociaretur. Sed non satis urget me apocryphorum praeferre sententiam illis superioribus rebus definitis. For additional passages and chiefly from Greek scholia see Rönsch Zeitschr. für wissenschaftl. Theol. 1869 pp. 216-220. Hilgenfeld Clementis Romani epist. 2nd ed. pp. 127-129. In the lists of the apocryphal books we find a Διαθήκη Μωυσέως and an Ἀνάληψις Μωυσέως (the one immediately after the other in the stichometry of Nicephorus and in the "Synopsis Athanasii" as given in Credner's Zur Geschichte des Kanons pp. 121 145; as also in the anonymous list edited by Pitra and others see v. 7 below). Now seeing that the writing that has come down to us is in point of fact a "Testament (will) of Moses" though as we have already seen it is quoted in the Acts of the Council of Nicaea under the title Ἀνάληψις Μωυσέως it may be assumed that both these designations were the titles of two separate divisions of one and the same work the first of which has been preserved whereas the quotations in the Fathers almost all belong to the second.

Editions of the Latin text: Ceriani Monumenta sacra et prof. vol. i. fasc. i. (Milan 1861) pp. 55-64. Hilgenfeld Clementis Romani epistulae (likewise under the title Novum Testam. extra canonem receptum fasc. i.) 1st ed. 1866 pp. 93-115 2nd ed. 1876 pp. 107-135. Volkmar Mose Prophetie und Himmelfahrt eine Quelle für das Neue Testament zum erstenmale deutsch herausgegeben im Zusammenhang der Apokrypha und der Christologie überhaupt Leipzig 1867. Schmidt (Moriz) and Merx "Die Assumptio Mosis mit Einleitung und erklärenden Anmerkungen herausgegeben" (Merx' Archiv für wissenschaftl. Enforschung des A. T.'s vol. i. Part ii. 1868 pp. 111-152). Fritzsche Libri apocryphi Vet. Test. graece (Lips. 1871) pp. 700-730; comp. Prolegom. pp. 32-36. A rendering back into the Greek was attempted by Hilgenfeld for which see Zeitschr. für wissensch. Theol. 1868 pp. 273-309 356 and his Messias Judaeorum 1869 pp. 435-468; comp. Prolegom. pp. 70-76.

For contributions toward the criticism and exposition of our book see besides the editions just mentioned Ewald Göttinger gelehrte Anz. 1862 St. 1. Idem Gesch. des Volkes Israel vol. v. (3rd ed. 1867) pp. 73-82. Langen Das Judenthum in Palästina (1866) pp. 102-111. Idem in Reusch's Theolog. Literaturbl. 1871 No. 3. Hilgenfeld Zeitschr. für wissensch. Theol. 1867 pp. 217-223. Ibid. Haupt p. 448. Rönsch Zeitschr. f. wiss. Theol. vol. xi. 1868 pp. 76-108 466-468; xii. 1869 pp. 213-228; xiv. 1871 pp. 89-92; xvii. 1874 pp. 542-562; xxviii. 1885 pp. 102-104. Philippi Das Buch Henoch (1868) pp. 166-191. Colani "L'Assomption de Moïse" (Revue de Théologie 1868 2nd part). Carriere Note sur le Taxo de l'Assomption de Moïse (ibid. 1868 2nd part). Wieseler "Die jüngst aufgefundene Aufnahme Moses nach Ursprung und Inhalt untersucht" (Jahrbb. für deutsche Theol. 1868 pp. 622-648). Idem "Θασσί und Taxo" (Zeitschr. der deutschen morgenländ. Gesellsch. 1882 p. 193 sq.). Geiger's Jüdische Zeitschr. für Wissensch. und Leben 1868 pp. 41-47. Heidenheim "Beiträge zum bessern Verständniss der Ascensio Mosis" (Vierteljahrschr. für deutsch. und Englisch-theol. Forschung und Kritik vol. iv. (Part I. 1869). Hausrath Neutestamentl. Zeitgesch. 2nd ed. iv. pp. 76-80 (1st ed. iii. 278-282). Stähelin Jahrbb. für deutsche Theol. 1874 pp. 216-218. Drummond The Jewish Messiah (1877) pp. 74-84.

Lucius Der Essenismus (1881) pp. 111-119 127 sq. Reuss Gesch. der heil. Schriften A. T.'s § 572. Dillmann art. "Pseudepigraphen" in Herzog's Real-Enc. 2nd ed. xii. 352 sq. Deane "The Assumption of Moses" (Monthly Interpreter March 1885 pp. 321-348).

4. The Apocalypse of Baruch

The large Peshito manuscript of Milan (Cod. Ambros. B. 21 inf.) also contains a Revelation of Baruch regarding which we have no further information of a trustworthy kind. Only a small fraction of it viz. the epistle addressed to the nine and a half tribes in the captivity inserted at the close (chaps. 78-86) has been otherwise transmitted to us and already printed in the Paris and London Polyglots. But beyond this there is hardly any other trace of it to be met with (see below). The book was first introduced to public notice through a Latin version prepared and edited by Ceriani (1866). This scholar subsequently published the Syrian text itself (in ordinary type in 1871 and in a photo-lithographed facsimile in 1883). Fritzsche after making a few emendations upon it embodied Ceriani's Latin version in his edition of the Apocrypha (1871). The book purports to be a writing composed by Baruch in which he recounts (using the first person throughout) what happened to him immediately before and after the destruction of Jerusalem and what revelations were made to him. The contents are substantially as follows: — First section chaps. 1-5: In the five and twentieth year of the reign of Jeconiah [a complete confounding of dates by which the author means to indicate the time of the destruction of Jerusalem] God intimates to Baruch the impending ruin of Jerusalem and the kingdom of Judah. Chaps. 6-8: On the following day the Chaldean army appears before the walls of the city. However it is not the Chaldeans but four angels that destroy it. No sooner is this done than the Chaldeans enter the city and carry away its inhabitants into captivity. Chaps. 9-12: While Jeremiah accompanies these latter Baruch. in obedience to the command of God remains behind among the ruins. Second section chaps. 13-15: After he had fasted seven days God informs him that one day judgment would overtake the Gentiles as well and that in his own time; and He calms his apprehensions generally about the prosperity of the ungodly and the calamities of the righteous. Chaps. 16-20: Baruch brings forward yet further grounds of perplexity but God discourages his doing so and ultimately orders him to prepare by another seven days' fasting for receiving a revelation of the order of the times. Third section 21-26: After fasting and praying to God he is first of all censured by God for his doubts and pusillanimity and then in answer to his question as to when the judgment of the ungodly would take place and how long it would last God communicates to him the following (chaps. 27-28): The time of the tribulation will be divided into twelve parts and each part will bring with it its own special disaster. But the measure of that time will be two parts weeks of seven weeks (duae partes hebdomades septem hebdomadarum). Chaps. 28-30: To the further question of Baruch whether the tribulation would be confined to only one part of the earth or extend to the whole of it God answers that it will of course affect the whole earth. But after that the Messiah will appear and times of joy and glory begin to dawn. Chaps. 31-34: After receiving those revelations Baruch summons a meeting of the elders of the people in the valley of Kidron when he announces to them that: post modicum tempus concutietur aedificatio Sion ut aedificetur iterum. Verum non permanebit ipsa illa aedificatio sed iterum post tempus eradicabitur et permanebit desolata usque ad tempus. Et postea oportet renovari in gloria et coronabitur in perpetuum. Fourth section chaps. 35-38: Hereupon Baruch as he sits lamenting upon the ruins of the Holy of holies falls asleep and in a dream is favoured with a new revelation. He sees a large forest surrounded by mountains and rocks. Over against it grew a vine and from under the vine flowed a spring which developed into large streams that made channels for themselves underneath the forest and the mountains till these latter fell in and were swept away. Only a single cedar was

left but at last it too was uprooted. Thereupon the vine and the spring came and ordered the cedar to betake itself to where the rest of the forest had already gone. And the cedar was burnt up but the vine continued to grow and everything around it flourished. Chaps. 38–40: In answer to Baruch's request God interprets the dream to him as follows: Behold the kingdom that destroys Zion will itself be overthrown and subjugated by another that will succeed it. And this in its turn will be overthrown and a third will arise. And then this also will be swept away and a fourth will arise more terrible than all that have preceded it. And when the time for its overthrow has come then Mine Anointed will appear who is like a spring and a vine and He will annihilate the armies of that kingdom. And that cedar means the last remaining general (dux prince?) in it who will be condemned and put to death by Mine Anointed. And the reign of Mine Anointed will endure for ever. Chaps. 41–43: Baruch receives a commission to exhort the people and at the same time to prepare himself by renewed fasting for fresh revelations. Chaps. 44–46: Baruch exhorts the elders of the people. Fifth section chaps. 47–48:24: He fasts seven days and prays to God. Chap. 48:25–50: The new revelations have reference in the first instance to the tribulations of the last time generally. Chaps. 49–52: When upon this Baruch expresses a desire to learn something more about the nature of the new resurrection bodies of the righteous his wish is complied with; not only so but he is enlightened with regard to the future blessedness of the righteous and the misery of the ungodly generally. Sixth section chap. 53: In a new vision Baruch sees a huge cloud rising from the sea and covering the whole earth and discharging first black water and then clear then black again and then clear and so on twelve times in succession. At last there came black waters and after them bright lightning which latter brought healing to the whole earth and ultimately there came twelve streams and subjected themselves to this lightning. Chaps. 54–55: In answer to his prayer Baruch receives through the angel Ramiel the following interpretation of the vision: Chaps. 56–57: The huge cloud means the present world. The first the dark water means the sin of Adam whereby he brought death and ruin into the world. The second the clear water means Abraham and his descendants who although not in possession of the written law nevertheless complied with its requirements. The third the dark water represents the subsequent generations of sinful humanity particularly the Egyptians. The fourth the clear water means the appearing of Moses Aaron Joshua and Caleb and the giving of the law and God's revelations to Moses. The fifth the dark water represents the works of the Amorites and the magicians in which Israel also participated. The sixth the clear water represents the time of David and Solomon. The seventh the dark water means the revolt of Jeroboam and the sins of his successors and the overthrow of the kingdom of the ten tribes. The eighth the clear water means the integrity of Hezekiah and his deliverance from Sennacherib. The ninth the dark water means the universal ungodliness in the days of Manasseh and the announcing of the destruction of Jerusalem. The tenth the clear water denotes the reign of the good king Josiah. The eleventh the dark water represents the present tribulation (i.e. in Baruch's own time) the destruction of Jerusalem and the Babylonian captivity. Chap. 68: But the twelfth the clear water means that the people of Israel will again experience times of joy that Jerusalem will be rebuilt that the offering of sacrifices will be resumed and that the priests will return to their duties. Chaps. 69–71: But the last dark water which is yet to come and which proves worse than all that went before means this: that tribulation and confusion will come upon the whole earth. A few will rule over the many the poor will become rich and the rich will become poor knaves will be exalted above heroes wise men will keep silence and fools will speak. And in obedience to God's command the nations which He has prepared for the purpose will come and war with such of the leaders as are still left (cum ducibus qui reliqui fuerint tunc). And it will come to pass that he who escapes from the war will perish by the earthquake and he who escapes from the earthquake will perish by fire and he who escapes the fire will perish with hunger. And he who escapes the whole of those evils will be given into the hands of Mine

Anointed. Chaps. 72–74: But this dreadful dark water will at length be followed by yet more clear water. This means that the time of Mine Anointed will come and that He will judge the nations and sit for ever upon the throne of His kingdom. And all tribulation will come to an end and peace and joy will reign upon the earth. Chaps. 75–76: Baruch thanks God for the revelation with which he had been favoured and then God directs him to wait for forty days and then go to the top of a certain mountain where all the different regions of the earth would pass before his view. After this he is to be removed from the world. Seventh section chap. 77: Baruch delivers a hortatory address to the people and at the request of the latter he on the 21st day of the eighth month also composes two hortatory addresses to be sent to their brethren in the captivity one to the nine and a half tribes and the other to the remaining two and a half. Chaps. 78–86: The import of the first of the two addresses is as follows: Baruch in the first place reminds his readers that the judgment of God which has overtaken them is a just judgment he then tells them of the destruction of Jerusalem by Nebuchadnezzar and the carrying away of the inhabitants into captivity and intimates to them the judgment of God that is awaiting their oppressors and then their own ultimate deliverance. In conclusion he founds upon this an exhortation to continue steadfast in their devotion to God and His law. Chap. 87: He sends this epistle to the nine and a half tribes in captivity through the medium of an eagle.

At this point the book as we now possess it breaks off. But originally it must have contained somewhat more for from 77:19 there is reason to infer that the epistle addressed to the nine and a half tribes was followed by a similar one addressed to the other two and a half tribes. And from chap. 76 it is to be presumed that the book would proceed to tell how Baruch was shown all the countries of the world from the top of a mountain and was thereafter taken away from the earth.

As regards the date of the composition of our apocalypse this much at least may be affirmed with certainty that it was not written till after the destruction of Jerusalem by Titus. For in chap. 32:2–4 Baruch announces to the assembled people that (after its first destruction by Nebuchadnezzar) Jerusalem is to be rebuilt again. But that this building will not continue to stand but that it will in like manner be destroyed again. And then the city will lie waste for a long period until the glorious time when it will be rebuilt and crowned for ever. But with the exception of this passage there is not another that throws any light upon the date of the composition of our book. For nothing bearing upon this is to be gathered from the obscure passage in which we are informed that the time of tribulation is to last “two parts weeks of seven weeks” (28:2: duae partes hebdomades septem hebdomadarum) for the meaning of these words is as uncertain as it is obscure. Consequently the calculations which Ewald Hilgenfeld Wieseler and Dillmann above all have tried to found upon this passage have no certain basis on which to rest. Possibly one would be much more likely to find some clue to the date in question in the affinity which this work bears to the Fourth Book of Ezra. For the points of contact between both those books in regard to thought and expression alike are (as Langen has pointed out pp. 6–8) so numerous that we must of necessity assume either that they were written by one and the same author or that the one borrowed from the other. It is now almost universally believed that it may be proved with a greater or less degree of certainty that our book has drawn upon the Fourth Book of Ezra (so Ewald Langen Hilgenfeld Hausrath Stähelin Renan Drummond Dillmann). It appears to me however that as yet no decisive arguments have been advanced in support of this view. In the case of Langen who was the first to go thoroughly into this question and who has done much to influence subsequent opinion on the matter his main argument was that the Book of Baruch corrected as he supposed the somewhat crude notions of Ezra respecting the doctrine of original sin. In order that the reader may be in a more favourable position for estimating the

value of this argument we will here subjoin in parallel columns what each of the two books says on this point: —

EZRA:

BARUCH:

3:7: Et huic (Adamo) mandasti diligere viam tuam et praeteriviteam; et statim instituisti in eum mortem et in nationibus ejus.

3:21-22: Cor enim mailgnum bajulans primus Adam transgressus et victus est; sed et omnes qui de eo nati sunt. Et facta est permanens infirmitas.

4:30: Quoniam granum seminis mali seminatum est in corde Adam ab initio et quantum impietatis generavit usque nunc et generat usque dum verfiat area!

7:48: O tu quid fecisti Adam? Si enim tu peccasti non est factus solius tuus casus sed et nostrum qui ex te advenimus.

17:3: (Adam) mortem attulit et abscidit annos eorum qui ab eo geniti fuerunt.

23:4: Quando peccavit Adam et decreta fuit mors contra eos qui gignerentur etc.

48:42: O quid fecisti Adam omnibus qui a te geniti sunt!

54:15 19: Si enim Adam prior peccavit et attulit mortem super omnes immaturam; sed etiam illi qui ex eo nati sunt unusquisque ex eis praeparavit animae suae tormentum futurum: et iterum unusquisque ex eis elegit sibi gloriam futuram … Non est ergo Adam causa nisi animae suae tantum; nos vero. unusquisque fuit animae suae Adam.

Now Langen supposes that the last of the passages quoted from Baruch (54:19: Non est ergo Adam causa nisi animae suae tantum; nos vero unusquisque fuit animae suae Adam) is above all intended to modify the somewhat harsh view of Ezra. But one can easily see that the utterances of Baruch on other occasions are quite as blunt as those of Ezra. And on the other hand there are passages to be met with in Ezra in which the author emphasizes quite as strongly as Baruch 54:19 though in different terms the thought that every man is to blame for his own ruin. To take only a single example compare 8:55-61. Here then we have not even an actual difference of view far less a correction of the one writer on the part of the other. Further such other reasons as have been advanced in favour of the priority of Ezra and the dependent character of Baruch are merely considerations of an extremely general kind which may be met with considerations equally well calculated to prove quite the reverse. Some are inclined to think that in the case of the author of the Fourth Book of Ezra “there is more of a despairing frame of mind that his striving after light and his desire to have his apprehensions quieted are deeper more urgent and of a more overmastering character that because the impressions produced by the dreadful events are rather fresher in his mind his narrative is also for this very reason and in spite of its verbosity the more impressive of the two and so on” (so Dillmann). My own opinion is that it is quite the converse of this and that it would be nearer the truth to say that it is precisely in the case of Baruch that this problem is uppermost viz. How is the calamity of Israel and the impunity of its oppressors possible and conceivable? while in the case of Ezra though this problem concerns him too still there is a question that almost lies yet nearer his heart viz. Why

is it that so many perish and so few are saved? The subordination of the former of these questions to the other which is a purely theological one appears to me rather to indicate that Ezra is of a later date than Baruch. Not only so but it is decidedly of a more finished character and is distinguished by greater maturity of thought and a greater degree of lucidity than the last-mentioned book. But this is a point in regard to which it is scarcely possible to arrive at a definite conclusion. And hence we are equally unable to say whether our book was written shortly after the destruction of Jerusalem (so Hilgenfeld Fritzsche Drummond) or during the reign of Domitian (so Ewald) or in the time of Trajan (so Langen Wieseler Renan Dillmann). Undoubtedly the most probable supposition of all is that it was composed not long after the destruction of the holy city when the question "How could God permit such a disaster?" was still a burning one. It is older at all events than the time of Papias whose chimerical fancies about the millennial kingdom (Irenaeus v. 33. 3) are borrowed from our Apocalypse (xxix. 5). The existing Syrian text has been taken from the Greek (see Langen p. 8 sq.; Kneucker p. 192 sq.; Dillmann p. 358).

With the exception of the passage in Papias just mentioned no certain trace of the use of our book in the Christian Church is anywhere to be met with. There is every reason to believe that it had been pushed into the background by the kindred Ezra-apocalypse. Still the fact of its finding a place in the Peshito manuscript of Milan serves to show that it was still in use at a later period at least in the Syrian Church. In the lists of the apocrypha given in the Stichometry of Nicephorus and the "Synopsis Athanasii" (in Credner Zur Geschichte des Kanons pp. 121 145) there are added at the close: Βαροὺχ Ἀββακοὺμ Ἐζεκιὴλ καὶ Δανιὴλ ψευδεπίγραφα. But it is extremely uncertain whether by the first-mentioned book it is our apocalypse that is meant for besides the Baruch of the Greek Bible and which in the lists just referred to is included among the canonical books there were also other apocryphal writings bearing this name. (1) There are considerable fragments of a gnostic Book of Baruch given in the Philosophumena v. 26-27 (comp. v. 24). (2) A Christian Book of Baruch. which is akin to our apocalypse and has borrowed largely from it has been published in Ethiopic by Dillmann under the title "Reliqua verborum Baruchi" (in Dillmann's Chrestomathia aethiopica Lips. 1866) as it had been previously in Greek in a Greek Menaeus (Venetiis 1609) and recently again by Ceriani under the title "Paralipomena Jeremiae" (Monumenta sacra et profana vol. v. 1 Mediol. 1868) and finally in a German version by Prätorius (Zeitschr. für wissensch. Theol. 1872 pp. 230-247) and by König (Stud. u. Krit. 1877 pp. 318-338). On this book comp. also Ewald Gesch. des Volkes Israel vii. 183. Fritzsche Libri apocr. prolegom. p. 82. Sachsse Zeitschr. für wissensch. Theol. 1874 p. 268 sq. Kneucker Das Buch Baruch p. 196 sq. Dillmann in Herzog's Real-Enc. 2nd ed. xii. 358 sq. (3) In the Altercatio Simonis Judaei et Theophili Christiani lately published by Harnack there occurs the following passage from a Book of Baruch (Gebhardt and Harnack Texte und Untersuchungen vol. i. part 3 1883 p. 25): Prope finem libri sui de nativitate ejus [scil. Christi] et de habitu vestis et de passione ejus et de resurrectione ejus prophetavit dicens: Hic unctus meus electus meus vulvae incontaminatae jaculatus natus et passus dicitur. Judging from the Christology implied in this passage the Baruch here in question can only have been composed at the soonest in the fourth century of our era (see Harnack p. 46). Further in Cyprian's Testim. iii. 29 we find that in one manuscript there has been inserted a quotation from some Book of Baruch or other which quotation however we have no means of verifying. (4) Tichonrawow contemplates editing an Apocalypse of Baruch in the old Slavonic version (see Theol. Literaturztg. 1877 p. 658). Whether it has as yet appeared and what its relation to other Books of Baruch with which we are already acquainted I am unable to say.

The epistle to the nine and a half tribes in the captivity which forms the conclusion of our

apocalypse has been already printed in the Paris Polyglot vol. ix. in the London Polyglot vol. iv. in Lagarde's edition of the Syrian version of the apocrypha (Libri Vet. Test. apocryphi syriace ed. de Lagarde Lips. 1861) also in Latin in Fabricius Codex pseudepigr. Vet. Test. ii. 145-155. Also in an English and French version; see Fritzsche's Exeget. Handbuch zu den Apokryphen i. 175 sq. and Libri Apocr. p. xxxi. Kneucker Das Buch Baruch p. 190 sq.

Ceriani's Latin version of our apocalypse appeared in the Monumenta sacra et profana vol. i. fasc. 2 (Mediol. 1866) pp. 73-98. For this see also Fritzsche Libri apocryphi Vet. Test. graece (Lips. 1871) pp. 654-699. The Syrian text was edited by Ceriani in the Monumenta sacra et profana vol. v. fasc. 2 (Mediol. 1871) pp. 113-180. This latter was also included in the photo-lithographed fac-simile of the whole manuscript published under the title Translatio Syra Pescitto Veteris Testamenti ex codice Ambrosiano sec. fere VI. photolithographice edita curante et adnotante Antonio Maria Ceriani 2 vols. in 4 parts Milan 1876-1883 (the Apocalypse of Baruch being in the last part). Comp. Theol. Literaturzeitung 1876 p. 329; 1878 p. 228; 1881 col. 4; 1884 col. 27.

Critical inquiries: Langen De apocalypsi Baruch anno superiori primum edita commentatio Friburgi in Brisgovia 1867 (xxiv. p. 4). Ewald Göttinger gel. Anzeigen 1867 p. 1706 sqq. Idem Gesch. des Volkes Israel vii. 83-87. Hilgenfeld Zeitschr. für wissensch. Theol. 1869 pp. 437-440. Idem Messias Judaeorum p. lxiii. sq. Wieseler Theol Stud. u. Krit. 1870 p. 288 (in his article on the Fourth Book of Ezra). Fritzsche Libri apocr. Prolegom. pp. 30-32. Hausrath Neutestamentl. Zeitgesch. 2nd ed. iv. 88 sq. (1st ed. iii. 290). Stähelin Jahrbb. für deutsche Theol. 1874 p. 211 sqq. Renan "L'Apocalypse de Baruch" (Journal des Savants April 1877 pp. 222-231). Idem Les évangiles 1877 pp. 517-530. Drummond The Jewish Messiah 1877 pp. 117-132. Kneucker Das Buch Baruch 1879 pp. 190-198. Kaulen in Wetzer and Welte's Kirchenlex. 2nd ed. i. 1058 sq. (art. "Apokryphen-Literatur"). Dillmann in Herzog's Real-Enc. 2nd ed. xii. 356-358 (art. "Pseudepigraphen"). Deane "The Apocalypse of Baruch" i. (Monthly Interpreter April 1885 pp. 451-461).

5. The Fourth Book of Ezra

Of all the Jewish apocalypses none has been so widely circulated in the early Church and in the Church of the Middle Ages as the so-called Fourth Book of Ezra. By Greek and Latin Fathers it is used as a genuine prophetical work (see below). The fact of there being Syrian Ethiopic Arabic and Armenian versions of the book is evidence of the extent to which it was circulated in the East. Then the circumstance that a Latin version has come down to us in a large number of Bible manscripts is calculated to show the favour with which in like manner it was still regarded by the Church of Rome in the Middle Ages. It was for this reason no doubt that it was also added as an appendix to the authorized Roman Vulgate. Not only so it even found its way into German versions of the Protestant Bible (see more below). The whole of the five versions which we possess are taken some of them directly others indirectly from a Greek text (now no longer extant) which moreover is to be regarded as the original one.

The text of the Latin Vulgate consists of sixteen chapters. But as is generally admitted the two first and the two last of these which do not appear in the Oriental versions are later additions by a Christian hand. Accordingly in its original form the book would only embrace the portion between chaps. 3 and 14 inclusive. The contents of the original work are divided into seven visions with which as he himself informs us Ezra had been favoured. First vision (3:1-5:20): In the thirtieth year after the destruction of the city (Jerusalem) Ezra is in Babylon and in his prayer to God he complains of the calamities of Israel on the one hand and of the prosperity of the

Gentile nations on the other (3:1-36). The angel Uriel comes and in the first place reproves him for his complaints (4:1-21) and then proceeds to remind him that wickedness has its appointed time (4:22-32) just as the dead have an appointed time during which they require to stay in the nether world (4:33-43). But the most of the distress is already past and its end will be announced by means of definite signs (4:44-5:13). Ezra is so exhausted by the revelation that has been imparted to him that he requires to be strengthened by the angel. By fasting for seven days he prepares himself for a new revelation (5:14-20). Second vision (5:21-6:34): Ezra renews his complaints and is once more rebuked by the angel (5:21-40). This latter points out to him that in the history of mankind one thing must come after another and that the beginning and the end cannot come at one and the same time. Ezra is reminded however that he may nevertheless see that the end is already approaching. It will be brought about by God Himself the Creator of the world (5:41-6:6). The signs of the end are more fully enumerated than in the previous vision (6:7-29). Uriel here takes leave of Ezra with the promise of further revelations (6:30-34). Third vision (6:35-9:25): Ezra complains again and is again rebuked by the angel (6:35-7:25). Upon this he is favoured with the following revelation: – Whenever the signs (enumerated in the preceding visions) begin to appear then those delivered from the calamities in question will see wonderful things: For my Son the Anointed One will appear with His retinue and He will diffuse joy among those that are spared and that for four hundred years. And at the expiry of those years my Son the Anointed One will die He and all who have the breath of life. For the space of seven days corresponding to the seven creative days there will not be a single human being upon the earth. Then the dead will rise; and the Most High will come and sit upon the judgment-seat and proceed with the judgment (7:26-35). And the place of torment will be revealed and over against it the place of rest. And the length of the day of judgment will be a year-week (6:1-17 = Bensly vv. 36-44). Only a few men will be saved. The majority will be consigned to perdition (6:18-48 = Bensly vv. 45-74). Moreover the ungodly do not enter at death into habitations of rest but when they die are at once consigned to sevenfold torment of which this also forms a part that they find it no longer possible to repent and that they foresee their future condemnation. But the righteous on the other hand enter into rest and experience sevenfold joy of which among other things this forms a part that they foresee their ultimate blessedness (6:49-76 = Bensly 75-101). But on the day of judgment each receives what he has deserved; and no one by interceding for him can alter the fate of another (6:77-83 = Bensly 102-105). Ezra's objection that surely the Scriptures speak of the righteous having often interceded in behalf of the ungodly is dismissed with the remark on the part of the angel that what might avail for this world will not do so for eternity as well (7:36-45). When Ezra is deploring that the whole ruin of the human race has been brought about by Adam the angel refers him to the impiety of men through which they have become the authors of their own ruin (7:46-69). Then follow further explanations having reference to the circumstance that of the many that are created so very few are saved (8:1-62). Finally the signs of the last time are unfolded to Ezra anew (8:63-9:13) and his anxiety at the thought of so many being lost is once more set at rest (9:14-25). Fourth vision (9:26-10:60): While Ezra is again indulging his complaints he sees a woman on his right hand weeping and who in answer to his questions tells him that after thirty years of barrenness she gave birth to a son brought him up with great difficulty and then procured a wife for him but that just as he was entering the bride-chamber he fell and was killed (9:26-10:4). Ezra chides her for bewailing the mere loss of a son when she ought rather to be weeping over the destruction of Jerusalem and the ruin of so many men (10:5-24). Then all at once her face is lifted up she utters a cry the earth quakes and instead of the woman there appears a strongly built city. At this sight Ezra is so perplexed that he cries to the angel Uriel who at once appears and gives him the following explanation of what he had just seen: The woman is Zion. The thirty years of barrenness are the 3000 years during which no sacrifices

had as yet been offered on Zion. The birth of the son represents the building of the temple by Solomon and the instituting of sacrificial worship on Zion. The death of the son refers to the destruction of Jerusalem. But the newly built city was shown to Ezra in the vision with the view of comforting him and of saving him from despair (10:25-60). Fifth vision (11:1-12:51): In a dream Ezra sees an eagle rise out of the sea having twelve wings and three heads. And out of the wings grew eight subordinate wings which became small and feeble winglets. But the heads were resting and the centre one was larger than the others. And the eagle flew and ruled over the land. And from within its body there issued a voice which ordered the wings to rule one after another. And the twelve wings ruled one after the other (the second more than twice as long as any of the others 11:17) and then vanished and similarly two of the winglets so that at last only the three heads and the six winglets were left. Two of those winglets separated themselves from the rest and placed themselves under the head on the right-hand side. The other four wanted to rule but two of them soon vanished and the two were consumed by the heads. And the middle head ruled over the whole earth and then vanished. And the two other heads also ruled. But the one on the right-hand side devoured the one on the left (11:1-35). Then Ezra sees a lion and hears how with a human voice it describes the eagle just referred to as being the fourth of those animals to which God has in succession committed the empire of the world. And the lion announces to the eagle its impending destruction (11:36-46). Thereupon the only remaining head also vanished. And the two winglets which had joined themselves to it began to rule. But their rule was of a feeble character. And the whole body of the eagle was consumed with fire (12:1-3). The meaning of the vision which Ezra rehearses is as follows. The eagle represents the last of Daniel's kingdoms. The twelve wings are twelve kings who are to rule over it one after another. The second will begin to reign and will reign longer than the others. The voice which issues from the body of the eagle means that in the course of the duration of that kingdom (inter tempus regni illius as we ought to read with the Syriac and the other Oriental versions) evil disorders will arise; and it will be involved in great trouble only it will not fall but regain its power. But the eight subordinate wings represent eight kings whose respective times will be of short duration. Two of these will perish when the intermediate time approaches (appropinquante tempore medio i.e. that interregnum to which reference had just been made). Four of them will be reserved for the time when the end is approaching and two for the time of the end itself. But the meaning of the three heads is as follows. At the time of the end the Most High will raise up three kings who will rule over the earth. And they will cause impiety to reach a climax and will bring about the end. The one (= the middle head) will die in his bed but in the midst of torment. Of the remaining two one will be cut off by the sword of the other while the latter will himself fall by the sword at the time of the end. Finally the two subordinate wings which joined the head on the right represent the two remaining kings of the closing period whose reign will be feeble and full of disorder (12:4-30). But the lion which announces to the eagle its impending destruction represents the Messiah whom the Most High has reserved for the end. He will arraign them (the kings?) while yet alive before His tribunal and convict them of their wickedness and then destroy them. But the people of God He will cause to rejoice (during 400 years as was foretold in the third vision) till the day of judgment comes (12:31-34). After receiving those revelations Ezra is commissioned to write what he had seen in a book and preserve it in a secret place (12:35-51). – Sixth vision (13:1-58): Once more he sees in a dream a man rising up out of the sea. And an innumerable company of men gathered themselves together for the purpose of warring against that man. And when they marched out against him he emitted a fiery breath and flames from his mouth so that they were all burnt up. Thereupon other men advanced toward him some of them joyfully others in sadness and some again in fetters (13:1-13). In answer to Ezra's request this vision is explained to him as follows. The man who rises out of the sea is he by whom God will redeem His whole creation. He will annihilate

his enemies not with the spear or implements of war but by means of the law which is like unto fire. But the peaceful crowd that advances towards him is the ten tribes returning from the captivity (13:14–58). — Seventh vision (14:1–50): Ezra is commissioned by God to instruct the people and set his house in order and withdraw from mortal things for he is about to be taken from the earth. Moreover he is to take to himself five men who during a period of forty days are to write down what they are told to write. And Ezra did so. And the men wrote what they did not understand. Thereupon Ezra was carried away and conveyed to the place appointed for such as he (14:1–50).

For anything at all decisive with regard to the date of the composition of this remarkable book we are chiefly indebted to the interpretation of the vision of the eagle. For the data furnished by the other passages that have been brought to bear upon this point are of too uncertain a character to be of much service. For example in chap. 6:9 it is stated that the present world is to end with the rule of Edom while the world to come is to begin with the supremacy of Israel (finis enim hujus saeculi Esau et principium sequentis Jacob). But it is open to question whether by Edom it is the Herodians (so Hilgenfeld Volkmar) or whether it is the Romans (so Oehler in Herzog's Real-Enc. 1st ed. vol. ix. p. 430 2nd ed. vol. ix. p. 660; Ewald Excursus p. 198; Langen p. 125 sq.) that are meant. The latter is no doubt the correct view of the matter. But even if the former were to be preferred very little after all would be gained considering the long period embraced by the Herodian dynasty (down till the year 100 of our era). Then as for the calculation of the world-periods as given in chap. 14:11 12 (Duodecim enim partibus divisum est saeculum et transierunt ejue decimam et dimidium decirnae partis superant autem ejus duae post medium decimae partis). The mere fact of the reading fluctuating so much here (in the Syriac and Armenian versions the passage does not occur at all) should of itself have been enough to deter any one from attempting any calculation whatever of these world-periods. It will be seen then that apart from the general purport of the book it is the vision of the eagle alone that can be said to furnish a clue to the date of its composition. In the interpretation of this vision the following points which naturally present themselves on a general survey of the contents are to be kept steadily in view: the twelve principal wings the eight subordinate ones and the three heads represent twenty-three sovereigns or rulers who reign one after the other and that in the following order. First we have the twelve principal wings and two of the subordinate ones. Then comes a time of disorder. At the expiry of this period four subordinate wings have their turn and after them the three heads. During the reign of the third head the Messiah appears upon which follows the overthrow of the third head and the short feeble reign of the two remaining subordinate wings. We thus see that from the author's standpoint both the overthrow of the third head and the reign of the last two subordinate wings were still in the future; from which it follows that he must have written during the reign of the third head and that the reign of the two last subordinate wings is not matter of history but exists only in the author's imagination. Further the following points are to be specially noted: (1) The second principal wing reigns more than twice as long as any of the rest (11:17). (2) Many of the wings particularly of the subordinate wings come upon the scene without actually getting the length of reigning and therefore represent mere pretenders and usurpers. (3) All the rulers belong to one and the same kingdom and are or at least aim at being the rulers of the whole of that kingdom. (4) The first dies a natural death (12:26) the second is murdered by the third (11:35 12:28). Now with the help of this exegetical result let us test the various interpretations that have been attempted and which we may divide into three leading groups according as the eagle has been supposed to refer either (1) to Rome under the monarchy and the republic or (2) to the Greek rule or (3) to Rome under the emperors.

1. Laurence van der Vlis and Lücke (2nd ed.) understand the vision of the eagle as referring to the history of Rome from the time of Komulus till that of Caesar. Those three writers are all agreed in this that the three heads represent Sulla Pompey and Caesar and that our book was composed in the time of Caesar (Lücke) or shortly after his assassination (van der Vlis) or a little later still (Laurence). No doubt the interpretation 12+8 wings is beset with considerable difficulty but this is supposed to be got over by falling back upon those persons who at a later period aspired to the throne and upon the party leaders in the time of the civil wars. But even if this were not a somewhat doubtful proceeding there are still two considerations that could not

fail to prove fatal to this view: first the fact that for a Jewish apocalyptic writer the whole period previous to the time of Pompey would have simply no interest whatever; and then this other fact that if Rome is to be thought of at all the reference can only be to a time when she was mistress of the world. For the whole of the wings and heads are intended to represent rulers who exercised or at all events aspired to exercise away over the entire world.

2. Hilgenfeld supposes the vision to have reference to the Greek rule. It is true that previously (Apokalyptik pp. 217–221) he took the 12+8 wings to mean the Ptolemies. The twelve wings and the first two of the subordinate wings he made out to be the following: — (1) Alexander the Great (2) Ptolemy I. Lagi (3–8) Ptolemy II. to Ptolemy VII. (9) Cleopatra I. (10–14) Ptolemy VIII. Lathyrus to Ptolemy XII. Auletes. The other six subordinate wings Were supposed to refer to the offshoots from the Ptolemaic dynasty down to Cleopatra the younger († 30 B.C.). Then some time after (Zeitschr. 1860 pp. 335–358) he substituted the Seleucidae for the Ptolemies and reckoned the kings from Alexander the Great on to the descendants of Seleucus. But still he always adhered strictly to the view that the three heads were to be taken as referring to Caesar Antony and Octavian and that the book must have been composed immediately after Antony's death in the year 30 B.C. (Zeitschr. 1867 p. 285: "exactly 30 years before Christ"). Although this interpretation enables us more easily to find room for the twenty kings than the foregoing one still it can hardly be said to be a bit more tenable. One great objection to it above all is this that while it supposes the twenty wings to refer to Greek rulers it regards the three heads on the other hand as referring to Roman rulers whereas the text obviously requires us to regard the whole as rulers of one and the same kingdom. But Hilgenfeld's interpretation is incompatible above all with the statement that the second wing was to rule twice as long as any of the others (11:17). For this will suit neither the case of Ptolemy I. nor that of Seleucus I. Nicator. Hilgenfeld too has fully realized the awkwardness of this passage and while at one time he was disposed to look upon it as an interpolation he has more recently had recourse to the expedient of supposing that in the statement in question the author had in view only the first six wings namely those on the right side on which assumption he finds that the notice exactly suits the case of Seleucus I. (Zeitschr. 1867 p. 286 sq. 1870 p. 310 sq.). But the text does not in the least degree sanction such a limitation as this (nemo post te tenebit tempus tuum sed nee dimidium ejus). There is a further contradiction of the text in the referring of the first head to Caesar who as is well known was assassinated whereas according to chap. 12:26 the ruler in question was to die super lectum. But let us say generally that every interpretation is to be regarded as untenable which proceeds on the assumption that the book was written earlier than the destruction of Jerusalem by Titus. One of the principal objects of the book is just this to comfort the people on the occasion of the destruction in question. Ezra over and over again prays to have an explanation of the mystery of Jerusalem's lying low in the dust while the Gentile nations exult in triumph. It is with regard to this that through the medium of a divine revelation he obtains instruction and comfort. Now to write a work of this nature could hardly be supposed to have any meaning or object whatsoever except at a time when Jerusalem was actually lying in ruins. No doubt it is the first destruction of the city (by Nebuchadnezzar) that is in view. But as it is of course impossible that the book can have been written in the decades immediately following this event (if for nothing but chap. 11:39 12:11 where Daniel is presupposed) the only course open to us is to come down to a date subsequent to the destruction by Titus and to assume that the author intended that first destruction by Nebuchadnezzar to be regarded as so to speak a type of the second and that the consolations purporting to have been communicated to Ezra were in reality meant for that generation in whose minds the recollection of the destruction of the year 70 was still fresh; although for the pseudo-Ezra this event was perhaps more a thing of the past than it was for the pseudo-Baruch. Then a distinct allusion to the

destruction of the city by the Romans may also be found in the words which the lion addresses to the eagle (11:42): Destruxisti habitationes eorum qui fructificabant et humiliasti muros eorum qui te non nocuerunt. Consequently there cannot be a doubt that –

3. Corrodi Lücke (1st ed.) Gfrörer Dillmann Volkmar Ewald Langen Wieseler Keil Hausrath Renan Drummond Reuss Gutschmid Le Hir are correct in holding that the eagle is to be understood as representing imperial Rome. They are all at one in this that the line of rulers should begin with Caesar and that by the second wing the duration of whose reign was more than twice as long as that of any of the others (11:17) it is Augustus that is meant. This point may in fact be regarded as settled. For the placing of Cæsar as the first in the line of Roman emperors is also to be met with elsewhere (Joseph. Antt. xviii. 2. 2 6. 10; Orac. Sibyll. 5:10-15. Comp. Volkmar p. 344). Moreover the length of time during which Augustus reigned is estimated as a rule at 56 years counting from his first consulate in the year 711 A.U.C. = 43 B.C. (see Volkmar p. 344; Gutschmid Zeitschr. 1860 p. 37). According to this calculation the actual duration of the reign of Augustus is found to have been more than twice longer than that of all the other Roman emperors belonging to the first three centuries.

But there is one point in regard to which there is an essential difference between Gutschmid and Le Hir on the one hand and all the other writers mentioned above on the other. For while Corrodi (i. 208) and the others understand the three heads as referring to the three Flavian emperors (Vespasian Titus and Domitian) and accordingly regard the book as having been written during the last decades of the first century of our era Gutschmid interprets as follows: – He takes the twelve principal wings to represent: (1) Caesar (2) Augustus (3) Tiberius (4) Caligula (5) Claudius (6) Nero (7) Vespasian (8) Domitian (9) Trajan (10) Hadrian (11) Antoninus Pius (12) Marcus Aurelius. The first two of the subordinate wings he supposes to refer to Titus and Nerva and the four immediately following them to: (1) Commodus (2) Pertinax (3) Didius Julianus and (4) Pescennius Niger. The three heads again he takes to represent Septimius Severus (193-211 A.D.) with his two sons Caracalla and Geta. Geta was murdered by Caracalla but this latter also fell by the sword (217 A.D.). The last two of the subordinate wings he supposes to be intended for Macrinus and his son Diadumenianus who were assassinated in the year 218 A.D. He thinks therefore that the vision of the eagle must have been written immediately before in the month of June 218 (Zeitschr. 1860 p. 48). Moreover Gutschmid regards the vision of the eagle as a later interpolation while he thinks – and here he is more in accord with Hilgenfeld – that the main body of the book must have been written in the year 31 B.C. Le Hir in his interpretation of the vision now in question coincides with Gutschmid in almost every particular (Etudes Bibliques i. pp. 184-192). The only point in which they differ is this that Le Hir founding upon the list of emperors given by Clement of Alexandria counts the reign of Marcus Aurelius and Commodus as simply one thus including the latter among those represented by the principal wings while to make up for this he inserts Clodius Albinus after Pescennius Niger among those represented by the subordinate wings. Nor does he think that the entire book was written in the year 218 A.D. but is of opinion that there was in the first instance a Jewish original and subsequently a Christian revision and modification of this latter. He holds that the former which is already made use of in the Epistle of Barnabas was written in the last quarter of the first century of our era while the Christian revision in which the vision of the eagle was inserted would be composed in the year 218 A.D. (Etudes Bibliques i. p. 207 sq.).

The tempting thing about this interpretation is that it enables us actually to specify all the rulers represented by the 12 + 8 wings which if we suppose the Flavian period to be in view it is impossible to do. But for all that it is unquestionably erroneous. It is precluded above all by the

circumstance that the book is already quoted by Clement of Alexandria. Consequently it must have been in existence toward the close of the second century. No doubt Gutschmid and Le Hir are disposed to fall back upon the hypothesis of interpolation or of revision and modification. But the book itself furnishes neither occasion nor justification for such a hypothesis. The vision of the eagle fits in admirably and could scarcely be omitted without completely mutilating the work. The hypothesis of interpolation is therefore gratuitous in the extreme to say nothing of the fact that it is incompatible with many points of detail. For example Galba Otho and Vitellius are completely left out of account. Commodus is classed by Gutschmid with those who are represented by the subordinate wings while Le Hir counts his reign and that of Marcus Aurelius as constituting simply one reign all which is extremely forced. But the most awkward thing of all is that the two subordinate wings Titus and Nerva did not reign as the text however requires us to suppose (12:21) appropinquante tempore medio i.e. shortly before the interregnum before the period of disorder but in the heart of the peaceful rule of the principal wings.

Consequently if we are to adopt the ordinary interpretation we will have to stop at the Flavian period. There can be no mistaking the fact that all that is said with regard to the three heads will apply admirably to the three Flavian emperors Vespasian Titus and Domitian. Those who had brought about the destruction of the holy city really constituted for the Jew the acme of power and ungodliness. Vespasian died as we are told 12:26 super lectum et tamen cum tormentis (comp. Sueton. Vesp. xxiv. Dio Cass. lxvi. 17). It is true Titus was not murdered by Domitian as is presupposed in chaps. 11:35 12:28. Yet it was currently believed that this was the case and certainly Domitian's demeanour at the time of his brother's death gave ample occasion for such a belief (Sueton. Domitian II. Dio Cass. lxvi. 26; Orac. Sibyll. 12:120–123. Aurelius Victor Caesar x. and xi. states explicitly that Titus had been poisoned by Domitian). This likewise corresponds with the actual fact that several of the subordinate wings i.e. of the usurpers had been disposed of with the help of the other two heads. But after all the finding of a place for the whole 12 + 8 wings is not a matter of insuperable difficulty. The twelve principal wings may be regarded as representing say the following rulers: — (1) Caesar (2) Augustus (3) Tiberius (4) Caligula (5) Claudius (6) Nero (7) Galba (8) Otho (9) Vitellius to whom may be added the three usurpers: (10) Vindex (11) Nymphidius (12) Piso. But what is to be made of the eight subordinate wings? To dispose of them Volkmar and Ewald have had recourse to expedients of the most singular kind. Volkmar who is followed by Renan makes out the number of rulers to be not 12 + 8 but by taking the wings as pairs only 6 + 4. The six rulers he takes to be the Julian emperors from Caesar to Nero; the four again he takes to be: Galba Otho Vitellius and Nerva. So Volkmar and Renan and that although we are plainly told in chap. 12:14 that: Regnabunt autem in ea reges duodecim unus post unum; and in ver. 20 of the same chapter find the words: exsurgent enim in ipso octo reges. Ewald again goes the length of thinking that not only the eight subordinate wings but also the three heads are to be regarded as included among the twelve principal wings and consequently that the three groups of rulers are to be identified and that we should reckon only twelve rulers altogether (counting from Caesar to Domitian). The most obvious exegetical principles should have been sufficient to prevent any such attempts at explanation as we have here. Nor can Langen be said to have altogether eschewed this arbitrary style of criticism when he inclines as he does to take the numbers merely as round numbers and to regard the twelve principal wings as intended to represent the six Julian emperors. For the text undoubtedly requires us to assume that there were 12 + 8 rulers or at all events pretenders. No less untenable is the view of Gfrörer (i. 90 sq.) who refers the eight subordinate wings partly to Herod and some of his descendants partly to Jewish (!!) agitators as John of Gischala and Simon Bar-Giora; or that of Wieseler who thinks that the whole eight subordinate wings are meant to represent the Herodian dynasty alone. In point of fact however the only distinction

between the subordinate and the principal wings is this that in the case of the former the reign is short and feeble (12:20) or they fail ever to get the length of reigning at all (11:25-27). As for the rest they are quite as much as the principal wings rulers of the entire empire or at all events aspire to be so. Consequently it is impossible to suppose that it is vassal princes that are represented by those subordinate wings; rather must we hold with Corrodi (Gesch. des Chiliasmus i. 207) that it is "governors rival candidates for the throne and rebels" or with Dillmann (Herzog's Real-Enc. 1st ed. vol. xii. p. 312) that it is "Roman generals and pretenders" that are in view. Of course we have had to avail ourselves of the better known among the usurpers in order to complete the number twelve. But it would appear that the author reckons along with them all those Roman generals who during the period of disorder (68-70) had at any time put forward claims to the throne. And of these surely it would not be difficult to make out six. For it is only a question of six seeing that as has been already noticed the last two of the subordinate wings do not represent actual historical personages.

If the view which represents the three heads as referring to the Flavian emperors be correct it should not be difficult to determine the date of the composition of our book. We have already seen that the author wrote during the reign of the third head inasmuch as he is already acquainted with the manner in which the second was put to death while on the other hand he is looking forward to the overthrow of the third after the Messiah has made His appearance. Consequently the composition of the book is not with Corrodi and Ewald to be referred to so early a date as the time of Titus nor again with Volkmar Langen Hausrath and Renan to one so late as the time of Nerva but with Gfrörer Dillmann Wieseler and Reuss to the reign of Domitian (81-96 A.D.).

The designation Fourth Book of Ezra under which our work is known is current only in the Latin Church and is to be traced to the fact that the canonical books Ezra and Nehemiah were reckoned as First and Second Ezra respectively while the Ezra of the Greek Bible was regarded as Third Ezra (so Jerome Praef. in version. libr. Ezrae Opp. ed. Vallarsi ix. 1524: Nec quemquam moveat quod unus a nobis editus liber est; nec apocryphorum tertii et quarti somniis delectetur). This mode of designating those different books has also been retained in the official Roman Vulgate where Third and Fourth Ezra are inserted at the end of the New Testament. In the manuscript of Amiens from which Bensly edited the Latin fragment the canonical books Ezra and Nehemiah taken together are regarded as First Ezra the so-called Third Ezra is counted as Second Ezra while Fourth Ezra is divided into three books chaps. i.-ii. being counted as Third Ezra chaps. iii.-xiv. as Fourth Ezra and chaps. xv. xvi. as Fifth Ezra (Bensly The Missing Fragment p. 6). Similarly though with greater complication still in the Codex Sangermanensis and the manuscripts derived from it (Bensly p. 85 sq.). The earliest designation seems to have been Ἔσδρας ὁ προφήτης (Clemens Alex. Strom. iii. 16. 100) or Ἔσδρα ἀποκάλυψις for it is doubtless our Fourth Book of Ezra that is meant by the apocryphal work bearing that name which occurs in the list of the Apocrypha edited by Montfaucon Cotelier Hody and Pitra (see p. 126). For more on the different titles see Volkmar Das vierte Buch Esra p. 3. Hilgenfeld Messias Judaeorum pp. xviii.-xxi.

Use and high repute of the book in the Christian Church. — It is probable that it is this work that is referred to in the following passage in the Epistle of Barnabas chap. xii.: Ὁμοίως πάλιν περὶ τοῦ σταυροῦ ὁρίζει ἐν ἄλλῳ προφήτῃ λέγοντι• Καὶ πότε ταῦτα συντελεσθήσεται; λέγει κύριος• Ὅταν ξύλον κλιθῇ καὶ ἀναστῇ καὶ ὅταν ἐκ ξύλου αἷμα στάξῃ. Comp. Fourth Ezra 4:33: Quomodo et quando haec? … 5:5: Si de ligno sanguis stillabit. It is true that here the first half of the quotation is wanting but for all that Le Moyne and Fabricius (Cod. pseudepigr. ii. 184) were

undoubtedly correct in tracing it to Fourth Ezra. Comp. further Cotelier Hilgenfeld and Harnack in their editions of the Epistle of Barnabas; Hilgenfeld Die apostol. Väter p. 47. It is also extremely probable that we are indebted to Fourth Ezra for the legend to the effect that when the Holy Scriptures had perished on the occasion of the destruction of Jerusalem by Nebuchadnezzar Ezra completely restored them again by means of a miracle. So Irenaeus iii. 21. 2. Tertullian De cultu femin. i. 3. Clemens Alex. Strom. i. 22. 149. Comp. Fourth Ezra 14:18–22 and 37–47. Fabricius Codex pseudepigr. i. 1156–1160. Hilgenfeld Messias Judaeorum p. 107. Strack in Herzog's Real-Enc. 2nd ed. vol. vii. 414 sq. (art. "Kanon des A. T.'s").

The first express quotation occurs in Clemens Alex. Strom. iii. 16. 100: Διὰ τί γὰρ οὐκ ἐγένετο ἡ μήτρα τῆς μητρός μου τάφος ἵνα μὴ ἰδω τὸν μόχθον τοῦ Ἰακὼβ καὶ τὸν κόπον τοῦ γένους Ἰσραήλ; Ἔσδρας ὁ προφήτης λέγει. Comp. 4 Ezra 5:35. Our book is repeatedly used and quoted as prophetical above all by Ambrose. See the passages in Fabricius Cod. pseudepigr. ii. pp. 183 185 sqq. Hilgenfeld Messias Judaeorum p. xxii. sq. Le Hir Etudes Bibliques i. 142. Bensly The Missing Fragment pp. 74–76. It is also quoted as propheta Esdras in the so-called Opus imperfectum in Matthaeum printed among Chrysostom's works (ed. Montfaucon vol. vi.) Homil. xxxiv. s. fin. Jerome who maintains a critical attitude toward the Apocrypha generally is the only one who expresses himself unfavourably. See the passage quoted above from the Praef. in version. libr. Ezrae and especially Adv. Vigilantium chap. vi. (Opp. ed. Vallarsi ii. 393): Tu vigilans dormis et dormiens scribis et proponis mihi librum apocryphum. qui sub nomine Esdrae a te et similibus tui legitur ubi scriptum est quod post mortem nullus pro aliis audeat deprecari quem ego librum numquam legi. Quid enim necesse est in manus sumere quod ecclesia non recepit. But although our book continued to be excluded from the canon it nevertheless enjoyed a wide circulation especially in the Middle Ages. Bensly has proved by actual verification that it finds a place in more than sixty Latin manuscripts of the Bible (Bensly The Missing Fragment pp. 42 82 sqq.) and this without taking into account scarcely any of the Italian libraries. As we have already mentioned it appears in the official Vulgate as an appendix. It also finds a place in not a few German editions of the Bible Lutheran and Reformed as well as Catholic (for the evidence in regard to this see Gildemeister Esdrae liber quartus arabice 1877 p. 42). On the history of the use comp. further Fabricius Codex pseudepigr. ii. 174–192. Idem Cod. apocryph. Nov. Test. i. 936–938. Volkmar Das vierte Buch Ezra p. 273 sq. Hilgenfeld Messias Judaeorum pp. xviii.-xxiv. lxix. sq.

Care must be taken not to confound the Fourth Book of Ezra with the Christian work entitled the Apocalypse of Ezra which Tischendorf has edited (Apocalypses apocryphae Lips. 1866 pp. 24–33). On this comp. Tischendorf Stud. u. Krit. 1851 p. 423 sqq. Idem Prolegom. to his edition pp. 12–14. Le Hir Etudes Bibliques (Paris 1869) ii. 120–122. By the Ἔσδρα ἀποκάλυψις which occurs in the list of the Apocrypha edited by Montfaucon Pitra and others it is possibly the Fourth Book of Ezra that is meant (see p. 126). On the Ezra-Apocrypha comp. also Fabricius Cod. pseudepigr. i. 1162. On the later additions to the Fourth Book of Ezra (chaps. i.-ii. and xv. xvi.) which in the manuscripts appear as yet as separate Books of Ezra and which came for the first time to be blended with the main work in the printed text see Dillmann in Herzog's Real-Enc. 2nd ed. vol. xii. 356 and Bensly The Missing Fragment pp. 35–40.

The texts of the Fourth Book of Ezra that have come down to us are the following: –

(1.) The old Latin version which is the most literal and therefore the most important of all. The vulgar text as it had long been printed was extremely inaccurate. In the edition of Fabricius (Codex pseudepigraphus Vet. Test. vol. ii. 1723 pp. 173–307) the Arabic version which was given to the public through Ockley's English translation in 1711 was collated throughout with the

Latin text. Sabatier was the first to lay the foundation for the critical restoration of the text by his publication of the variants of the important Codex Sangermanensis (Sabatier Bibliorum sacrorum Latinae versiones antiquae vol. iii. 1743 pp. 1038 1069-1084). Numerous emendations based upon the Codex Sangermanensis and the Ethiopic version published by Laurence in 1820 were proposed by Van der Vlis (Disputatio critica de Ezrae libro apocrypho vulgo quarto dicto Amstelod. 1839). The first critical edition was published by Volkmar (Handbuch der Einleitung in die Apocryphen second part: Das vierte Buch Ezra Tüb. 1863). In this edition Sabatier's collation of the Cod. Sangermanensis and a Zürich manuscript collated by Volkmar himself were made use of. These manuscripts however were not collated with sufficient care as the subsequent editions of Hilgenfeld (Messias Judaeorum Lips. 1869) and Fritzsche (Libri apocryphi Vet. Test. graece Lips. 1871) have shown. Both these writers give the Latin text according to three different manuscripts: (a) the Cod. Sangermanensis saec. ix. collated anew for Hilgenfeld's edition by Zotenberg; (b) the Cod. Turicensis saec. xiii. also collated anew for Hilgenfeld's edition by Fritzsche; (c) a Cod. Dresdensis saec. xv. collated by Hilgenfeld. In the whole of those editions a considerable fragment is wanting between chaps. vii. 35 and vii. 36 which could only be supplied from the Oriental versions. This fragment was first discovered so far as the Latin text is concerned by Bensly in a manuscript at Amiens (formerly at Corbie near Amiens) in the year 1875 (Bensly The Missing Fragment of the Latin Translation of the Fourth Book of Ezra discovered and edited with an Introduction and Notes Cambridge 1875. Comp. Theol. Literaturztg. 1876 p. 43 sq.). After this it was also published by Hilgenfeld (Zeitschr. für wissensch. Theol. 1876 pp. 421-435). Two years after this again the same fragment was edited from a Madrid manuscript (formerly in Alcalá de Henares) by Wood and from among the remains of John Palmer the Orientalist († 1840) who had transcribed it as early as the year 1826 (Journal of Philology vol. vii. 1877 pp. 264-278). Besides the manuscripts hitherto mentioned Bensly (pp. 42 82 sqq.) has verified some sixty others of the Latin text. Those of them in which there is the large hiatus in chap. vii. and this holds true of probably the whole of them at all events of the Turicensis and the Dresdensis as also of the printed vulgar text are of no value for the hiatus in the Cod. Sangermanensis was due to the cutting out of a leaf so that all the manuscripts and texts in which precisely the same hiatus occurs must have followed that codex (as from a letter addressed to Bensly Gildemeister appears to have already noted in the year 1865). Consequently in the case of any future edition consideration will be due in the first instance only to: (a) the Cod. Sangermanensis (now in Paris) dating from the year 822 A.D. (Bensly p. 5); (b) the Amiens manuscript also belonging to the ninth century and independent of the Cod. Sanger.; and (c) the Madrid manuscript. At the same time we may observe that the Latin manuscripts of the Bible in the majority of the Italian libraries have not yet been examined in connection with our book.

(2.) Next to the Latin the best and most trustworthy version is the Syriac which has been transmitted to us in the large Peshito manuscript of Milan (Cod. Ambros. B. 21 Inf.). It was published for the first time by Ceriani first of all in a Latin version (Ceriani Monumenta sacra et profana vol. i. fasc. 2 Mediol. 1866 pp. 99-124) then in the Syriac text itself (Ceriani Mon. sac. et prof. vol. v. fasc. 1 Mediol. 1868 pp. 4-111). This latter is also given in the photo-lithographed facsimile of the whole manuscript (Translatio Syra Pescitto Veteris Testamenti ex cod. Ambr. photolithographice ed. Ceriani 2 vols. in 4 parts Milan 1876-1883; comp. vol. iii. p. 92). Hilgenfeld has embodied Ceriani's Latin version in his Messias Judaeorum (Lips. 1869).

(3.) The Ethiopic version which is also of importance for the reconstruction of the original text. It had been previously published by Laurence accompanied with a Latin and English version but only from a single manuscript and not quite free from errors (Laurence Primi Ezrae libri qui apud

Vulgatam appellatur quartus versio Aethiopica nunc primo in medium prolata et Latine Angliceque reddita Oxoniae et Londoni 1820). Numerous corrections have been made by van der Vlis (Disputatio critica de Ezrae libro apocrypho vulgo quarto dicto Amst. 1839). A collection of the variants in the other manuscripts has been furnished by Dillmann in the appendix to Ewald's dissertation in the Abhandlungen der Göttinger Gesellsch. der Wissensch. vol. xi. 1862–1863. Then in the last place Prätorius availing himself of Dillmann's collection of variants and also collating with a Berlin manuscript has made various emendations in the Latin version which Hilgenfeld has embodied in his Messias Judaeorum (Lips. 1869). A critical edition is still a desideratum. Among the Ethiopic manuscripts of the so-called Magdala collection which some years ago were forwarded to the British Museum at the close of the war between the English and King John of Abyssinia there happen to be no fewer than eight of our book (see Wright's catalogue in the Zeitschr. der DMG. 1870 p. 599 sqq. Nos. 5 10 11 13 23 24 25 27. Bensly The Missing Fragment p. 2 note 3).

(4.) The two Arabic versions are of but secondary importance owing to the great freedom in which their authors often indulge. (a) One of them which is in a manuscript in the Bodleian Library at Oxford was in the first instance published only in an English version by Ockley (in Whitson's Primitive Christianity revived vol. iv. London 1711). Ewald was the first to publish the Arabic text (Transactions of the Göttingen Gesellsch. der Wissensch. vol. xi. 1862–1863). Emendations upon Ockley's version and Ewald's text were furnished by Steiner (Zeitschr. für wissensch. Theol. 1868 pp. 426–433) with whose assistance Hilgenfeld also composed a Latin rendering for his Messias Judaeorum (Lips. 1869). The Arabic version here in question is also found in a Codex Vaticanus which though merely a transcript of the one in the Bodleian library is nevertheless of some value in so far as it was copied before the leaf which is at present wanting in the Bodleian codex went amissing (Bensly The Missing Fragment p. 77 sq. Gildemeister Esdrae liber quartus p. 3; this latter supplies at pp. 6–8 the text of this fragment which is omitted in Ewald's edition). (b) An extract from another Arabic version is likewise found in a Bodleian codex from which it has been edited by Ewald (as above). A German version of this extract was furnished by Steiner (Zeitschr. f. wissensch. Theol. 1868 pp. 396–425). On the extract itself comp. further Ewald Transactions of the Göttingen Gesellsch. der Wissensch. 1863 pp. 163–180. The complete text of this version was published by Gildemeister in Arabic and Latin from a Codex Vaticanus (Esdrae liber quartus arabice e codice Vaticano nunc primum edidit Bonnae 1877).

(5.) The Armenian version which is still freer than the Arabic one and is of but little service for the restoration of the original text. It was published as early as the year 1805 in the edition of the Armenian Bible issued under the superintendence of the Mechitarists but Ceriani was the first to rescue it from oblivion while Ewald again furnished specimens of it in a German rendering (Transactions of the Göttingen Gesellsch der Wissensch. 1865 pp. 504–516). A Latin version prepared by Petermann and based upon a collation of four manuscripts is given in Hilgenfeld's Messias Judaeorum (Lips. 1869). In the older editions of the Armenian Bible (the first dating as far back as 1666) there is an Armenian version of our book which was prepared by the first editor Uscanus himself and taken from the Vulgate (see Scholtz Einl. in die heiligen Schriften vol. i. 1845 p. 501. Gildemeister Esdrae liber quartus arabice p. 43. This may be made use of for the purpose of correcting Bensly p. 2 note 2).

German versions of our book have been published by Volkmar (Das vierte Buch Esra 1863) and Ewald (Transactions of the Göttingen Gesellsch. der Wissensch. vol. xi. 1862 1863) while Hilgenfeld attempted a rendering back into the Greek (Messias Judaeorum Lips. 1869).

Critical inquiries. For the earlier literature see Fabricius Codex pseudepigr. ii. 174 sqq. Lücke Einl. p. 187 sqq. Volkmar Das vierte Buch Esra (1863) pp. 273-275 374 sqq. Hilgenfeld Messias Judaeorum p. liv. sqq. Corrodi (also spelt Corodi) Kritische Geschichte des Chiliasmus vol. i. (1781) pp. 179-230. Gfrörer Das Jahrhundert des Heils (also under the title Geschichte des Urchristenthums vols. i. ii.) 1838 i. 69-93. Lücke Versuch einer vollständigen Einleitung in die Offenbarung des Johannes (2nd ed. 1852) pp. 144-212. Bleek Stud. u. Krit. 1854 pp. 982-990 (review of Lücke's Einl.). Noack Der Ursprung des Christenthums vol. i. (1857) pp. 341-363. Hilgenfeld Die jüdische Apokalyptik (1857) pp. 185-242. Idem Die Propheten Esra und Daniel 1863. Idem Zeitschr. für wissensch. Theologie vol. i. 1858 pp. 250-270; iii. 1860 pp. 335-358; vi. 1863 pp. 229-292 457 sq.; x. 1867 pp. 87-91 263-295; xiii. 1870 pp. 308-319; xix. 1876 pp. 421-435. Gutschmid "Die Apokalypse des Esra und ihre späteren Bearbeitungen" (Zeitschr. für wissensch. Theol. 1860 pp. 1-81). Dillmann in Herzog's Real-Enc. 1st ed. vol. xii. 1860 pp. 310-312; 2nd ed. vol. xii. 1883 pp. 353-356 (art. "Pseudepigraphen"). Volkmar Handbuch der Einleitung in die Apokryphen second part: Das vierte Buch Esra Tüb. 1863. At a previous date by the same author Das vierte Buch Esra und apokalyptische Geheimnisse überhaupt Zürich 1858. "Einige Bemerkungen über Apokalyptik" (Zeitschr. für wissensch. Theol. 1861 pp. 83-92). Ewald "Das vierte Esrabuch nach seinem Zeitalter seinen arabischen Uebersetzungen und einer neuen Wiederherstellung" (Transactions of the Royal Gesellsch. der Wissensch. of Göttingen vol. xi. 1862-1863 histor.-philol. section pp. 133-230. Also as a separate reprint). Idem Gesch. des Volkes Israel vol. vii. 3rd ed. 1868 pp. 69-83. Ceriani "Sul Das vierte Ezrabuch del Dottor Enrico Ewald" (Estratto dalle Memorie del R. Instituto Lombardo di scienze e lettere) Millano 1865. Langen Das Judenthum in Palästina 1866 pp. 112-139. Le Hir "Du IV. livre d'Esdras" (Etudes Bibliques 2 vols. Paris 1869 i. 139-250). Wieseler "Das vierte Buch Esra nach Inhalt und Alter untersucht" (Stud. u. Krit. 1870 pp. 263-304). Keil Lehrb. der histor.-krit. Einleitung in die kanon. und apokr. Schriften des A. T. 3rd ed. 1873 pp. 758-764. Hausrath Neutestamentl. Zeitgesch. 2nd ed. iv. 80-88 (1st ed. iii. 282-289). Renan "L'apocalypse de l'an 97" (Revue des deux Mondes 1875 March pp. 127-144). Idem Les évangiles 1877 pp. 348-373. Drummond The Jewish Messiah 1877 pp. 84-117. Reuss Gesch. der heiligen Schriften Alten Testaments (1881) sec. 597.

6. The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs

In the pseudepigraphic prophecies which we have hitherto been considering revelations and predictions — and therefore the apocalyptic element — chiefly predominated. But just as these revelations themselves had practical objects as their ultimate aim such objects as the strengthening and comforting of the faithful so alongside of them there was also another class of works in which the exhortations and encouragements were more directly expressed. We have a pseudepigraphic prophecy of this description in The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs which is chiefly composed of such direct exhortations. This somewhat extensive work has come down to us in its entirety in the Greek text which was published for the first time by Grabe (1698) although from the beginning of the sixteenth century a good many printed copies of a Latin version prepared in the thirteenth by Robert Grossetest Bishop of Lincoln had been in circulation.

The book as we now have it contains a great many direct allusions to the incarnation of God in Christ for which reason almost all modern critics look upon it as the production of a Christian author. But it is extremely doubtful whether this is a correct view of the matter and whether we ought not rather to assume that the work in its original form is of Jewish authorship and that the passages that are of a Christian character were interpolated at some later date. As is indicated

by the title itself the book consists of the spiritual “testaments” which the twelve sons of Jacob left behind them for their descendants. In each of those testaments three different elements may be distinguished. (1) The patriarch in each instance rehearses in the first place the history of his own life in the course of which he either charges himself with sins he has committed (as is done by the majority of them) or on the other hand boasts of his virtues. The biographical notices follow the lines of the Biblical narrative although after the fashion of the Haggadean Midrash they are enriched with a large number of fresh details. (2) The patriarch then proceeds to address to his descendants a number of appropriate exhortations based upon the preceding autobiographical sketch urging them to beware of the sin that had been the cause of such deep distress to their ancestor and in the event of his being able to boast of something redounding to his credit recommending them to imitate his virtuous behaviour. The subject on which the exhortations turn is as a rule one that happens to have a very intimate connection with the biographical notices the patriarch’s descendants being warned precisely against that sin or it may be to imitate that virtue which had been exemplified in his own life. (3) But besides this we also find toward the end of each of the testaments (with the exception perhaps of that of Gad where this point is only briefly hinted at) certain predictions regarding the future of the particular tribe in question the patriarch for example predicting that his descendants would one day apostatize from God or what sometimes appears to amount to the same thing sever their connection with the tribes of Levi and Judah and thereby involve themselves in misery and especially the evils of captivity and dispersion. This prediction is frequently accompanied with an exhortation to adhere to the tribes of Levi and Judah. On the other hand these predictions are interspersed with a large number of very direct references to redemption through Christ.

The circles of thought in these “testaments” are of a very heterogeneous character. On the one hand they contain a great deal that it seems impossible to explain except on the assumption that they were composed by a Jewish author. The history of the patriarchs is amplified precisely in the style of the Haggadean Midrash. The author assumes that salvation is in store only for the children of Shem while those of Ham are doomed to destruction (Simeon 6). He manifests a lively interest in the Jewish tribes as such; he deplores their apostasy and dispersion; he exhorts them to cleave to the tribes of Levi and Judah as being those which God has specially called to be the leaders of the others; he cherishes the hope of their ultimate conversion and deliverance. It is true no doubt that in his positive injunctions he nowhere inculcates the observance of the ceremonial law such injunctions being more of a moral character throughout nearly the entire book and consisting for example of warnings against the sins of envy avarice anger lying incontinency exhortations to the love of one’s neighbour compassion integrity and such like. But at the same time he does not fail to speak of the priestly sacrificial worship and that even with many details introduced into it not met with in the Old Testament itself as being an institution of divine appointment. On the other hand again we also meet with numerous passages which can only have been written by a Christian passages which teach the Christian doctrine of the universal character of salvation as well as that of redemption through the incarnation of God nay in one instance there is a distinct reference to the Apostle Paul (Benjamin 11). The Christology upon which those passages proceed is of a decidedly patripassian character.

Grabe who was the first to edit the Greek text already endeavoured to account for those incongruities by the hypothesis that the book was written by a Jew but had been subsequently interpolated by a Christian. All modern critics however (since Nitzsch) have entirely dismissed this hypothesis and the only point on which there is a difference of opinion amongst them is as to whether the author occupied the standpoint of a Jewish or a Gentile Christian. The former is

the prevailing view; the latter was propounded by Ritschl in the first edition of his Entstehung der altkatholischen Kirche was subsequently adopted by Vorstman and Hilgenfeld but was ultimately abandoned again by Ritschl himself. At the same time there was no doubt a feeling on the part of many that it would be impossible to solve the difficulty without having recourse to the interpolation hypothesis. Kayser above all tried to demonstrate the existence of a tolerably large number of such interpolations. But even in his case the matter is dealt with only incidentally to enable him to maintain the view as to the Jewish-Christian character of the writing. It was reserved for Schnapp to enter in a systematic manner into the question as to whether the whole work had not been reconstructed from beginning to end. He endeavoured to show that to the book in its original form belonged only the parts mentioned under Nos. 1 and 2 above i.e. merely the biographical narratives and their accompanying exhortations. But he seeks to prove that all those portions in which the future fortunes of the tribes are predicted with some other things of a kindred nature (visions in particular) are to be regarded as later interpolations though he distinguishes at the same time between Jewish and Christian interpolations. He thinks that the bulk of these interpolations would be made by a Jewish hand but that into these again numerous references to the redemption through Christ had been afterwards inserted by a Christian hand. He considers therefore that the original work itself must also have been of Jewish origin. It appears to me that the latter part of this hypothesis in so far that is as the Christian revision is concerned has at all events hit the mark. It would be vain to attempt to reduce the heterogeneous utterances in our Testaments to a common Jewish-Christian standpoint all of them that bear a specifically Christian stamp being without exception of a Gentile-Christian and universalist character. The salvation is destined εἰς πάντα τὰ ἔθνη. The Christology is the patripassian Christology that so largely prevailed in many quarters in the Christian Church during the second and third centuries. There is nothing here that can be said to indicate a “Jewish-Christian” standpoint. Again it is impossible to reconcile with the Christian passages in question that series of utterances characterized above which can only have emanated from a Jewish author. How is it ever to be supposed that a Christian ay or even a Jewish-Christian author should think of characterizing the tribes of Levi and Judah as those to whom God had committed the guidance of Israel. Then what could we conceive such an author to mean by exhorting the rest of the tribes to join themselves to the two just mentioned and to submit themselves to their authority? Why it was precisely the tribes of Levi and Judah i.e. the official Judaism of Palestine that distinguished themselves above all the others in the way of rejecting the gospel. We can hardly imagine therefore that even a Jewish-Christian author would be likely to represent them as occupying the leading position above referred to. Nor does he so represent them as one who is merely taking a theoretical survey of history and as though he meant to censure the defection from the tribes of Levi and Judah merely as a thing of the past. But he also urges a loyal adherence to those tribes as a present duty. Nor can we here suppose that Levi is intended to represent the Christian clergy. For what in that case would Judah be supposed to represent? Then there is the further circumstance that many of the Christian passages obviously disturb the connection and thus proclaim themselves to be interpolations at the very outset. What is more the much canvassed passage regarding Paul in the Testament of Benjamin (11) is wanting in the case of two independent testimonies among the manuscripts and versions as at present known to us namely in the Roman manuscript and the Armenian version. From all this it may be regarded as tolerably certain that all the Christian passages are to be ascribed to some interpolator who with a Jewish original before him introduced modifications here and there to adapt it to the purposes and needs of the Christian Church. This assumption will also enable us to explain how it comes to be stated in our Testaments that Christ was a descendant of the tribes of Levi and Judah alike. How it would ever occur to a Christian author himself to emphasize this point so much even supposing Mary

to have belonged to the tribe of Levi it is difficult to see for in the primitive Christian tradition it was only upon the descent from Judah that stress was laid. But the matter becomes perfectly intelligible when we assume that the author had a text before him in which Levi and Judah were held up as the chosen and model tribes. For finding this in his text he proceeds to justify it from his Christian standpoint by representing Christ as descended from the tribe of Levi in His capacity as priest and from that of Judah in His capacity as king it being left an open question whether he assumes the Levitical descent of Mary or has in view only some spiritual connection on the part of Christ with both those tribes in virtue of His twofold office of priest and king. It is further worthy of note that deviating from his Jewish original the Christian interpolator as a rule puts the tribe of Judah first. How long or short those Christian interpolations may have been it is not always possible to determine with any degree of certainty. It is probable however that they were on a larger scale than Schnapp is inclined to suppose.

It is rather more difficult to answer this other question namely whether this Jewish original itself was not the production of several authors. The grounds on which Schnapp bases his attempt to distinguish and eliminate the prophetic portions of the book are not quite so cogent in the case of Christian passages. At the same time there is no denying that in most instances those predictions start up in the book with a remarkable suddenness. The Testaments seem to have been intended in the first instance to serve as a kind of moral sermon. They concern themselves as a rule with some special sin or other of which the patriarch had been guilty and against which he warns his descendants. When we find then that all of a sudden and in quite a general way there comes in some prediction about the falling away of the tribes and that without any further notice being taken of the special sin that had been previously treated of it becomes evident at once that the connection is thereby interrupted and disturbed all the more that the terms with which the Testaments conclude are such as imply that they had been preceded by exhortations and exhortations alone. Comp. above all Simeon 5–7; Levi 14–19; Judah 21–25; Dan 5. In any case we can have no difficulty in detecting in the Testaments a good many interpolations of considerable length even apart from those passages that are of a specifically Christian kind; take for example the two visions in the Testament of Levi 2–5 and 8 which only interrupt the connection. Then in the biographical portion of the Testament of Joseph we find two perfectly parallel narratives coming the one immediately after the other (chaps. 1–10 and 10–18) of which only one can be supposed to be the original one. Again in the course of what is said with regard to the tribe of Levi we come across this glaring contradiction that while on the one hand it is recommended to the other tribes as their leader it is represented on the other as having itself fallen away nay as having been instrumental in seducing the rest into apostasy (Levi 14; Dan 5). Both those classes of statements cannot possibly have emanated from one and the same person. We may therefore say that in any case the Testaments have undergone repeated revision and remodification. But this much however may be held as certain that the great bulk of the book is of Jewish origin. The foremost place in it is assigned to these moral sermons which remind us partly of Jesus the Son of Sirach and partly of Philo and which must have emanated from some author to whom moral conduct was a matter of deeper interest than the ceremonial law. Along with these we have prophetic passages composed by the same or some other author in which the falling away from Levi and Judah is represented as being the cause of all evil while the members of the nation scattered throughout the whole world are recommended to enter into close relationship with these tribes therefore with the leading circles of Palestine. On the date of the composition of our book it is impossible to express anything like a definite opinion. As it is probable that the Christian revision was already known to Irenaeus the Jewish original cannot have been composed later than the first century of our era though on the other hand we can scarcely venture to refer it to an earlier date seeing that the author

probably made use of the Book of Jubilees (see below). In several passages the destruction of Jerusalem and the temple is presupposed (Levi 15; Dan 5 fin.). But it is extremely doubtful whether these are to be regarded as belonging to the work in its original shape. Possibly they were subsequently inserted by some Christian hand.

On the references in our book to earlier writings see Sinker Testamenta XII. Patriarcharum (1869) pp. 34-48; Dillmann in Ewald's Jahrb. der bibl. Wissensch. iii. 91-94; Rönsch Das Buch der Jubiläen (1874) pp. 325 sqq. 415 sqq. References to the predictions of Enoch are of very frequent occurrence (Simeon 5; Levi 10 14 16; Judah 18; Zebulon 3; Dan 5; Naphtali 4; Benjamin 9). These passages all belong to the prophetic sections though in the majority of instances they are not actual quotations but free allusions to alleged predictions of Enoch with the view of explaining how the patriarchs obtained their information with regard to the future. Surely from this it is perfectly obvious that the author must have already been acquainted with one or more of the various books bearing the name of Enoch. In the biographical portions therefore in those sections which undoubtedly belong to the original work there are numerous coincidences with the Book of Jubilees. But neither are these absent from those portions which according to Schnapp are supposed to belong to the author of the Jewish revision. See in general Dillmann and Rönsch as above.

In patristic literature the notion of the descent of Christ from the tribes of Levi and Judah is met with as early as the time of Irenaeus which notion is probably to be traced to our book; see Irenaeus Fragm. xvii. (ed. Harvey ii. 487): Ἐξ ὧν ὁ Χριστὸς προετυπώθη καὶ ἐκεγνώσθη καὶ ἐγεννήθη• ἐν μὲν γὰρ τῷ Ἰωσὴφ προετυπώθη• ἐκ δὲ τοῦ Λευὶ καὶ τοῦ Ἰούδα τὸ κατὰ σάρκα ὡς βασιλεὺς καὶ ἱερεὺς ἐγεννήθη• διὰ δὲ τοῦ Συμεὼν ἐν τῷ ναῷ ἐπεγνώσθη κ.τ.λ. The passages in Tertullian Adv. Marcion. v. 1 Scorpiace xiii. which since Grabe's time (Spicileg. i. 132) have usually been traced to the Testament of Benjamin 11 are simply based on Gen. 49:27; similarly Hippolyt. ed. Lagarde p. 140 fragm. 50. It is not unlikely that the passage about Paul in Benjamin 11 would be inserted in the text of the Testament at a very late period and that on the strength of the patristic interpretation of Gen. 49:27; comp. p. 119. The Testaments are expressly quoted by Origen In Josuam homil. xv. 6 (ed. de la Rue ii. 435; Lommatzsch xi. 143): Sed et in aliquo quodam libello qui appellatur testamentum duodecim patriarcharum quamvis non habeatur in canone talem tamen quendam sensum invenimus quod per singulos peccantes singuli satanae intelligi debeant (comp. Reuben 3). It is doubtful whether Procopius Gazaeus may be supposed to have our book in view in his Comment. in Gen. xxxviii. (see the passage in Sinker's Test. XII. Patr. p. 4). In the Stichometry of Nicephorus the Πατριάρχαι are included among the ἀπόκρυφα along with Enoch the Assumptio Mosis and such like (Credner Zur Gesch. des Kanons p. 121); similarly in the Synopsis Athanasii (Credner p. 145) and in the anonymous list of canonical books edited by Montfaucon Pitra and others (on which see p. 126 below). In the Constitut. apostol. vi. 16 mention is made of an apocryphal work entitled οἱ τρεῖς πατριάρχαι which must be different from the book now in question unless there has been some mistake with regard to the number.

Four manuscripts of the Greek text are extant: (1) A Cambridge one belonging to the tenth century; (2) an Oxford one belonging to the fourteenth (on both of which see Sinker's Test. XII. Patr. pp. vi-xi.); (3) a manuscript in the Vatican Library belonging to the thirteenth century; and (4) one in the cloister of St. John in Patmos belonging to the sixteenth (on both of which again see Sinker Appendix 1879 pp. 1-7). In addition to these we should also mention as independent testimonies (1) the as yet unprinted Armenian version eight manuscripts of which have been verified by Sinker and the oldest of which dates from the year 1220 A.D. (Sinker Appendix pp.

23-27 and p. vii. sq.); and (2) the Old Slavonic version which was published by Tichonrawow in his Pamjatniki otretschennoi russkoi literatury (2 vols. Petersburg 1863) but which has not yet been submitted to critical investigation.

As yet no trace has been discovered of any early Latin version. But coming down to the thirteenth century we find the Latin version of Robert Grossetest Bishop of Lincoln and which as Sinker has shown is based upon the Cambridge manuscript (see Grabe's Spicileg. i. 144; Sinker Appendix p. 8). This version has come down to us through numerous manuscripts (Sinker's Test. pp. xi.-xv. Appendix p. 9) and since the beginning of the sixteenth century it has not only been frequently printed (at first without place or date being given though probably about 1510-1520 see Sinker Appendix p. 10; on the later impressions consult Sinker Test. p. xvi. sq.) but likewise translated into almost every modern language — English French German Dutch Danish Icelandic Bohemian while these translations again were also frequently printed in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries (Sinker Appendix pp. 11-23).

The first edition of the Greek text was prepared by Grabe who based it upon the Cambridge manuscript collating it at the same time with the Oxford one. This edition also contained Grossetest's Latin version for which two manuscripts belonging to the Bodleian Library were made use of (Grabe Spicilegium Patrum vol. i. Oxon. 1698 2nd ed. 1714; on the use of the manuscripts see p. 336 sq.). Grabe's text has been reproduced by Fabricius (Codex pseudepigraphus Vet. Test. vol. i. Hamburg 1713) Gallandi (Bibliotheca veterum patrum vol. i. Venetiis 1788) and Migne (Patrolog. graec. vol. ii.). A careful edition of the Cambridge manuscript accompanied with the variants of the Oxford one has been printed by Sinker (Testamenta XII. Patriarcharum ad fidem codicis Cantabrigiensis edita accedunt lectiones cod. Oxoniensis Cambridge 1869). Some time after this same scholar published in an Appendix a collation of the Vatican and the Patmos manuscripts (Testamenta XII. Patriarcharum: Appendix containing a collation of the Roman and Patmos MSS. and bibliographical notes Cambridge 1879).

Special disquisitions: Grabe in his edition (Spicileg. i. 129-144 and 335-374). Corrodi Kritische Geschichte des Chiliasmus ii. 101-110. K. J. Nitzsch. Commentatio critica de Testamentis XII. Patriarcharum libro V. T. pseudepigrapho Wittenberg 1810. Wieseler Die 70 Wochen und die 63 Jahrwochen des Propheten Daniel (1839) p. 226 sqq. Lücke Einl. in die Offenbarung Johannis (2nd ed. 1852) pp. 334-337. Dorner Entwicklungsgesch. der Lehre von der Person Christi i. 254-264. Reuss Gesch. der heil. Schriften Neuen Testaments § 257. Ritschl Die Entstehung der alt-kathol. Kirche (2nd ed. 1857) pp. 172-177. Kayser "Die Test. der XII. Patr." in the Beiträge zu den theologischen Wissenschaften edited by Reuss and Cunitz 3 vols. (1851) pp. 107-140. Vorstman Disquisitio de Testamentorum Patriarcharum XII. origine et pretio Rotterd. 1857. Hilgenfeld Zeitschr. für wissenschaftl. Theol. 1858 p. 395 sqq.; 1871 p. 302 sqq. Van Hengel "De Testamenten der twaalf Patriarchen op nieuw ter sprake gebragt" (Godgeleerde Bijdragen 1860). Ewald Gesch. des Volkes Israel vii. 363-369. Langen Das Judenthum in Palästina (1866) pp. 140-157. Sinker in his edition. Geiger Jüdische Zeitschr. für Wissensch. und Leben 1869 pp. 116-135; 1871 pp. 123-125. Friedr. Nitzsch Grundriss der christl. Dogmengeschichte vol. i. 1870 pp. 109-111. Renan L'église chrétienne (1879) pp. 268-271. An article in The Presbyterian Review for January 1880 (mentioned by Bissell The Apocrypha p. 671). Dillmann art. "Pseudepigraphen" in Herzog's Real-Enc. 2nd ed. vol. xii. p. 361 sq. Schnapp Die Testamente der zwölf Patriarchen untersucht Halle 1884 (and notice of this work in the Theolog. Literaturzeitung 1885 p. 203).

7. The Lost Pseudepigraphic Prophecies

Besides the pseudepigraphic prophecies that have come down to us many others of a similar description were in circulation in the early Church as we learn partly from the lists of the canon and partly from quotations found in the Fathers. In the case of most of them it is of course no longer possible to determine with any certainty whether they were of Jewish or of Christian origin. But considering that in the earliest days of the Christian Church this was a species of literary activity that flourished chiefly among the heretical sects and that it was not till a somewhat later period that it began to be cultivated in Catholic circles as well it may be assumed with some degree of probability that those Old Testament pseudepigraphic writings which are mentioned in terms of high respect by the earliest of the Fathers down say to Origen inclusive are to be regarded generally as being of Jewish and not of Christian origin. With the criterion thus obtained we may combine still another. We happen to have several lists of the canon in which the Old Testament Apocrypha are enumerated with great completeness. Now among the writings thus enumerated occur those which have come down to us (Enoch the Twelve Patriarchs the Assumptio Mosis the Psalms of Solomon) and which are undoubtedly of Jewish origin. This then must surely be regarded as sufficiently justifying the conjecture that the others would also be of similar origin. The lists in question are the following: –

1. The so-called Stichometry of Nicephorus i.e. a list of the canonical and apocryphal books of the Old and New Testaments along with the number of verses in each book and which list is given as an appendix to the Chronographia compendiaria of Nicephorus Constantinopolitanus (about 800 A.D.) though it is without doubt of a considerably earlier origin (printed in the appendix to Dindorf's edition of George Syncellus further in a critically amended text given by Credner in two programmes for the University of Giessen 1832-1838 and also reproduced in Credner's Zur Geschichte des Kanons 1847 pp. 117-122 but best of all in de Boor's Nicephori opuscula Lips. 1880). Here the list of the Old Testament ἀπόκρυφα runs thus (ed. de Boor p. 134 sq.): –

α′ – Ἐνὼχ στίχων ͵δω′ (4800).

β′ – Πατριάρχαι στίχων ͵ερ′ (5100).

γ′ – Προσευχὴ Ἰωσὴφ στίχων ͵αρ′ (1100).

δ′ – Διαθήκη Μωϋσέως στίχων ͵αρ′ (1100).

ε′ – Ἀνάληψις Μωϋσέως στίχων ͵αυ′ (1400).

ς′ – Ἀβραὰμ στίχων τ′ (300).

ζ′ – Ἐλὰδ (sic) καὶ Μωδὰδ στίχων υ′ (400).

η′ – Ἠλία προφήτου στίχων τις′ (316).

θ′ – Σοφονίου προφήτου στίχων χ′ (600).

ι′ – Ζαχαρίου πατρὸς Ἰωάννου στίχων φ′ (500).

ια′ – Βαρούχ Ἀμβακούμ Ἰεζεκιὴλ καὶ Δανιὴλ ψευδεπίγραφα.

2. The so-called Synopsis Athanasii which simply reproduces from the Stichometry of

Nicephorus the section containing the Apocrypha without giving however the number of the verses (Credner Zur Geschichte des Kanons p. 145).

3. Akin to this latter is an anonymous list which was published: (a) from a Codex Coislinianus belonging to the tenth century by Montfaucon Bibliotheca Coisliniana Paris 1715 p. 194; (b) from a Cod. Paris. Regius by Cotelier Patrum Apost. Opp. vol. i. 1698 p. 196; (c) from a Cod. Baroccianus by Hody De Bibliorum textibus 1705 p. 649 col. 44 (those three manuscripts are based upon each other in the order just given and as may be seen from a more careful comparing of them with the text); and lastly (d) from a Codex Vaticanus by Pitra Juris ecclesiastici Graecorum historia et monumenta vol. i. Romae 1864 p. 100. As appears from the numbering there is an omission in the three first-mentioned manuscripts (No. 8 being left out). According to Pitra the complete list of the ἀπόκρυφα is as follows: –

α′ – Ἀδάμ.

β′ – Ἐνώχ.

γ′ – Λάμεχ.

δ′ – Πατριάρχαι.

ε′ – Ἰωσὴφ προσευχή.

ς′ – Ἐλδὰμ καὶ Μοδάμ (al. Ἐλδὰδ καὶ Μωδάδ).

ζ′ – Διαθήκη Μωσέως.

η′ – Ἡ ἀνάληψις Μωσέως.

θ′ – Ψαλμοὶ Σολομῶντος.

ι′ – Ἠλίου ἀποκάλυψις.

ια′ – Ἠσαίου ὅρασις.

ιβ′ – Σοφονίου ἀποκάλυψις.

ιγ′ – Ζαχαρίου ἀποκάλυψις.

ιδ′ – Ἔσδρα ἀποκάλυψις.

ιέ – Ἰακώβου ἱστορία.

ις′ – Πέτρου ἀποκάλυψις and so on (these being followed by other New Testament Apocrypha).

This list is in the main identical with that of the Stichometry of Nicephorus. With a single exception (No. 6 Ἀβραάμ) the whole of the first ten numbers of the Stichometry are reproduced in it. But besides this these nine numbers have this in common with each other that they are probably all of them prophetic pseudepigraphs i.e. writings purporting to have been composed by the various men of God whose names they bear or at all events containing a record of revelations with which those men are alleged to have been favoured a circumstance which

probably accounts for their comparatively wide circulation throughout the Church. The last of the nine here in question shows by its title Ζαχαρίου πατρὸς Ἰωάννου that it belongs to the Christian Apocrypha. With regard to the others four of them have already been considered by us (Enoch. the Patriarchs the Testament and the Ascension of Moses; on the two latter see p. 81) while the remaining four (Joseph's Prayer Eldad and Modad Elias Zephaniah) are all quoted with deference either by Origen or by some still older Fathers and may therefore be regarded with a certain degree of probability as Jewish products. Consequently they fall to be more fully considered by us here.

1. Joseph's Prayer (Προσευχὴ Ἰωσήφ). For the information we possess regarding this production we are indebted above all to repeated quotations from it found in Origen. This Father speaks of it as "a writing not to be despised" (οὐκ εὐκαταφρόνητον γραφήν) and expressly states that it was in use among the Jews (παρ' Ἑβραίοις). In the passages quoted it is Jacob who figures all through describing himself as the first-born of all living beings nay as the head of all the angels themselves. He informs us that when he was coming from Mesopotamia he met Uriel who wrestled with him and claimed to be the foremost of the angels. But he says that he corrected him and told him that he Uriel was only the eighth in rank after himself. In another passage Jacob states that he had had an opportunity of inspecting the heavenly records and that there he read the future destinies of men.

Origen In Joann. vol. ii. chap. xxv. (Opp. ed. de la Rue iv. 84; Lommatzsch i. 147): Εἰ δέ τις προσίεται καὶ τῶν παρ' Ἑβραίοις φερομένων ἀποκρύφων τὴν ἐπιγραφομένην Ἰωσὴφ προσευχὴν ἄντικρυς τοῦτο τὸ δόγμα καὶ σαφῶς εἰρημένον ἐκεῖθεν λήψεται … Φησὶ γοῦν ὁ Ἰακώβ• "Ὁ γὰρ λαλῶν πρὸς ὑμᾶς ἐγὼ Ἰακὼβ καὶ Ἰσραὴλ ἄγγελος θεοῦ εἰμι ἐγὼ καὶ πνεῦμα ἀρχικόν• καὶ Ἀβραὰμ καὶ Ἰσαὰκ προεκτίσθησαν πρὸ παντὸς ἔργου• ἐγὼ δὲ Ἰακὼβ ὁ κληθεὶς ὑπὸ ἀνθρώπων Ἰακὼβ τὸ δὲ ὄνομά μου Ἰσραὴλ ὁ κληθεὶς ὑπὸ θεοῦ Ἰσραὴλ ἀνὴρ ὁρῶν θεὸν ὅτι ἐγὼ πρωτόγονος παντὸς ζώου ζωουμένου ὑπὸ θεοῦ." Καὶ ἐπιφέρει• "Ἐγὼ δὲ ὅτε ἠρχόμην ἀπὸ Μεσοποταμίας τῆς Συρίας ἐξῆλθεν Οὐριὴλ ὁ ἄγγελος τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ εἶπεν ὅτι κατέβην ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν καὶ κατεσκήνωσα ἐν ἀνθρώποις• καὶ ὅτι ἐκλήθην ὀνόματι Ἰακώβ ἐζήλωσε καὶ ἐμαχέσατό μοι καὶ ἐπάλαιε πρὸς μὲ λέγων• προτερήσειν ἐπάνω τοῦ ὀνόματός μου τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ καὶ τοῦ πρὸ [l. πρὸ τοῦ] παντὸς ἀγγέλου. Καὶ εἶπα αὐτῷ τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ καὶ πόσος ἐστὶν ἐν υἱοῖς θεοῦ• οὐχὶ σὺ Οὐριὴλ ὄγδοος ἐμοῦ κἀγὼ Ἰσραὴλ ἀρχάγγελος δυνάμεως κυρίου καὶ ἀρχιχιλίαρχός εἰμι ἐν υἱοῖς θεοῦ; οὐχὶ ἐγὼ Ἰσραὴλ ὁ ἐν προσώπῳ θεοῦ λειτουργὸς πρῶτος καὶ ἐπεκαλεσάμην ἐν ὀνόματι ἀσβέστῳ τὸν θεόν μου."

Origen ibid. (Lommatzsch i. 148): Ἐπὶ πλεῖον δὲ παρεξέβημεν παραλαβόντες τὸν περὶ Ἰακὼβ λόγον καὶ μαρτυράμενοι ἡμῖν οὐκ εὐκαταφρόνητον γραφήν.

Origen Fragm. comment. in Genes. vol. iii. chap. ix. toward the end (ed. de la Rue ii. 15; Lommatzsch viii. 30 sq. = Euseb. Praep. evang. vi. 11. 64 ed. Gaisford): Διόπερ ἐν τῇ προσευχῇ τοῦ Ἰωσὴφ δύναται οὕτω νοεῖσθαι τὸ λεγόμενον ὑπὸ τοῦ Ἰακώβ• "Ἀνέγνων γὰρ ἐν ταῖς πλαξὶ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ ὅσα συμβήσεται ὑμῖν καὶ τοῖς υἱοῖς ὑμῶν." Comp. also ibid. chap. xii. toward the end of the chapter (ed. de la Rue ii. 19; Lommatzsch viii. 38) where the contents of the somewhat lengthened fragment first quoted are given in an abridged form.

Fabricius Codex pseudepigr. Vet. Test. i. 761-771. Dillmann art. "Pseudepigraphen" in Herzog's Real-Enc. 2nd ed. xii. 362.

2. The book entitled Eldad and Modad. This was a writing that was circulated under the name of two Israelites called אֶלְדָּד and מֵידָד (Sept. Ἐλδὰδ καὶ Μωδάδ) who according to Num. 11:26-29

uttered certain predictions in the camp during the march through the wilderness. Besides being mentioned in the lists of the Apocrypha this book is also quoted in the Shepherd of Hermas and that as a genuine prophetical work. According to the Targum of Jonathan on Num. 11:26-29 the predictions of the two personages here in question had reference chiefly to Magog's final attack upon the congregation of Israel. But whether this may be regarded as indicating what the theme of our book is likely to have been is extremely doubtful.

Hermas Pastor Vis. ii. 3: Ἐγγὺς κύριος τοῖς ἐπιστρεφομένοις ὡς γέγραπται ἐν τῷ Ἐλδὰδ καὶ Μωδάτ τοῖς προφητεύσασιν ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ τῷ λαῷ.

The Targum of Jonathan on the Pentateuch is given in the fourth volume of the London Polyglot along with a Latin translation. Comp. also Beer "Eldad und Medad im Pseudojonathan" (Monatsschr. für Gesch. und Wissensch. des Judenth. 1857 pp. 346-350). Weber System der altsynagogalen palästinischen Theologie 1880 p. 370.

Fabricius Codex pseudepigr. Vet. Test. i. 801-804. Dillmann art. "Pseudepigraphen" in Herzog's Real-Enc. 2nd ed. xii. 363. Cotelier Hilgenfeld and Harnack in their editions of the Shepherd of Hermas notes on Vision ii. 3.

3. The Apocalypse of Elijah. The prophet Elijah has this in common with Enoch. that like him he was taken up to heaven without dying. Consequently in the legends of the saints he is often associated with Enoch (for the literature of this see Enoch. p. 70) and like this latter could not fail to be regarded as a peculiarly suitable medium through which to communicate heavenly revelations. A writing bearing his name is mentioned in the Constitut. apostol. vi. 16 and in the patristic quotations simply as an Apocryphum. According to the more exact titles as given in the lists of the Apocrypha (Ἠλία προφήτου in Nicephorus Ἠλίου ἀποκάλυψις in the anonymous list) and in Jerome (see below) this book was a somewhat short apocalyptic work consisting according to the Stichometry of Nicephorus of 316 verses. It is often mentioned by Origen and subsequent ecclesiastical writers as being the source of a quotation made by Paul and which cannot be traced to any part of the Old Testament (1 Cor. 2:9: καθὼς γέγραπται• ἃ ὀφθαλμὸς οὐκ εἶδεν καὶ οὗς οὐκ ἤκουσεν καὶ ἐπὶ καρδίαν ἀνθρώπου οὐκ ἀνέβη κ.τ.λ.). No doubt Jerome strongly protests against the notion that Paul is here quoting an apocryphal work. But the thing is not at all incredible for do we not find that the Book of Enoch has also been undoubtedly quoted by the author of the Epistle of Jude? If that be so then this circumstance serves at the same time to prove the early existence and Jewish origin of the Apocalypse of Elijah. This same passage that is quoted in First Corinthians is likewise quoted by Clemens Romanus chap. xxxiv. fin. Now as non-canonical quotations occur elsewhere in Clement it is just possible that he in like manner has made use of the Apocalypse of Elijah. At the same time it is more likely that he has borrowed the quotation from the First Epistle to the Corinthians. According to Epiphanius the passage Eph. 5:14 (ἔγειρε ὁ καθεύδων καὶ ἀνάστα ἐκ τῶν νεκρῶν καὶ ἐπιφαύσει σοι ὁ Χριστός) was also taken from our Apocryphum. But seeing that Origen makes no mention of this in his collations of passages of this sort that statement is of a very questionable character and probably rests upon some confusion or other. According to Euthalius Eph. 5:14 was taken from an apocryphal work that bore the name of Jeremiah.

Origen Comment. ad Matth. xxvii. 9 (de la Rue iii. 916; Lommatzsch v. 29): Et apostolus scripturas quasdam secretorum profert sicut dicit alicubi: "quod oculus non vidit nec auris audivit" (1 Cor. 2:9); in nullo enim regulari libro hoc positum invenitur nisi in secretis Eliae prophetae. Comp. further Comment. ad Matt. xxiii. 37 (de la Rue iii. 848; Lommatzsch iv. 237 sqq.) where in connection with the saying of Christ that Jerusalem killed the prophets Origen

observes that the Old Testament records only a single instance of a prophet being put to death in Jerusalem and then proceeds to add: Propterea videndum ne forte oporteat ex libris secretioribus qui apud Judaeos feruntur ostendere verbum Christi et non solum Christi sed etiam discipulorum ejus (for example such further statements as Heb. 11:37) … Fertur ergo in scripturis non manifestis serratum esse Jesaiam et Zachariam occisum et Ezechielem. Arbitror autem circuisse in melotis [ἐν μηλωταῖς Heb. 11:37] in pellibis caprinis Eliam qui in solitudine et in montibus vagabatur. And so among the other passages that go to prove that apocryphal books are sometimes referred to in the New Testament we should also include 1 Cor. 2:9. Lastly Origen goes on to observe: Oportet ergo caute considerare ut nec omnia secreta quae feruntur in nomine sanctorum suscipiamus propter Judaeos qui forte ad destructionem veritatis scripturarum nostrarum quaedam finxerunt confirmantes dogmata falsa nec omnia abjiciamus quae pertinent ad demonstrationem scripturarum nostrarum. The whole connection here plainly shows that it is exclusively Jewish Apocrypha that Origen has in view.

Euthalius in his learned statistical work on the Epistles of Paul (458 A.D.) likewise traces 1 Cor. 2:9 to the Apocalypse of Elijah (Zaccagni Collectanea monumentorum veterum Romae 1698 p. 556 = Gallandi Biblioth. patrum x. 258). In this he is followed by Syncellus ed. Dindorf i. 48 and an anonymous list of quotations in Paul's Epistles which is given (a) by Montfaucon (Diarium Italicum p. 212 sq. and Bibliotheca Bibliothecarum i. 195) from a Codex Basilianus and (b) by Cotelier (in his edition of the Apostolic Fathers note on Constitut. apost. vi. 16) from two Parisian manuscripts.

Jerome Epist. 57 ad Pammachium chap. ix. (Opp. ed. Vallarsi i. 314): Pergamus ad apostolum Paulum. Scribit ad Corinthios: Si enim cognovissent Dominum gloriae etc. (1 Cor. 2:8-9).… Solent in hoc loco apocryphorum quidam deliramenta sectari et dicere quod de apocalypsi Eliae testimonium sumtum sit etc. (Jerome then traces the quotation to Isa. 44:3). Idem Comment. in Jesaijam lxiv. 3 [al. lxiv. 4] (Vallarsi iv. 761): Parapbrasim hujus testimonii quasi Hebraeus ex Hebraeis assumit apostolus Paulus de authenticis libris in epistola quam scribit ad Corinthios (1 Cor. 2:9) non verbum ex verbo reddens quod facere omnino contemnit sed sensuum exprimens veritatem quibus utitur ad id quod voluerit roborandum. Unde apocryphorum deliramenta conticeant quae ex occasione hujus testimonii ingeruntur ecclesiis Christi.… Ascensio enim Isaiae et Apocalypsis Eliae hoc habent testimonium.

Clemens Rom. chap. xxxiv. fin.: λέγει γάρ• Ὀφθαλμὸς οὐκ εἶδεν καὶ οὖς οὐκ ἤκουσεν καὶ ἐπὶ καρδίαν ἀνθρώπου οὐκ ἀνέβη ὅσα ἡτοίμασεν τοῖς ὑπομένουσιν αὐτόν (in St. Paul: τοῖς ἀγαπῶσιν αὐτόν). Comp. the note on this in Gebhardt and Harnack's edition. The passage is also frequently quoted elsewhere in patristic literature and was a special favourite with the Gnostics; see Hilgenfeld Die apostol. Väter p. 102; Ritschl Die Entstehung der altkathol. Kirche p. 267 sq.

Epiphanius Haer. xlii. p. 372 ed. Petav. (Dindorf ii. 388): "Διὸ λέγει ἔγειρε ὁ καθεύδων καὶ ἀνάστα ἐκ τῶν νεκρῶν καὶ ἐπιφαύσει σοι ὁ Χριστός" (Eph. 5:14). Πόθεν τῷ ἀποστόλῳ τὸ "διὸ καὶ λέγει" ἀλλὰ ἀπὸ τῆς παλαιᾶς δῆλον διαθήκη; τοῦτο δὲ ἐμφέρεται παρὰ τῷ Ἠλίᾳ. Hippolytus De Christo et Antichr. chap. lxv. quotes the same passage (Eph. 5:14) with the formula ὁ προφήτης λέγει and with a slight deviation in regard to the terms (ἐξεγέρθητι instead of ἀνάστα). It also occurs with the same deviation and with the formula ἡ γραφὴ λέγει in an utterance of the Naasenes quoted by Hippolytus (Philosophum. v. 7 p. 146 ed. Duncker). But both those quotations are undoubtedly to be traced simply to the Epistle to the Ephesians (Hilgenfeld Nov. Test. extra canonem receptum 2nd ed. iv. 74 thinks though without any distinct ground for doing so that they may have been taken from the Apocalypse of Peter). According to

Euthalius Eph. 5:14 formed part of an Apocryphum that bore the name of Jeremiah (Zaccagni Collectanea monumentorum veterum p. 561 = Gallandi Biblioth. patr. x. 260). Similarly Syncellus ed. Dindorf i. 48 and the above-mentioned anonymous list of Paul's quotations from the Scriptures which simply reproduces Euthalius. We may safely venture to assume that this Apocryphum bearing the name of Jeremiah was itself of Christian origin.

The work by the Hellenist Eupolemus περὶ τῆς Ἠλίου προφητείας (Euseb. Praep. evang. ix. 30) has nothing to do with our Apocryphum. On this see sec. 33. Isr. Levi endeavours to make out the probable existence of a Hebrew Apocalypse of Elijah on the strength of two Talmudic passages (Sanhedrin 97b; Joma 19b) where certain utterances of Elijah regarding questions of Messianic dogma happen to be quoted (Revue des études juives vol. i. 1880 p. 108 sqq.). On a passage of this sort from post-Talmudic times see Jellinek Bet-ha-Midrash vol. iii.

Fabricius Cod. pseudepigr. Vet. Test. i. 1070–1086. Lücke Einleitung in die Offenbarung des Johannes 2nd ed. p. 235 sq. Bleek Stud. u. Krit. 1853 p. 330 sq. Dillmann in Herzog's Real-Enc. 2nd ed. xii. 359. The commentaries on 1 Cor. 2:9 and Eph. 5:14.

4. The Apocalypse of Zephaniah. Apart from the Stichometry of Nicephorus and the anonymous list of the Apocrypha (see p. 126) all we know of this writing is from a quotation in Clement of Alexandria.

Clemens Alex. Strom. v. 11. 77: Ἆρ' οὐχ ὅμοια ταῦτα τοῖς ὑπὸ Σοφονία λεχθεῖσι τοῦ προφήτου; "καὶ ἀνέλαβέν με πνεῦμα καὶ ἀνήνεγκέν με εἰς οὐρανὸν πέμπτον καὶ ἐθεώρουν ἀγγέλους καλουμένους κυρίους καὶ τὸ διάδημα αὐτῶν ἐπικείμενον ἐν πνεύματι ἁγίῳ καὶ ἦν ἑκάστου αὐτῶν ὁ θρόνος ἐπταπλασίων φωτὸς ἡλίου ἀνατέλλοντος οἰκοῦντας ἐν ναοῖς σωτηρίας καὶ ὑμνοῦντας θεὸν ἄρρητον ὕψιστον."

Fabricius Cod. pseudepigr. Vet. Test. i. 1140 sq. Dillmann in Herzog's Real-Enc. xii. 360.

The Apocalypses we have just been considering are far from exhausting the number of them that were in circulation in the early Church. At the end of the Stichometry of Nicephorus mention is made of ψευδεπίγραφα of Baruch Habakkuk Ezekiel and Daniel. As we have already stated Euthalius was acquainted with an Apocryphum bearing the name of Jeremiah. Jerome mentions a Hebrew Apocryphum bearing this prophet's name in which Matt. 27:9 occurred. But as regards all these and many others besides it is extremely doubtful for various reasons and chiefly from their appearing somewhat late in the Christian Church whether they are of Jewish origin. It is obvious that the four last-mentioned pseudepigraphs are to be regarded as an addition at some subsequent period to the original Stichometry of Nicephorus.

VI. THE SACRED LEGENDS

The authors of the pseudepigraphic prophecies had chiefly in view the practical aim of imparting greater weight to the lessons and exhortations which they desired to address to their contemporaries by ascribing them to the sacred authorities whose names they bear. Not only however did they represent the holy men of God themselves as speaking to posterity but it was not uncommon at the same time to enrich the accounts we have regarding those personages with new material partly for the purpose of giving to the present generation a clearer view of the sacred narrative generally by the addition of copious details and partly by surrounding these saints of the olden time with a halo of glory to hold them up more and more unreservedly as shining models for Israel to imitate (comp. in general et seq.). Now there were two ways in

which the things here in question viz. the amplifying and embellishing of the sacred story and adapting it to purposes of edification could be effected either by a continual modifying of the text of the Biblical narrative or by singling out certain personages in it and making them the heroes of fictitious legends. At first it was the former of these courses that was chiefly followed though afterwards the latter came more and more to be adopted as well. A classical example of each of those two modes of enriching the sacred story has come down to us from a comparatively early period from somewhere about the time of Christ. The so-called Book of Jubilees is an instance of the way in which the text was modified while in the Martyrdom of Isaiah we have a specimen of the fictitious legend. Other writings of this description are either known to us merely from quotations or have come down to us only in the shape of Christian versions of them. But a large amount of material of this sort is also to be found in writings the principal objects of which are different from those mentioned above. Legendary amplifications of the sacred narrative are also to be met with in almost all of the pseudepigraphic prophecies. This as appears from what has been already said is true above all of the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs into which the biographical element enters so largely. And so for this reason it has also very many points of contact with the first of the two principal works which we will now proceed to consider.

1. The Book of Jubilees

Didymus Alexandrinus Epiphanius and Jerome quote an apocryphal book under the title τὰ Ἰωβηλαῖα or ἡ λεπτὴ Γένεσις from which they borrow various details connected with the history of the patriarchs. Then copious extracts from this same work are given by the Byzantine chroniclers Syncellus Cedrenus Zonoras Glycas from the beginning of the ninth down to the twelfth century. But at this latter point the book disappears and for a long time it was looked upon as lost till it turned up again in the present century in the Abyssinian Church where it was found in an Ethiopic version. It was published for the first time by Dillmann in a German translation (Ewald's Jahrbücher ii.-iii. 1850-1851) and afterwards in the Ethiopic text (1859). Besides this Ethiopic version a large fragment of the work is likewise extant in an old Latin version which in like manner was not discovered till modern times the author of the discovery being Ceriani who found it in a manuscript in the Ambrosian Library at Milan and afterwards published it among the Monumenta sacra et profana (vol. i. fasc. 1 1861). This Latin fragment was also subsequently edited by Rönsch accompanied with a Latin rendering by Dillmann of the corresponding portion in the Ethiopic version as well as a commentary and several excursuses full of valuable matter (1874).

The contents of the book are substantially the same as those of our canonical Genesis for which reason it is also generally styled "the smaller Genesis" not because it is of smaller dimensions (on the contrary it is larger than the other) but because it is inferior in point of authority to the canonical book. It stands to this latter very much in the same relation as a Haggadean commentary to the text of the Bible. At the same time it is as far as possible from being an actual exposition of the text which in fact the Haggadean Midrash never pretends to be but simply a free reproduction of the early Biblical history from the creation of the world down to the institution of the Passover (Ex. 12) and that from the standpoint and in the spirit of later Judaism. The whole is made to assume the form of a revelation imparted to Moses on Mount Sinai by an "angel of the presence." The object of the author in selecting this form was to secure at once for the new matters which he has to communicate the same authority as was already accorded to the text of the Bible. In his reproduction he has paid special attention to the matter of chronology the due fixing of this being without doubt one of the leading objects for which his book was written. He takes as the basis of reckoning the jubilee-period of 49 years which again

resolves itself into seven year-weeks of seven years each and then in fixing the date of any event he determines the exact month of the exact year of the exact year-week of the exact jubilee-period in which it occurred. From this it is not difficult to see why the whole book was called τὰ Ἰωβηλαῖα "the Jubilees." As the author was interested in chronology generally so he lays a peculiar stress upon the observance of the annual festivals and endeavours to prove with regard to each of the leading feasts that it had been instituted in the very earliest times; so for example with regard to Pentecost or the feast of Weeks (Ewald's Jahrbb. ii. 245 iii. 8) the feast of Tabernacles (Ibid. iii. 11) the great Day of Atonement (iii. 46) and the feast of the Passover (iii. 68 sq.). This also serves to explain why it is that he happens to finish with the institution of the Passover (Ex. 12).

As the author seeks to reproduce the history of primitive times in the spirit of his own day he deals with the Biblical text in a very free fashion. Many things that did not happen to interest him or that he considered objectionable were either omitted or altered while others were still further amplified by the addition of numerous particulars of one kind or another. He is always by way of showing exactly where the founders of the primitive families or races got their wives from; he explains how far Gen. 2:17 had been literally fulfilled (comp. Justin Dial. c. Tryph. chap. lxxxi.) with whose help Noah brought the animals into the ark how the Hamitic family of the Canaanites and the Japhetic one of the Medes found their way within the sphere of the Semitic family why Rebecca had such a decided preference for Jacob and so on. He is acquainted with the names of the wives of the whole of the patriarchs from Adam down to the twelve sons of Jacob he knows the name of the particular peak of Mount Ararat on which Noah's ark rested and many other things of a similar kind. All those embellishments and amplifications are entirely in the spirit of later Judaism. A peculiarly characteristic feature is the circumstance that the patriarchs are represented as paragons of moral excellence to even a greater extent than in the Biblical narrative itself and as being already in the habit of observing the whole of the Mosaic ritual of offering sacrifices and firstlings and of celebrating the annual festivals the new moons and the Sabbaths. It is further characteristic that everywhere the hierarchia coelestis is represented as forming the background of this world's history. The angels good and evil alike are regularly interfering with the course of human affairs and inciting men to good and evil actions. We learn that the angels observed the law in heaven long before it was promulgated upon earth. For from the very beginning that law stood inscribed upon the heavenly tablets and it was only by degrees that it was copied from these and communicated to men. It appears moreover that the whole of the divine teachings had not been openly published to the people of Israel many of them having been communicated to the patriarchs only in secret books which were transmitted by them to later generations.

Notwithstanding its many salient features of a characteristic nature it is still difficult to say amid what circles the book had its origin. Jellinek regards it as an Essenian work of an anti-Pharisaic tendency. But although a good many things in it such as its highly developed angelology its secret books its doctrine of the continued existence of the soul without any resurrection of the body (iii. 24) seem to favour the hypothesis of an Essenian origin yet there are others that but the more decisively preclude such a hypothesis. It says nothing about those washings and purifications that formed so important a feature of Essenism. It is true the author strongly reprobates the eating of blood still he by no means expresses his disapproval of animal sacrifices as was so emphatically done by the Essenes. Still less are we to think of a Samaritan origin as Beer is disposed to do for this hypothesis again is precluded by the fact that the author speaks of the garden of Eden the mount of the east Mount Sinai and Mount Zion as being "the four places of God upon earth" (ii. 241 251) and thus excludes Gerizim from the number. Again

Frankel's view that the book was written by a Hellenistic Jew belonging to Egypt is no less untenable. For as will be seen immediately the language in which it was originally composed was not Greek but Hebrew. There cannot be a doubt that the greater number of the peculiarities by which this book is characterized are such as it has in common with the prevailing Pharisaism of the time. And one might refer it to this without further ado were it not that several difficulties stand in the way such as its opposition to the mode of reckoning adopted in the Pharisaic calendar (ii. 246) and its doctrine of a continued existence of the soul apart from any resurrection (ii. 24). But it would be absolutely erroneous again if in consequence of these facts and because of the decided prominence given to the tribe of Levi (iii. 39 sq.) we were to suppose that a Sadducee was the author of our work for its elaborate angelology and its doctrine of immortality are of themselves sufficient to render such a supposition impossible. The truth of the matter would rather seem to be this that the author while of course representing in all essential respects the standpoint of the dominant Pharisaism of his time gives expression to his own personal views only in connection with one or two particulars here and there (so also for example Dillmann Rönsch Drummond).

That the book had its origin in Palestine is already evidenced by the fact that it was written originally in Hebrew For although the Ethiopic and the Latin versions have been taken from the Greek this does not alter the fact that the original was composed in Hebrew as is evident from explicit statements to this effect made by Jerome. The date of the composition of our work may be determined if not within very narrow limits yet with an approximate degree of certainty. For we find on the one hand that our author undoubtedly makes use of nay that he actually quotes the Book of Enoch. Then it is extremely probable on the other that the author of the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs had our book before him when he wrote. In addition to this there is the further circumstance that we nowhere find any reference whatever to the destruction of Jerusalem; on the contrary it is assumed throughout to be still standing as the central place of worship (comp. above all iii. 42 69). From all this we may venture with tolerable probability to refer the composition of our work to the first century of our era.

On the various titles of the book see Rönsch Das Buch der Jubiläen pp. 461–482. Besides those mentioned above we also find in Syncellus and Cedrenus the title ἀποκάλυψις Μωυσέως (Syncellus ed. Dindorf i. 5 and 49; Cedrenus ed. Bekker i. 9).

The Ethiopic and Latin versions are both based upon a Greek text on the former of which see Dillmann in Ewald's Jahrbb. iii. 88 sq. and on the latter Rönsch Zeitschr. für wissenchaftl. Theol. 1871 pp. 86–89. Idem Das Buch der Jubiläen pp. 439–444. But according to Jerome we must assume that the original text was in Hebrew. It may be conjectured that the Greek version would be prepared only at a comparatively late date say in the third century A.D. which would serve to explain how it happened that the book did not come into use in the Christian Church till the fourth century A.D.

It is obvious that in our work a liberal use is made of the Book of Enoch nay in one passage (Ewald's Jahrbb. ii. 240) it is said of Enoch that: "He wrote in a book the signs of heaven in the order of their months in order that the children of men might know the seasons of the years according to the order of the various months.... He saw in his dream the past and the future what was going to happen to the sons of the children of men in their generations one after another down to the day of judgment. All this he saw and knew and wrote it down as a testimony and left it on the earth as a testimony for all the sons of the children of men and for their generations." This and all that is said elsewhere regarding Enoch agrees entirely with the contents of our Book of Enoch. See in general Dillmann in Ewald's Jahrbb. iii. 90 sq. Rönsch Das Buch der

Jubiläen pp. 403–412.

On the allusions to our book in the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs see p. 122. The quotations found in the Fathers and the Byzantine writers are collected by Fabricius in his Codex pseudepigr. Vet. Test. i. 849–864 ii. 120 sq. Rönsch Zeitschr. für wissensch. Theol. 1871 p. 69 sq. Idem Das Buch der Jubiläen pp. 250–382.

Didymus Alex. In epist. canonicas enarrationes ad 1 John iii. 12 (Gallandi Biblioth. patr. vi. 300): Nam et in libro qui leprogenesis [l. leptogenesis] appellatur ita legitur quia Cain lapide aut ligno percusserit Abel (to which quotation Langen has drawn attention in the Bonner Theol. Literaturbl. 1874 p. 270).

Epiphanius Haer. xxxix. 6: Ὡς δὲ ἐν τοῖς Ἰωβηλαίοις εὑρίσκεται τῇ καὶ λεπτῇ Γενέσει καλουμένῃ καὶ τὰ ὀνόματα τῶν γυναικῶν τοῦ τε Καΐν καὶ τοῦ Σὴθ ἡ βίβλος περιέχει κ.τ.λ.

Jerome Epist. 78 ad Fabiolam Mansio 18 (Vallarsi i. 488) speaking of the name of a place called Ressa (רִסָּה Num. 33:21) observes: Hoc verbum quantum memoria suggerit nusquam alibi in scripturis sanctis apud Hebraeos invenisse me novi absque libro apocrypho qui a Graecis λεπτή id est parva Genesis appellatur; ibi in aedificatione turris pro stadio ponitur in quo exercentur pugiles et athletae et cursorum velocitas comprobatur. Ibid. Mansio 24 (Vallarsi i. 485) speaking again of the name of a place called Thare (תָּרַח Num. 33:27) observes: Hoc eodem vocabulo et iisdem literis scriptum invenio patrem Abraham qui in supradicto apocrypho Geneseos volumine abactis corvis qui hominum frumenta vastabant abactoris vel depulsoris sortitus est nomen.

In the Decretum Gelasii we find included among the Apocrypha a work entitled Liber de filiabus Adae Leptogenesis (see Credner Zur Gesch. des Kanons p. 218. Rönsch. pp. 270 sq. 477 sq.). It may be conjectured that here we have an erroneous combination of two titles belonging to two separate works. However we can see from this as well as from the circumstance of their being a Latin version of it that the book was also known in the West. On the indications of its having been made use of by occidental writers see Rönsch pp. 322–382 passim.

Syncellus ed. Dindorf i. 5: ὡς ἐν λεπτῇ φέρεται Γενέσει ἣν καὶ Μωϋσέως εἶναί φασί τινες ἀποκάλυψιν. i. 7: ἐκ τῆς λεπτῆς Γενέσεως. i. 13: ἐκ τῶν λεπτῶν Γενέσεως. i. 49: ἐν τῇ Μωϋσέως λεγομένῃ ἀποκαλύψει. i. 183: ἡ λεπτὴ Γένεσίς φησιν. i. 185: ὡς ἐν λεπτῇ κεῖται Γενέσει. i. 192: ὥς φησιν ἡ λεπτὴ Γένεσις. i. 203: ἐν λεπτῇ Γενέσει φέρεται.

Cedrenus ed. Bekker i. 6: καὶ ἀπὸ τῆς λεπτῆς Γενέσεως. i. 9: ὡς ἐν λεπτῇ φέρεται Γενέσει ἣν καὶ Μωσέως εἶναί φασί τινες ἀποκάλυψιν. i. 16: ὡς ἡ λεπτὴ Μωσέως Γένεσίς φησιν. i. 48: ὡς ἐπὶ τῇ λεπτῇ κεῖται Γενέσει. i. 53: ἐν τῇ λεπτῇ Γενέσει κεῖται. i. 85: ἐν τῇ λεπτῇ Γενέσει κεῖται.

Zonoras ed. Pinder (given in common with the two foregoing in the Boun edition of the Corpus scriptorum historiae Byzantinae) vol. i. p. 18: ἐν τῇ λεπτῇ Γενέσει.

Glycas ed. Bekker (also given in the Bonn collection) p. 198: ἡ λεγομένη λεπτὴ Γένεσις. P. 206: ἡ δὲ λεπτὴ Γένεσις λέγει. P. 392: ἡ δὲ λεγομένη λεπτὴ Γένεσις οὐκ οἶδ’ ὅθεν συγγραφεῖσα καὶ ὅπως φησίν.

The literature of our book is enumerated and considered at some length by Rönsch in Das Buch der Jubiläen pp. 422–439.

Texts: Kufâlê sive Liber Jubilaeorum aethiopice ad duorum libror. manuscr. fidem primum ed. Dillmann Kiel 1859. Dillmann Das Buch der Jubiläen oder die kleine Genesis aus dem Aethiopischen übersetzt (Ewald's Jahrbb. der bibl. Wissensch. vol. ii. 1850 pp. 230-256; vol. iii. 1851 pp. 1-96). Ceriani Monumenta sacra et profana vol. i. fasc. 1 (1861) pp. 15-54. Rönsch Das Buch der Jubiläen oder die kleine Genesis unter Beifügungen des revidirten Textes der in der Ambrosiana aufgefundenen lateinischen Fragmente etc. etc. erläutert untersucht und herausgegeben Leipzig 1874.

Special disquisitions: Treuenfels Die kleine Genesis (Fürst's Literaturbl. des Orients 1846 Nos. 1-6; comp. vol. for 1851 No. 15) which was written before the Ethiopic text was discovered. Jellinek Ueber das Buch der Jubiläen und das Noach-Buch Leipzig 1855 (reprinted from part 3 of the Bet ha-Midrasch). Beer Das Buch der Jubiläen und sein Verhältniss zu den Midraschim Leipzig 1856. Idem Noch ein Wort über das Buch der Jubiläen Leipzig 1857. Frankel Monatsschr. für Gesch. und Wissensch. des Judenthums 1856 pp. 311-316 380-400. Dillmann Zeitschr. der deutschen morgenländ. Gesellsch. xi. 1857 pp. 161-163. Krüger "Die Chronologie im Buch der Jubiläen" (Zeitschr. der DMG. vol. xii. 1858 pp. 279-299). Langen Das Judenthum in Palästina (1866) pp. 84-102. Rubin Das Buch der Jubiläen oder die kleine Genesis in's Hebräische übersetzt mit einer Einleitung und mit Noten versehen Wien Beck's Univ.-Buchhandlung 1870. Ginsburg art. "Jubilees Book of" in Kitto's Cyclopaedia of Biblical Literature. Rönsch Zeitschr. für wissensch. Theol. 1871 pp. 60-98. Idem Das Buch der Jubiläen Leipzig 1874. Hilgenfeld Zeitschr. für wissensch. Theol. 1874 pp. 435-441. Drummond The Jewish Messiah (1877) pp. 143-147. Reuss Gesch. der heil. Schriften A.T.'s § 571. Dillmann Beiträge aus dem Buch der Jubiläen zur Kritik des Pentateuch-Textes (Transactions of the Berlin Academy 1883 pp. 323-340). Idem in Herzog's Real-Enc. 2nd ed. xii. 364 sq.

2. The Martyrdom of Isaiah

An apocryphal work containing an account of the martyrdom of Isaiah is repeatedly mentioned by Origen. He simply calls it an ἀπόκρυφον tells us nothing of its contents beyond the statement that Isaiah had been sawn asunder and plainly describes it as a Jewish production. Again in the Constitutiones apostol. reference is made merely in a general way to an Apocryphum Ἠσαΐου. On the other hand in the list of the canon edited by Montfaucon Pitra and others there is a more precise mention of a Ἠσαΐου ὅρασις (see p. 127). Epiphanius knows of an ἀναβατικὸν Ἠσαΐου which was in use among the Archontics and the Hieracites. Jerome speaks of an Ascensio Isaiae. It is extremely probable that these references are not all to one and the same work that on the contrary Origen had in view a purely Jewish production while the others referred to a Christian version of it or to some Christian work quite independent of it. For there exists a Christian Apocryphum on Isaiah which at all events is made up of a variety of elements though the oldest of them may be pretty clearly seen to be a Jewish history of the martyrdom of Isaiah. This Apocryphum like so many others has come down to us in its entirety only in an Ethiopic version and was published for the first time by Laurence (1819). The second half of it is likewise extant in an old Latin version which was printed at Venice in 1522 but had long disappeared until it was brought to light again by Gieseler (1832). This whole material accompanied with valuable disquisitions and elucidations has been embodied in Dillmann's edition (Ascensio Isaiae Lips. 1877). Lastly Gebhardt published (1878) a Greek text which however does not profess to be the original book but an adaptation of it in the shape of a Christian legend of the saints.

The contents of the whole work as given in the Ethiopic text are as follows: First part: the martyrdom (chaps. 1-5). Isaiah intimates to Hezekiah the future impiety of his son Manasseh

(chap. 1). After Hezekiah's death Manasseh as had been foretold abandons himself entirely to the service of Satan in consequence of which Isaiah and those of his way of thinking retire into solitude (chap. 2). Thereupon a certain person called Balkirah complains to King Manasseh that Isaiah had been uttering prophecies against the king and the people (chap. 3:1–12). As for Balkirah he had been incited to this hostility to Isaiah by Satan (Berial) who was angry at the former because he had predicted the coming redemption by Christ. Here the writer takes occasion to recount the whole history of Jesus and His Church as it had been foretold by Isaiah and that from Christ's incarnation down to the Neronic persecution (chap. 4:2) and the last judgment (3:13–4 fin.). In deference to the clamours for the punishment of the prophet Manasseh orders him to be sawn asunder a martyr death which he bears with singular firmness (chap. 5). Second part: the vision (chaps. 6–11). In the twentieth year of Hezekiah's reign Isaiah sees the following vision which he communicates to King Hezekiah and to Josab his own (the prophet's) son (chap. 6). An angel conducts the prophet first of all through the firmament and throughout the whole six lower heavens and shows him all that was to be seen in each of them (chaps. 7 and 8). At last they reach the seventh heaven where Isaiah sees all the righteous that have died from Adam downwards and then he sees God the Lord Himself (chap. 9). After having heard God the Father giving to his Son Jesus Christ His commission to descend into the world Isaiah comes back again to the firmament accompanied by the angel (chap. 10). Here there is revealed to him the future birth of Jesus Christ and the history of His life upon earth down to His crucifixion and resurrection whereupon the angel returns to the seventh heaven while Isaiah goes back to his earthly body (chap. 11).

This outline of the contents of our book will suffice to show that here we have to do with two elements of a totally distinct and dissimilar nature. There is no connection whatever between the vision and the martyrdom. Not only so the vision is with singular awkwardness made to follow the martyrdom which in the order of time it should of course have preceded. Nor does the martyrdom again form one connected whole. Above all is the whole passage 3:13–5:1 which interrupts and disturbs the connection obviously to be regarded as a later interpolation as is also the kindred passage in the second part 11:2–22. And lastly the introduction again has only an apparent connection with what follows. On closer examination we find reason to suspect that in all probability that introduction was inserted at some subsequent period. On the strength of these facts Dillmann has propounded the following hypotheses regarding the origin of our book. In the first place we are to distinguish two elements that are independent of each other. (1) The account of the martyrdom of Isaiah chaps. 2:1–3:12 and 5:2–14 which is of Jewish origin; and (2) the vision of Isaiah chaps. 6–11 (exclusive of 11:2–22) which is of Christian origin. Then we are to regard these two elements (3) as having been amalgamated by a Christian who at the same time composed and inserted the introduction (chap. 1). Lastly when the work had assumed this shape another Christian would afterwards insert the two sections (chaps. 3:13–5:1 and 11:2–22). These conjectures may at least be regarded as extremely probable. They are borne out not only by the internal indications already referred to but by external testimony as well. In the free version of the whole book edited by Gebhardt no trace is to be met with of sections 3:13–5:1 and 11:2–22. Besides this latter section (11:2–22) does not occur in the Latin version which as has been previously observed embraces only chaps. 6–11. It is evident therefore that the sections in question must be later interpolations. But the circumstance that the vision and the vision alone is all that has come down to us in the Latin version goes to confirm the assumption that this vision of itself originally formed an independent whole. By the ὅρασις the ἀναβατικόν ascensio Isaiae mentioned by the Fathers we have therefore to understand merely that visionary journey of Isaiah through the seven heavens which had been composed by some Christian or another. In the case of Origen however it is the Jewish account of the martyrdom of Isaiah (chaps. 2:1–

3:12 and 5:2-14) that is in view. This latter is simply a legendary story composed for the purpose of glorifying the prophet. It contains nothing of an apocalyptic character and consequently does not belong to the category of prophetic pseudepigraphs but to that of legendary works.

The story of the sawing asunder of Isaiah is mentioned by writers of so early a date as Justin Martyr Dial. c. Tryph. chap. cxx.; Tertullian De patientia chap. xiv.; Scorpiace chap. viii. (comp.). It is probably this too that the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews has in view in chap. xi. 37. In so far as it is probable that the reference here is to our book so far have we at the same time a clue to the date of the composition of that Epistle.

Origen Epist. ad Africanum chap. ix. (de la Rue i. 19 sq.; Lommatzsch xvii. 51). With the view of proving that the Jewish authorities had suppressed everything that represented them in an unfavourable light some specimens of which have nevertheless come down to us in apocryphal writings (ὧν τινα σώζεται ἐν ἀποκρύφοις) Origen proceeds as follows: Καὶ τσύτου παράδειγμα δώσομεν τὰ περὶ τὸν Ἠσαΐαν ἱστορούμενα καὶ ὑπὸ τῆς πρὸς Ἑβραίους ἐπιστολῆς μαρτυρούμενα ἐν οὐδενὶ τῶν φανερῶν βιβλίων γεγραμμένα (here follows the quotation Heb. 11:37).… Σαφὲς δ' ὅτι αἱ παραδόσεις λέγουσι πεπρίσθαι Ἠσαΐαν τὸν προφήτην• καὶ ἕν τινι ἀποκρύφῳ τοῦτο φέρεται• ὅπερ τάχα ἐπίτηδες ὑπὸ Ἰουδαίων ῥεραδιούργηται λέξεις τινὰς τὰς μὴ πρεπούσας παρεμβεβληκτόων τῇ γραφῇ ἵν' ἡ ὅλη ἀπιστηθῇ.

Origen Ad Matth. xiii. 57 (de la Rue iii. 465; Lommatzsch iii. 49): Καὶ Ησαΐας δὲ πεπρίσθαι ὑπὸ τοῦ λαοῦ ἱστόρηται• εἰ δέ τις οὐ προσίεται τὴν ἱστορίαν διὰ τὸ ἐν τῷ ἀποκρύφῳ Ἠσαΐα αὐτὴν φέρεσθαι πιστευσάτω τοῖς ἐν τῇ πρὸς Ἑβραίους οὕτω γεγραμμένοις (Heb. 11:37).

Origen Ad Matth. xxiii. 37 (de la Rue iii. 848; Lommatzsch iv. 237 sq.): Propterea videndum ne forte oporteat ex libris secretioribus qui apud Judaeos feruntur ostendere verbum Christi et non solum Christi sed etiam discipulorum ejus.… Fertur ergo in scripturis non manifestis serratum esse Jesaiam etc.

Origen In Jesaiam homil. i. 5 (de la Rue 108; Lommatzsch xiii. 245 sq.): Ajunt [Judaei] ideo Isaiam esse sectum a populo quasi legem praevaricantem et extra scripturas annuntiantem. Scriptura enim dicit: "nemo videbit faciem meam et vivet." Iste vero ait: "vidi Dominum Sabaoth." Moses ajunt non vidit et tu vidisti? Et propter hoc eum secuerunt et condemnaverunt eum ut impium. And this is precisely as the affair is represented in our book chap. iii. 8 sqq.

Epiphanius Haer. xl. 2 (speaking of the Archontics): λαμβάνουσι δὲ λάβας ἀπὸ τοῦ ἀναβατικοῦ Ἠσαΐα ἔτι δὲ καὶ ἄλλων τινῶν ἀποκρύφων. Idem Haer. lxvii. 3: βούλεται δὲ [scil. Hierakas] τὴν τελείαν αὐτοῦ σύστασιν ποιεῖσθαι ἀπὸ τοῦ ἀναβατικοῦ Ἠσαΐου δῆθεν ὡς ἐν τῷ ἀναβατικῷ λεγομένῳ ἔλεγεν ἐκεῖσε (here follows a quotation which substantially coincides with a passage in chap. ix. of our book).

Jerome Comm. in Isaiam chap. lxiv. 3 [al. lxiv. 4] (Vallarsi iv. 761): Ascensio enim Isaiae et apocalypsis Eliae hoc habent testimonium namely the passage 1 Cor. 2:9. With regard to the Apocalypsis Eliae see p. 129. The passage actually occurs in the Latin text of the Ascensio Isaiae. It is wanting however in the Ethiopic and so is obviously an interpolation.

Jerome Comm. in Isaiam chap. lvii. fin. (Vallarsi iv. 666): Judaei … arbitrantur … Isaiam de sua prophetare morte quod serrandus sit a Manasse serra lignea quae apud eos certissima traditio est.

On the patristic quotations comp. also Fabricius Codex pseudepigr. Vet. Test. i. 1086-1100.

The Ethiopic text was published by Laurence accompanied with a Latin and English version (Ascensio Isaiae vatis opusculum pseudepigraphum cum versione Latina Anglicanaque publici juris factum Oxoniae 1819). Mai (Scriptorum veterum nova collectio vol. iii. 2 1828 p. 238 sq.) published two fragments of an old Latin version viz. chaps. ii. 14-iii. 13 and vii. 1-19 without being aware that they formed part of our Apocryphum. After Niebuhr had discovered the source from which they came they were fully discussed by Nitzsch (Stud. u. Krit. 1830 p. 209 sqq.). The old Latin version of the Visio (chaps. vi.-xi. of the Ethiopic text) which had been printed at Venice in 1522 and had then disappeared for a long time was found again and reprinted by Gieseler in a Göttingen program (Vetus translatio latina visionis Jesaiae etc. Götting. 1832). The Latin version of Laurence accompanied with the old Latin texts was also reprinted by Gfrörer Prophetae veteres pseudepigraphi Stuttg. 1840. A German version of those texts was published by Jolowicz (Die Himmelfahrt und Vision des Propheten Jesaja aus dem Aethopischen [or as it should rather have been? aus Laurence lateinischer Uebersetzung] und Lateinischen in's Deutsche übersetzt Leipzig 1854). A critical edition of the Ethiopic text along with an amended translation and containing also the old Latin versions was issued by Dillmann (Ascensio Isaiae Aethiopice et Latine cum prolegomenis adnotationibus criticis et exegeticis additis versionum Latinarum reliquiis edita Lips. 1877). Gebhardt published a Greek text in which we have a free version of the whole book framed in the style of the later Christian legends of the saints (Zeitschr. für wissenschaftl. Theologie 1878 pp. 330-353).

Special disquisitions: Gesenius Commentar über den Jesaja vol. i. 1821 p. 45 sqq. Nitzsch Stud. u. Krit. 1830 pp. 209-246. Gieseler Göttinger Progr. 1832 (see above). Gfrörer Das Jahrhundert des Heils 1838 i. p. 65 sqq. A. G. Hoffmann art. "Jesajas" in Ersch and Gruber's Allg. Encycl. sec. ii. vol. xv. (1838) pp. 387-390. Lücke Einleitung in die Offenbarung des Johannes 2nd ed. 1852 pp. 274-302. Bleek Stud. u. Krit. 1854 pp. 994-998. Reuss Gesch. der heil. Schriften Neuen Testaments sec. 274. Ewald Gesch. des Volkes Israel vii. 369-373. Langen Das Judenthum in Palästina (1866) pp. 157-167. Dillmann in his edition (1877). Idem in Herzog's Real-Enc. 2nd ed. vol. xii. 359 sq. Renan L'église chrétienne 1879) p. 528 sq.

3. The Lost Legendary Works

In a manner similar to that which we have just seen exemplified in the case of Isaiah pretty nearly the whole of the prominent personages belonging to the hallowed days of old were laid hold of by the legendary spirit for the purpose of throwing around them a halo of glory. The plain narratives of Holy Scripture were far too simple and unadorned to satisfy the tastes and the needs of later times. A desire was manifested to know more about those men above all to know something regarding them of a more piquant and edifying character than was furnished by the canonical records. Accordingly we find that it is the lives of the three great heroes Adam the progenitor of the human race Abraham the father of Israel and Moses the great lawgiver that have been most elaborately embellished by fictitious legends. And there are many other men of God besides whose lives have been subjected to a similar treatment (comp. in general et seq.). Then Christians have laid hold of the existing Jewish legends and elaborated them with equal nay if possible with greater zeal. Consequently as in the case of the Apocalypses so also here we often find it impossible to distinguish with any certainty between what is Jewish and what is Christian. The foundations of the legends themselves are in most cases undoubtedly Jewish. But it is not improbable that the earliest writings of this class are also to be ascribed to Jewish authors. This holds true above all of the three great founders of new epochs Adam Abraham and Moses to whom therefore we will here confine ourselves.

1. Books of Adam. A variety of tolerably voluminous Christian works on the life of Adam have come down to us an Ethiopic one a Syriac one another in Syriac and Arabic one in Greek and another in Latin. Although the whole of these are unquestionably of Christian origin and although there is not one of them that can be regarded as based upon a Jewish original still it is probable that they have drawn upon Jewish material. A Jewish Book of Adam is mentioned in the Talmud. The Constitutiones apostol. vi. 16 mention an apocryphal Ἀδάμ along with the Apocrypha bearing the names of Moses Enoch and Isaiah. Again in the list of the Apocrypha published by Montfaucon Pitra and others Ἀδάμ finds a place among the rest of the Jewish Apocrypha (see p. 126). Indeed at an early period there already existed Gnostic ἀποκαλύψεις τοῦ Ἀδάμ (Epiphanius Haer. xxvi. 8). In the Decretum Gelasii there occurs a Liber qui appellatur Poenitentia Adae (Credner Zur Gesch. des Kanons p. 219).

Editions of the Christian books of Adam: (1) Dillmann published a German translation of an Ethiopic Book of Adam (Ewald's Jabrbb. der bibl. Wissensch. vol. v. 1853 pp. 1-144). The Ethiopic text was published by Trumpp (Transactions of the Akademie der Wissensch. of Münich philosopho-philol. department vol. xv. 1879-1881) and an English version by Malan (Book of Adam and Eve also called the Conflict of Adam and Eve with Satan translated from the Ethiopic London 1882). (2) Akin to the above and if we are to believe Dillmann possessing a greater claim to originality is a Syriac work entitled "the treasure hole" (i.e. the hole in which the treasures of Paradise were kept) which as yet is known only through a German version published by Bezold (Die Schatzhöhle aus dem syr. Texte dreier unedirter Handschriften in's Deutsche übersetzt Leipzig 1883). (3) Another Syriac and Arabic work entitled "The Testament of Adam" has been published by Renan in the Syriac text accompanied with a French translation (Journal asiatique fifth series vol. ii. 1853 pp. 427-71). (4) Tischendorf published a Greek Book of Adam under the title Apocalypsis Mosis (Apocalypses apocryphae Lips. 1866) and which was also published by Ceriani (Monum. sacra et prof. v. 1). On this comp. p. 81. (5) Nearly allied to this Greek work in fact to some extent identical with it is the Latin Vita Adae et Evae published by Wilh. Meyer (Transactions of the Münich Academy philos.-philol. department vol. xiv. 1878).

Comp. in general Fabricius Codex pseudepigr. Vet. Test. i. 1-94 ii. 1-43. Zunz Die gottesdienstlichen Vorträge der Juden 1832 p. 128 sq. (the Rabbinical quotations here). Dukes in Fürst's Literaturbl. des Orients 1849 coll. 76-78. Comp. also ibid. 1850 pp. 705 sqq. 732 sqq. Lücke Einl. in die Offenbarung des Johannes 2nd ed. p. 232. Hort art. "Adam Books of" in Smith and Wace's Dictionary of Christian Biography vol. i. 1877 pp. 34-39. Renan L'église chrétienne (1879) p. 529 sq. Dillmann in Herzog's Real-Enc. 2nd ed. xii. 366 sq.

2. Abraham. A short apocryphal book of Ἀβραάμ (consisting of 300 verses) occurs in the Stichometry of Nicephorus and the Synopsis Athanasii (see p. 125). And as in these lists it is found in the very heart of the Jewish Apocrypha it is of course a different book from that of the ἀποκάλυψις Ἀβραάμ which was in use among the Sethites (Epiphanius Haer. xxxix. 5). On the other hand it is no doubt the former of these that Origen has in view in the case of those statements regarding Abraham which he borrows from a certain apocryphal work.

Origen In Lucam homil. xxxv. init. (de la Rue iii. 973; Lommatzsch v. 217): Legimus si tamen cui placet hujuscemodi scripturam recipere justitiae et iniquitatis angelos super Abrahami salute et interitu disceptantes dum utraeque turmae suo eum volunt coetui vendicare.

Comp. also Lücke Einl. in die Offenb. Joh. p. 232; and for the Abrahamic legend generally see;

and Fabricius Cod. pseudepigr. i. pp. 341-428 ii. p. 81 sq. B. Beer Leben Abrahams nach Auffassung der jüdischen Sage Leipzig 1859.

3. Moses and his time. The apocryphal literature regarding Moses himself has been already considered at p. 80. But among the books referring both to himself and his time there is still another work to be mentioned the theme of which was a single episode in the lawgiver's life we mean the Book of Jannes and Jambres the two Egyptian magicians who according to Ex. 7:8 sqq. wrought miracles before Pharaoh equal to those of Moses and Aaron but were nevertheless beaten in the end. The names are not mentioned in the Old Testament but they occur at a comparatively early date in the legends and they were known not only in Jewish but in Gentile and Christian circles as well as the names of the two famous Egyptian magicians in question. The orthography fluctuates exceedingly. In the Greek texts the prevailing spelling is Ἰαννῆς καὶ Ἰαμβρῆς as in the Targum of Jonathan it is יניסוימברים. In the Talmud on the other hand we find יוחני וממרא (Jochane and Mamre) while in the Latin texts the names are almost uniformly spelt Jannes (or Jamnes) et Mambres. What the original spelling was it is difficult to determine. In any case the names appear to be of Semitic origin (see Steiner in Schenkel's Bibellex. iii. 189; Riehm's Wörterb. p. 665 sq.; Orelli in Herzog's Real-Enc. vi. 478 sq.). The book written about the magicians in question is mentioned by Origen and in the Decretum Gelasii. As the name of Jannes was known even to so early a writer as Pliny and as it is probable that those anonymous personages owed their name and individuality first of all to the apocryphal book itself we may perhaps venture to refer the date of the composition of this work to pre-Christian times.

For the Rabbinical passages referring to Jannes and Jambres see Buxtorf's Lex. Chald. col. 945-947. Schoettgen Horae hebr. note on 2 Tim. 3:8. Wetstein Nov. Test. note on same passage. Levy Chald. Wörterb. i. 337. Idem Neuhebr. Wörterb. ii. 226. The form יוחני וממרא is found in Menachoth lxxxv.; ינים וימברים in the Targum of Jonathan on Ex. 1:15 7:11; Num. 22:22; and also יונוסויומברוס (Jonos and Jombros) in the Tanachuma and Sohar.

Of heathen writers Pliny and Apuleius are acquainted with Jannes while the neo-Platonist Numenius knows both Jannes and Jambres. (1) Pliny Hist. Nat. xxx. 1. 11: Est et alia magices factio a Mose et Janne et Lotape ac Judaeis pendens sed multis milibus annorum post Zoroastren. (2) Apuleius Apolog. (or De magia) chap. xc. ed. Hildebrand: Ego ille sim Carinondas vel Damigeron vel is Moses vel Jannes vel Apollonius vel ipse Dardanus vel quicumque alius post Zoroastren et Hostanen inter magos celebratus est. (3) Numenius in Eusebius Praep. evang. ix. 8: Τὰ δ' ἐξῆς Ἰαννῆς καὶ Ἰαμβρῆς Αἰγύπτιοι ἱερογραμματεῖς ἄνδρες οὐδένος ἥττους μαγεῦσαι κριθέντες εἶναι ἐπὶ Ἰουδαίων ἐξελαυνομένων ἐξ Αἰγύπτου. Μουσαίῳ γοῦν τῷ Ἰουδαίων ἐξηγησαμένῳ ἀνδρὶ γενομένῳ θεῷ εὔξασθαι δυνατωτάτῳ οἱ παραστῆναι ἀξιωθέντες ὑπὸ τοῦ πλήθους τοῦ τῶν Αἰγυπτίων οὗτοι ἦσαν τῶν τε συμφορῶν ἃς ὁ Μουσαῖος ἐπῆγε τῇ Αἰγύπτῳ τὰς νεανικωτάτας αὐτῶν ἐπιλύεσθαι ὤφθησαν δυνατοί. In view of this passage Origen Contra Celsum iv. 51 says with regard to Numenius that: Ἐκτίθεται καὶ τὴν περὶ Μωϋσέως καὶ Ἰαννοῦ καὶ Ἰαμβροῦ ἱστορίαν. Owing to the circumstance that the term Μουσαῖος which is here used for Moses is precisely the same as that employed by the Hellenist Artapan Freudenthal (Alexander Polyhistor. 1875 p. 173) is disposed to think that the story is borrowed from Artapan and that he is the author of the legend. But this argument however cannot be regarded as conclusive. Then the names of the magicians which in all probability are Semitic seem rather to point to a Palestinian origin.

Then passing within the pale of Christianity the passage that first claims attention is 2 Tim. 3:8:

ὃν τρόπον δὲ Ἰαννῆς καὶ Ἰαμβρῆς ἀντέστησαν Μωϋσεῖ. Further among Greek authors we may mention Evang. Nicodemi (= Acta Pilati) chap. v.; Constitut. apostol. viii. 1 and subsequent Fathers; but above all the hagiologist Palladius who relates in his Historia Lausiaca (written about 420 A.D. see Fabricius-Hartes Bibl. graec. x. 98 sqq.) that Macarius visited the κηποτάφιον which Jannes and Jambres had erected for themselves and that he had an interview with the demons that had their abode there (see the passage in Fabricius Cod. pseudepigr. ii. 106-111). Latin writers: The Latin text of the Evang. Nicodemi (= Gesta Pilati) chap. v.; Abdiae hist. apostol. vi. 15 (in Fabricius Cod. apocr. Nov. Test. i. 622). Cyprian De unitate ecclesiae chap. xvi. The Latin translator of Origen in the passages to be quoted below. The Decretum Gelasii (in Credner Zur Gesch. des Kanon's p. 220) and subsequent Fathers. The Latin writers as well as the Western authorities for the text of 2 Tim. 3:8 (Cod. FG and the text of the Itala) read Jannes (or Jamnes) et Mambres almost uniformly. See the various readings in connection with 2 Tim. 3:8 in the critical editions of the New Testament; also Thilo Cod. apocr. Nov. Test. p. 553 and the earlier literature given there. As the Talmud adopts the spelling ממרא Westcott and Hort are warranted in observing as they do in the note on 2 Tim. 3:8 in their edition of the New Testament that "the Western text probably derived Μαμβρῆς from a Palestinian source."

The Book of Jannes and Jambres (or Mambres) is mentioned: (1) By Origen Ad Matth. xxvii. 9 (de la Rue iii. 916; Lommatzsch v. 29): Quod ait "sicut Jannes et Mambres restiterunt Mosi" non invenitur in publicis scripturis sed in libro secreto qui suprascribitur: Jannes et Mambres liber. (2) Again Origen Ad Matth. xxiii. 37 (de la Rue iii. 848; Lommatzsch iv. 239) quotes 2 Tim. 3:8: "sicut Jannes et Mambres restiterunt Mosi sic et isti resistunt veritati" as evidence that apocryphal writings are sometimes referred to in the New Testament. Nec enim scimus in libris canonizatis historiam de Janne et Mambre resistentibus Mosi. (3) It is also mentioned in the Decretum Gelasii (in Credner Zur Gesch. des Kanon's p. 220): Liber qui appellatur Poenitentia Jamnis et Mambre apocryphus.

Comp. in general: Fabricius Codex pseudepigr. Vet. Test. i. 813-825 ii. 105-111. Suicer Thesaurus under Ἰαννῆς. Wolf Curae philol. in Nov. Test. note on 2 Tim. 3:8; and the commentaries generally on this passage. J. G. Michaelis De Janne et Jambre famosis Aegyptiorum magis Hal. 1747 The lexicons to the New Testament and the Bible Dictionaries of Winer Schenkel and Riehm. Rud. Hofmann Das Leben Jesu nach den Apokryphen (1851) p. 352 sq. Orelli in Herzog's Real-Enc. 2nd ed. vi. 478 sq. Dillmann ibid. xii. 365. Holtzmann Die Pastoralbriefe (1880) p. 140 sq. Heath in Palestine Exploration Fund Quarterly Statement 1881 pp. 311-317.

Whatever other works based on Biblical legends were in use in the early Church are either entirely unknown to us (such for example as the Book of Λάμεχ quoted in the list of the Apocrypha edited by Montfaucon and Pitra see p. 126) or they may without hesitation be regarded as Christian productions as for instance the history of Noria the wife of Noah (Epiph. Haer. xxvi. 1) or the ἀναβαθμοὶ Ἰακώβου (Epiph. Haer. xxx. 16) or the history of Asenath the wife of Joseph (according to Gen. 41:45) which are still extant in various texts. What the Jewish substratum may have been in those instances it is impossible to make out with any degree of certainty although there can scarcely be a doubt that Jewish Books of Noah for example were once to be met with. For further information regarding this whole literature consult Fabricius Cod. pseudepigr. and Dillmann art. "Pseudepigraphen" in Herzog's Real-Enc.

VII. BOOKS OF MAGIC AND MAGICAL SPELLS

By way of appendix to the above we may here mention further a class of literary productions which lie on the extreme confines of Jewish literature and which serve to show that the superstition that had sprung from the soil of the heathen nature-religions also continued to flourish with no little vigour among the people of Israel: we refer to the books of magic and magic spells. In the ancient world these represented the popular arts of healing. As even in our own day Christians are often met with who prefer the quack doctor to the skilled physician so in the ancient world at least in that part of it that was under the influence of the East there was often a tendency to have recourse to the magician and the exorcist rather than to the regular doctor in every sort of ailment. It is interesting in this connection to hear for example what Celsus says about the Egyptians (in Origen Contra Cels. viii. 58): "That some (higher) being or other controls things of even the most trifling nature may be learnt from what is alleged by the Egyptians who tell us that thirty-six (or as others affirm a good many more) demons or divinities of the air have allotted among themselves the human body which is supposed to be divided into a corresponding number of parts and that each has taken one of these parts under his own peculiar charge. And they know the names of the demons in their native tongue such as Chnumen and Chachumen and Knat and Sikat and Biu and Eru and Erebui and Ramanor and Reinanoor or whatever else they may be called. By invoking these they cure the ailments of the different members of the body." What Celsus here alleges with respect to the Egyptians is confirmed mutatis mutandis by hundreds of testimonies in regard to the rest of the ancient world as well. Magic and exorcism and that above all for curative purposes were uncommonly popular and prevalent throughout the entire Roman Empire. Nor did the Jewish people form an exception. We know from the Old and New Testaments as well as from Josephus how extensively the various forms of magic prevailed also among them. In later times Solomon was regarded as being above all the author of this art (on the strength of 1 Kings 5:12 13). Josephus informs us that this monarch composed and bequeathed to posterity certain incantations by means of which demons could be restrained and so effectually expelled that they would never re-enter the man again. By way of showing the efficacy of those incantations he tells a very amusing story about a Jew of the name of Eleazar who on one occasion and in presence of Vespasian and his sons and several Roman officers drew out a demon through the demoniac's nose by holding a magic ring under this organ and repeating at the same time the incantations of Solomon forbade him ever to enter again. At length to prove that the demon was actually expelled he ordered this latter to overturn a vessel of water that was near at hand which order was at once complied with (Joseph. Antt. viii. 2. 5). From the way in which Josephus speaks of the Solomonic incantations we feel constrained to assume that they must have been embodied in special books. Origen distinctly alleges as much. Those books survived although only after having undergone a variety of adaptations till far on into the Middle Ages. We still hear of one of the name of Aaron being at the court of Manuel Comnenus and who was in possession of a βίβλον Σολομώντειον by means of which whole legions of demons could be exorcised. This literature also found its way into Christian circles. The Decretum Gelasii knows of a Contradictio Salomonis while a Christian Testamentum Salomonis is still extant. And it is through popular Christian works of this sort that the knowledge of the efficacy of Solomon's magic spells has come down to more modern times and found its way into Goethe's Faust (the exorcising of the poodle: "Für solche halbe Hüllenbrut 1st Salomonis Schlüssel gut").

Official Judaism did not of course quite approve of those books of magic although the Babylonian Talmud itself is full of superstition. According to a tradition which is found both in the Mishna and in certain Byzantine writers (Suidas Glycas) we learn that the pious king Hezekiah ordered the suppression of Solomon's "Book of Cures" because the people trusted it so much that they neglected to pray to God.

On the subject of magic in the ancient world generally an abundant store of material is to be found in Georgii's art. "Magia" in Pauly's Real-Encyc. der class. Alterthumswissensch. iv. 1377-1418. On the same among the Jews see the article "Zauberei" in the Bible dictionaries of Winer Schenkel and Riehm. On this subject in Talmudic Judaism again see Brecher Das Transcendentale Magie und magische Heilarten im Talmud Wien 1850. Joel Der Aberglaube und die Stellung des Judenthums zu demselben 1st part Breslau 1881.

On Solomon see Fabricius Codex pseudepigr. Vet. Test. i. 1032-1063. The Crypta ubi Salomon daemones torquebat were still seen at Jerusalem by the pilgrim of Bordeaux in the fourth century A.D. (Tobler Palaestinae descriptiones 1869 p. 3).

Joseph. Antt. viii. 2. 5: Ἐπῳδάς τε συνταξάμενος αἷς παρηγορεῖται τὰ νοσήματα τρόπους ἐξορκώσεων κατέλιπεν οἷς ἐνδούμενα τὰ δαιμόνια ὡς μηκέτ' ἐπανελθεῖν ἐκδιώκουσι κ.τ.λ. (here follows the story about Eleazar referred to above).

Origen Ad. Matth. xxvi. 63 (de la Rue iii. 910; Lommatzsch. v. 7): Quaeret aliquis si convenit vel daemones adjurare; et qui respicit ad multos qui talia facere ausi sunt dicet non sine ratione fieri hoc. Qui autem adspicit Jesum imperantem daemonibus sed etiam potestatem dantem discipulis suis super omnia daemonia et ut infirmitates sanarent dicet quoniam non est secundum potestatem datam a Salvatore adjurare daemonia; Judaicum est enim. Hoc etsi aliquando a nostris tale aliquid fiat simile fit ei quod a Salomone scriptis adjurationibus solent daemones adjurari. Sed ipsi qui utuntur adjurationibus illis aliquoties nec idoneis constitutis libris utuntur; quibusdam autem et de Hebraeo acceptis adjurant daemonia.

On the βίβλον Σολομώντειον of Aaron in the time of Manuel Comnenus see the passage from Nicetas Choniates quoted in Fabricus Cod. pseudepigr. i. 1037 sq.

Decretum Gelasii (in Credner Zur Gesch. des Kanons p. 224) § 61: Scriptura quae appellatur Contradictio Salomonis apocr. Ibid. § 62: Philacteria omnia quae non angelorum ut illi confingunt sed daemonum magis conscripta sunt nominibus apocr.

The Christian Testamentum Salomonis was published by Fleck Wissenschaftl. Reise durch Deutschland Italien etc. vol. ii. 3 (1837) pp. 111-140. Also in Fürst's Orient vols. v. and vii. A German translation was contributed by Bornemann (Zeitschr. für die histor. Theol. 1844 iii. pp. 9-56). Comp. also Bornemann Conjectanea in Salomonis Testamentum (Biblische Studien von Geistlichen des Königr. Sachsen second year 1843 pp. 45-60 for fourth year 1846 pp. 28-69). With regard to the date of its composition comp. the passage from Leontius as given in Fabricius Cod. pseudepigr. i. 1063 sq. In how strange a manner Jewieh-Christian and heathen elements were all mixed up with each other may be seen for example from two Greek manuscripts containing magical treatises which were published by Parthey (Transactions of the Berlin Academy 1865).

Mishna Pesachim iv. 9: "Hezekiah concealed the book of cures (גנז ספר רפואות) and the learned approved of this." Comp. the commentary of Maimonides on this in Surenhusius's Mishna ii. 150 where it is expressly stated that the tradition had in view Solomon's Book of Cures. Suidas (Lex. under Ἐζεκίας): Ἦν Σολομῶνι βίβλος ἰαμάτων πάθους παντός ἐγκεκολαμμένη τῇ τοῦ ναοῦ φλιᾷ. Ταύτην ἐξεκόλαψεν Ἐζεκίας οὐ προσέχοντος τοῦ λαοῦ τῷ θεῷ διὰ τὸ τὰς θεραπείας τῶν παθῶν ἐνθένδε τοὺς πάσχοντας αὐτοὺς κομίζεσθαι περιορῶντας αἰτεῖν τὸν θεόν. Glycas in Fabricius Cod. pseudepigr. i. 1042 sq.

THE GRAECO-JEWISH LITERATURE

Preliminary Remarks.

STILL more varied than the Palestinian-Jewish is the Graeco-Jewish literature. Scriptural and Rabbinic Judaism on the one hand Greek philosophers poets and historians on the other form the factors through whose co-operation a literature of the most motley and varied character sprang up upon the soil of the Jewish Dispersion; a literature many-sided with respect not only to its forms but also to the standpoints taken up by its authors and the objects they pursued.

Hellenistic Judaism and its literature partake of the general intellectual and literary character of the period viz. of that Alexandrino-Roman epoch of Greek literature during which the latter left the soil of Greek nationality and became a universal literature. For the nations of the Mediterranean region did not merely assimilate Greek culture but also contributed on their part to the literary productivity of the age. In all lands authors made their appearance whose Greek education prepared them to participate in every kind of literary effort and whose co-operation imparted to Greek literature a cosmopolitan character; cosmopolitan in the twofold respect of origin and effect. The tide of the mental acquisitions of the East now flowed in increasingly upon Greek literature. Religion and philosophy received thence fresh impulses poets and historians fresh material. And on the other hand the effect aimed at was also cosmopolitan for they who now took pen in hand wrote not only for the little nation of the Greeks but for the educated classes throughout the world.

In this literary productivity Hellenized Jews also took a part. And what has just been said applies to them above all others viz. that they introduced a new element into Greek literature. The religious knowledge of Israel which had hitherto been the possession of only a small circle now brought its influence to bear in the department of Greek literature. The religious faith of Israel its history and its great and sacred past were depicted in the forms and with the means furnished by the literary culture of the Greeks and thus made accessible to the whole world. Such Jews wrote not only for their compatriots and co-religionists but for the purpose of making known to all mankind the illustrious history of Israel and its pre-eminent religious enlightenment.

The connection between their own national culture and that of the Greeks was of course in the case of the Jews as well as of other Orientals no merely external one. Judaism and Hellenism now really entered upon a process of mutual internal amalgamation. Judaism which in its unyielding Pharisaic phase appears so rigidly exclusive proved itself uncommonly pliable and accommodating upon the soil of Hellenism and allowed a far-reaching influence to the ascendant Greek spirit. The Hellenistic Jews were as unwilling as others to let themselves be deprived of that common possession of the entire educated world the great poets philosophers and historians of Greece. They too derived from the living spring of the Greek classics that human culture which seemed to the ancient world the supreme good. Under its influence however Judaism imperceptibly underwent a change. It stripped itself of its particularistic character. It discovered that there were true and Divine thoughts in the literature of the heathen world and appropriated them it embraced all men as brethren and desired to lead all who were still walking in darkness to the knowledge of the truth.

But while the Jews were thus like other Orientals becoming Greeks it was at the same time

seen that Judaism was something very different from the heathen religions. Its internal power of resistance was incomparably greater than theirs. While the other Oriental religions were merged in the general religious medley of the times Judaism maintained itself essentially inviolate. It adhered strictly and firmly to the unity of the Godhead and the repudiation of all images in worship and maintained the belief that God's dealings with mankind tend to a blissful end. Judaism by thus firmly adhering in presence of the pressure exercised by Hellenism to that which formed its essence proved the pre-eminence of its religious strength.

The consciousness of this pre-eminence impresses its character upon the Graeco-Jewish literature. It pursues for the most part the practical aim of not only strengthening its co-religionists and making them acquainted with their great past but also of convincing its non-Jewish readers of the folly of heathenism and of persuading them of the greatness of Israel's history and of the futility of all attacks upon that nation. Great part of it is therefore in the most comprehensive sense apologetic. In the predominance of the practical aim it is akin to the Palestinian. For as the latter has chiefly in view the strengthening and reviving of fidelity to the law the Graeco-Jewish literature at least for the most part pursues the object of inspiring the non-Jewish world with respect for the people and the religion of Israel nay if possible of bringing them to embrace the latter.

The chief seat of Hellenistic Judaism and consequently of Graeco-Jewish literature was Alexandria the capital of the Ptolemies which through their exertions had been raised to the first rank as a place of scholarship in the Hellenistic period. The means of culture afforded by the age were here at disposal in a profusion not to be found elsewhere; while at the same time Jews were nowhere else found living together in so great numbers out of Palestine. Hence there was an inward necessity that Hellenic Judaism should here reach its utmost prosperity and its literature be here chiefly cultivated. But it would be a mistake to suppose that such pursuits were cultivated only in Alexandria. They were indeed by no means specifically "Alexandrine" but the common possession of Hellenistic that is extra-Palestinian Judaism in general. Nay even in Palestine they found advocates although the Maccabean movement opposed a strong barrier to the encroachments of this tendency.

The diversity both in literary form and theological standpoint of the works now to be discussed is chiefly dependent on their greater adherence now to scriptural types now to Greek models. Between the two extremes here mentioned however are found a great variety of productions which it is difficult to subject to definite classification. The following groups may perhaps be most fitly distinguished.

I. TRANSLATIONS OF THE HOLY SCRIPTURES

1. The Septuagint

The foundation of all Judaeo-Hellenistic culture is the ancient anonymous Greek translation of the Scriptures known by the name of the Septuagint (οἱ ἑβδομήκοντα septuaginta interpretes) and preserved entire by the tradition of the Christian Church; Hellenistic Judaism is as inconceivable without it as the evangelical Church of Germany without Luther's translation of the Bible.

The single name must not mislead us to the notion; that we have here to deal with a single work not only the work of different authors but the work also of different times being subsequently comprised under this name. The oldest part is the translation of the Pentateuch of the origin of

which the so-called Epistle of Aristeas gives a detailed narrative. King Ptolemy II. Philadelphus (283-247 B.C.) was induced by his librarian Demetrius Phalereus to have the laws of the Jews also translated into Greek for his library. At his request the Jewish high priest Eleasar sent him seventy-two able men six out of each tribe by whose labours the whole was finished in seventy-two days (for particulars see No. VII). The historical nature of this account embellished as it is by a multitude of graphic details is now generally given up. The only question is whether the foundation of the fictitious embellishment may not perhaps be some historical tradition the essence of which was that the translation of the Jewish law into Greek was projected by Ptolemy Philadelphus at the instance of Demetrius Phalereus. This would in itself be very possible. For the learned and literary zeal of the Ptolemies and especially of Ptolemy Philadelphus would certainly make it conceivable that he should wish to incorporate the law of the Jews also in his library. In favour of this view may also be cited the circumstance that the Jewish philosopher Aristobulus in the time of Ptolemy VI. Philometor relates just what we have designated as the possible essence of the tradition without betraying any acquaintance with the fictitious embellishments of the Epistle of Aristeas which seems to show that he was following some tradition quite independent of the said Epistle. It is however suspicious that according to a very trustworthy account Demetrius Phalereus did not live at the court of Ptolemy at all but had already been banished by him from Alexandria immediately after the death of Ptolemy Lagos. Thus the supposed essence of the tradition also falls and there remains merely a bare possibility that the Septuagint translation of the Pentateuch owes its origin to the literary efforts of Ptolemy Philadephus. It is also as possible that it was called forth by the exigencies of the Jews themselves. For Jews who had at heart the maintenance of an acquaintance with the law even among the Dispersion observing that the knowledge of the sacred language was more and more decreasing and that the Jews of the Dispersion were appropriating Greek as their mother tongue might feel themselves induced to translate the law into Greek for the purpose of preserving the knowledge of it among Greek Jews also. This translation having been in the first place undertaken as a private labour gradually obtained official validity also. But obscure as is the origin of the translation it may be safely admitted on internal grounds that its locality was Alexandria and its date the third century before Christ for the Hellenist Demetrius who wrote in the time of Ptolemy IV. (222-205) certainly made use of it (see below No. III.).

The preceding remarks apply only to the translation of the Pentateuch to which alone the Aristeas legend refers. But after the sacred Thorah had once been made accessible to Hellenistic Jews the need of possessing the rest of the Scriptures in the Greek tongue was gradually experienced. Hence translations first of the prophets and afterwards of the Hagiographa followed. These too chiefly originated in Egypt. Some of the Hagiographa such as the Book of Daniel and some of the psalms not having been composed till the era of the Maccabees the Greek translations of these more recent Hagiographa cannot have been made earlier than about the middle of the second century before Christ. It seems however that in fact the translations into Greek of the. bulk of the Hagiographa together with the prophets were at about this time already in existence. Sirach the grandson of Jesus who came to Egypt in the year 132 excuses the defects of his translation by the fact that what is said in Hebrew does not retain the same meaning when translated into another language which is he says the case not only in his work but also in the Law and the Prophets and the other Scriptures (Wisdom Prolog.: οὐ γὰρ ἰσοδυναμεῖ αὐτὰ ἐν ἑαυτοῖς ἑβραϊστὶ λεγόμενα καὶ ὅταν μεταχθῇ εἰς ἑτέραν γλῶσσαν• οὐ μόνον δὲ ταῦτα ἀλλὰ καὶ αὐτὸς ὁ νόμος καὶ αἱ προφητεῖαι καὶ τὰ λοιπὰ τῶν βιβλίων οὐ μικρὰν ἔχει τὴν διαφορὰν ἐν ἑαυτοῖς λεγόμενα). Hence he evidently was already acquainted with a translation of the Prophets and the "other Scriptures." The Septuagint translation of Chronicles was certainly known to Eupolemus who wrote about the middle of the second

century before Christ (see below paragraph 3 and Freudenthal Alexander Polyhistor p. 119); that of the Book of Job to the historian Aristeas whose date it must be admitted is not exactly known but who being quoted by Alexander Polyhistor must have lived at latest in the first half of the first century before Christ (see below No. III. and Freudenthal Alexander Polyhistor p. 139).

After what has been said no further proof of all these translations being of Jewish origin is needed. The character of the translation differs widely in the different books being now tolerably free now helplessly verbal but chiefly the latter. As yet a precise investigation has been made only of individual books. A special difficulty in such investigation lies in the fact that it is often necessary to reconstruct the Hebrew text which must have been in the hands of the translators. In one point however all these works are alike viz. in the barbarous Greek produced under the influence of the Hebrew originals. Quite a new language swarming with such strong Hebraisms that a Greek could not understand it is here created. Not to mention the imitation of Hebrew constructions many Greek words which correspond to one meaning of a Hebrew word are without further ceremony made equivalent to the whole extent of the meanings comprised in the Hebrew word and thus significations are forced upon words which they do not at all possess in Greek (e.g. the words δόξα εἰρήνη and many others). How far colloquial intercourse with Hellenized Jews may have anticipated the labours of the translators cannot be determined. It is probable that an alternative action here took place. Much which the translators ventured upon was already found by them in colloquial language. But then the reaction upon the development of Judaic Greek exercised by a translation which came into general use would at the least be quite as great.

For the translations in question were not only combined into a whole but were also universally accepted by the Jews of the Dispersion as their text of Scripture. The oldest Hellenists Demetrius and Eupolemus in their compilations of Scripture history rely solely upon the Septuagint; Philo throughout assumes it Josephus does so for the most part. With Philo the text of the Septuagint is so far a sacred text that he argues from its casual details nay not only did this translation universally penetrate into private use but it was also used as Holy Scripture in the synagogue service (see). It was then transferred from the hands of the Jews to the Christian Church and regarded by it as the authentic text of Scripture. But the very circumstance of the Christian Church taking possession of this translation and deriving thence its polemical weapons in its conflict with the Jews gradually co-operated in bringing the Septuagint into discredit with them and in giving rise to new Jewish translations especially that of Aquila which in the time of Origen stood in higher respect with the Jews than did the Septuagint.

The text of the Septuagint has come down to us solely by the tradition of the Christian Church. In its history the learned labours of Origen which finally – and not without his own fault – led to a base corruption of the text are epoch-making Origen on account of the uncertainty of the Septuagint text and its great deviations from the Hebrew prepared a large edition of the Bible in which were written in six adjacent columns: (1) The Hebrew text in Hebrew characters; (2) the Hebrew text in Greek characters; (3) the translation of Aquila; (4) that of Symmachus; (5) the Septuagint; (6) the translation of Theodotion and indeed in this order (see Hieronymus Comment. in Tit. iii. 9 [Opp. ed. Vallarsi vii. 1. 734]; Epiphan. de mensuris et ponderibus § 19 and the other evidences in Field Origenis hexaplorum guae supersunt prolegom. p. 50). This was to lay a sure foundation for learned Scripture exegesis and especially for learned controversy against the Jews who often reproached Christians with their ignorance of the genuine text of Scripture (see on the motive and object of his undertaking Origen Comment. in Matth. vol. xv. c. xiv.; epist. ad African. § 5). The work affording a sixfold Scripture text was

called the Hexapla. Origen also prepared another edition without the two Hebrew columns which was called the Tetrapla (Euseb. Hist. eccl. vi. 16). On the other hand it was also called Octapla because in certain books of the Old Testament two anonymous Greek translations were added to the above-named six texts (Epiphain. de mensuris et ponderibus § 19; Euseb. Hist. eccl. vi. 16. Comp. on the whole work the Prolegomena in Field Origenis Hexaplorum guae supersunt 2 vols. Oxonii 1875 and the Introductions to the Old Test of e.g. De Wette-Schrader § 56; Bleek-Wellhausen § 282). The fatal circumstance was that Origen was not content with placing the text of the Septuagint in juxtaposition with the others but to facilitate its use noted is the Septuagint text itself the deviations from tke Hebrew by (a) furnishing such words sentences or paragraphs as were missing in the Hebrew with an obelus (the sign of erasure) and (b) by interpolating with the addition of an asterisk from other translations and mostly from Theodotion those found in the Hebrew and missing in the Septuagint (see his own remarks in his Comment. in Matth vol. xv. c. xiv. [Lommatzsch iii. 357]: καί τινα αὲν ὠβελίσαμεν ἐν τῷ έβραϊκῷ μὴ κείμενα οὐ τολμήσαντες αὐτὰ πάντη περιελεῖν• τινὰ δὲ μετ' ἀστερίσκων προσεθήκαμεν. Hieronymus Praef. in vers. Paralipom. [ed. Vallarsi ix. 1407 sq.]: sed quod majoris audaciae est in editione Septuaginta Theodotionis editionem miscuit asteriscis designans quae minus ante fuerant et virgulis quae ex superfluo videbantur apposita). He often proceeded also in a similar manner with inaccurate translations of the LXX. "by adding with an asterisk behind the obelized reading of the LXX. the parallel passages corresponding with the Hebrew from another version" (Bleek-Wellhausen p. 586). This text then especially copied from the Hexapla and often showing very careless dealing with the critical marks being disseminated since Eusebius (see Field Proleg. p. 99) a mass of such "hexaplarian" readings was introduced into the traditional text of the Septuagint; the common text (κοινὴ ἔκδοσις) being corrected by this hexaplarian one. The exclusion of hexaplarian additions is therefore the chief task of Septuagint criticism; and this is still approximately attainable for most of the books of the Old Testament the critical notes of Origen being still extant partly in certain Greek manuscripts partly in the Syriac translation of the hexaplarian Septuagint text (see Bleek-Wellhausen Einl. in das A. T. pp. 593 588 sqq.). The inserted matter has been very completely collected in Field Origenis Hexaplorum quae supersunt sive veterum interpretum Graecorum in totum Vetus Testamentum fragmenta 2 vols. Oxonii 1875. By the separation however from the hexaplarian text of the Septuagint of the passages marked with an asterisk the original text is by no means obtained. The MSS. already varied very much in the time of Origen (see Comment. in Matth. vol. xv. c. xiv. ed. Lommatzsch iii. 357). Origen first compiled from them a text for himself and then quietly altered according to the Hebrew many particulars in it which could not be made known by obelus or asterisk (Field p. 60 sqq.). Hence such a proceeding will only obtain the Recension of Origen.

Others besides Origen have occupied themselves with learned labours upon the text of the Septuagint. We know especially of two other recensions those of Hesychius and Lucianus; the former of these was disseminated in Egypt the latter from Antioch to Constantinople (Hieronymus praef. in vers. Paralipom. ed Vallarsi ix. 1405 sq.: Alexandria et Egypta in Septuaginta suis Hesychium laudat auctorem. Constantinopolis usque Antiochiam Luciani Martyris exemplaria probat. Mediae inter has provinciae Palestinos codices legunt quos ab Origine elaboratos Eusebius et Pamphilus vulgaverunt; totusque orbis hac inter se trifaria varietate compugnat). Hesychius is perhaps identical with the Egyptian bishop of this name who suffered martyrdom in the persecution of Maximinus 312 (Euseb. Hist. eccl. viii. 13. 7). No particulars are known concerning the nature of his recension. Lucianus was the noted presbyter of Antioch who also suffered martyrdom in the persecution of Maximinus 312 (Euseb. Hist. eccl. viii. 13.2 ix. 6.3). His recension was an emendation of the Septuagint according to the Hebrew with the help of other Greek translations (Suidas Lex. s.v.: Λουκιανὸς ὁ μάρτυς• αὐτὸς ἀπάσας

[scil. τὰς ἱερὰς βίβλους] ἀναλαβὼν ἐκ τῆς Ἑβραΐδος αὐτὰς ἐπανενεώσατο γλώττης ἣν καὶ αὐτὴν ἠκριβωκὼς ἐς τὰ μάλιστα ἦν). Comp. Field Proleg. cap. ix. Harnack in Herzog's Real-Enc. 2nd ed. viii. 767 sqq. on "Hesychius and Lucianus." Also the Introductions to the Old Testament e.g. De Wette-Schrader § 57; Bleek-Wellhausen § 283. According to the recent investigations of Field and Lagarde (see Theol. Litztg. 1876 p. 605) the recension of Lucianus is still preserved in several MSS. Lagarde has edited the text according to these (one volume has as yet appeared Librorum Veteris Testamenti canonicorum pars 1 graece edita Götting. 1883).

The labours however of Hesychius and Lucianus have but contributed to further confusion in the text of the Septuagint. For the text of the κοινή is now not only mixed up with the Hexapla text but also with those of Hesychius and Lucianus and the former having been even in the text of Origen very uncertain there is no longer any prospect of a certain recovery of the original text of the Septuagint. It is true that being still acquainted with the chief recensions we are in a position safely to pronounce judgment as to which of the MSS. is comparatively freest from the peculiarities of these recensions and therefore represents with the greatest comparative purity the original text. The old Latin texts also furnish important assistance.

Among those Greek manuscripts which contain the whole Old Testament or at least a great part of it the Vaticanus (1209) is acknowledged to hold the first rank with respect to the purity of the text. Its text has been ostensibly published by Mai (Vetus et Novum Testamentum ex antiquissimo codice Vaticano 5 vols. Rome 1857). His edition is however very untrustworthy. More accurate is the new Roman édition de luxe in facsimile type (Bibliorum Sacrorum Graecus codex Vaticanus edd. Vercellone and Cozza 6 vols. Rom 1868–1881 price of each vol. £6; comp. also Theol. Litztg. 1882 p. 121). Next to the Vaticanus must be mentioned the Sinaiticus discovered by Tischendorf in the year 1859 of which about half of the Old Testament has been preserved. Edition de luxe Bibliorum Codex Sinaticus Petropolitanus ed. Tischendorf 4 vols. Petersburg 1862. Tischendorf had previously discovered a smaller portion of this manuscript and published it under the title of Frederico-Augustanus (Codex Frederico-Augustanus ed. Tischendorf Lips. 1846). — The Alexandrinus which is already much infected by hexaplarian readings ranks third among these great Bible manuscripts. It forms the foundation of Grabe's edition of the Septuagint. The Vetus Testamentum Graecum e Codice MS. Alexandrino cura Henrici Herveii Baber 3 vols. London 1812–1826 gives the text of the MS. itself. Recently an edition has been prepared in photo-lithographic facsimile of which the portion comprising the New Testament has been first issued (Facsimile of the Codex Alexandrinus New Testament and Clementine Epistles published by order of the Trustees London 1879; comp. Theol. Litztg. 1880 p. 230). — The Old Testament appeared in 3 vols. 1881 sqq. Comp. also on the manuscripts the Prolegomena of the editions especially Holmes-Parsons and Tischendorf. The publications of Tischendorf (Monumenta sacra inedita) and Ceriani (Monumenta sacra et profana) contain much material.

Bibliographical information concerning the numerous editions of the Septuagint will be found in Le Long Bibliotheca sacra ed. Masch. vol. ii. 2 1781 pp. 262–304 Fabricius Bibliotheca graeca ed. Harles iii. 673 sqq. Rosenmüller Handbuch für die Literatur der bibl. Kritik und Exegese vol. ii. 1798 pp. 279–322. Winer Handbuch der Theol. Literatur i. 47 sq. Frankel Vorstudien zu der Septuaginta 1841 pp. 242–252. Tischendorf Prolegomena to his edition. De Wette-Schrader Einleitung in das A. T. § 58. All the editions fall back upon the following four chief editions: (1) The Complutensian Polyglot 6 vols. in Complutensi universitate 1514–1517. (2) The Aldina Sacrae Scripturae Veteris Novaeque omnia Venice 1518. (3) The Roman or Sixtine edition Vetus Testamentum juxta Septuaginta ex auctoritate Sixti V. Pont. Max. editum Rome 1587.

The text of this edition is relatively the best among the printed texts conforming as it does frequently though by no means entirely to the Vaticanus 1209. Since the majority of the more recent editions reproduce this Sixtine text the printed common text is a relatively good one. (4) Grabe's edition Septuaginta Interpretum vols. i.–iv. ed. Grabe Oxonii 1707–1720. It chiefly follows the Codex Alexandrinus. Of recent editions the most important is Vetus Testamentum Graecum edd. Holmes and Parsons 5 vols. Oxonii 1798–1827. The text is reproduced from the Sixtine edition but accompanied by an unusually copious collection of manuscript various readings. Though what is offered is not quite trustworthy and rather confuses than instructs by its copiousness still this edition has the merit of having for the first time brought forward the material furnished by the MSS. in general (comp. Bleek and Wellhausen Einl. in das A. T. p. 592 sq.). The manual edition of Tischendorf Vetus Testamontum Graece juxta LXX. interpretes 2 vols. Lips. 1850 2nd ed. 1880 also gives the Sixtine text with only unimportant corrections. Nestle has added to the sixth edition a collatios of the Vaticanus and Sinaiticus as well as of the Alexandrinus already collated by Tischendorf (Veteris Testamenti Graeci codices Vaticanus et Sinaiticus cum textu recepto collati ab E. Nestle Lips. 1880).

The literature on the Septuagint is almost unbounded (comp. Fabricius-Harles Biblioth. gr. iii. 658 sqq. Rosenmüller Handb. für die Literatur der bibl. Kritik und Exegese ii. 395 sqq. De Wette-Schrader Einl. in das A. T. § 51 sqq. Fritzsche in Herzog's Real-Enc. 2 vols. i. 280 sqq.). The chief work of earlier date is: Hody De bibliorum textibus originalibus versionibus Graecis et Latina vulgata Oxon. 1705. Of recent times may be mentioned: (1) On single books Thierseh De Pentateuchi versione Alexandrina Erlang. 1841. Hollenberg Der Charakter der alexandrinischen Uebersetzung des Buches Josua und ihr textkritischer Werth Moers 1876 (Gymnasialprogr.). Wichelhaus De Jeremiae versione Alexandrina Halis 1847. Vollers Das Dodekapropheten der Alexandriner 1st half Berlin 1880. The same in Stade's Zeitschr. für die alttestamentl. Wissensch. vol. iii. 1883 pp. 219–272 vol. iv. 1884 pp. 1–20. Lagarde Anmerkungen zur griechischen Uebersetzung der Proverbien Leipzig 1863. Bickell De indole ac ratione versionis Alex. in interpretando libro Jobi Marb. 1863. (2) On the whole: Frankel Vorstudien zu der Septuaginta Leipzig 1841. Herzfeld Gesch. des Volkes Jisrael iii. 465 sqq. 534–556. Ewald Gesch. des Volkes Israel iv. 322 sqq. Gfrörer Philo ii. 8–18. Dähne Geschichtliche Darstellung der jüd.-alex. Religions-Philosophie ii. 1–72. Fritzsche art. "Alexandrinische Uebersetzung des A. T." in Herzog's Real-Enc. 2nd ed. i. 280–290. The Introductions to the Old Testament of Eichhorn Bertholdt Hävernick Keil and others especially De Wette Lehrbuch der hist.-krit. Einl. in die kanon und apokr. Bücher des A. T. viii. edited by Schrader (1869) § 51–58. Bleek Einleitung in das Alte Testament 4th ed. superintended by Wellhausen (1878) pp. 571–598. Reuss Gesch. der heil. Schriften Alten Testaments (1881) § 436–439.

2. Aquila and Theodotion

The Septuagint translation was indisputably regarded as the sacred text of the Scriptures by Hellenistic Jews down to the beginning of the second century after Christ. The period of its ascendancy is at the same time that of the prime of Hellenistic Judaism. Subsequently to the second century the latter entered upon a slow but continuous course of retrogression which — to leave out of consideration the limits prescribed to the encroachments of Judaism by political legislation — was mainly brought about by the co-operation of two factors viz. the increased power of Rabbinic Judaism and the victorious advance of Christianity. A significant symptom in this movement was the new Greek translations of the Bible the object of which was to place in the hand of Greek-speaking Jews a text in conformity with the authorized Hebrew one. It is true that on the one hand the undertaking of such translations was a proof of the still existing

strength and importance of Hellenistic Judaism. On the other hand however they show that Hebrew authority had now attained acceptance and acknowledgment in a far stricter sense than formerly in the region of Hellenistic Judaism. The Jews of the Dispersion were renouncing their own culture and placing themselves under the guardianship of the Rabbins. These translations are at the same time a monument in the history of the struggle between Judaism and Christianity. They were to place in the hands of the Jews a polemical weapon in their contest with Christian theologians who were making the most of the very uncertain Septuagint text in their own cause (comp. especially Justin Dial. c. Tryph. c. 68 s. fin. 71 and elsewhere).

Of the three Greek translations of the Bible which Origen placed in his Hexapla of the Septuagint (Aquila Symmachus and Theodotion see above p. 164) only Aquila and Theodotion will here engage our notice; for Symmachus was according to Euseb. Hist. eccl. vi. 17 an Ebionite and therefore a Christian. Of Theodotion too it is not certain whether he was a Jew. Aquila on the contrary is unanimously designated as such and indeed as a proselyte.

According to Irenaeus who is the first to mention Aquila he was a Jewish proselyte of Pontus. The statement with respect to his native land is by reason of its striking parallel with Acts 18:2 somewhat suspicious though Epiphanius more precisely names Sinope in Pontus as his home. On the other hand it seems certain – notwithstanding his thorough Knowledge of Hebrew – that Aquila was a proselyts. For he is designated as such (עקילס הַגֵּר) not only by all the Fathers but also in the Jerusalem Talmud and in Rabbinic literature in general. Of the fables related of him by Epiphanius – that he was a relation (πενθερίδης) of the Emperor Hadrian that he at first turned Christian then was excluded from the Christian Church on account of his inclination to astrology and became a Jew – thus much is credible that he lived in the time of Hadrian. Rabbinical tradition also places him in the time of R. Elieser R. Joshua and R. Akiba and thus in the first decades of the second century after Christ. The aim of his translation was to imitate the Hebrew text as exactly as possible so that he not only ventured upon the bold formation of a multitude of new words for the purpose of obtaining Greek terms which should exactly correspond with Hebrew ones but he slavishly rendered Hebrew particles by Greek particles even when their meaning did not allow it (for proof of this see Field and others). A noted example ridiculed by Jerome is that in the very first sentence of Genesis he rendered the sign of the accusative אֵת by σύν (σὺν τὸν οὐρανὸν καὶ σὺν τὴν γῆν). This attention to the most trifling detail may perhaps be referred to the influence of Akiba whose pupil Aquila is said to have been. Jerome often mentions a prima and secunda editio of Aquila. And the numerous passages in which two different translations are referred to Aquila (collected in Field) confirm the existence of two different editions of the work. On account of its close accordance with the Hebrew text the work was at its first appearance favoured by R. Elieser and R. Joshua the eminent Rabbinical authorities and was as testified by Origen and also indirectly confirmed by Justinian's 146th Novella soon much preferred to the LXX. by Hellenistic Jews. About a dozen passages are quoted from it in Rabbinic literature. The work as a whole perished with Rabbinic Judaism. For what remains of it we are indebted to its admission into Origen's Hexapla. Numerous notices of Aquila's translation are preserved from the latter work some by quotations in Eusebius Jerome and other Fathers who still made use of the original Hexapla in the library of Pamphilus at Caesarea (Hieron. comment. in Tit. iii. 9 ed. Vallarsi vii. 1. 734) some in marginal notes in the MSS. of the Hexaplarian Septuagint text.

Irenaeus iii. 21. 1 (in Greek in Eusebius H. E. v. 8. 10): ἀλλ' οὐχ ὡς ἔνιοί φασι τῶν νῦν τολμώντων μεθερμηνεύειν τὴν γραφήν• "ἰδοὺ ἡ νεᾶνις ἐν γαστρὶ ἕξει καὶ τέξεται υἱόν" ὡς Θεοδοτίων ἡρμήνευσεν ὁ Ἐφέσιος καὶ Ἀκύλας ὁ Ποντικὸς ἀμφότεροι Ἰουδαῖοι προσήλυτοι.

Eusebius Demonstr. evang. vii. 1. 32 ed. Gaisford (p. 316 ed. Paris): προσήλυτος δὲ ὁ Ἀκύλας ἦν οὐ φύσει Ἰουδαῖος. Epiphanius De mensuris et ponderibus § 14 15.

Hieronymus Epist. 57 ad Pammachium c. 11 (Opp. ed. Vallarsi i. 316): Aquila autem proselytus et contentiosus interpres qui non solum verba sed etymologias quoque verborum transferre conatus est jure projicitur a nobis. Quis enim pro frumento et vino et oleo possit vel legere vel intelligere χεῦμα ὀπωρισμόν σιλπνότητα quod nos possumus dicere fusionem pomationem et splendentiam. Aut quia Hebraei non solum habent ἄρθρα sed et πρόαρθρα ille κακοζήλως et syllabas interpretatur et literas dicitque σὺν τὸν οὐρανὸν καὶ σὺν τὴν γῆν quod Graeca et Latina lingua omnino non recipit. Jerome generally gives a very favourable opinion of the accuracy and trustworthiness of Aquila. See Epist. 32 ad Marcellam (Vallarsi i. 152) Comm. in Jesaj. xlix. 5 6 (Vallarsi iv. 564) Comm. in Hoseam ii. 16 17 (Vallarsi vi. 656). See the passages of Jerome in which he mentions the prima and secunda editio of Aquila in Field Origenis Hexaplae quae supersunt proleg. p. xxv. sq.

Talmud jer. Megilla i. 11 fol. 71: תירגם עקילס הגר התורה לפני ר׳ אליעזר ולנפי ר׳ יהושע וקילסו אותו ואמרו לו יָפִיפִיתָ מבני אדם "Aquila the proselyte translated the Thorah in the time of R. Elieser and R. Joshua; and they praised him and said to him 'Thou art the fairest among the children of men' "(Ps. 45:3 with an allusion to the translation of the Thorah into the Japhetic). Jer. Kiddushin i. 1 fol. 59: תירגם עקילס הגר לפני ר׳ עקיבה "Aquila the proselyte translated in the time of Akiba" etc. Hieronymus Comment. in Jes. viii. 11 sqq. (Vallarsi iv. 122 sq.): Akibas quem magistrum Aquilae proselyti autumant. (Comp. .) A collection of Rabbinical passages in which the translation of Aquila is quoted is already given by Asariah de Rossi Meor Enajim c. 45; comp. also Wolf Biblioth. Hebraea i. 958-960 iii. 890-894; Zunz Die gottesdienstlichen Vorträge der Juden p. 82 sq.; and most exhaustively by Anger De Akila pp. 12-25. The name of Aquila is in Rabbinical literature often distorted into אונקלוס (Onkelos); so also e.g. in all the passages of the Tosefta see Zuckermandel's edition Index s.v. אונקלס.

Origenes epist. ad African. c. 2: Ἀκύλας … φιλοτιμότερον πεπιστευμένος παρὰ Ἰουδαίοις ἡρμηνευκέναι τὴν γραφήν• ᾧ μάλιστα εἰώθασιν οἱ ἀγνοοῦντες τὴν Ἑβραίων διάλεκτον χρῆσθαι ὡς πάντων μᾶλλον ἐπιτετευγμένῳ. It is mentioned in Justinian's Novella 146 that it was disputed among the Jews themselves whether the Scriptures were to be read in Hebrew or Greek in the synagogue service. Justinian directs that the latter shall not be hindered and as a Christian emperor recommends in the first place the use of the Septuagint but permits also the use of Aquila's translation (which was thus manifestly preferred by the Jews).

The fragments are very completely collected in Field Origenis Hexaplorum quae supersunt 2 vols. Oxonii 1875. The chief work formerly was Montfaucon Hexaplorum Origenis quae supersunt 2 vols. Paris 1713. Freudenthal regards the Septuagint translation of Ecclesiastes as the work of Aquila see Alexander Polyhistor p. 65 note.

The Literature: Hody De bibliorum textibus (1705) pp. 573-578. Montfaucon Hexapl. Orig. praelim. pp. 46-51. Fabricius Biolioth. graec. ed. Harles iii. 690-692. Anger De Onkelo Chaldaico quem ferunt Pentateuchi paraphraste et quid ei rationis intercedat cum Akila Graeco Veteris Testamenti interprete Part I.: De Akila Lips. 1845. Field Proleg. pp. xvi.-xxvii. Arnold art. "Bibelübersetzungen" in Herzog's Real-Enc. 1st ed. ii. 187 sq. Ewald Gesch. des Volkes Israel vii. 386-390. Herzfeld Gesch. des Volkes Jisrael iii. 62-64. Grätz Gesch. der Juden iv. 2nd ed. p. 437 sqq. Lagarde Clementina (1865) p. 12 sqq. Joel Blicke in die Religionsgeschichte (1880) p.

43 sqq. Die Einleitungen in's Alte Testament von Eichhorn (4th ed.) i. 521-531; Bertholdt ii. 534-537; Herbst i. 155-157; Keil (3rd ed.) p. 557 sq.; De Wette-Schrader § 55; Bleek-Wellhausen § 281.

It might appear questionable whether Theodotion who as well as Symmachus is as a rule called an Ebionite by Jerome should be named here at all. But Jerome elsewhere calls him a Jew and in a passage in which he expresses himself most precisely states the former as only the opinion of some. The other opinion viz. that Theodotion was a Jew and indeed a Jewish proselyte is evidenced by Irenaeus and also by Epiphanius whose fictions (that Theodotion was at first a Marcionite and then went over to Judaism) are not deserving of credit. According to Irenaeus Theodotion was a native of Ephesus. Epiphanius makes him a Marcionite and a native of Pontus. With regard to his date Epiphanius who places him under Commodus (A.D. 180-192) is generally credited. But the statements of Epiphanius are here untrustworthy. Nor must the circumstance that Origen places Theodotion in the last place in his Hexapla mislead us to the notion of his being the most recent of these translators of Scripture. He is at all events a predecessor of Irenaeus and very probably not more recent than Aquila for the use of his translation in the Shepherd of Hermas has lately been raised to almost a certainty. The work of Theodotion pursues in general the same object as that of Aquila viz. that of furnishing a translation which should render the Hebrew text more accurately than is done by the LXX. Theodotion however bases his work upon the LXX. correcting the latter according to the Hebrew so that it can only be called a thorough revision of this translation with which it is however in very close accordance. One peculiarity of his work is that he transcribes Hebrew words into Greek without translating them even more frequently than Aquila and Symmachus (Field gives a list of all the known cases Proleg. p. 40 sq.). We have no evidence of the use of this translation among the Jews. His translation of Daniel having been received by the Christian Church and having therefore supplanted the original Septuagint translation of Daniel in the Septuagint manuscripts has come down to us complete (the latter is preserved in only one MS. a codex Chisianus). For the rest numerous fragments of Theodotion have been preserved in the same manner as those of Aquila.

Hieronymus De viris illustr. c. liv. (Vallarsi ii. 893): Aquilae scilicet Pontici proselyti et Theodotionis Hebionei et Symmachi ejusdem dogmatis. Idem Comment. in Habak. iii. 11-13 (Vallarsi vi. 656): Theodotio autem vere quasi pauper et Ebionita sed et Symmachus ejusdem dogmatis. pauperem sensum secuti Judaice transtulerunt.... Isti Semichristiani Judaice transtulerunt et Judaeus Aquila interpretatus est ut Christianus. Idem praef. in vers. Iob (Vallarsi ix. 1100): Judaeus Aquila Symmachus et Theodotio judaizantes haeretici. Elsewhere however Jerome calls Theodotion simply a Jew see Epist. 112 ad Augustin. c. 19 (Vallarsi i. 752): hominis Judaei atque blasphemi. Jerome expresses himself most precisely in the praef. comment. in Daniel (Vallarsi v. 619 sq.): Illud quoque lectorem admoneo Danielem non juxta LXX. interpretes sed juxta Theodotionem ecclesias legere qui utique post adventum Christi incredulus fuit licet eum quidam dicant Ebionitam qui altero genere Judaeus est.

Irenaeus iii. 21. 1 (= Euseb. H. E. v. 8. 10); see the passage above p. 171. Epiphanius De mensuris et ponderibus § 17 18.

As for the chronology the circumstance which is chiefly decisive is that Theodotion was certainly the predecessor of Irenaeus. For the latter not only expressly mentions him but also makes use of his translation of Daniel (see Zahn art. "Irenaeus" in Herzog's Real-Enc. 2nd ed. vii. 131). The relation of Justin Martyr to Theodotion is doubtful. The text of the long portion which he quotes from Daniel Dial. c. Tryph. c. xxxi. agrees indeed in many minutiae with Theodotion in

opposition to the Septuagint of the cod. Chisianus and yet the use of the former cannot be inferred because the agreement with the latter preponderates. See Credner Beiträge zur Einl. in die biblischen Schriften vol. ii. (1838) pp. 253-274. In the Shepherd of Hermas Vis. iv. 2. 4 however use is freely made of Daniel 6:23 and that in a form which strikingly agrees with Theodotion in opposition to the LXX. (see Hort in John Hopkins' University Circular December 1884 and Harnack Theol. Litztg. 1885 p. 146). Hence it can scarcely be doubted that he preceded Hermas. But perhaps he was also a predecessor of Aquila for after the acceptance of Aquila's translation by the Hellenistic Jews forming as it does the first halting-place on the way to the formation of a Greek translation of the Bible in strict conformity with the Hebrew his would have been tolerably superfluous. This assumption will also explain his disappearance from Jewish tradition. It is also worthy of remark that Irenaeus names him before Aquila. Finally it may also be mentioned that in the Revelation of St. John sentences and expressions from Daniel are used in a form which accords more with Theodotion than the Septuagint (9:20 10:5 13:7 20:4. Comp. Salmon Introduction to the Study of the Books of the Old Testament 1885 pp. 654-668; and in accordance with it Harnack Theol. Litztg. 1885 p. 267). It must however be confessed that the accordances are not of a kind to allow us to infer with certainty an acquaintance with Theodotion's work on the part of the writer of the Apocalypse.

On the relation of Theodotion to the Septuagint Jerome says in his Comment. in Ecclesiastes ii. (Vallarsi iii. 396): Septuaginta vero et Theodotio sicut in pluribus locis ita et in hoc quoque concordant (i.e. in opposition to Aquila and Symmachus).

The acceptance of Theodotion's version of Daniel by the Christian Church in place of the Septuagint is repeatedly testified by Jerome see Contra Rufin. ii. 33 (Vallarsi ii. 527); praef. comment. in Daniel (Vallarsi v. 619 sq.); praef. in version. Daniel (Vallarsi ix. 1361 sq.).

The Literature: Hody De bibliorum textibus (1705) pp. 579-585. Montfaucon Hexapl. Orig. praelim. pp. 56 57. Fabricius Bibliotheca graec. ed. Harles iii. 692-695. Field Orig. Hexapl. proleg. pp. xxxviii-xlii. Arnold art. "Bibelübersetzungen" in Herzog's Real-Enc. 1st ed. ii. 188. Fürst in the Literaturbl. des Orients 1848 p. 793. Credner as above. Zahn as above. Supernatural Religion (complete edition 1879) ii. 210 sq. The Introductions to the Old Testament of Eichhorn Bertholdt Herbst Keil De Wette-Schrader Bleek-Well-hausen and others. The older literature in Fürst Biblioth. Judaica iii. 420-422.

II. REVISION AND COMPLETION OF SCRIPTURE LITERATURE

The work of Aquila and its favourable reception on the part of the Hellenistic Jews prove that from about the second century after Christ Hellenistic Judaism also kept strictly to the text and canon of the Palestinians. This is confirmed by the expressions of Origen in his Epistle to Julius Africanus. He here speaks of such component parts of the canon as are missing in the Hebrew especially of the additions to Daniel and Esther and the Books of Tobit and Judith as if they had never belonged to the Jewish canon. He regards them as the exclusive possession of Christians and says plainly that they are rejected by the Jews without making any distinction between Greek and Hebrew Jews (Epist. ad African. c. 2 3 and 13). Hence the canon of the Palestinians was at that time absolutely valid among the Jews of the Dispersion also. This was not the case in earlier times. The Jews of the Dispersion indeed always possessed on the whole the same Scriptures as those of Palestine. But in Palestine the canon attained a settled form about the second century before Christ. Later works even when they appeared under the name of sacred authorities and found approbation were no longer incorporated therein. Among the Hellenistic Jews on the contrary the boundaries still fluctuated for some centuries. A whole

multitude of works originating in the last two centuries before or even in the first after Christ were united by them to the collection of the Holy Scriptures and among them some also which being originally written in Hebrew and originating in Palestine did not become the property of Hellenistic Judaism till they had been translated into Greek. We have certainly no direct evidence of this fact. But the fact that the Christian canon of the Old Testament was from the beginning of wider and more vacillating extent than the Hebrew can only be explained by the circumstance that the Christian Church received the canon in just this form from the hands of Hellenistic Judaism. Hence the latter at the time of the founding of the Christian Church had in its collection of Holy Scriptures those books which are in the Protestant Church designated according to the precedent of Jerome as "apocryphal" because they are absent from the Hebrew canon. One thing however must not be forgotten that on the whole no settled boundary existed.

It is in accordance with this long maintained freedom in dealing with the canon that the Hellenistic Jews allowed themselves a liberty of procedure with single works longer than the Palestinians did. In the same manner as Palestinian Judaism had formerly acted with respect to its literature did Hellenistic Judaism during our period also freely handle and enrich by additions works already canonical in Palestine. This treatment had as a rule the same motives and objects as the legendary embellishment of more ancient sacred history. The only difference was that in the case of books already canonical the legend was placed beside the Scripture text while in that of books not as yet received into the canon it was interpolated in the text itself.

The majority of those books which though admitted by the Hellenistic Jews into the collection of the Holy Scriptures originally made no claim to be esteemed as such has therefore been treated of by us elsewhere. We here group together only (1) the revisions and completions of such books as had in their more ancient forms become canonical in Palestine (Ezra Esther Daniel the Prayer of Manasseh [an addition to 2 Chron. 33]) and (2) certain books which from the first aspired to be regarded as Scripture and which entered as such into the Hellenistic collection of the Scriptures (Baruch the Epistle of Jeremiah).

1. The Greek Ezra

Besides the Greek translation of the Hebrew canonical Book of Ezra there is also a free Greek revision differing from the canonical Ezra partly by transpositions partly by interpolations. The exact relation between the two will appear from the following survey of the composition of the Greek Ezra: –

Chap. 1 = 2 Chron. 35-36: Restoration of the temple worship under Josiah (639-609) and history of the successors of Josiah down to the destruction of the temple (588).

Chap. 2:1-14 = Ezra 1: Cyrus in the first year of his reign (537) permits the return of the exiles and delivers up the sacred vessels.

Chap. 2:15-25 = Ezra 4:7-24: In consequence of a complaint against the Jews Artaxerxes forbids (465-425) the continuance of the rebuilding of (the temple and) the walls of Jerusalem.

Chap. 3-5:66: independent: Zerubbabel obtains the favour of Darius (521-485) and receives from him permission for the return of the exiles.

Chap. 5:7-70 = Ezra 2:1-4:5: A list of those who returned with Zerubbabel the operations of

Zerubbabel and the interruption of the building of the temple in the time of Cyrus (536-529) till the second year of Darius (520).

Chap. 6-7 = Ezra 5-6: Resumption and completion of the rebuilding of the temple in the sixth year of Darius (516).

Chap. 8-9:36 = Ezra 7-10: Return of Ezra with a train of exiles in the seventh year of Artaxerxes (458); commencement of Ezra's operations.

Chap. 9:37-55 = Neh. 7:73-8:13: Public reading of the law by Ezra

According to this survey the reviser of the canonical Ezra took in hand the following changes: 1. The portion chap. 4:7-24 of the canonical Ezra is removed to an earlier place. 2. The portion chaps. 3-5:6 of the Greek Ezra is interpolated from an unknown source. 3. The book opens with 2 Chron. 35-36:4. Neh. 7:73-8:13 is added at the close. By the two first-named operations the confusion partly begotten by the canonical Ezra is considerably increased. For in this latter the portion chap. 4:6-23 stands out of place. It belongs to a much later period and treats not of the interruption of the rebuilding of the temple but of an interruption in the building of the walls. The editor of the Greek Ezra has indeed rescued this passage from the connection in which it is incorrectly placed but only to transpose it to a position if possible still more erroneous taking at the same time the liberty of adding to it by way of completion the interruption of the building of the temple. Not however contented with this he has also interpolated the paragraph chaps. 3-5:6 which transposes us to the times of Darius while subsequently (5:7-70) the times of Cyrus are again spoken of. Thus then the history goes directly backwards; first we have (2:15-25) Artaxerxes then (3-5:6) Darius and lastly (5:7-70) Cyrus. And in the last-named portion we are told in the most unembarrassed manner that Zerubbabel returned with the exiles in the time of Cyrus (comp. 5:8 67-70) while previously it was expressly stated that Zerubbabel received permission for their return from the special favour of Darius. With respect to the documents which were in the hands of our compiler only two things remain to be noticed: 1. That he did not translate the canonical Ezra from the Hebrew (so Fritzsche and most others) but compiled from the Septuagint (so rightly Keil Einl. 3rd ed. p. 704 sq.). 2. That he certainly discovered beforehand the portion chaps. 3-5:6 since it stands in direct opposition to the rest of the narrative. It seems to be a Greek original and not a translation from the Hebrew. The object of the whole compilation has been on the whole correctly expressed by Bertholdt (Einl. iii. 1011): "He intended to compile from older works a history of the temple from the last epoch of the legal worship to its rebuilding and the restoration of the prescribed ritual therein." Evidently however he meant to give also still more concerning Nehemiah for the abrupt conclusion could not possibly have been intentional. With respect to the date of the book all that can be said is that it was already used by Josephus (Antt. xi. 1-5).

Josephus in his account of the restoration of the theocracy (Antt. xi. 1-5) entirely conforms to the course of this Greek Ezra. For he brings what is contained in chaps. 2:15-25 and 3-5:6 of this book into the same position and the same order i.e. interpolates it between the first and second chapters of the canonical Ezra (Antt. xi. 2-3). In so doing however he does not proceed without historical criticism for he simply changes Artaxerxes who in the Greek Ezra is inserted in a quite impossible place into Cambyses so as to restore the correct order: Cyrus Cambyses Darius. He removes the further historical stumbling-block of the Greek Ezra of Cyrus reappearing after Darius by doing away with Cyrus in this place and making the return of the exiles first take place under Darius. This indeed restores the correct order of the Persian kings but a narrative is thus concocted which differs still more widely from actual history than that of the Greek Ezra itself.

Apparently this book was generally and from the first used in the Christian Church also. Clemens Alex. Strom. i. 21. 124: Ἐνταῦθα Ζοροβάβελ σοφίᾳ νικήσας τοὺς ἀνταγωνιστὰς τυγχάνει παρὰ Δαρείου ὠνησάμενος ἀνανέωσιν Ἱερουσαλὴμ καὶ μετὰ Ἔσδρα εἰς τὴν πατρῴαν γῆν ἀναζεύγνυσι (can only refer to chaps. iii. iv. of the Greek Ezra). Origenes Comment. in Johann. vol. vi. c. 1 (Lommatzsch i. 174): Καὶ κατὰ τοὺς Ἔσδρα χρόνους ὅτε νικᾷ ἡ ἀλήθεια τὸν οἶνον καὶ τὸν ἐχθρὸν βασιλέα καὶ τὰς γυναῖκας ἀνοικοδομεῖται ὁ ναὸς τῷ θεῷ (comp. Esra graec. iv. 33 sqq.). Idem in Josuam homil. ix. 10 (Lommatzsch xi. 100): et nos dicamus sicut in Esdra scriptum est quia "a te domine est victoria et ego servus tuus benedictus es deus veritatis" (Esra graec. iv. 59-60). Cyprian epist. lxxiv. 9: Et apud Hesdram veritas vicit sicut scriptum est: "Veritas manet et invalescit in aeternum et vivit et obtinet in saecula saeculorum" etc. (Esra graec. iv. 38-40). For numerous passages from later Fathers see Pohlmann Tüb. Theol. Quartalschrift 1859 p. 263 sqq. In the authorized editions of the Vulgate the book is placed in the Appendix to the Bible after the New Testament.

The book is sometimes entitled the first Book of Ezra (so the Greek MSS.: Ἔσδρας α′) sometimes the third Book of Ezra the canonical Books of Ezra and Nehemiah being reckoned the first and second (so Jerome [praef. in version. libr. Esrae ed. Vallarsi ix. 1524: nec quemquam moveat quod unus a nobis editus liber est; nec apocryphorum tertii et quarti somniis delectetur] and especially the authorized editions of the Vulgate).

Among the Greek manuscripts the Vaticanus (called No. 2 in Fritzsche's edition as well as by Holmes and Parsons) and the Alexandrinus (No. 3) hold the first rank the book not being contained in the Sinaiticus. On the editions see above pp. 10 and 11.

Ancient translations: 1. The old Latin preserved in two recensions one of which is found in the manuscripts and editions of the Vulgate the other in the cod. Colbertinus 3703. Both texts in Sabatier Bibliorum sacrorum Latinae versiones antiquae vol. iii. (in the Appendix after the New Testament corresponding to the position in the Vulgate). On the relation of both to one another see Fritzsche Handb. i. 10. 2. The Syriac on which comp. p. 11. This book is not contained in the large Milan Peshito manuscripts.

On the exegesis in general see p. 11. Commentary: Fritzsche Exeget. Handbuch zu den Apokryphen Part i. Leipzig 1851.

Separate investigations: [Trendelenburg] "On the apocryphal Esras" (Eichhorn's Allg. Biblioth. der bibl. Literatur vol. i. 1787 pp. 178-232). Dähne Geschichtl. Darstellung der jüd-alex. Religionsphilosophie vol. ii. (1834) pp. 116-125. Herzfeld Gesch. des Volkes Jisrael i. 320 sqq. iii. 72 sqq. Treuenfels "Ueber das apokryphische Buch Esra" (Fürst's Literaturbl. des Orients 1850 Nos. 15-18 40-49). The same "Entstehung des Esra apocryphus" (Fürst's Orient 1851 Nos. 7-10). Pohlmann "Ueber das Ansehen des apokryphischen dritten Buchs Esras" (Tüb. Theol. Quartalschr. 1859 pp. 257-275). Ewald Gesch. des Volkes Israel iv. 163-167. Bissell "The First Book of Esdras" (Bibliotheca sacra 1877 pp. 209-228; reprinted in Bissell The Apocrypha of the Old Testament 1880 p. 62 sqq. Clark Edinburgh). The Introductions of Eichhorn Bertholdt De Wette-Schrader Keil Reuss (see above p. 12).

2. Additions to Esther

The canonical Book of Esther relates how a Jewish virgin a foster-daughter of Mordecai was chosen for his wife by the Persian king Ahasuerus (Xerxes); how Haman the prime minister of the king published a decree in his name for the extirpation of all the Jews and was already

making preparations to hang Mordecai; how Mordecai however who had formerly saved the king's life was raised to great honour and Haman hanged on the gibbet destined for Mordecai whereupon Mordecai by an edict promulgated in the king's name revoked the edict of Haman and gave permission to the Jews to destroy their enemies; and finally how the Jewish feast of Purim was instituted for the commemoration of this wonderful deliverance of the Jews. A multitude of passages are interpolated in the Greek revision of the book e.g. the edict of Haman a prayer of Mordecai and a prayer of Esther the edict of Mordecai and the like. In these portions the spirit of the narrative is maintained and they present nothing needing remark. There is no reason for adopting the view of a Hebrew model (so e.g. Langen). According to the superscription of the Greek edition it was the work of Lysimachus the son of Ptolemy of Jerusalem and was brought to Egypt in the fourth year of King Ptolemy and Cleopatra by the priest Dositheus and his son Ptolemy. Since no less than four Ptolemies had a Cleopatra to wife the information even if it be regarded as trustworthy is not of much chronological value. It is certain only that Josephus was already acquainted with the Greek revision with the additions.

Josephus in his reproduction of its contents (Antt. xi. 6) has admitted also all the additions of the Greek revision.

Origenes Epist. ad African. c. 3 mentions these additions and expressly names the most important; assuming as self-evident the canonicity of the book in this form (the additions included). He also mentions De oratione c. 13 (Lommatzsch xvii. 134) the prayers of Mordecai and Esther inserted between chaps. 4 and 5 and gives in the same work c. 14 (Lommatzsch xvii. 143) the first words of both prayers.

The Greek text is extant in two widely differing recensions: (1) the common which is supported by the best manuscripts the Vaticanus (No. 2) the Alexandrinus (No. 3) and the Sinaiticus (No. 10); and (2) a much retouched one in codd. 19 93 108 (or more precisely 19 93 and 108 the last two manuscripts containing both the common and the touched-up texts). Langen thought he could prove that Josephus already had access to the latter. But Josephus chiefly coincides with the common text (comp. e.g. the portion Esth. 2:21–23 = Joseph. Antt. xi. 6.4 which is entirely expunged from the revised text the name of the eunuch Achrathaios Esth. 4:5 = Joseph. Antt. xi. 6. 4 which is also absent in the revised text and other matters). It has also been rendered very probable by recent investigations that the revised text is derived from Lucianus (see above p. 165). If then one or two instances of contact between Josephus and the revised text are really not accidental this would only prove that the words in question were formerly found in the common text also. Fritzsche published both texts at first separately (Ἐσθήρ duplicem libri textum ed. O. F. Fritzsche Zurich 1848) then in his edition of the Libri apocryphi Vet. Test. graece (1871). Comp. on the editions 10 above.

Ancient translations. 1. The Latin (a) The old Latin scording to a cod. Corbeiensis with the various readings of two other manuscripts in Sabatier Bibliorum sacrorum Latinae versiones antiquae vol. i. The beginning of the book according to the same translation is also found in Bibliotheca Casinensis vol. i. (1873) Florileg. pp. 287–289. On the character of the translation see Fritzsche Exeget. Handb. i. 74 sq. (b) The translation of Jerome who in his translation of the book from the Hebrew gives also a free Latin version of the Greek additions but places them all at the end and marks them with the obelus (Opp. ed. Vallarsi ix. 1581: Quae habentur in Hebraeo plena fide expressi. Haec autem quae sequuntur scripta reperi in editione vulgata quae Graecorum lingua et teris continetur … quod juxta consuetudinem nostram obelo ÷ id est veru praenotavimus). 2. The Syriac translation see above p. 11.

For the exegesis in general see above p. 11. Commentary: Fritzsche Exeget. Handbuch zu den Apokryphen Part i. Leipzig 1851. The other literature: Zunz Die gottesdienstlichen Vorträge der Juden (1832) pp. 120–122. Langen “Die beiden griechischen Texte des Buches Esther” (Theol. Quartalschr. 1860 pp. 244–272). The same Die deuterokanonischen Stücke des Buches Esther Freiburg 1862. The introductory works of von Jahn Eichhorn Bertholdt Welte Scholz Nöldeke De Wette-Schrader Reusch Keil Kaulen Kleinert Reuss (see above p. 12).

3. Additions to Daniel

The Greek text of the Book of Daniel contains the followig additions: (a) The Prayer of Azariah and the Thanksgiving of the Three Children in the Furnace. For when the three companions of Daniel were cast into the furnace (Dan. 3) one of them Azariah who was also called Abed-Nego first uttered a prayer for deliverance and when this was heard all three joined in a song of praise. The words of both are given. (b) The History of Susannah. A beautiful Jewess named Susannah the wife of Jehoiakim is while bathing surprised by two lustful Jewish elders and then when she cries for assistance slanderously accused by them of having committed adultery with a youth. Upon the false witness of the elders Susannah is condemned to death but saved by the wisdom of the youthful Daniel who procures a fresh investigation and by a skilful examination convicts the elders of perjury. (c) The History of Bel and the Dragon. Properly two independent narratives both of which are intended to expose the worthlessness and imposture of idolatrous worship. In the one we are told how King Cyrus (so Theodotion the king’s name not being mentioned in the Septuagint text) was convinced by a clever contrivance of Daniel that the image of Bel did not itself consume the food laid before it. In the other how Daniel having fed the Dragon to whom divine honours were paid by the Babylonians with cakes made of pitch fat and hair and so killed it was cast into the den of lions and there miraculously fed by the prophet Habakkuk and after seven days drawn out of the pit unhurt. Of these fragments only the first (the Prayer of Azariah and the Song of the Three Children) is properly speaking a completion of the canonical Book of Daniel the two others having no internal connection with it. In the text of Theodotion the History of Susannah stands at the commencement of that book the History of Bel and the Dragon at its close. This position is also evidenced by the Fathers (Hippolytus Julius Africanus and Origen). Neither of the fragments gives occasion for assuming a Hebrew original. The History of Susannah is even very certainly a Greek original as Julius Africanus and Porphyry already showed from the play upon the words σχῖνος and σχίζειν (vers. 54 55) πρῖνος and πρίειν (vers. 58 59) (African. epist. ad Origen Porphyr. quoted by Jerome praef. comment. in Daniel ed. Vallarsi 619).

Specially copious material is in existence for the history of the use and canonical validity of these fragments in the Christian Church.

Justin Martyr mentions Apol. i. Ananias Azarias and Misael the three companions of Daniel. But it is not clear from his brief notice of them whether he was also acquainted with the additions.

Irenaeus and Tertullian quote both the History of Susannah and that of Bel and the Dragon. Irenaeus iv. 26. 3: audient eas quae sunt a Daniele propheta voces etc. (comp. Susanna vers. 56 and 52 53 according to Theodotion). Idem iv. 5. 2: Quem (Deum) et Daniel propheta cum dixisset ei Cyrus rex Persarum: “Quare non adoras Bel?” annuntiavit dicens: “Quoniam” etc. Tertullian De corona c. iv. (Susanna). Idem De idololatria c. xviii. (Bel and the Dragon); de jejunio c. vii. fin. (the same).

Hippolytus in his commentary on Daniel deals also with the Greek additions. The explanation of

the History of Susannah (Opp. ed. Lagarde pp. 145–151) and a few notes on the Song of the Three Children (Lagarde p. 186 fragm. 122 p. 201 fragm. 138) are extant. It is evident from the beginning of the notes on Susannah that Hippolytus read this portion as the commencement of the Book of Daniel. See in general Bardenhewer Des heiligen Hippolytus von Rom Commentar zum Buche Daniel Freiburg 1877; and Zahn Theol. Litztg. 1877 p. 495 sqq.

Julius Africanus alone among the older Fathers disputes the canonicity of these fragments. In his Epistola ad Origenem (printed in the editions of Origen e.g. in Lommatzsch xvii. 17 sqq.) he calls Origen to account for appealing in a disputation to the History of Susannah which is but a spurious addition to Daniel: Θαυμάζω δὲ πῶς ἔλαθέ σε τὸ μέρος τοῦ βιβλίου τοῦτο κίβδηλον ὄν … ἥδε ἡ περικοπὴ σὺν ἄλλαις δύο ταῖς ἐπὶ τῷ τέλει τῷ παρὰ τῶν Ἰουδαίων εἰλημμένῳ Δανιὴλ οὐκ ἐμφέρεται. The last remark refers as appears from the reply of Origen to the two pieces of Bel and of the Dragon. Hence Africanus read these at the close and the History of Susannah at the beginning of the book.

Origen in his reply (Epistola ad Africanum) seeks to defend the genuineness and canonicity of these pieces with a great amount of scholarship. In so doing he mentions not only the History of Susannah and those of Bel and the Dragon but also the Prayer of Azariah and the Song of the Three Children and indeed speaks of them as standing in the midst of the text of Daniel remarking that all three were found both in the LXX. and in the text of Theodotion (Epist. ad African. c. ii.). In the tenth book of his Stromata he gives an exegesis of the History of Susannah and that of Bel from which Jerome makes extracts in his commentary on Daniel chaps. 13–14 (Hieron. Opp. ed. Vallarsi v. 730–736; also in Orig. Opp. ed. Lommatzsch xvii. 70–75). All the fragments are elsewhere frequently quoted by Origen and that according to the text of Theodotion. (1) Susannah Comm. in Joann. vol. xx. c. 5 (Lommatzsch ii. 204); ibid. vol. xxviii. c. 4 (Lommatzsch ii. 316); Comm. in Matth. series lat. c. 61 (Lommatzsch iv. 347); Comm. in Epist. ad. Rom. lib. iv. c. 2 (Lommatzsch vi. 249); Fragm. in Genes. vol. iii. c. iv. (Lommatzsch viii. 13); in Genes. homil. xv. 2 (Lommatzsch viii. 261); in Josuam homil. xxii. 6 (Lommatzsch xi. 190); Selecta in Psalmos Ps. 36 (37) homil. iv. 2 (Lommatzsch xii. 210); in Ezekiel homil. vi. 3 (Lommatzsch xiv. 82); Selecta in Ezek. c. 6 (Lommatzsch xiv. 196). Comp. especially with respect to canonicity in Levit. homil. i. 1 (Lommatzsch ix. 173) against those who adhere to the literal and historical sense of Scripture: sed tempus est nos adversus improbos presbyteros uti sanctae Susannae vocibus quas illi quidem repudiantes historiam Susannae de catalogo divinorum voluminum desecarunt. Nos autem et suscipimus et opportune contra ipsos proferimus dicentes “Angustiae mihi undique.” (2) Prayer of Azariah and Song of the Three Children: Comm. in Matth. vol. xiii. c. 2 (Lommatzsch iii. 211); Comm. in Matth. series lat. c. 62 (Lommatzsch iv. 352); Comm. in Epist. ad Rom. lib. i. c. 10 (Lommatzsch vi. 37); ibid. lib. ii. c. 9 (Lommatzsch vi. 108); ibid. lib. vii. c. 1 (Lommatzsch vii. 87); De Oratione c. xiii. and xiv. (Lommatzsch xvii. 134 143). (3) Bel and the Dragon: Exhortatio ad martyrium c. 33 (Lommatzsch xx. 278).

Cyprian de dominica oratione c. 8 adduces the Song of the Three Children as a standard example of publica et communis oratio. Comp. also De Lapsis c. 31. He quotes the story of Bel ad Fortunatum c. 11; and Epist. lviii. 5.

The Greek text used by the Fathers since Irenaeus was that of Theodotion which has also passed into the manuscripts and editions of the LXX. (see above p. 173). The genuine Septuagint text of Daniel is preserved to us in only one manuscript a cod. Chisianus; and after the previous labours of others (Bianchini and Vincentius de Regibus see Theol. Litztg. 1877 p. 565) has been published for the first time by Simon de Magistris (Daniel secundum LXX. ex

tetraplis Origenis nunc primum editus e singulari Chisiano codice Rom. 1772). On this edition which is not free from errors are based the more recent ones and also that of Hahn (Δανιὴλ κατὰ τοὺς ἑβδομήκοντα e cod. Chisiano ed. etc. H. A. Hahn Lips. 1845). Still more incorrect is the text in part formed from Holmes and Parsons' Apparatus of Various Readings which Tischendorf has added to his edition of the Septuagint. It is to Cozza (Sacrorum Bibliorum vetustissima fragmenta Graeca et Latina ed. Cozza pars iii. Romae 1877; comp. the notice of Gebhardt Theol. Litiztg. 1877 p. 565 sq.) that we are first indebted for a trustworthy impression of the MSS. The Syriac translation of the hexaplarian LXX. text of which Daniel and other books have been preserved in a Milan manuscript serves as a check and criticism of the cod. Chisianus. The Book of Daniel from this translation has already been published by Bugati (Daniel secundum editionem LXX. interpretum ex Tetraplis desumtam ex codice Syro-Estranghelo Bibliothecac Ambrosianae Syriace edidit etc. Caj. Bugatus Mediol. 1788). A photo-lithographic copy of the whole manuscript has been published by Ceriani (Codex Syro-Hexaplaris Ambrosianus photolithographice editus Mediol. 1874 as vol. vii. of the Monum. sacra et prof.). Fritzsche in his edition of the Apocrypha gives both the Greek texts (LXX. and Theodotion) of Susannah Bel and the Dragon and the Septuagint only with the various readings of Theodotion of the Prayer of Azarias and the Song of the Three Children in which Theodotion has made but few alterations. Comp. on the editions of the Greek text (i.e. of Theodotion) p. 10 above.

Ancient translations. A Vetus Latinus only fragmentary in Sabatier Biblior. sacror. Latinae versiones antiguae vol. ii. The Greek original is Theodotion. Jerome has likewise translated the Greek additions from Theodotion and admitted them marked with the obelus into his translation of Daniel from the Hebrew. See his remarks ed. Vallarsi ix. 1376 1399. On the editions of the Syriac common text see above p. 11. The Syriac translation of the Story of Bel and the Dragon from a collection of Midrashim is also found in Neubauer The Book of Tobit 1878 pp. 39–43.

For the exegesis in general see above p. 11. Commentary: Fritzsche Exeget. Handbuch zu den Apocryphen Pt. i. Leipzig 1851. The other literature: Zunz Die gottesdienstlichen Vorträge der Juden (1832) p. 122 sq. Delitzsch De Habacuci prophetae vita atque aetate (Lips. 1842) pp. 23 sqq. 105 sqq. Frankel Monatsschr. f. Gesch. und Wissensch. des Judenth. 1868 pp. 440–449 (on Susannah). Wiederholt Theol. Quartalschr. 1869 pp. 287 sqq. 377 sqq. (History of Susannah); 1871 p. 373 sqq. (Prayer of Azarias and Song of the Three Children); 1872 p. 554 sqq. (Bel and the Dragon). Rohling Das Buch des Propheten Daniel 1876. Brüll "Das apokryphische Susannabuch" (Jahrbb. für jüd. Gesch. und Literatur Pt. iii. 1877 pp. 1-69; also separate). The Introductions of Jahn Eichhorn Bertholdt Welte Scholz Nöldeke De Wette-Schrader Reusch Keil Kaulen Kleinert Reuss (see above p. 12).

4. The Prayer of Manasseh

In like manner as the prayers of Mordecai and Esther were interpolated as supplements to the Book of Esther and the Prayer of Azariah and the Song of the Three Children to that of Daniel so was a prayer of Manasseh in which the king in his captivity humbly confesses his sin before God and prays for pardon composed as a completion of 2 Chron. 33:12 13. There was the more occasion for the composition of such a prayer since it is stated in 2 Chron. 33:18 19 that the Prayer of Manasseh is written in the history of the kings of Israel and in the Chronicle of Hosai. The prayer stands in most manuscripts in the appendix to the Psalms where many other similar fragments are collected (so e.g. in the cod. Alexandrinus).

The Prayer is first quoted in the Constitut. apostol. ii. 22 where it is given in its literal entirety.

For later Christian testimony to its canonicity see Fabricius Biblioth. graec. ed. Harles iii. 732 sq. In the authorized Romish Vulgate it is in the appendix to the Bible after the New Testament (like 3 and 4 Ezra).

The Latin translation which has passed into the Vulgate is “of quite another kind from the usual old Latin and is certainly of more recent origin” (Fritzsche i. 159). Sabatier has compared three manuscripts for it (Biblior. sacror. Lat. vers. ant. iii. 1038 sq.).

The editions and the exegesis are the same as of the other Apocrypha. Commentary: Fritzsche Exeget. Handbuch zu den Apocryphen Pt. i. Leipzig 1851.

For other legends (Jewish and Christian) with respect to Manasseh see Fabricius Cod. pseudepigr. i. 1100–1102. Id. Biblioth. gr. ed. Harl. iii. 732 sq. Fritzsche Handb. i. 158.

5. The Book of Baruch

The Greek Book of Baruch properly belongs to the class of Pseudepigraphic prophets and is distinguished among them by its very meritorious contents. We place it here as being at least according to its second half of Graeco-Jewish origin and as having been admitted into the Greek Bible as a canonical book.

The whole claims to be the composition of Baruch the confidential friend and companion of the prophet Jeremiah. Its contents are tolerably miscellaneous and are divided into two halves the second of which again comprises two sections. The first half (chaps. 1:1–3:8) begins with a superscription in which what follows is described as a Book of Baruch which he wrote in the fifth year after the destruction of Jerusalem by the Chaldeans (1:1 2). This book was read by Baruch before King Jeconiah and all the exiles in Babylon; and the reading produced such an impression that it was resolved to send money to Jerusalem that sacrifices and prayers might there be offered for King Nebuchadnezzar and his son Belshazzar. At the same time the Jews dwelling in Jerusalem were enjoined to read out in the temple on the feast days the writing therewith sent (1:3–14). This writing which is next given in full is evidently identical with that read by Baruch and therefore announced in the superscription. It is an ample confession of sin on the part of the exiles who recognise in the fearful fate which has overtaken themselves and the holy city the righteous chastisement of God for their sins and entreat Him again to show them favour. They confess especially that their disobedience to the King of Babylon was a rebellion against God Himself because it was His will that Israel should obey the King of Babylon (2:21–24). The second half of the book (chaps. 3:9–5:9) contains instruction and consolation for the humbled people: (a) Instruction — Israel is humbled because they have forsaken the source of wisdom. True wisdom is with God alone. To it must the people return (3:9–4:4). (b) Consolation — Jerusalem is not laid waste for ever nor are the people to be always in captivity. They must take courage for the scattered members shall again he assembled in the Holy Land (4:5–5:9).

The second half is joined to the first without any intervening matter at chap. 3:9. An internal connection only so far exists that both halves presuppose the same historical situation viz. the desolation of Jerusalem and the carrying away of the people into captivity. In other respects however they stand in no connection with each other and it is hardly conceivable that they formed from the first part of the same whole. To this must be added that the style and mode of expression widely differ being in the first half Hebraistic and in the second fluent and rhetorical Greek. Hence Fritzsche Hitzig Kneucker Hilgenfeld and Reuss have correctly inferred that the two halves are the works of different authors. Nay one might feel inclined with Hitzig Kneucker

and Hilgenfeld to regard even the first half as no single work but to look upon chap. 1:3–14 as a later interpolation. For it cannot be denied that the narrative of the reading of the Book of Baruch and of the effect produced thereby comes in like an interruption between 1:1 2 and 1:15–3:8. After the superscription 1:1 2 the book itself is expected. A discrepancy of statement also ensues owing to the inserted narrative the destruction of the temple being assumed by the book itself (1:2 2:26) and; the continuance of the sacrificial service by the narrative (1:10–14). But lastly all these inconsistencies are possible in one and the same author; and other matters such especially as the like dependence on Daniel in 1:11 12 and 1:15–2:20 favour identity of authorship.

Most of the older critics adopt the view of a Hebrew original for the whole; and Kneucker in spite of his assumption of three different composers firmly maintains it nay tries with much care to reconstruct the Hebrew original. There are however sufficient points of contact for this in the first half only. The second half is evidently a Greek original. Hence we are constrained with Fritzsche Hilgenfeld and Reuss to admit concerning the origin of this book that its first half was originally composed in Hebrew then translated into Greek and completed by the addition of the second half.

In determining the date of its composition its close dependence on the Book of Daniel is decisive. There are in it correspondences with the latter which make the employment of it by the author of Baruch indubitable. Especially is there an almost verbal agreement between Dan. 9:7–10 and Baruch 1:15–18. The juxtaposition too of Nebuchadnezzar and Belshazzar is common to both books (Dan. 5:2 sqq. = Baruch 1:11 12). That so thoroughly original and creative a mind however as the author of the Book of Daniel should have copied from the Book of Baruch is certainly not to be admitted. Thus we have already arrived at the Maccabaean period and most Protestant critics stop there (so e.g. Fritzsche Schrader Keil). But the situation assumed in the Book of Baruch by no means agrees with the Maccabaean era. The Book of Baruch and especially its first half with which we are first of all concerned presupposes the destruction of Jerusalem and the leading of the people into captivity (1:2 2:23 26). In this catastrophe the people recognise a judgment of God for their sins and particularly for their rebellion against the heathen authority which God Himself had set over Israel (2:21–24). The penitent people hasten therefore to order sacrifices and prayers for their heathen rulers (1:10 11). All this — as the destruction by the Chaldeans is out of question — only suits the time after the destruction of Jerusalem by Titus. This very catastrophe was moreover brought about by the rebellion of the people against the heathen authorities. And the special act of rebellion was as Josephus expressly states the doing away with the daily sacrifice for the Roman emperor (Bell. Jud. ii. 17. 2–4; comp. above sq.). In this political revolution our author saw a rebellion against the will of God and therefore in the fearful catastrophe the righteous judgment of God upon it. And he sought by all he relates of the exiles in the time of Baruch to bring this view to bear upon his fellow-countrymen. It must therefore certainly be admitted as by Hitzig and Kneucker that this book was written after the year A.D. 70. For the quite non-historical juxtaposition of Nebuchadnezzar and Belshazzar recalling the relation of Vespasian and Titus also agrees with that date. The narrative that in the straits of war parents ate the flesh of their children (2:3) frequently recurs indeed in the description of the horrors of war but is also found just in the description of the siege of A.D. 70 by Josephus (Bell. Jud. vi. 3. 4).

What has been said applies chiefly to only the first half of the book. But the second half also essentially assumes the same situation viz. the desolation of Jerusalem and the leading of the people into captivity (4:10–16). Its object is to give instruction and consolation in view of these

events. Hence its composition cannot well be placed much later than that of the first half. At all events this second half is later than the Salomonian Psalter. For Baruch 5. agrees almost verbally with Psalt. Salom. 11.; and the dependence must by reason of the psalm-like character and the probably primitive Hebrew of the Salomonian Psalter be sought for on the side of the Book of Baruch.

The fact that it found acceptance in the Christian Church is not opposed to our conclusion as to the somewhat recent composition of the book. For exactly the same thing took place in the case of the Apocalypse of Baruch and the fourth Book of Ezra.

The existence of a Hebrew text of this book is disputed by Jerome see praef. comment. in Jerem. (Vallarsi iv. 834): Libellum autem Baruch qui vulgo editioni Septuaginta copulatur nec habetur apud Hebraeos. Idem praef. in version. Jerem. (Vallarsi ix. 783): Librum autem Baruch notarii ejus qui apud Hebraeos nec legitur nec habetur. So too Epiphanius De mensuris et ponderibus § 5: τῶν θρήνων αὐτοῦ καὶ τῶν ἐπιστολῶν Βαροὺχ εἰ καὶ οὐ κεῖνται ἐπιστολαὶ παρ' Ἑβραίοις. But both Jerome and Epiphanius for the most part try only to prove that the book was not in the Hebrew canon. Certainly they seem to have known of no Hebrew text at all but that does not prove that none ever existed. For its existence may be cited the remark found three times in the Milan manuscript of the Syrus hexaplaris (on i. 17 and ii. 3) "this is not in the Hebrew" (see Ceriani's notes to his edition in the Monum. sacra et prof. i. 1 1861).

Among the Jews (i.e. among the Hellenistic Jews?) this book together with the Lamentations of Jeremiah was according to the testimony of the Apostolic Constitutions read at public worship on the 10th Gorpiaios (by which is certainly meant the 10th Ab the day of the destruction of Jerusalem) Const. apost. v. 20: καὶ γὰρ καὶ νῦν δεκάτῃ τοῦ μηνὸς Γορπιαίου συναθροιζόμενοι τοὺς θρήνους Ἱερεμίου ἀναγινώσκουσιν … καὶ τὸν Βαρούχ. In the Syriac text of the Const. apost. the Book of Baruch it is true is not named. See Bunsen Analecta Ante-Nicaena ii. 187. On the date of the 10th Gorpiaios comp. also Freudenthal Die Flavius Josephus beigelegte Schrift über die Herrschaft der Vernunft (1869) p. 147 sq.

On its use in the Christian Church see the copious proofs in Reusch Erklärung des Buch's Baruch (1853) pp. 1–21 and 268 sqq. The book is very frequently quoted as a work of the prophet Jeremiah because it was from early times combined with his book. The passage concerning the appearance of God upon earth (Bar. 3:37: μετὰ τοῦτο ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς ὤφθη καὶ ἐν τοῖς ἀνθρώποις συνανεστράφη) which Kneucker rightly regards as a Christian gloss was a favourite one with the Fathers. The oldest quotation is in Athenagoras Suppl. c. 9 where Bar. 3:35 is cited as the saying of a προφήτης. Irenaeus iv. 20 refers to Bar. 3:37. He also quotes (v. 35. 1) Bar. 4:36 to 5 fin. with the formula significavit Jeremias propheta dicens. Clemens Alexandrinus Paedag. i. 10. 91 92 quotes various passages of this book as sayings of the prophet Jeremiah. In Paedag. ii. 3. 36 he quotes Bar. 3:16–19 with the formula ἡ θεία που λέγει γραφή. Hippolytus mentions in his work Contra Noetum that Noetus and his followers appealed to Bar. 3:35–37 among other passages in proof of their patripassian Christology (Hippol. ed. Lagarde p. 44). He then to help himself out of difficulty himself gives (ed. Lagarde p. 47) a very sophistical interpretation of the passage. Hence the book is for Hippolytus as well as Noetus a standard authority. Origenes in Jerem. homil. vii. 3 (Lommatzsch xv. 190): γέγραπται• "ἄκουε Ἰσραήλ κ.τ.λ." = Bar. 3:9–13. Idem. Selecta in Jerem. c. 31 (Lommatzsch xv. 456): γέγραπται ἐν τῷ Βαρούχ• "τί ὅτι ἐν γῇ κ.τ.λ." = Bar. 3:10. Commodian. Carmen apologet. (ed. Ludwig) vers. 367 368: Hieremias ait: Hic deus est etc. = Bar. 3:35–37. Cyprian. Testim. ii. 6: Item apud Hieremiam prophetam: Hic deus noster etc. = Bar. 3:35–37. Material from later Fathers will be found in Reusch as above quoted to which need only be added Altercatio Simonis Judaei et

Theophili Christiani ed. Harnack p. 17 (in Gebhardt and Harnack Texte und Untersuchungen vol. i. No. 3 1883).

Among the Greek manuscripts the most important are: the Vaticanus (which however not having been collated for this book by Holmes and Parsons has also been paid no regard to in Fritzsche's edition) the Alexandrinus (No. iii. in Holmes and Parsons) and the Marchalianus (No. xii.). The Sinaiticus does not contain the Book of Baruch. On the editions see above p. 10.

Ancient translations. 1. The Latin which is extant in two widely differing recensions: (a) that which has passed into the Vulgate and (b) one first published by Joseph Caro Rome 1688. The latter according to three MSS. in Sabatier Biblior. sacror. Latinae versiones antiquae vol. ii. p. 734 sqq. Also in Bibliotheca Casinensis vol. i. (1873) Florileg. pp. 284–287. On the relation of the two to each other see Fritzsche Handb. i. 175. Reusch Erklärung des Buchs Baruch p. 88 sq. Kneucker Das Buch Baruch p. 157 sqq. 2. The two Syriac translations (a) the Peshito or the Syriac common text comp. above p. 11. (b) The Syrus hexaplaris contained for this book in the Milan manuscript of the Syrus hexaplaris. The Book of Baruch with the letter of Jeremiah of this MS. were first published by Ceriani (Monumenta sacra et profana vol. i. fasc. i. 1861). Also in the photo-lithographic copy of the entire manuscript see above p. 187. 3. A Coptic translation published by Brugsch (Zeitschr. für ägyptische Sprache und Alterthumskunde 10–12th year 1872–1874 comp. 1876 p. 148).

The exegesis in general see above p. 11. Commentaries: Fritzsche Exeget. Handb. zu den Apokrypken Part i. Leipzig 1851. Reusch Erklarung des Buchs Baruch Freiburg 1853. Ewald Die Propheten des Alten Bundes vol. iii. (2nd ed. 1868) pp. 251–298. Kneucker Das Buch Baruch Geschichts und Kritik Uebersetzung und Erklärung Leipzig 1879. The other literature: Hävernick De libro Baruchi apocrypho comm. crit. Regim. 1843. Hitzig Zeitschr. für wissenschaftl. Theol. 1860 pp. 262–273. Ewald Gesch. des Volkes Israel vol. iv. (1864) p. 265 sqq. Hilgenfeld Zeitschr. für wissensch. Theol. vol. v. 1862 pp. 199–203; xxii. 1879 pp. 437–454; xxiii. 1880 pp. 412–422. Kneucker the same periodical 1880 pp. 309–323. The Introductions of Jahne Eichhorn Bertholdt Welte Scholz De Wette-Schrader Reusch Keil Kaulen Kleinert Reuss (see above p. 12).

6. The Letter of Jeremiah

The letter of Jeremiah which is said to have been written to the exiles destined to be led away to Babylon is a warning against idolatry turning upon the theme that images of wood silver and gold are the weak powerless and perishable creatures of man's hand which can absolutely do neither good nor harm. The author seeks by these particulars to restrain his co-religionists in the Dispersion from all participation in heathen rites. This small fragment is certainly of Greek origin.

Many have seen in the passage 2 Macc. 1:1 sqq. a reference to this letter. But what is there said does not actually suit it. When Origen asserts that the Lamentations and "the letter" also were combined in the Hebrew canon with the Book of Jeremiah (Euseb. Hist. eccl. vi. 25. 2: Ἱερεμίας σὺν θρήνοις καὶ τῇ ἐπιστολῇ ἐν ἑνί) this certainly rests upon an oversight. Origen only means to say that the writings of Jeremiah were reckoned by the Jews as one so that the number twenty-two is consequently that of the collected books of Holy Scripture. Christian quotations: Tertullian Scorpiace c. 8. Cyprian De dominica oratione c. 5 and later writers.

In the majority of editions and manuscripts the letter is appended to the Book of Baruch (in the

Vulgate as its sixth chapter). Hence what has been said of manuscripts editions ancient translations and exegesis with respect to that book applies almost throughout in this case.

III. HISTORICAL LITERATURE

The literary productions as yet discussed are in part compilations in part imitations of older scriptural works. Hence there is but little specifically "Hellenistic" to be observed in them. The peculiarity of Judaeo-Hellenistic literature is apparent in an entirely different manner in those works which incline in form towards non-scriptural Greek models and are thus found in the department of historical poetic and philosophic literature. And first for the historical. Pharisaic Judaism as such had scarcely an interest in history. It saw in history merely an instruction a warning how God ought to be served. Hellenistic Judaism was certainly in a far higher degree interested in history as such. A knowledge of the history of the past formed part of the culture of the times. And no people could lay claim to he reckoned among the civilised nations unless they could point to an old and imposing history. Even nations hitherto regarded as barbarian now compiled their histories and clad them in Greek garments for the purpose of making them accessible to the entire cultured world. The Hellenistic Jews also took their part in such efforts. They too worked up their sacred history for the instruction of both their own fellow-countrymen and the non-Jewish world. The most comprehensive work of the kind with which we are acquainted is the great historical work of Josephus. He had however a series of predecessors who laboured some upon longer some upon shorter periods of Jewish history in various forms. Of these some set to work in modest annalistic manner (Demetrius) some with fantastic and legendary embellishments in majorem Judaeorum gloriam (Eupolemus Artapanus) while some sought in a philosophical manner to represent the great Jewish lawgiver as the greatest of philosophers nay as the father of all philosophy (Philo). But the Greek Jews occupied themselves not only with the older Jewish history but also depicted — as Pharisaic Judaism had ceased to do — important occurrences which they had as contemporaries experienced for the purpose of transmitting them to posterity (Jason of Cyrene Philo Josephus Justus of Tiberias). Many who carried on authorship as a vocation were active in both departments. We therefore here place together historical works of both kinds viz. compilations of the older sacred history and delineations of contemporary events.

The most ancient of these Judaeo-Hellenistic historians have been only rescued from utter oblivion by Alexander Polyhistor. This voluminous writer who lived about the years 80–40 B.C. (according to the statements of Suidas Lex. s.v. Ἀλέξανδρος and Sueton. De gramm. c. 20 comp. Müller Fragm. iii. 206 and Unger Philologus 1884 p. 528 sqq.) composed among other works one περὶ Ἰουδαίων in which he strung together apparently with scarcely any additions of his own extracts from foreign authors concerning the Jews. Eusebius in his turn embodied in his Praeparatio evangelica (ix. 17–39) a large portion of this collection of extracts. And it is to this circumstance that we are almost entirely indebted for our acquaintance with the oldest Judaeo-Hellenistic and Samaritan compilations of scriptural history whether in poetic or prosaic form with those of Demetrius Eupolemus Artapanus Aristeas Kleodemus Philo Theodotus and Ezekiel. Besides Eusebius Clemens Alexandrinus also once quotes Alexander's work περὶ Ἰουδαίων (Strom. i. 21. 130); and he undoubtedly makes use of it even when he quotes Demetrius Philo Eupolemus Artapanus and Ezekiel from whom Alexander gives extracts (Strom. i. 21. 141 23. 153–156). The quotation also in Josephus Antt. i. 15 is certainly derived from the work περὶ Ἰουδαίων with which Josephus elsewhere betrays his acquaintance (contra Apion. i. 23 and various traces in the Antiquities). But this is all that is preserved of independent quotation from Alexander's work. The extracts in Eusebius are in chronological order. They

begin with fragments on the history of Abraham from Eupolemus Artapanus Molon Philo Kleodemus. Then follow portions on the history of Jacob from Demetrius and Theodotus then others on Joseph from Artapanus and Philo. That this order is not first derived from Eusebius but was followed by Alexander Polyhistor is shown by the nature of the text. For the single portions are joined together by the connecting words of Alexander himself.

This is moreover confirmed by a comparison of the quotations in Clemens Alexandrinus. For as in Eusebius so in Clemens Alexandrinus the extracts on the history of Moses follow each other in direct succession: —

Eupolemus = Euseb. ix. 26 = Clemens Str. i. 23. 153.

Artapanus = Euseb. ix. 27 = Clemens Str. i. 23. 154.

Ezekiel = Euseb. ix. 28 = Clemens Str. i 23. 155 156.

Hence we see that this is the original order of Alexander Polyhistor. The genuineness of Alexander's work has of late been frequently disputed especially by Rauch and Cruice. It is thought inconceivable that a heathen author like Alexander should have had so special an interest in Jewish affairs; it is also thought strange that he should call the Old Testament Scriptures ἱεραὶ βίβλοι (Euseb. ix. 24 29. 15) and that he should here give such detailed accounts of Jewish history while he elsewhere betrays the strangest ignorance of it. Its genuineness has been defended against these objections by Hulleman (p. 156 sq.) Müller (Fragm. iii. 209) and especially with convincing proofs by Freudenthal (pp. 174–184). The question is moreover one of minor importance since it is tolerably indifferent whether these extracts were collected by Alexander or by some one else; for in either case the extraordinary differences in form and contents existing in these fragments is a guarantee that we have here to deal with extracts from works then actually existing and not with the single work of a forger. Only the determination of the date would be affected if it could be really proved that the collection was not the production of Alexander Polyhistor inasmuch as the time of Alexander would then cease to be a limit. The fragments in themselves furnish no cause for relegating them to a later date. For the most recent of the authors from whom the extracts are made and whose date can be determined independently of Alexander is Apollonius Molon (Euseb. ix. 19) a Greek orator of probably about 120–100 B.C. (see No. VI. below).

References to Jewish affairs are also found in other works of Alexander Polyhistor. He quotes the Jewish Sibyl in his Chaldaean ancient history (Euseb. Chron. ed. Schöne i. 23. Cyrill. adv. Julian. ed. Spanh. p. 9. Syncell. ed. Dindorf i. 81. Comp. Joseph. Antt. i. 4. 3; Freudenthal p. 25 sq.). In his work on Italy is found the odd assertion that the Jewish law was derived from a female named Moso (Suidas Lex. s.v. Ἀλέξανδρος. Müller Fragm. n. 25); and to his work on Syria belongs probably the information that Judaea received its name from Juda and Idumaea the children of Semiramis (Steph. Byz. s.v. Ἰουδαία. Müller Fragm. n. 98–102). It is just these strange statements which have given rise to the denial of Alexander's authorship of the work περὶ Ἰουδαίων — but very incorrectly for he simply copied what he found in his authorities. Consequently according to their nature his information is now correct now incorrect. It rests upon only a somewhat wanton combination when the pseudo-Justinian Cohort. ad Graec. c. 9 ascribes also to Alexander a statement concerning the date of Moses (see my article on "Julius Africanus as the source of the pseudo-Justinian Cohortatio ad Graecos" in Brieger's Zeitschr. für Kirchengesch. vol. ii. 1878 p. 319 sqq.).

The text of the fragment περὶ Ἰουδαίων is in Euseb. Evangelicae Praeparationis libri xv. ed. Gaisford 4 vols. Oxford 1843. Clementis Alex. Opera ed. Dindorf 4 vols. Oxford 1869. Müller Fragmenta historicorum Graecorum vol. iii. pp. 211–230. The prose fragments partly according to a recent collation of manuscripts are best given in Freudenthal Alex. Polyhistor pp. 219–236. On the manuscripts and editions of Eusebius see Freudenthal pp. 199–202.

Comp. in general: Rauch De Alexandri Polyhistoris vita atque scriptis Heidelb. 1843 quoted by Müller and others as "Rumpf." Cruice De Fl. Josephi in auctoribus contra Apionem afferendis fide et auctoritate (Paris 1844) pp. 20–30. Hulleman "De Corn. Alexandro Polyhistore" (Miscellanea philologa et paedagoga edd. gymnasiorum Batavorum doctores vol. i. 1849 pp. 87–178). C. Müller Fragm. hist. Graec. iii. 206–244. Vaillant De historicis qui ante Josephum Judaicas res scripsere nempe Aristea Demetrio Eupolemo Hecataeo Abderita Cleodemo Artapano Justo Tiberiensi Cornelio Alexandro Polyhistore (Paris 1851 Didot) pp. 88–98 (a follower of Cruice). Creuzer Theol. Stud. und Krit. 1853 p. 76 sqq. Herzfeld Gesch. des Volkes Jisrael iii. 570 sqq. Westermann in Pauly's Real-Enc. der class. Alterthums-wissensch. i. 1 (2nd ed. 1864) p. 734 sq. Freudenthal Alexander Polyhistor und die von ihm erhaltenen Reste judaischer und samaritanischer Geschichtswerke Bresl. 1875. Reuss Gesch. der heiligen Schriften A. T.'s (1881) § 520 521. Unger "Wann schrieb Alexander Polyhistor?" (Philologus vol. xliii. 1884 pp. 528–531).

1. Demetrius

In the same century in which Berosus composed the ancient history of the Chaldaeans and Manetho that of the Egyptians but about sixty years later Demetrius a Jewish Hellenist compiled in a brief chronological form a history of Israel his work being equally with theirs according to the sacred records. Clem. Alex. Strom. i. 21. 141 states its title to have been περὶ τῶν ἐν τῇ Ἰουδαίᾳ βασιλέων. And it can be scarcely a reason for doubting the correctness of this title that the fragments deal almost all with only the most ancient period (so Freudenthal p. 205 sq.). For Justus of Tiberias e.g. also treated of the time of Moses in his Chronicle of the Jewish kings. The first fragment in Euseb. Praep. evang. ix. 21 concerns the history of Jacob from his emigration to Mesopotamia till his death. At the close the genealogy of the tribe of Levi is carried on to the birth of Moses and Aaron. Chronology is made a special aim. Nay the whole is far more a settlement of chronology than a history properly so called. The date of every single circumstance in the life of Laban e.g. the birth of each of his twelve sons and such matters is precisely determined. Of course many dates have to be assumed for which Scripture offers no support. A large portion of the chronological statements is obtained by combinations and in some instances very complicated combinations of actual dates of Holy Scripture. A second fragment (Euseb. Praep. evang. ix. 29. 1–3) from the history of Moses is chiefly occupied in proving that Zipporah the wife of Moses was descended from Abraham and Keturah. This fragment is also used in the Chronicon paschale ed. Dindorf i. 117 and is quoted from Eusebius in the Chron. Anon. in Cramer Anecdota Paris ii. 256. In a third (Euseb. Praep. evang. ix. 29. 15) the history of the bitter waters (Ex. 15:22 sqq.) is related. Lastly the chronological fragment preserved in Clem. Alex. Strom. i. 21. 141 gives precise statements concerning the length of time from the carrying away into captivity of the ten tribes and the tribes of Judah and Benjamin to Ptolemy IV. It is just this fragment which gives us also a key to the date of Demetrius. For it is evident that he chose the time of Ptolemy IV. (222–205 B.C.) as a closing point for his calculations because he himself lived in the reign of that monarch. Hence we obtain also an important standpoint for determining the date of the LXX. For that Demetrius made use of the Septuagint translation of the Pentateuch is acknowledged even by Hody although such

acknowledgment is unfavourable to his tendency of pointing out the limited diffusion obtained by the LXX. A glance at the contents of the fragment renders it needless to prove that its author was a Jew. It would certainly never have entered the mind of a heathen to take such pains in calculating and completing the Biblical chronology. Nevertheless Josephus took him for one and confounded him with Demetrius Phalereus (Contra Apion. i. 23 = Euseb. Praep. evang. ix. 42; comp. Müller Fragm. ii. 369. Freudenthal p. 170 note). Among moderns too e.g. Hody is found the mistaken notion that he was a heathen. The correct one is however already met with in Eusebius Hist. eccl. vi. 13. 7 and after him in Hieronymus De vir. illustr. c. 38 (ed. Vallarsi ii. 879).

Clemens Alex. Strom. i. 21. 141: Δημήτριος δέ φησιν ἐν τῷ περὶ τῶν ἐν τῇ Ἰουδαίᾳ βασιλέων τὴν Ἰούδα φυλὴν καὶ Βενιαμὶν καὶ Λευὶ μὴ αἰχμαλωτισθῆναι ὑπὸ τοῦ Σεναχηρεὶμ ἀλλ' εἶναι ἀπὸ τῆς αἰχμαλωσίας ταύτης εἰς τὴν ἐσχάτην ἣν ἐποιήσατο Ναβουχοδονόσορ ἐξ Ἱεροσολύμων ἔτη ἑκατὸν εἴκοσι ὀκτὼ μῆνας ἕξ. ἀφ' οὗ δὲ αἱ φυλαὶ αἱ δέκα ἐκ Σαμαρείας αἰχμάλωτοι γεγόνασιν ἕως Πτολεμαίου τετάρτου [B.C. 222] ἔτη πεντακόσια ἑβδομήκοντα τρία μῆνας ἐννέα ἀφ' οὗ δὲ ἐξ Ἱεροσολύμων ἔτη τριακόσια τριάκοντα ὀκτὼ μῆνας τρεῖς. The text of this fragment is in many instances corrupt 1. It is impossible that Demetrius with his minute accuracy in scriptural chronology could have reckoned from 573–338 i.e. 235 years from the carrying away of the ten tribes to the carrying away of the tribes of Benjamin and Judah when the interval amounts to about a hundred years less. Hence the number 573 must either be reduced or that of 338 increased by one hundred. The latter is undoubtedly correct since it may be shown that other ancient chronologists have made the post-exilian period too long (see above on Daniel p. 54). If Demetrius therefore put down about seventy years too much for this time there is for just this reason utterly no motive for doing away with this mistake by altering "Ptolemy IV." into "Ptolemy VII." For even in the accurate Demetrius such a mistake concerning the length of the post-exilian period cannot seem surprising since the scriptural figures here leave him in the lurch. 2. By abbreviation of the text arose the absurdity that an αἰχμαλωτισθῆναι ὑπὸ τοῦ Σεναχηρείμ is first denied and then that this αἰχμαλωσία is computed from. The thought of the original text undoubtedly is that the tribes of Judah and Benjamin were not made captives but only laid under contribution by Sennacherib; and that 120 years elapsed between this pillaging expedition of Sennacherib and the carrying away of Judah and Benjamin. With this computation it best agrees that from the carrying away of the ten tribes to that of Judah and Benjamin 573 - 438 = 135 years are reckoned. For the carrying away of the ten tribes by Shalmanezer actually took place about seven or eight years before Sennacherib's attack upon Judah (2 Kings 18:9–13).

Comp. in general: Vigerus' Anmerkungen to his edition of the Praep. evang. of Eusebius (1628). Huetius Demonstr. evang. (5th ed. Lips. 1703) Prop. iv. c. 2 § 22 30. Hody De biblior. textibus (1705) p. 107. Valckenaer De Aristobulo p. 18. Dähne Geschichtl. Darstellung der jüd.-alex. Rel.-Phil. ii. 220 sq. Cruice De Fl. Josephi fide (1844) pp. 53–58. C. Müller Fragm. hist. Graec. iii. 207 sqq. Vaillant De historicis gui ante Josephum Judaicas res scripsere (Paris 1851). pp. 45–52. Herzfeld Gesch. des Volkes Jisrael iii. 486–488 575 sq. M. Niebuhr Gesch. Assur's und Babel's (1857) pp. 101–104. Freudenthal Alexander Polyhistor (1875) pp. 35–82 205 sqq. 219 sqq. Mendelssohn Anzeige Freudenthal's in der Jenaer Lit.-Ztg. 1885 No. 6. Siegfried Zeitschr. f. wissenschaftl. Theol. 1875 p. 475. Gutschmid Jahrbb. für Protestant. Theol. 1875 p. 744 sqq. Grätz Monatsschr. f. Gesch. u. Wissensch. d. Judenth. 1877 p. 68 sqq. Bloch Die Quellen des Fl. Josephus (1879) p. 56 sqq.

2. Eupolmus

In place of the dry chronological computations of Demetrius we find in Eupolemus a chequered narrative which freely handles the scriptural history and further embellishes it with all kinds of additions. Formerly three different works of this writer were spoken of: 1. Περὶ τῶν τῆς Ἀσσυρίας Ἰουδαίων; 2. Περὶ τῆς Ἠλίου προφητείας; and 3. Περὶ τῶν ἐν τῇ Ἰουδαίᾳ βασιλέων (so Kuhlmey p. 3). The first of these falls away because in the fragment in Euseb. Praep. evang. ix. 17: Εὐπόλεμος δὲ ἐν τῷ περὶ Ἰουδαίων τῆς Ἀσσυρίας φησὶ πόλιν Βαβυλῶνα πρῶτον μὲν κτισθῆναι ὑπὸ τῶν κ.τ.λ. the words τῆς Ἀσσυρίας certainly refer to what follows (Rauch p. 21; Freudenthal p. 207). The title περὶ τῶν ἐν τῇ Ἰουδαίᾳ βασιλέων is certified by Clemens Alex. Strom. i. 23. 153. To this work also undoubtedly belongs the fragment referring to the history of David and Solomon in Euseb. Praep. evang. ix. 30-34 which Alexander Polyhistor asserts that he took from a work περὶ τῆς Ἠλίου προφητείας (Freudenthal p. 208). Thus we in truth obtain only one work instead of the supposed three. The first fragment (Euseb. Praep. evang. ix. 17) probably does not belong to Eupolemus at all (comp. hereon No. 6 below); a second almost verbally identical in Euseb. Praep. evang. ix. 26 and Clemens Alex. Strom. i. 23. 153 represents Moses as the “first sage” who transmitted to the Jews the art of alphabetical writing which was then handed on by the Jews to the Phoenicians and by the latter to the Hellenes. The Chronicon paschale ed. Dindorf i. 117 also has this fragment from Eusebius and Cyrillus Alex. adv. Julian. ed. Spanh. p. 231 has it from Clement. The long passage in Euseb. Praep. evang. ix. 30-34 refers to the history of David and Solomon. It commences with a summary of chronology from Moses to David then briefly relates the chief events of the history of David (Euseb. ix. 30) and then gives a correspondence between Solomon and the kings Uaphree of Egypt and Suron of Phoenicia about assistance in the building of the temple (Euseb. ix. 31-34; comp. Clemens Alex. Strom. i. 21. 130; Chron. pasch. ed. Dind. i. 168); and lastly describes in detail the building of the temple (Euseb. ix. 34). The correspondence with Suron = Hiram is taken from 2 Chron. 2:2 15 comp. 1 Kings 5:15-25; and that with Uaphres freely imitated from this model. Probably the fragment in Euseb. ix. 39 in which it is related how Jeremiah foretold the captivity and how his prediction was fulfilled by the conquest of Jerusalem by Nebuchadnezzar also belongs to Eupolemus. The fragment is according to the reading of the best manuscripts anonymous but may on internal grounds be ascribed to Eupolemus (Freudenthal p. 208 sq.). A chronological fragment in Clemens Alex. Strom. i. 2114. 1 which computes in a summary manner the time from Adam and Moses respectively to the fifth year of Demetrius or the twelfth of Ptolemy gives us information concerning the date of Eupolemus. For by this Demetrius we must probably understand (see below) Demetrius I. Soter (162-150 B.C.) and hence Eupolemus would have written in the year 158-157 B.C. or shortly afterwards. He may therefore be as many have supposed identical with the Eupolemus mentioned 1 Macc. 8:17. In this case he would be a Palestinian which is certainly favoured also by the circumstance that he seems besides the translation of the LXX. of which the Book of Chronicles was certainly in his hands to have made use also of the original Hebrew text (Freudenthal pp. 108 119). Concerning his nationality whether Jew or heathen opinions are as also in the case of Demetrius divided; Josephus c. Apion. i. 23 (= Euseb. Praep. evang. ix. 42) esteemed him a heathen as do also Hody and Kuhlmey. On the other hand Eusebius Hist. eccl. vi. 13. 7 and Jerome De viris illustr. c. 38 regard him as a Jew. And this as Freudenthal has recently shown is undoubtedly correct (pp. 83-85).

Clemens Alex. Strom. i. 21. 141: Ἔτι δὲ καὶ Εὐπόλεμος ἐν τῇ ὁμοίᾳ πραγματείᾳ τὰ πάντα ἔτη φησὶν ἀπὸ Ἀδὰμ ἄχρι τοῦ πέμπτου ἔτους Δημητρίου βασιλείας Πτολεμαίου τὸ δωδέκατον βασιλεύοντος Αἰγύπτου συνάγεσθαι ἔτη ͵ερμα΄. ἀφ᾽ οὗ δὲ χρόνου ἐξήγαγε Μωυσῆς τοὺς Ἰουδαίους ἐξ Αἰγύπτου ἐπὶ τὴν προειρημένην προθεσμίαν συνάγεσθαι ἔτη διςχίλια πεντακόσια ὀγδοήκοντα. [ἀπὸ δὲ τοῦ χρόνου τούτου ἄχρι τῶν ἐν Ῥώμῃ ὑπάτων Γαΐου Δομετιανοῦ

Κασιανοῦ συναθροίζεται ἔτη ἑκατὸν εἴκοσι]. In this fragment also the text is defective. Above all it is certain that the number 2580 must be corrected to 1580 since Eupolemus could not have reckoned 2580 years from Moses to his own time. Then the synchronism of the fifth year of Demetrius with the twelfth of Ptolemy causes difficulties. For no twelfth year of any Ptolemy coincides with the fifth year of Demetrius II. (= 142-141 B.C.). The twelfth year indeed of Ptolemy VII. (= 159-158) concurs with the fifth year of Demetrius I. (= 158-157 B.C.). But Ptolemy VII. Physcon was at that time only ruler of Cyrenaica. He reigned in Egypt contemporaneously with his brother Ptolemy VI. Philometor who however began his reign four years previously. We must therefore either regard with Gutschmid the whole statement concerning Ptolemy as a gloss or which is more simple alter the number. However this may be the supposition that Demetrius I. Soter is intended is especially favoured by the circumstance that at all events such was the view of Clemens Alex. For he reckons from the fifth year of Demetrius to the consulship of Cn. Domitius Calvinus and C. Asinius Pollio (these names being certainly hidden under the corrupted words Γαΐου Δομετιανοῦ Κασιανοῦ) i.e. to the year 40 B.C. in which Herod was named king (Joseph. Antt. xiv. 14. 5) 120 years which of necessity reach back to Demetrius L even if the reckoning is not quite accurate. Gutschmid has best restored the closing words by the complement Γναίου Δομετίου καὶ Ἀσινίου ὑπὸ Κασιανοῦ συναθροίζεται. Cassianus is mentioned as a chronologist by Clem. Strom. i. 21. 101.

Comp. in general: Huetius Demonstr. evang. Prop. iv. c. ii. § 29. Hody De biblior. textib. p. 106. Valckenaer De Aristobulo pp. 18 24. Dähne Geschichtl. Darstellung ii. 221 sq. Kuhlmey Eupolemi fragmenta prolegomenis et commentario instructa Berol. 1840. Rauch De Alex. Polyh. pp. 20-22. Cruice De Fl. Jos. fide pp. 58-61. C. Müler Fragm. hist. gr. iii. 207 sqq. Vaillant De historicis etc. pp. 52-59. Herzfeld Gesch. des Volkes Jisrael iii. 481-483 572-574. M. Niebuhr Gesch. Assur's pp. 353-356. Cobet in Λόγιος Ἑρμῆς ἐκδ. ὑπὸ Κόντου vol. i. (Leyden 1866) p. 168 sq. Ewald Gesch. d. V. Isr. i. 76 vii. 91 92. Freudenthal Alex. Polyh. pp. 82 sqq. 105-130 208 sqq. 225 sqq. Siegfried Zeitschr. f. wissenschaftl. Theol. 1875 p. 476 sqq. Gutschmid Jahrbb. f. prot. Theol. 1875 p. 749 sqq. Grätz Monatsschr. f. Gesch. u. Wissensch. d. Judenth. 1877 p. 61 sqq. Bloch Die Quellen des Fl. Josephus (1879) p. 58 sqq.

3. Artapanus

In his work περὶ Ἰουδαίων Artapanus is still farther removed than Eupolemus from the sober and unadorned style of Demetrius. The sacred history is quite methodically embellished or to speak more correctly remodelled by fantastic and tasteless additions – and this recasting is throughout in the interest of the tendency to a glorification of the Jewish people. One chief aim is directed towards proving that the Egyptians were indebted to the Jews for all useful knowledge and institutions. Thus the very first fragment (Euseb. Praep. evang. ix. 18) relates that Abraham when he journeyed into Egypt instructed the king Pharethothes in astrology. A second (Euseb. ix. 23) narrates how Joseph when raised by the king to be the chief governor of the country provided for the better cultivation of the land. And finally the long article concerning Moses (Euseb. ix. 27) gives detailed information of his being the real founder of all the culture and even of the worship of the gods in Egypt. For he it was whom the Greeks call Musaeus the instructor of Orpheus the author of a multitude of useful inventions and attainments of navigation architecture military science and philosophy. He also divided the country into thirty-six provinces and commanded each province to worship God; he also instructed the priests in hieroglyphics. He introduced order into State affairs. Hence he was beloved by the Egyptians who called him Hermas διὰ τὴν τῶν ἱερῶν γραμμάτων ἑρμηνείαν. King Chenephres however sought out of envy to get rid of him. But none of the means he used succeeded. When

Chenephres was dead Moses received commandment from God to deliver His people from Egyptian bondage. The history of the exodus and of all that preceded it especially of the miracles by which the permission to depart was extorted is then related at length and in accordance with the Scripture narrative but at the same time with many additions and embellishments. Single traits from this history are related with express appeal to Artapanus in Clemens Alex. Strom. i. 23. 154 in Chron. pasch. ed. Dindorf i. 117 and in the Chron. anonym. in Cramer Anecdota Paris ii. 176. Traces of the employment of this work may be pointed out especially in Josephus (see Freudenthal pp. 169–171). The more plainly its Jewish authorship is manifested by the tendency of the whole work the more strange does it appear that Moses and the patriarchs should be exhibited as founders of the Egyptian worships. Jacob and his sons are represented as founding the sanctuaries at Athos and Heliopolis (23. 4). Moses directs each province to honour God (τὸν Θεὸν σεφθήσεσθαι); he prescribes the consecration of the Ibis (27. 9) and of Apis (27. 12). In a word the religion of Egypt is referred to Jewish authority. This fact has been explained by Freudenthal by the surely incorrect notion that the author was indeed a Jew but wanted to pass for a heathen and indeed for an Egyptian priest (pp. 149 sq. 152 sq.). For nowhere does such an attempt come plainly forward. And with such a tendency an entirely unknown name such as Artapanus would certainly never have been chosen as a shield. Nor does it at all explain the phenomena. For if the work had appeared under a heathen mask we should surely expect that it would have energetically denounced in the name of this acknowledged authority the abomination of idol-worship as is actually done e.g. in the case of the Sibyllist (iii. 20) and of pseudo-Aristeas (pp. 38 14 sq. ed. Mor. Schmidt). Thus under all circumstances the strange fact remains that a Jewish author has represented Moses as the founder of Egyptian rites. But however strange this may appear it is explained by the tendency of the whole. Moses was the introducer of all culture even of religious culture. This and nothing else is the meaning. Besides it must be considered that the heathen worship is in reality represented in a tolerably innocent light. For the sacred animals are not so much worshipped as on the contrary "consecrated" for their utility – τῷ Θεῷ as we cannot but conclude. But even thus we certainly have still to do with a Jewish author who cared more for the honour of the Jewish name than for the purity of divine worship. Perhaps too an apologetic purpose co-operated in causing the Jews who were decried as despisers of the gods to figure as founders of religious worship. Considering the marked prominence of Egyptian references there needs no other proof that the author was an Egyptian. With regard to date it can only be affirmed with certainty of him and of those who follow that they were predecessors of Alexander Polyhistor.

Comp. in general: Huetius Demonstr. evang. Prop. iv. c. ii. § 62. Valckenaer De Aristobulo p. 26. Dähne Geschichtl. Darstellung ii. 200–203. Rauch De Alexandro Polyhistore p. 22 sq. C. Müller Fragm. iii. 207 sqq. Vaillant De historicis etc. pp. 74–83. Herzfeld Gesch. des Volkes Jisrael iii. 483–486 574. Cobet in the Λόγιος Ἑρμῆς i. 170 171. Ewald ii. 129. Freudenthal Alex. Polyh. pp. 143–174 215 sqq. 231 sqq. Bloch Die Quellen des Josephus p. 60 sqq.

4. Aristeas

A fragment from the work of one otherwise unknown Aristeas περὶ Ἰουδαίων in which the history of Job is briefly related in accordance with the Bible is given in Euseb. Praep. ev. ix. 25. The history itself presents nothing worthy of remark but the personal accounts both of Job and his friends are supplemented on the ground of other scriptural material. Thus it is said of Job that he was formerly called Jobab Ἰώβ being evidently identical with Ἰωβάβ Gen. 36:33. Upon the ground of this identification Job is then made a descendant of Esau for Jobab was a son of Serach (Gen. 36:33) and the latter a grandson of Esau (Gen. 36:10 13). According indeed to the

extract of Alexander Polyhistor Aristeas is said to have related that Esau himself “married Bassara and begot Job of her” (τὸν Ἤσαυ γήμαντα Βασσάραν ἐν Ἐδὼμ γεννῆσαι Ἰώβ). Most probably however this rests upon an inaccurate reference of Alexander Polyhistor; for Aristeas who was quoting from the Bible must certainly have called Jobab not the son but correctly the great-grandson of Esau. From Gen. 36:33 is also derived the name Bassara as the mother of Job (Ἰωβὰβ υἱὸς Ζαρὰ ἐκ Βοσόρ’ρας where indeed Bosra is in reality not the mother but the native place of Jobab). Our author already used the LXX. translation of the Book of Job. It is moreover remarkable that in the supplement to Job in the Septuagint the personal accounts of Job are compiled exactly after the manner of Aristeas. Freudenthal thinks it certain that this supplement was derived from Aristeas.

Comp. in general: C. Müller Fragm. iii. 207 sqq. Herzfeld Gesch. des Volkes Jisrael iii. 488 sqq. 577–579. Ewald vii. 92. Freudenthal Alex. Polyhistor pp. 136–143 231.

5. Cleodemus or Malchus

The work of a certain Cleodemus or Malchus of which unfortunately only a short notice is preserved seems to have presented a classic example of that intermixture of native (Oriental) and Greek traditions which was popular throughout the region of Hellenism. The notice in question is communicated by Alexander Polyhistor but is taken by Eusebius Praep. evang. ix. 20 not directly from the latter but from Josephus Antt. i. 15 who on his part quotes literally from Alexander. The author is here called Κλεόδημος ὁ προφήτης ὁ καὶ Μάλχος ὁ ἱστορῶν τὰ περὶ Ἰουδαίων καθὼς καὶ Μωϋσῆς ἱστόρησεν ὁ νομοθέτης αὐτῶν. Both the Semitic name Malchus and the contents of the work prove that the author was no Greek but either a Jew or a Samaritan. Freudenthal prefers the latter view chiefly on account of the intermixture of Greek and Jewish traditions. But about 200–100 B.C. this is quite as possible in a Jew as in a Samaritan. In the work of this Malchus it is related that Abraham had three sons by Keturah Ἀφέραν Ἀσουρείμ Ἰάφραν from whom the Assyrians the town of Aphra and the land of Africa derive their names. The orthography of the names (which I have given according to Freudenthal) vacillates considerably. Hence אֵפָה עֵיפָה and עֵפֶר Gen. 25:3 4 are evidently identical with them. But while in Gen. 25 Arab tribes are intended our author derives from them entirely different nations which were known to him. He then further relates that the three sons of Abraham departed with Heracles to Libya and Antaeus that Heracles married the daughter of Aphra and of her begat Diodorus whose son again was Sophonas (or Sophax) from whom the Sophaki derive their name. These last traditions are also found in the Libyan (or Roman?) history of King Juba (Plutarch. Sertor c. ix. also in Müller Fragm. hist. gr. iii. 471); only that the genealogical relation of Diodorus and Sophax is reversed: Heracles begets Sophax of Tinge the widow of Antaeus and Diodorus is the son of Sophax.

Comp. in general: C. Müller Fragm. iii. 207 sqq. Vaillant De historicis etc. pp. 72–74. Herzfeld Gesch. des Volkes Jisrael iii. 489 575. Ewald vii. 91. Freudenthal. Alex. Polyh. pp. 130–136 215 230. Siegfried Zeitschr. f. wissensch. Theol. 1875 p. 476 sq.

6. An Anonymous Writer

Among the extracts of Alexander Polyhistor are found Euseb. Praep. evang. ix. 17 and 18 two which to judge by their contents are evidently identical although the one is much shorter than the other. The longer (Euseb. ix. 17) is given as an extract from Eupolemus who relates that Abraham descended in the [thir]teenth generation from the race of giants who after the deluge built the tower of Babel that he himself emigrated from Chaldaea to Phoenicia and taught the

Phoenicians τροπὰς ἡλίου καὶ σελήνης καὶ τὰ ἄλλα πάντα. He also proved of assistance to them in war. He then departed by reason of a famine to Egypt where he lived with the priests in Heliopolis and taught them much. instructing them in τὴν ἀστρολογίαν καὶ τὰ λοιπά. The real discoverer however of astrology was Enoch who received it from the angels and imparted it to men. We are told the same virtually but more briefly in the second extract Euseb. ix. 18 which Alexander Polyhistor derived from an anonymous work (ἐν δὲ ἀδεσπότοις εὕρομεν). If this parallel narrative is itself striking it must also be added that the longer extract can scarcely be from Eapolemus. Eupolemus was a Jew but in the extract Gerizim is explained by ὅρος ὑψίστου. Also according to Eupolemus Moses was the first sage (Euseb. ix. 26) while in the extract Abraham is already glorified as the father of all science. Hence the supposition of Freudenthal that the original of both extracts was one and the same viz. the anonymous work of a Samaritan and that the longer extract of Alexander has been ascribed by an oversight to Eupolemus is one which commends itself. In this work also as remains to be mentioned Greek traditions and Scripture history are again blended.

Comp. in general: C. Müller Fragm. iii. 207 sqq. Freudenthal Alex. Polyh. pp. 82–103 207 sq. 223 sqq. Siegfried Zeitschr. für wissenschaftl. Theol. 1875 p. 476.

7. Jason of Cyrene and the Second Book of Maccabees

The authors from whom extracts were made by Alexander Polyhistor compiled chiefly from the older Scripture history. The work of Jason of Cyrene on which our second Book of Maccabees is based is an example of the treatment of those important epochs of later Jewish history in which they had themselves lived by Hellenistic Jews. For this book is as the author himself informs us only an abridgment (ἐπιτομή 2 Macc. 2:26 28) from the larger work of a certain Jason of Cyrene (2 Macc. 2:23). The original work comprised five volumes which are in our second Book of Maccabees condensed into one (2 Macc. 2:23). Thus the contents of the former seem to have been parallel with those of the latter. The abridgment handed down to us tells first of an unsuccessful attack upon the treasury of the temple undertaken in the time of Seleucus IV. (B.C. 175) by his minister Heliodorus; it then relates the religious persecution of Antiochus Epiphanes and the apostasy of a portion of the Jews; and lastly recounts the Maccabaean rising and its progress down to the decisive victory of Judas over Nicanor (160 B.C.). Thus the book comprises a period of not much more than fifteen years 175–160 B.C. The events related are for the most part the same as in the first Book of the Maccabees. But the narrative differs in many particulars and in some parts even in the order of the events from the account in the first book. The differences are of such a kind that an acquaintance with that book can hardly be assumed on the part of our author (Hitzig Gesch. des Volkes Israel ii. 415 holds the opposite view). At the same time there can be no doubt that on the whole the simple narrative of 1 Macc. based as it is on good native sources deserves the preference over the rhetorical narrative of the second. On the other hand the latter offers a copiousness of independent detail especially in the preliminary history of the Maccabaean rising the historical truth of which there are no grounds for doubting. The view must therefore be accepted that contemporary sources of information were at the disposal also of Jason of Cyrene but that these were probably not in writing but only the oral accounts of contemporaries who narrated from memory the events of those fifteen years. If such narratives reached Jason not directly but through a series of intermediaries this would explain both the copiousness and the inaccuracy of the details.

If the view that Jason of Cyrene derived the history he relates from the lips of contemporaries is correct he must have written not long after 160 B.C. At all events unless we are willing to allow for the use of written documents also we must not make the interval between the events and the

date of the author too long as otherwise an acquaintance with such numerous and yet relatively correct particulars would be no longer possible. Nor does the mythical character of many of the narratives (e.g. the martyrdom of Eleazar and the seven brethren 2 Macc. 6–7) tend against the view of so early an origin. For a period of a few decades — especially at a distance from the scene of the events — is more than sufficient for the formation of such myths. The unhistorical notice xv. 37 that after the victory over Nicanor Jerusalem remained in the hands of the Hebrews can indeed only have been written by one at a great distance from the events. But on the other hand this scarcely affects Jason but his epitomizer. Why the narrative breaks off at the victory over Nicanor is somewhat enigmatical. Perhaps this ending was not contemplated by Jason.

With respect to the date of the epitomizer it can only be said that he is certainly more ancient than Philo who seems to have been acquainted with this book. Both the original work and the epitome were without doubt originally written in Greek. For it is very characteristically distinguished by its rhetorical Greek style from the annalistic Hebrew style of the first Book of Maccabees. The second book is very unlike the first in another respect also; it aims directly at edification by the narrative of the heroic faith of the Maccabees and of the marvellous events by which God preserved the continuance of the Jewish religion and worship.

The two letters which are now placed before this book (2 Macc. 1–2:18) stand in no connection with it. They are letters of the Palestinian to the Egyptian Jews in which the latter are summoned to the feast of the Dedication. They are evidently two originally independent pieces of writing afterwards combined by a later hand but not that of the epitomizer with this second Book of Maccabees. Their purpose is to influence the Egyptian Jews with respect to the feast of the Dedication.

In Philo's work Quod omnis probus liber § 13 (Mang. ii. 459) is described the manner in which many tyrants have persecuted the pious and virtuous. The several features of this description so greatly recall that of Antiochus Epiphanes in the second Book of Maccabees that an acquaintance with this book on the part of Philo can scarcely be doubted; comp. Lucius Der Essenismus (1881) pp. 36–39. Josephus has indeed a few points in common with this book which are absent from 1 Macc. (see Grimm Exeget. Handb. zu 2 Macc. p. 13). It is nevertheless very improbable that he was acquainted with the second Book of Maccabees (see Grimm p. 20). On the other hand the philosophical exhortation known as the fourth Book of Maccabees is entirely based upon it.

Christian testimony begins with Heb. 11:35; for ἐτυμπανίσθησαν evidently refers to 2 Macc. 6:19 28 (ἐπὶ τὸ τύμπανον προσῆγε ἐπὶ τὸ τύμπανον εὐθέως ἦλθε) while other allusions in Heb. 11:35 sq. recall 2 Macc. 6–7 Comp. Bleek Stud. und Kritik 1853 p. 339 and Bleek's Commentary on Heb. 11:35. The oldest quotation is Clemens Alex. Strom. v. 14. 97: Ἀριστοβούλῳ … οὗ μέμνηται ὁ συνταξάμενος τὴν τῶν Μακκαβαϊκῶν ἐπιτομήν (comp. 2 Macc. 1:10). Hippolytus in his work de Christo et Antichristo c. 49 (Lagarde p. 25) refers to this book in the words: καὶ ταῦτα μὲν … σεσήμανται ἐν τοῖς Μακκαβαϊκοῖς.

Origen appeals in many passages to this book in proof of important doctrines: 1. Of the doctrine of creation ex nihilo to 2 Macc. 7:28 (ἐξ οὐκ ὄντων ἐποίησεν αὐτὰ ὁ Θεός): Comment. in Joann. vol. i. c. 18 (Lommatzsch i. 37); de principiis ii. 1. 5 (Lommatzsch xxi. 142). 2. Of the doctrine of the intercession of saints to 2 Macc. 15:14 (ὁ πολλὰ προσευχόμενος περὶ τοῦ λαοῦ καὶ τῆς ἁγίας πόλεως Ἱερεμίας): Comment. in Joann. vol. xiii. c. 57 (Lommatzsch ii. 120); in Cant. Cant. lib. iii. (Lommatzsch xv. 26); de oratione c. 11 (Lommatzsch xvii. 125). 3. He also makes special

and very full mention of the history of Eleazar and the seven Maccabaean brothers (2 Macc. 6:18–7 fin.) as glorious examples of dauntless martyrdom in the Exhortatio ad martyrium c. 22–27 (Lommatzsch xx. 261–268); comp. also Comment. in epist. ad Rom. lib. iv. c. 10 (Lommatzsch vi. 305). 4. Other quotations in Origen: fragm. in Exod. (Lommatzsch viii. 302); contra Cels. viii. 46 fin. (Lommatzsch xx. 176).

Cyprian also quotes the history of the Maccabaean martyrs 2 Macc. 6–7 (ad Fortunatum c. 11 and Testim. iii. 17). The Fathers in general have delighted in treating of these Maccabaean martyrs (often with the use of the so-called fourth Book of Maccabees); nay they were at last transplanted among Christian saints. For material bearing on this see Wetstein's notes on Origen Exhort. ad martyr. c. 23 (Lommatzsch xx. 262) and the Vitae Sanctorum (Lipomannus Surius Bollandist. Nilles' Kalendarium manuale 1879 to August 1); some also in Freudenthal Die Flavius Josephus beigelegte Schrift über die Herrschaft der Vernunft (1869) p. 29 sqq. Creuzer Stud. und Krit. 1853 p. 85 sq. Bähr Die christlichen Dichter und Geschichtschreiber Roms (2nd ed. 1872) p. 50 sqq.

Its title as the second Book of the Maccabees is first found in Euseb. Praep. evang. viii. 9 fin.: Ἀριστόβουλος … οὗτος δ' αὐτὸς ἐκεῖνος οὗ καὶ ἡ δευτέρα τῶν Μακκαβαίων ἐν ἀρχῇ τῆς βίβλου μνημονεύει. Hieronymus Prol. galeatus to the Books of Samuel (Vallarsi ix. 459): Machabaeorum primum librum Hebraicum reperi. Secundus Graecus est quod ex ipsa quoque φράσει probari potest.

With respect to manuscripts editions and ancient translations what was said above p. 10 in the case of the first Book of Maccabees applies in most instances to the second. We need only remark: (1) that the second Book of Maccabees is not contained in the cod. Sinaiticus and (2) that besides the old Latin translation which has passed into the Vulgate (and which alone Sabatier Biblior. sacror. Lat. versiones antiquae vol. ii. knows) there is another in a cod. Ambrosianus from which Peyron has published it (Ciceronis orationum pro Scauro pro Tullio et in Clodium fragmenta inedita 1824 p. 73 sqq.); the edition of the same text promised for Ceriani's Monumenta sacra et prof. vol. i. fasc. 3 has as far as I know not yet made its appearance.

The exegetical and critical literature also of this book is almost entirely the same as that of the first Book of Maccabees (see above p. 11 sq.). In the Exegetisches Handbuch zu den Apokryphen (Leipzig 1857) the fourth part compiled by Grimm treats of the second third and fourth Books of the Maccabees. We mention besides: [H. Eberh. Glo. Paulus] "Ueber das zweyte Buch der Maccabäer" (Eichhorn's Allg. Biblioth. der bibl. Literatur vol. i. 1787 pp. 233–241). Bertheau De secundo libro Maccabaeorum Gotting. 1829. Herzfeld Gesch. des Volkes Jisrael ii. 443–456. Patrizzi De consensu utriusque libri Machabaeorum Romae 1856. Cigoi Historischchronologische Schwierigkeiten im zweiten Makkabäerbuche Klagenfurt 1868. Kasten Der historische Werth des zweiten Buches der Makkabäer Stolp 1879 (Gymnasialprogr.).

On the two letters at the beginning of the book see (besides the above-named literature): Valckenaer De Aristobulo pp. 38–44. Schlünkes Epistolae quae secundo Macc. libro i. 1–9 legitur explicatio Colon. 1844. The same Difficiliorum locorum epistolae quae 2 Macc. i. 10–ii. 18 legitur explicatio Colon. 1847. Grätz "Das Sendschreiben der Palästinenser an die ägyptischjudäischen Gemeinden wegen der Feier der Tempelweihe" (Monatsschr. für Gesch. und Wissensch. des Judenth. 1877 pp. 1–16 49–60).

8. The Third Book of Maccabees

The so-called third Book of Maccabees may here be mentioned along with the second as having at least the form of an historical narrative of a supposed episode of later Jewish history. In truth it is a tolerably insipid piece of fiction founded at most on an entirely unascertainable historical fact. It relates how Ptolemy IV. Philopator after his victory over Antiochus the Great at Raphia came to Jerusalem and entertained the desire of entering also the interior of the temple. As he was not to be turned from his purpose by any representations the Jews in their distress cried to God who heard their prayer and struck Ptolemy so that he fell stunned to the ground (1-2:24). Ptolemy exasperated returned to Egypt and meditated revenge. He deprived the Alexandrian Jews of their civic rights and commanded that all the Jews in Egypt together with their wives and children should be brought in chains to Alexandria where they were confined in the racecourse. Their number was so great that the clerks who were to write down the names of each had not after forty days' labour come to the end and were obliged to leave off for want of writing materials (2:25-4 fin.). Ptolemy now commanded that five hundred elephants should be intoxicated by wine and incense and incited against the people in the racecourse. When all preparations had been made the execution was delayed till the next day because the king had slept till the time for his chief meal. On the second day too nothing was done because the king had through the dispensation of God suddenly forgotten everything and was very angry to find that hostile designs were entertained against his faithful servants the Jews. On the same day however he repeated at his repast the former order for the extirpation of the Jews. When then on the third day matters at last seemed getting serious and the king was already approaching the racecourse with his troops two angels appeared from heaven at the prayer of the Jews and paralysed the troops of the king with terror. The elephants then rushed upon the troops of the king trampled on and destroyed them (5-6:21). The king was now much irritated against his counsellors and commanded the Jews to be liberated from their chains nay to be entertained for seven days at his expense. Then they celebrated their deliverance with feasting and rejoicing and resolved to keep these days as festivals for ever. And the king issued a letter of protection in favour of the Jews to all governors in the provinces and gave the Jews permission to put to death such of their fellow-countrymen as had apostatized from the faith. They made abundant use of this permission and returned joyfully home (6:22-7 fin.).

This narrative is not only almost throughout a mere fiction but it belongs among productions of the kind to those of the weakest sort. The author evidently revels in keeping up psychological impossibilities. The style also corresponds being bombastic and involved. The only foundation for the author's fiction seems to have been an old legend which we still read in Josephus. For he relates (contra Apion. ii. 5) that Ptolemy VII. Physcon cast the Jews of Alexandria who as adherents of Cleopatra were his political opponents to intoxicated elephants who however turned instead against the friends of the king whereupon the king gave up his purpose and the Jews of Alexandria celebrated the day in remembrance of the event. According to this account the celebration of this festival which is also mentioned in the third Book of Maccabees (6:36) seems at all events to be historical. And some unascertained fact may certainly be the foundation of the legend the older form of which seems to have been in the hands of Josephus since all is in his account simpler and more psychologically comprehensible and he was evidently unacquainted with the third Book of Maccabees. When then the latter refers the history to Ptolemy IV. instead of VII. this is already a divergence from the older legend and still more so are the other additions with which the author has enriched his narrative.

As to the date of the author the utmost that can be ventured is a conjecture. The contents and tendency of the book seem to presuppose a persecution of the Alexandrian Jews on account of which the author desires to comfort and encourage his co-religionists. This leads our thoughts

to the time of Caligula when such a persecution on a large scale took place for the first time. Hence Ewald Hausrath Reuss and others place the composition of the book in his reign. But then it would be strange that the author does not make Ptolemy lay claim to divine honours which was the chief stumbling-block in the case of Caligula. On the whole we should expect in it more special references to events under Caligula. Hence we can but approve of Grimm's reservation though he has every inclination to agree with Ewald'a hypothesis (Exeget. Handb. p. 218 sq.). In general we may say that the book originated at the earliest in the first century before Christ at the latest in the first century after Christ; the former because the author already knows the Greek additions to Daniel (6:6); the latter because it would otherwise have found no acceptance with the Christian Church.

The oldest Christian testimony is the Canones apost. (in Cotelier Patr. apost. 2nd ed. i. 453) canon 76 (al. 85): Μακκαβαίων τρία. The stichometry of Nicephorus also reckons: Μακκαβαϊκὰ γ′ (in Credner Zur Gesch. des Kanons p. 119). In the Synopsis Athanasii stands instead Μακκαβαϊκὰ βιβλία δ′ Πτολεμαϊκά (Credner p. 144) where according to Credner's conjecture καί is perhaps to be read instead of the number δ′ so that our third Book of Maccabees would have to be understood by Πτολεμαϊκά. For other testimony see Eichhorn Einl. in die apokr. Schriften des A. T. p. 288 sq. Grimm Handb. p. 221 sq. The book seems never to have been known in the Latin Church on which account it is absent from the Vulgate. On the other hand it found approbation in the Syrian Church as the existing old Syriac translation proves. The name "Book of Maccabees" has been very inaptly given to the book merely because here also a persecution of Jews faithful to their religion is the subject.

The book is as a rule found in the manuscripts of the Septuagint so especially in the cod. Alexandrinus. Hence it is also found in most editions of the Septuagint and in the separate editions of the Greek apocryphal books (see above p. 10 sq.). Of ancient versions the old Syriac need only be mentioned here (see above p. 11).

For the exegetical aids in general see above p. 11. Commentary: Grimm "Das zweite dritte und vierte Buch der Maccabäer" (Exegetisches Handbuch zu den Apokryphen des A.T.'s Part 4) Leipzig 1857. Investigations: Eichhorn Einl. in die apokryphischen Schriften des A.T.'s pp. 278-290. Bertholdt Einl. in sammtliche kanon. und apokr. Schriften des A. u. N. T. vol. iii. pp. 1082-1091. Ewald Gesch. des Volkes Israel iv. 611-614. De Wette-Schrader Einl. in das A.T.'s p. 572 sq. Keil Einl. in das A.T. 3rd ed. p. 720 sq. Hausrath Neutestamentl. Zeitgesch. 2nd ed. ii. 262-265. Reuss Gesch. der heil Schriften Alten Testaments § 574.

9. Philo's Historical Works

Philo the philosopher must also be named here as a writer of works on Jewish history. Indeed he has left us narratives not only from the more ancient history but also from that of his own times.

1. With respect to the former a large work which has been preserved almost entire viz. a comprehensive delineation of the Mosaic legislation must first be mentioned. It is not indeed an historical narrative properly so called but a systematic statement; still it is one so made that Philo attempts therein to give a survey of the legislative labours of Moses himself i.e. of the virtual contents of the Pentateuch. That he does not do this without being essentially influenced by his own philosophical views is a thing self-evident. But still his purpose is simply to give in an objective historical manner; a survey of the Mosaic legislation. The several parts of this work have come down to us in the manuscripts and editions under special titles as though they were

separate books. It will be shown below § 34 that the plan of the whole work is as follows: (a) The first book refers to the creation of the world. For Moses treated of this in the beginning of his work to make it plain that his legislation was according to the will of nature. (b) The following books treat of the lives of Enos Enoch Noah Abraham Isaac Jacob and Joseph but so that the first three are only briefly treated in the introduction to the life of Abraham while the last four have each a separate book devoted to them. The lives of Abraham and Joseph have been preserved. The histories of all these individuals is related because by their lives they exhibit the universal types of morality "the living unwritten laws." (c) Next follows the legislation proper the ten chief commandments first in one book and then in four books the special laws arranged according to the rubrics of the ten commandments (particulars § 34). Thus a survey is really taken of the actual contents of the Pentateuch. The tendency of the entire work is everywhere to hold up the Jewish law as the wisest and most humane. The ritual and ceremonial laws are not passed by; but Philo always knows how to realize their rational side so that he who perfectly observes them is not only the best but also the most cultured man the true philosopher. This also makes it clear that the work if not solely was chiefly intended for non-Jewish readers. The educated of all nations were to be brought by it to the perception that the Jewish was the most perfect law the law by which men were best trained to be good citizens and true philosophers.

In a separate work which does not as has been usually supposed belong to this collective work Philo has also written a life of Moses himself. In this also the manner and object are the same as in the systematic work. Moses is described as the greatest and wisest of lawgivers and as raised above all others by mighty deeds and miraculous experiences.

2. Philo also described in a lengthy work the most important and the saddest episode of the Jewish history of his times the persecutions of the Jews under Caligula. By way of introduction he spoke also in it of the persecutions brought about by Sejanus in the reign of Tiberius. The work according to Eusebius contained five books. The two which have come down to us (in Flaccum and de legatione ad Cajum) probably formed the third and fourth (particulars § 34). Philo having been an eye-witness of the events he narrates nay as leader of a Jewish embassy to Caligula a prominent sharer in them his work is a first-class authority for the history of this period.

10. Josephus

The best known historian of Jewish affairs in the Greek language is the Palestinian Josephus properly Joseph the son of Matthias a priest of Jerusalem. Of his two chief works one is the Ἰουδαϊκὴ Ἀρχαιολογία a comprehensive delineation of the entire Jewish history from the beginning to his own times. It is the most extensive work on Jewish history in the Greek language with which we are acquainted and has on that account so retained the lasting favour of Jewish heathen and Christian readers as to have been preserved entire in numerous manuscripts (particulars see above Div. i. vol. i. § 3). Notwithstanding its great difference from the philosophizing delineation of Philo its tendency is similar. For it is the purpose of Josephus not only to instruct his heathen readers for whom it was in the first instance intended in the history of his people but also to inspire them with respect for the Jewish nation both as having a history of hoar antiquity and a long series of celebrities both in peace and war to point to and as able to bear comparison in respect of laws and institutions with any nation (comp. especially Antt. xvi. 6. 8). The other chief work of Josephus the History of the Jewish War from A.D. 66–73 gives the history more for its own sake. The events of these years are in themselves so important that they seemed worthy of a detailed description. Perhaps it was written by command of Vespasian from whom Josephus received an annual salary (Vita 76) and to whom

the work was delivered as soon as it was completed (contra Apion. i. 9; Vita 65). If a tendency to boasting is detected in it this refers rather to the individual Josephus and the Romans than to the Jewish nation.

11. Justus of Tiberias

Justus of Tiberias a contemporary and fellow-countryman of Josephus was also his fellow-labourer. He too devoted himself to authorship after the destruction of his nation but having been less successful therein than Josephus his works were less read and have therefore been lost. He has this in common with Josephus that he too treated both of Jewish history as a whole and of the events of his own times each in one work. His History of the Jewish Kings from Moses to Agrippa II. was according to the statement of Photius who was still acquainted with it (Biblioth. Cod. 33) "very brief in expression and passed over much that was necessary." As it was made use of by Julius Africanus in his Chronicle it may well be supposed that its form was that of a chronicle in which stress was chiefly laid upon the settling of the chronology.

In another work Justus seems to have presented whether wholly or partly the History of the Jewish War in a manner by which Josephus felt himself compromised since in his Vita he enters into a very warm controversy against Justus.

IV. EPIC POETRY AND THE DRAMA

1. Philo the Epic Poet

The appropriation of Greek forms of literature on the part of the Hellenistic Jews did not stop at prose. Even the epic and dramatic poetry of the Greeks were transplanted to the soil of Hellenistic Judaism the sacred history being sung under the form of the Greek Epos nay represented in the form of the Greek drama. For what is still preserved of this remarkable literature we are indebted to the extracts of Alexander Polyhistor which have been inserted by Eusebius in his Praeparatio evangelica (see above p. 197 sqq.).

Three small fragments from a Greek poem "On Jerusalem" (Περὶ τὰ Ἱεροσόλυμα) by a certain Philo are given by Eusebius (Euseb. Praep. evang. ix. 20 24 37). The subject of the first is Abraham of the second Joseph of the third the springs and water-pipes of Jerusalem the abundance of which is extolled. The first and third are taken from the first book of the work quoted (ix. 20: Φίλων ἐν τῷ πρώτῳ τῶν Περὶ τὰ Ἱεροσόλυμα; ix. 37: Φίλων ἐν τοῖς Περὶ Ἱεροσολύμων … ἐν τῇ πρώτῃ); the second professedly from the fourteenth (ix. 24: Φίλων ἐν τῇ ιδ′ τῶν Περὶ Ἱεροσόλυμα). But that Philo should have used fourteen books to get as far as the history of Joseph is too improbable. Hence we may suppose with Freudenthal that possibly we must read ἐν τῇ ιδ′ instead of ἐν τῇ δ′. The language of Philo is that of the Greek epic but his hexameters are written with a true contempt of Greek prosody and the diction is pompous and so involved as to be unintelligible.

The Philo mentioned by Clemens Alex. Strom. i. 21. 141 and by Josephus contra Apion. i. 23 (= Euseb. Praep. evang. ix. 42) and whom Josephus distinguishes from the more recent philosopher by calling him Philo the elder (Φίλων ὁ πρεσβύτερος) is certainly identical with our epic writer. According to the notice of him in Clemens Alexandrinus we might indeed suppose that some prose writer who treated Jewish history in like manner as Demetrius and Eupolemus do was spoken of (Strom. i. 21. 141: Φίλων δὲ καὶ αὐτὸς ἀνέγραψε τοὺς βασιλεῖς τοὺς Ἰουδαίων διαφώνως τῷ Δημητρίῳ). Josephus took him for a heathen for he adduces him

together with Demetrius and Eupolemus as a proof that many heathen authors also had a tolerably accurate acquaintance with Jewish history. But the circumstance that both Clemens and Josephus in the passages cited place this Philo in the same series as Demetrius and Eupolemus (both have the order Demetrius Philo Eupolemus) proves that both were drawing from the same source and this can be no other than Alexander Polyhistor. Since then no other Philo than the epic writer occurs in the copious contributions from Alexander Polyhistor in Eusebius there is no doubt that Clemens and Josephus mean the same. Consequently Philo as the fragments in Eusebius give us reason to suppose sang in such wise of the town of Jerusalem as to give at the same time a history of the Jewish kings.

As to the date of Philo this much only can be said that he preceded Alexander Polyhistor. Hence he may be perhaps placed in the second century before Christ. There is no direct evidence that he was a Jew but from the tenor of his poem it can scarcely be doubtful.

Comp. in general: Huetius Demonstr. ev. Prop. iv. c. 2 § 33. Viger's Anm. zu Euseb. ix. 20. Philippson Ezechiel des jüdischen Trauerspieldichters Auszug aus Egypten und Philo des Aelteren Jerusalem 1830. Delitzsch Zur Gesch. der jüd. Poesie (1836) pp. 24 209. Dähne Geschichtl. Darstellung der jüd.-alex. Religions-Philosophie ii. 215 note. Cruice De Fl. Josephi fide (1844) p. 61 sq. Müller Fragm. hist. Graec. iii. 207 sqq. Herzfeld Gesch. des Volkes Jisrael iii. 519 575. Ewald Gesch. des Volkes Israel iv. 338 vii. 91. Freudenthal Alex. Polyhistor pp. 34 100 170.

2. Theodotus

The poem of Theodotus on Sichem a long portion from which is given partly by verbal quotation partly by a statement of its contents in Euseb. Praep. evang. ix. 22 seems to have been of the same kind as that of Philo on Jerusalem. The entire portion refers to the history of the town of Sichem. Its situation is first described and then its seizure by the Hebrews in accordance with Gen. 34; how Jacob first dwelt in Mesopotamia there married and begat children then departed with them to the district of Sichem and received a portion of land from Emmor the king of Sichem; next how Sichem the son of Emmor ravished Dinah Jacob's daughter whereupon Jacob declared himself ready to give Dinah to Sichem to wife on condition that all the Sichemites should be circumcised; and lastly how Simeon and Levi two of Jacob's sons slew Emmor and Sichem and in conjunction with their brethren destroyed the city of the Sichemites. Jacob's sojourn in Mesopotamia not being mentioned till after the description of the town of Sichem and only as an introduction to the history of its seizure by the Hebrews which follows it is evident that the history of the town of Sichem is the real theme of the poem; and since it is called a "holy city" (ἱερὸν ἄστυ) it can scarcely be doubted that Theodotus was a Samaritan. Hence the title Περὶ Ἰουδαίων given to the poem in Eusebius can hardly be accurate. At the commencement of the extract it is said that the town had its name from Sikimios a son of Hermes (ἀπὸ Σικιμίου τοῦ Ἑρμοῦ). Theodotus thus seems like other Hellenists to have embellished Jewish history with scraps from Greek mythology. The diction as well as the construction of the hexameters is better than Philo's. With respect to date what was said of Philo applies here also.

Comp. in general: Huetius Demonstr. ev. iv. 2. 32. Fabricius-Harles Biblioth. gr. x. 516. Müller Fragm. hist. gr. iii. 207 sqq. Pauly's Real-Enc. der class. Alterthumswissensch. art. "Theodotus" Nr. 13. Herzfeld Gesch. des Volkes Jisrael iii. 520 sq. 576 sq. Ewald Gesch. des Volkes Israel iv. 338 vii. 91. Freudenthal Alex. Polyh. p. 99 sq.

3. Ezekiel the Tragic Poet

The most remarkable phenomenon in the department of Judaeo-Hellenistic poetry is the manufacture of scriptural matter into Greek dramas. We know indeed of only one such Jewish dramatist Ezekiel; and it must be left uncertain whether he had either successor or predecessor. But at all events he composed other dramas besides the one which is known to us by extracts being called "The poet of Jewish tragedies" (Clemens Alex. Strom. i. 23. 155: ὁ Ἐζεκίηλος ὁ τῶν Ἰουδαϊκῶν τραγῳδιῶν ποιητής. Euseb. Praep. evang. ix. 28: Ἐζεκιῆλος ὁ τῶν τραγῳδιῶν ποιητής). We know more by extensive extracts in Eusebius and Clemens Alexandrinus (after Alexander Polyhistor) of one of them which was called "the Exodus" Ἐξαγωγή and which depicted the history of the departure of the Jews from Egypt (Clemens Alex. Strom. i. 23. 155: ἐν τῷ ἐπιγραφομένῳ δράματι "Ἐξαγωγή." Euseb. Praep. evang. ix. 29. 14 ed. Gaisford: ἐν τῷ δράματι τῷ ἐπιγραφομένῳ Ἐξαγωγή). The moment chosen as the starting-point of the action was apparently that when Moses fled to Midian after slaying the Egyptian (Ex. 2); for the first extract transposes us to that period (Euseb. Praep. evang. ix. 28 = Clemens Alex. Strom. i. 23. 155-156). It is a long monologue of Moses in which he relates the history of his life down to that juncture and concludes with the words that he is now in consequence a wanderer in a foreign land. He then sees the seven daughters of Raguel approaching (Ex. 2:16 sqq.) and asks who they are when Zipporah gives him the information. The further progress of the action is only alluded to in the extract where we are told that the watering of the flock and the marriage of Zipporah with Moses now takes place (Ex. 2:16 sqq.). In the second extract (Euseb. ix. 29. 4-6 ed. Gaisford) Moses relates a dream to his father-in-law which the latter explains to mean that Moses will attain to a high official post and will have the knowledge of things past present and future. In another scene (Euseb. ix. 29. 7-11 ed. Gaisford) it is represented on the authority of Ex. 3-4 how God spoke to Moses from a burning bush and commissioned him to deliver the people of Israel from bondage. As God speaks invisibly from the bush He is not made to appear on the stage but only His voice is heard. The details are pretty much in agreement with Ex. 3-4. In the extract which follows (Euseb. ix. 29. 12-13 ed. Gaisford) God gives (according to Ex. 11-12) more exact directions concerning the departure and the celebration of the Passover. It cannot be decided whether this also belongs to the scene of the bush. In a further scene (Euseb. ix. 29. 14 ed. Gaisford) an Egyptian enters who has escaped the catastrophe in the Red Sea and relates how the Israelites passed safely through the waters and the Egyptian host perished in them. Finally in the last fragment (Euseb. ix. 29. 15-16) a messenger in whom we are to imagine one sent to reconnoitre for the Israelites announces to Moses the discovery of an excellent place of encampment at Elim with twelve springs of water and seventy palm trees (Ex. 15:27 = Num. 33:9). Then the messenger relates how a marvellously strong bird nearly twice as large as an eagle which all the other birds followed as their king appeared. The description of this bird is also found without mention of the name of Ezekiel in Eustathius Comm. in Hexaemeron ed. Leo Allatius (1629) p. 25 sq.

From these fragments it appears that the action agrees pretty closely with the scriptural narrative though with many embellishments of detail. The poetry of the author is very prosaic. On the other hand a certain amount of skill in dramatizing the material cannot be denied him. The diction and versification (Iambic trimeters) are tolerably fluent. It has been doubted – incorrectly it seems to me – whether this drama was ever intended for representation. The aim of it is certainly the same as that of the scriptural dramas of the Middle Ages (the passion plays etc.) viz. on the one hand to make the people in this way also better acquainted with sacred history on the other and chiefly to supplant as far as possible profane and heathen pleasures by the supply of such "wholesome food." Here perhaps as in other productions of Judaeo-

Hellenistic literature heathen readers and spectators were calculated on.

That Ezekiel was a Jew is undoubtedly shown even by his name. What was said of the dates of Philo and Theodotus applies in his case also.

Comp. in general: Huetius Demonstr. evang. iv. 2. 24. Fabricius Biblioth. graec. ed. Harles ii. 305 sq. viii. 624 sq. 635 636. Eichhorn "De Judaeorum re scenica" in the Commentationes Societ. Gotting. recentiores vol. ii. Gotting. 1813. Philippson Ezechiel des jüdischen Trauerspieldichters Auszug aus Egypten und Philo des Aelteren Jerusalem 1830. Delitzsch Zur Gesch. der jüdischen Poesie (1836) pp. 28 209 211-219. Dähne Geschichtl. Darstellung der jüd.-alex. Religions-Philosophie ii. 199 sq. Fürst Biblioth. Jud. i. 264. Frankel Ueber den Einfluss der palästinischen Exegese auf die alexandrinische Hermeneutik (1851) pp. 113-119. Herzfeld Gesch. des Volkes Jisrael iii. 517-519. Ewald Gesch. des Volkes Israel ii. 127 iv. 338. Bähr in Pauly's Real-Enc. iii. 365. Dübner in the appendix to Fragmenta Euripidis iterum ed. F. G. Wagner (accedunt indices locupletissimi Christus patiens Ezechieli et christianorum poetarum reliquiae dramaticae) Paris Didot 1846 pp. 7-10 and 1-7. Magnin Journal des Savants 1848 pp. 193-208 (Recension of Dübner's appendix to Fragm. Eurip. ed. Wagner). Dindorf Praefat. to his edition of Euseb. Opp. vol. i. pp. 19-25. Bernhardy Grundriss der griechischen Litteratur ii. 2 (3rd ed. 1872) p. 76. Cobet in the Λογιος Ερμης i. 457-459.

V. PHILOSOPHY

In the departments of history and poetry it was chiefly only the external form that was borrowed from the Greeks but in that of philosophy a real internal blending of Jewish and Greek thought a strong actual influencing of Jewish belief by the philosophy of the Greeks took place. We perceive this the most plainly in Philo. He exhibits a completely double aspect; on one side he is a Jew on the other a Greek philosopher (particulars § 34). But we should be much mistaken if we took him for an isolated phenomenon in the history of his people and age. He is but a classic representative of a current flowing through centuries and necessarily implied by the nature of Hellenistic Judaism. To Greek culture belonged also an acquaintance with the great thinkers of the Greeks. The Hellenistic Jews in appropriating the former thereby placed themselves also under the influence of Greek philosophy. We have certain proofs of this since the second century before Christ. But we may assume that the fact mentioned is in general as old as Hellenistic Judaism itself. The Jew whom Aristotle met in Asia Minor was already Ἑλληνικὸς οὐ τῇ διαλέκτῳ μόνον ἀλλὰ καὶ τῇ ψυχῇ (see vol. ii. 225).

The Jewish feature of this Judaeo-Hellenistic philosophy appears chiefly in the fact that like the Palestinian חָכְמָה it pursued essentially practical aims. Not logic or physics but ethic was in its sight the chief matter. This ethic was indeed often founded upon the theoretic philosophy of the Greeks. Still the latter is but a means to an end the proper end of Jewish philosophers viz. the practical one of educating man to true morality and piety.

Also in the choice made of the literary form the Jewish foundation is still apparent. The case here is exactly the reverse of what it is in poetry. The contents exhibit a strong Greek influence but the literary form is derived from Palestine. The author of the Wisdom of Solomon chooses the form of proverbs Philo gives his discussions in the manner of Rabbinic Midrash i.e. in prolix learned commentaries on the text of the Pentateuch from which the most heterogeneous philosophic ideas are developed by the help of allegorical exegesis. The so-called fourth Book of the Maccabees is a hortatory address of which the synagogue sermon may perhaps be regarded as the model. Only in a few smaller pieces does Philo choose the form of inquiry and dialogue after Greek models.

In the mixture of Jewish and Greek notions in these writers the proportions of course vary. In some the influence of Greek ideas is stronger in others weaker. But even those which are most saturated with Greek ideas are essentially rooted in the soil of Judaism. For they not only insist upon the unity of a supramundane God and the control of Divine Providence which punishes the wicked and rewards the good but they also firmly adhere to the belief that the most perfect knowledge of things human and divine is given in the Mosaic revelation so that Judaism is the way to true wisdom and virtue. And not only does the amount of Greek influence vary but different Greek systems are preferred now one now another being more agreed with. Plato Aristotle the Stoics and Pythagoreans have all furnished material to the sphere of ideas of these Jewish philosophers. Especially in the Platonico-Pythagorean and in the Stoic teaching did Jewish thinkers find many elements capable of being assimilated with the Jewish faith. That the appropriation of these was always eclectic is self-evident. But here Jewish philosophy only participates in the fundamental characteristic of later Greek philosophy in general.

1. The Wisdom of Solomon

We place the so-called “Wisdom of Solomon” first not because it is certainly the oldest of the

literary productions to be here discussed but because it most closely resembles in form the ancient Palestinian proverbial wisdom. In like manner as Jesus the son of Sirach does the author praise true wisdom which is to be found only with God and is imparted to man by God alone. But the execution is quite different from that of Jesus Sirach. While the latter shows how the truly wise man comports himself in the different circumstances of practical life this book is properly only a warning against the folly of ungodliness and especially of idolatry. Around this one theme do the contents of the whole book revolve and consequently the proverbial form is not strictly adhered to but often passes into that of connected discourse.

According to chap. 9:7 sqq. Solomon himself is to be regarded as the speaker and those addressed are the judges and kings of the earth (1:1: οἱ κρίνοντες τὴν γῆν; 6:1: βασιλεῖς δικασταὶ περάτων γῆς). Thus it is properly an exhortation of Solomon to his royal colleagues the heathen potentates. He the wisest of all kings represents to them the folly of ungodliness and the excellence of true wisdom. Its contents may be divided into three groups. It is first shown (chaps. 1–5) that the wicked and ungodly although for a period apparently prosperous will not escape the judgments of God but that the pious and just after having been for a time tried by sufferings attain to true happiness and immortality. In a second section (chaps. 6–9) Solomon directs his royal colleagues to his own example. It is just because he has loved high and divine wisdom and has united himself to her as his bride that he has attained to glory and honour. Hence he still prays for such wisdom. The third section (chaps. 10–19) points out by referring to the history of Israel and especially to the different lots of the Israelites and the Egyptians the blessing of godliness and the curse of ungodliness. A very long tirade on the folly of idolatry (chaps. 13–15) is here inserted.

The work being in its chief contents a warning against the folly of ungodliness it can only be so far intended for Jewish readers as ungodliness was to be found among them also. But we should be hardly mistaken if we were to suppose that the author had heathen readers at least as much in view. The numerous allusions to Scripture history seem indeed to presuppose Jewish readers (so e.g. Grimm Exeget. Handb. p. 27). But then what is the purpose of the garment chosen according to which the kings and potentates of the earth are addressed? Why the long-winded discourse on the folly of idolatry for which there was no occasion with Jewish readers who still deserved the name? The contents recall in many respects the Sibylline oracles which going forth under a heathen authority were certainly intended for heathen readers. As in these so in the book in question the folly of an ungodly life is set before its readers. At all events its warning and instruction are addressed to heathen-minded readers whether these are by birth Jews or heathen and chiefly indeed to the great and mighty of this world.

The special theological standpoint of the author agrees with that of Palestinian proverbial wisdom as we find it in the Proverbs of Solomon and in Jesus the son of Sirach. Divine Wisdom is the supreme good the source of all truth virtue and happiness with our author also. But while like the author of the Book of Proverbs and Jesus Sirach he starts from the assertion that this Wisdom is first of all present with God it becomes in his conception almost an independent person beside God. His utterances indeed do not seem to really exceed what we already read in Prov. 8–9. But what is there more a poetic personification becomes with him a philosophic theory. Wisdom is according to him a breath (ἀτμίς) of God's power a pure effluence (ἀπόρ'ρια) from the glory of the Almighty the brightness (ἀπαύγασμα) of the everlasting light (7:25 26). It is most intrinsically united with God (συμβίωσιν θεοῦ ἔχουσα) is initiated into the knowledge of God (μύστις τῆς τοῦ θεοῦ ἐπιστήμης) and a chooser of His works (αἱρέτις τῶν ἔργων αὐτοῦ) i.e. chooses among the works of which God has conceived the idea which shall be carried into

execution (8:3 4: comp. Grimm on the passage) is assessor on God's throne (9:4: ἡ τῶν σῶν θρόνων πάρεδρος) understands the works of God and was present when He created the world knows what is well-pleasing in His eyes and right according to His commandments (9:9). Wisdom is thus not only represented as the special possession of God but as an assistant of God originating from His own nature. Together therewith "the almighty word of God" (ὁ παντοδύναμός σου λόγος) is also personified in a manner which approaches hypostatic union (18:15 sq.). Thus we have here already the elements from which the Philonian doctrine of the λόγος (= reason and word of God) as a hypostasis mediating between God and the world is formed. For Wisdom occupies in our author a position similar to that of Philo's Logos with respect to the world also. She has a spirit which is easily moving all-overseeing all-pervading (7:22-24: εὐκίνητον πανεπίσκοπον διήκει καὶ χωρεῖ διὰ πάντων etc.). She works everything (8:5; τὰ πάντα ἐργαζομένη) rules all things (8:1: διοικεῖ τὰ πάντα) makes all things new (7:27: τὰ πάντα καινίζει). "By passing from generation to generation into holy souls she prepares friends of God and prophets" (7:27). It is she who was manifested in the history of Israel e.g. in the pillar of fire and cloud which led the Israelites through the wilderness (10:17 and chap. 10 in general). Hence Wisdom is in a word the medium by which God works in the world. The tendency of this whole speculation is evidently the same as in Philo viz. to secure by the insertion of such an intermediary the absolute supramundane nature of God who cannot be conceived of as in direct contact with a sinful world. But it must not be lost sight of that it is by no means our author's concern to dwell upon this thought. He desires on the contrary to exhibit Divine Wisdom as the supreme good. He does not seek to show that Wisdom is different from God but on the contrary how near it is to Him. While then he is moving in this sphere of thought he merely takes up a view already current among his associates.

The influence of Greek philosophy is moreover shown in the details of execution. The formulae with which the rule of wisdom in the world is described (7:24: διήκει χωρεῖ; 8:1: διοικεῖ) recall the Stoic doctrine of the world-spirit of God as the wisdom of the world immanent in and pervading it. The enumeration also of the four cardinal virtues (8:7: σωφροσύνη φρόνησις δικαιοσύνη ἀνδρεία) is to be referred to Stoic influence (see Zeller as above). The psychology of the author on the other hand is Platonico-dualistic. The soul of man is pre-existent. If it is good it enters an undefiled body (8:20: ἀγαθὸς ὢν ἦλθον εἰς σῶμα ἀμίαντον). The body is only an "earthly tabernacle" for the νοῦς (9:15: γεῶδες σκῆνος). After a short time the body must restore the soul like a loan and then fall to dust (15:8). In this anthropology the territory of the Jewish view is entirely forsaken. Instead of a resurrection of the body we have here the Greek view of the immortality of the soul.

With respect to the author's date it must be regarded as certain that he succeeds Jesus the son of Sirach but precedes Philo. For his standpoint is a preliminary step to Philo's. This would not in itself prove a higher antiquity. But with the near affinity of the two it is not conceivable that our author would have remained unaffected by Philo if he had succeeded him. There is absolutely no foundation for the notion (as e.g. by Weisse) of Christian origin. That the author was an Alexandrian may by reason of the great prominence of references to Egyptian matters be regarded as certain. On the other hand it cannot be imagined that Philo was himself the author of this book as was believed by some even in the time of Jerome (Hieron. praef. in vers. libr. Salom. Opp. ed. Vallarsi ix. 1293 sq.: "Nonnulli scriptorum veterum hunc esse Judaei Philonis affirmant"); and also by many moderns as Luther Joh. Gerhard Calovius and others (see Grimm Handb. p. 21 sqq.). The authorship of Philo is entirely excluded by the difference of his sphere of thought.

The book has been used from the beginning in the Christian Church. Even in the Pauline Epistles such loud echoes are found as make St. Paul's acquaintanceship with the book probable (see Bleek Stud. und Krit. 1853 pp. 340-344; on the other side Grimm Exeget. Handb. p. 35 sqq.). It is tolerably certain that it was known to Clemens Romanus (Clem. Rom. xxvii. 5 = Sap. Sal. 12:12 and 11:21; comp. also Clem. lx. 1 = Sap. 7:17). In Tatian Oratio ad Graecos c. vii. init. the same is said of Christ as is said (Sap. 2:23) of God. Irenaeus in his large work on heresy nowhere quotes indeed Sap. Sol. but borrows from it (iv. 38. 3) the saying: ἀφθαρσία δὲ ἐγγὺς εἶναι ποιεῖ θεοῦ (Sap. 6:20). With reference to this Eusebius (Hist. eccl. v. 8. 8) says of Irenaeus: Καὶ ῥητοῖς δέ τισιν ἐκ τῆς Σολομῶνος σοφίας κέχρηται μονονουχὶ φάσκων• Ὅρασις δὲ θεοῦ περιποιητικὴ ἀφθαρσίας ἀφθαρσία δὲ ἐγγὺς εἶναι ποιεῖ θεοῦ. In the βιβλίον διαλέξεων διαφόρων which has not come down to us Irenaeus according to the testimony of Eusebius expressly quoted from the Book of Wisdom (Hist. eccl. v. 26: τῆς λεγομένης σοφίας Σολομῶντος μνημονεύει). Canon Muratorianus lin. 69-71: "Sapientia ab amicis Salomonis in honorem ipsius scripta." See also Hesse Das muratorische Fragment (1873) p. 239 sqq. Tertullian adv. Valentinianos c. 2 refers to Wisd. 1:1 in the words: "ut docet ipsa Sophia non quidem Valentini sed Salomonis." Tertullian also made use of the Book of Wisdom. Clemens Alexandrinus quotes it nine times and frequently makes use of it besides. The express quotations are introduced as either sayings of Solomon (so Strom. vi. 11. 93 14. 110 14. 114 15. 120-121) or of the σοφία (Paedag. ii. 1. 7; Strom. ii. 2. 5 iv. 16. 103-104 v. 14. 89) or with the formula εἴρηται (Strom. vi. 14. 113). Hippolytus repeatedly quotes the book as a genuine προφητεία Σολομῶν περὶ Χριστοῦ (adv. Judaeos § 9 and 10 = Lagarde p. 66 sq.) especially the passage 2:12-20 which is also frequently interpreted in a Messianic sense by moderns (see vol. ii. p. 139).

Origen is after the author of the Muratorian Fragment the first to intimate a doubt with respect to the Solomonian authorship. He quotes it with the sceptical formula as ἡ ἐπιγεγραμμένη τοῦ Σολομῶντος σοφία (in Joann. vol. xx. c. 4 = Lommatzsch ii. 202) ἡ σοφία ἡ ἐπιγεγραμμένη Σολομῶντος (in Jerem. homil. viii. 1 = Lommatzsch xv. 193) ὁ περὶ τῆς σοφίας εἰπών (Selecta in Jerem. c. 29 = Lommatzsch xv. 453) ἐν τῇ ἐπιγεγραμμένῃ Σολομῶντος σοφίᾳ (contra Cels. v. 29 = Lommatzsch xix. 216) "in sapientia quae dicitur Salomonis qui utique liber non ab omnibus in auctoritate habetur" (de principiis iv. 33 = Lommatzsch xxi. 472 sq.). But he quotes it almost as frequently simply as a work of Solomon. And that it is to him a canonical book is especially shown by the entire section de principiis i. 2. 5-13 where he uses the passage Wisd. 7:25 26 together with Col. 1:15 and Heb. 1:3 as fundamental passages from which he develops his Christology. The whole section de princ. i. 2. 9-13 is nothing but an exegetical discussion of Wisd. 7:25 26. On the whole there are about forty quotations from this book in Origen.

Cyprian uses the Book of Wisdom as in the fullest sense canonical. He quotes it as Sapientia Salomonis (Testim. ii. 14 iii. 16 53 58 59 66; Ad Fortunatum c. 1) scriptura divina (De habitu virginum c. 10; Epist. vi. 2) scriptura sancta (Ad Demetrianum c. 24) or with the formulae as scriptum est (De zelo et livore c. 4; Epist. iv. 1 lv. 22) per Salomonem docet spiritus sanctus and the like (De mortalitate c. 23; Ad Fortunatum c. 12). He quotes two or three times passages from the Proverbs with the formula in Sapientia Salomonis (Testim. iii. 1 6 16 56); and once a passage from Wisdom with the formula in Ecclesiastico (Testim. iii. 112); but both from inadvertence since he elsewhere decidedly distinguishes between Proverbs Ecclesiasticus and Wisdom.

The manuscripts editions and ancient translations (together with their editions) are the same for this book as for Ecclesiasticus (see above p. 29) the two books being as a rule combined with

each other. The cod. Vaticanus has been used for our book in Fritzsche's edition of the Apocrypha but apparently only according to the data in Reusch (Observ. crit. 1861) which on their part rest upon the untrustworthy edition of the codex by Mai (see upon this p. 11 above). Valuable contributions to the textual criticism are given in Reusch Observationes criticae in librum Sapientiae Frib. 1861. The separate edition (Reusch Liber Sapientiae graece Frib. 1858) gives the text of the Sixtine edition. An edition of the Greek text with the old Latin and the Authorized English translation: Deane Σοφια Σαλωμων The Book of Wisdom the Greek text the Latin Vulgate and the Authorized English version with an introduction critical apparatus and a commentary Oxford 1881.

The exegesis in general see above p. 11. Commentaries: Bauermeister Commentarius in Sapientiam Salomonis Götting. 1828. Grimm Commentar über das Buch der Weisheit Leipzig 1837. J. A. Schmid Das Buch der Weisheit übersetzt und erklärt 1858 (Cathol.). Grimm Das Buch der Weisheit erklärt (Exegetisches Handbuch zu den Apokryphen 6 pts.) Leipzig 1860 (not a new edition of the former work but an entirely new one). Gutberlet Das Buch der Weisheit übersetzt und erklärt 1874 (Cathol.). Deane in the above-named separate edition. The older literature in Fabricius Biblioth. graec. ed. Harles iii. 727–732. Fürst Biblioth. Jud. iii. 219–221. Grimm Exeget. Handb. p. 45 sq. Herzog's Real-Enc. 2nd ed. i. 496.

Separate investigations: Salthenius Diss. critico-theol. de auctore libri Sapientiae Philone potius Alexandrino quam seniore Regim. 1739. Bretschneider De libri Sapientiae parte priore c. i.–xi. e duobus libellis conflata. Pts. i.–iii. Viteb. 1804. Winzer De philosophia morali in libro Sap. exposita Viteb. 1811. Grimm De Alexandrina Sapientiae libri indole perperam asserta Jen. 1833 (subsequently withdrawn by himself). Gfrörer Philo vol. ii. (1831) pp. 200–272. Dähne Geschichtl. Darstellung der jüd.-alex. Religionsphilosophie vol. ii. (1834) pp. 152–180. Bruch Weisheitslehre der Hebräer Strassb. 1851 pp. 322–378. Schmieder Ueber das B. der Weisheit 1853. Weisse Die Evangelienfrage (1856) p. 202 sqq. Noach Psyche iii. 2 pp. 65–102. Nägelsbach in Herzog's Real-Enc. 1st ed. xvii. 622 sqq. Ewald Gesch. des Volkes Israel iv. 626 sqq. The same Jahrbb. der bibl. Wissensch. iii. 264 sq. ix. 234 sq. x. 219 sq. xi. 223 sqq. Zeller Die Philosophie der Griechen iii. 2 (3rd ed. 1881) pp. 271–274. Kübel "Die ethischen Grundanschauungen der Weisheit Salomo's" (Stud. und Krit. 1865 pp. 690–722). Heinze Die Lehre vom Logos (1872) pp. 192–202. Fritzsche in Schenkel's Bibellex. v. 647 sqq. Hausrath Neutestamentl. Zeitgesch. 2nd ed. ii. 259 sqq. Grätz Gesch. der Juden vol. iii. (3rd ed. 1878) pp. 628–630 (note 3). Perez La Sapienza di Salomone saggio storico-critico Firenze 1871. The same Sopra Filone Alessandrino e il suo libro detto "La Sapienza di Salomone" Palermo 1883. The Introductions of Jahn Eichhorn Bertholdt Welte Scholz Nöldeke De Wette-Schrader Reusch Keil Kaulen Kleinert Reuss (see above p. 12).

2. Aristobulus

The author of the Wisdom of Solomon is one whose views are still chiefly based upon the Palestinian Proverbial Wisdom which in him is only peculiarly modified by the influence of Greek philosophy. The Alexandrian Aristobulus on the contrary is a Hellenistic philosopher in the proper sense. He is acquainted with and expressly quotes the Greek philosophers Pythagoras Socrates Plato and is at home with their views as a philosopher by profession.

The statements of the ancients do not indeed entirely agree as to his date. It may however pass for certain that he lived in the time of Ptolemy VI. Philometor and therefore towards the middle of the second century before Christ (about 170–150 B.C.). He himself says in one of his works addressed to a Ptolemy that the Greek translation of the Pentateuch was made "under King

Philadelphus thy ancestor" (Euseb. Praep. evang. xiii. 12. 2 ed. Gaisford: ἐπὶ τοῦ προσαγορευθέντος Φιλαδέλφου βασιλέως σοῦ δὲ προγόνου). Thus he at all events wrote under a descendant of Ptolemy II. Philadelphus. But both Clemens Alexandrinus and Eusebius in his Chronicle distinctly mention Philometor. The same chronology is also presupposed when Clemens Alexandrinus and Eusebius identify this Aristobulus with the one who is mentioned in the beginning of the second Book of Maccabees (2 Macc. 1:10). In opposition to such evidence it cannot be taken into consideration that Anatolius places him under Ptolemy II. Philadelphus and that the only manuscript of the Stromata of Clemens Alexandrinus has erroneously Philadelphus instead of Philometor in one passage.

According to Clem. Alex. Strom. v. 14. 97 this Aristobulus wrote βιβλία ἱκανά. Probably Clemens does not mean to say that he wrote several books but that the one work which he knew of his was an extensive one. We are indebted for further particulars to Clemens Alexandrinus (Strom. i. 15. 72 i. 22. 150 v. 14. 97 vi. 3. 32) Anatolius (in Euseb. Hist. eccl. vii. 32 16-19 Anatolius was an older contemporary of Eusebius) and Eusebius (Praep. evang. vii. 14 viii. 10 xiii. 12). Aristobulus is also briefly mentioned by Origen (contra Cels. iv. 51). The only two passages which are verbally preserved are in Euseb. Praep. evang. viii. 10 and xiii. 12. For whatever other verbal quotations are found (Clemens Strom. i. 22. 150 = Euseb. Praep. ix. 6. Clemens Strom. vi. 3. 32 = Euseb. Praep. vii. 14) are certainly contained also in the text of these larger fragments. The passage which Cyrillus Alex. (contra Julian. p. 134 ed. Spanh.) ascribes to Aristobulus is derived from the third Book of the Indica of Megasthenes and has been only ascribed to Aristobulus in consequence of a very inconsiderate use of Clem. Al. Strom. i. 15. 72.

The work which was in the hands of these Fathers is designated as an explanation of the Mosaic laws. According however to the fragments preserved we must conceive of it not as an actual commentary on the text but as a free reproduction of the contents of the Pentateuch in which the latter is philosophically explained. Hence it is not Philo's allegorical commentaries on single passages of the text but his systematic delineation of the Mosaic legislation the characteristics of which have been described p. 219 above which is analogous to it. Like Philo Aristobulus already seems to have given a connected representation of the contents of the Pentateuch for the purpose of showing to the cultured heathen world that the Mosaic law if only correctly understood already contained all that the best Greek philosophers subsequently taught. The work was first of all intended for King Ptolemy Philometor himself who is therefore addressed in the text (Eus. Pr. viii. 10. 1 sqq. xiii. 12. 2). Hence it is self-evident that it is addressed simply to heathen readers. His chief object was as Clement says to show "that the peripatetic philosophy was dependent upon the law of Moses and the other prophets" (Strom. v. 14. 97: Ἀριστοβούλῳ … βιβλία πεπόνηται ἱκανὰ δι' ὧν ἀποδείκνυσι τὴν περιπατητικὴν φιλοσοφίαν ἔκ τε τοῦ κατὰ Μωυσέα νόμου καὶ τῶν ἄλλων ἠρτῆσθαι προφητῶν). This is substantially confirmed by the fragments preserved only instead of the peripatetic the Greek philosophy in general should rather be spoken of. For Aristobulus is not contented with exhibiting the intrinsic agreement of the Mosaic law with the philosophy of the Greeks but roundly asserts that the Greek philosophers a Pythagoras a Socrates a Plato derived their doctrines from Moses nay that even the poets Homer and Hesiod borrowed much from him for that the essential contents of the Pentateuch had been rendered into Greek long before the Greek translation of the Pentateuch made under Ptolemy Philadelphus. This bold assertion that Moses was the father of Greek philosophy and culture was embraced also by later Jewish Hellenists. Especially do we again meet with it in Philo.

The fragments preserved give us at least an approximate notion of the execution in detail. A

large portion of the passages are employed in settling the true sense of the Biblical anthropomorphisms. Thus e.g. the long passage in Euseb. Pr. evang. xiii. 12. 1–8 which according to the parallel passage in Clemens Alex. Strom. i. 22. 150 = Euseb. Pr. ix. 6 is taken from the first book of Aristobulus' work and evidently belonged to the explanation of the history of the Creation shows that nothing else is meant by the words "God said and it was" than that everything came to pass by the operation (δυνάμει) of God as indeed was taught by the Greek philosophers Orpheus and Aratus. The following passage (Eus. Pr. xiii. 12. 9–16) which also belonged to the explanation of the history of the Creation treats of the seventh day as the day of rest and explains its meaning by an appeal among other things to supposed verses of Hesiod Homer and Linus. Another passage (Eus. Pr. viii. 10) shows what we are to understand when the hands arms face and feet of God or a walking of God are spoken of. Lastly the extract from Anatolius given in Euseb. Hist. eccl. vii. 32. 17–18 is occupied with the Passover which is celebrated when both the sun and moon are in the equinox viz. the sun in the vernal and the moon opposite him in the autumnal equinox. Just this fragment shows that Aristobulus by no means occupied himself with only philosophically explaining away the text of the Pentateuch but that he really gave a description and explanation of the Mosaic law. While endeavouring however to settle its meaning he often enters as Origen especially intimates (contra Cels. iv. 51) into the region of allegorical interpretation.

The fragments give no further disclosure concerning the philosophical standpoint of Aristobulus. It may without any hesitation be assumed that he was an eclectic. The fragment on the meaning of the Sabbath "enters into a Pythagorean-like dilation on the power of the number seven." Elsewhere Aristobulus appeals not only generally to Pythagoras Socrates and Plato but when entering more into detail to the peripatetic doctrine in particular. That he the more closely adhered to the latter is vouched for by the Fathers who unanimously call him a peripatetic.

It is almost incomprehensible that many more recent scholars (e.g. Richard Simon Hody Eichhorn Kuenen Grätz Joel) should have disputed the genuineness of the whole work of Aristobulus. The picture which we obtain from the fragments of the work that have come down to us so entirely coincides with all that we elsewhere learn of the intellectual tendency of Hellenistic Judaism that there is absolutely no occasion for any kind of doubt. The sole reason against the genuineness which at all deserves mention is the certainly indisputable fact that Aristobulus cites supposed verses of Orpheus Hesiod Homer and Linus which are certainty forged by a Jew. It is thought that such audacity is inconceivable in a work intended for King Ptolemy himself. The assumption on which the argument starts is that the verses were forged by Aristobulus himself — an assumption not only incapable of proof but in the highest degree improbable. The verses were probably derived from an older Jewish work (see on this point No. VII.) and adopted by Aristobulus in all good faith in their genuineness. Aristobulus only did what later Christian apologists have also done without thereby affording a ground for doubting the genuineness of their works.

The entire work of Aristobulus is said according to a marginal note in the cod. Laurentianus of Clemens Alexandrinus' Stromata to have been still extant towards the dose of the Middle Ages in a library at Patmos (on Strom. i. 22. 150 a hand of the fifteenth or sixteenth century remarks: Ἀριστοβούλου βίβλος αὕτη ἡ πρὸς τὸν Φιλομήτορα ἐστὶν εἰς τὴν Πάτμον ἣν ἔγωγε οἶδα; see the note in Dindorf's ed.). Whether this note is worthy of credence is however very doubtful.

Compare in general: Richard Simon Histoire critique du Vieux Testament pp. 189 499. Hody De bibliorum textibus p. 50 sqq. Fabricius Biblioth. graec. ed. Harles i. 164 iii. 469 sq. Eichhorn Allgem. Bibliothek der biblischen Literatur vol. v. (1793) pp. 253–298. Valckenaer Diatribe de

Aristobulo Judaeo philosopho peripatetico Alexandrino Lugd. Bat. 1806 (chief work). Gabler's Journal für auserlesene theolog. Literatur vol. v. (1810) pp. 183-209 (advertisement of Valckenaer's work). Winer in Ersch and Gruber's Allgem. Encydop. § 1 vol. v. (1820) p. 266. Lobeck Aglaophamus i. (1829) p. 448. Gfrörer Philo ii. 711-21. Dähne Geschichtl. Darstellung der jüd.-alex. Religionsphilosophie ii. 73-112. Fürst Biblioth. Jud. i. 53 sq. Herzteld Gesch. des Volkes Jisrael iii. 473 sqq. 564 sqq. Ewald Gesch. des Volkes Israel iv. 335 sqq. Teuffel in Pauly's Real-Enc. i. 2 (2nd ed.) p. 1600. Cobet in the Λογιος Ἑρμης i. (1866) pp. 173-177 521. Zeller Die Philosophie der Griechen iii. 2 (3rd ed.) pp. 257-264. Ueberweg Grundriss 4th ed. i. 240 sqq. Binde Aristobulische Studien 2 pts. Glogau 1869-1870 (Gymnasialprogr.). Heinze Die Lehre vom Logos (1872) pp. 185-192. Kuenen De godsdienst van Israël ii. (1870) pp. 433-440. Freudenthal Alexander Polyhistor pp. 166-169. Grätz Monatsschr. für Gesch. und Wissensch. des Judenth. 1878 pp. 49-60 97-109. Joel Blicke in die Religionsgeschichte zu Anfang des zweiten christlichen Jahrhunderts (1880) pp. 77-100.

3. Philo

Philo the more recent fellow-countryman of Aristobulus by two centuries represents the same tendency. His main effort also is to prove that the views derived from Greek philosophers were genuinely Jewish. And this he does now for heathen now for Jewish readers; for the former to inspire them with respect for Judaism for the latter to educate them to such a Judaism as he himself represents. It may safely be assumed that there were between Aristobulus and Philo other representatives of this tendency. For it presented itself in Philo with such assurance and in such maturity of form as would not be conceivable without historical connection. Nothing however of the supposed literary productions of such individuals has come down to us.

Since Philo by reason of his eminent importance and the extent of his extant works demands a separate delineation (§ 34) we will here only briefly mention those writings of his in which philosophical instruction and discussion form the main object. Among these are in the first place two of his principal works on the Pentateuch viz.: (1) the Ζητήματα καὶ λύσεις a short explanation of Genesis and Exodus in the form of questions and answers; and (2) the Νόμων ἱερῶν ἀλληγορίαι the extensive allegorical commentaries on select passages of Genesis in the form of Rabbinical Midrash. These form Philo's chief philosophical work properly so called and constitute in extent about the half of Philo's still extant writings. (3) The work Περὶ τοῦ πάντα σπουδαῖον εἶναι ἐλεύθερον (Quod omnis probus liber) properly only the second half of a work whose first half which is lost dealt with the theme περὶ τοῦ δοῦλον εἶναι πάντα φαῦλον was also occupied in the discussion of philosophical questions. (4) Περὶ προνοίας. (5) Ἀλέξανδρος ἢ περὶ τοῦ λόγον ἔχειν τὰ ἄλογα ζῶα. Particulars concerning all these works will be found in § 34. The two last-named are also of interest because Philo in them chooses the form of the Greek dialogue in discussing the theme.

4. The Fourth Book of Maccabees

To philosophical literature belongs also the so-called fourth Book of Maccabees. For the Judaism which the author recommends is influenced by the Stoic philosophy.

In its form this piece of writing is a discourse. It directly addresses its hearers or readers (1:1 18:1). The contents being of a religious and edifying kind it might even be called a sermon and the choice of this form referred to the custom of religious lectures in the synagogues. But when Freudenthal (pp. 4-36) emphatically insists that we have here an actual specimen of synagogue preaching this is not only incapable of proof but also improbable the theme discoursed on being

not a text of Holy Scripture but a philosophic proposition.

The author had only Jews in view whether as hearers or readers (18:1: ὦ τῶν Ἀβραμιαίων σπερμάτων ἀπόγονοι παῖδες Ἰσραηλῖται). He desires to show them that it is not difficult to lead a pious life if only they follow the precepts of "pious reason." For "pious reason is the absolute ruler of the motives" (1:1: αὐτοδέσποτός ἐστι τῶν παθῶν ὁ εὐσεβὴς λογισμός). This proposition is the proper theme of the discourse; its meaning is first explained and its truth afterwards proved by facts from Jewish history especially by the laudable martyrdom of Eleazar and the seven Maccabaean brothers. A large portion of the contents is therefore devoted to a description of the martyrdom of these heroes of faith. In his grossly realistic delineation of the several tortures the author shows even greater want of taste than the second Book of Maccabees and the psychology assumed is as contrary as possible to nature. His authority seems to have been the second Book of Maccabees. At least it cannot be proved that he drew as Freudenthal (pp. 72–90) supposes from the larger work of Jason of Cyrene (2 Macc. 2:23).

The author's own standpoint is influenced by Stoicism. The fundamental idea of the whole discourse is that of Stoic morality viz. the rule of reason over impulse. The setting up too of four cardinal virtues (φρόνησις δικαιοσύνη ἀνδρεία σωφροσύνη) is derived from Stoicism. But this influence of Stoicism does not anywhere penetrate more deeply with the author. Even the fundamental idea is transformed in Jewish fashion. For the reason to which he ascribes dominion over desire is not human reason as such but pious reason: ὁ εὐσεβὴς λογισμός (1:1 7:16 13:1 15:20 16:1 18:2) i.e. reason guiding itself according to the rule of the divine law (comp. also 1:15 sq.). He also goes his own way in the description and division of the affections (see Freudenthal p. 55 sqq.; Zeller iii. 2. 276). But it would be doing him too much honour to designate him as an eclectic philosopher. He is but a dilettante in philosophicis somewhat after the fashion of Josephus who also knows how to give his Judaism a philosophic tinge. Of all Jewish philosophers known to us our author stands relatively nearest to Pharisaism for just what he extols in the Maccabaean brethren is their punctilious adherence to the ceremonial law. Two of his Jewish views in particular may be brought forward as worthy of notice – (1) his belief in the resurrection the form of which is not that of the Pharisaic belief in that doctrine but the form met with among other Jewish Hellenists of a faith in an eternal and blessed life of pious souls in heaven (13:16 15:2 17:5 18 fin.); and (2) the notion that the martyrdom of the righteous serves as an atonement for the sins of the people (6:29: καθάρσιον αὐτῶν ποίησον τὸ ἐμὸν αἷμα καὶ ἀντίψυχον αὐτῶν λάβε τὴν ἐμὴν ψυχήν; 17:29: ἀντίψυχον γεγονότας τῆς τοῦ ἔθνους ἁμαρτίας).

Josephus is named by Eusebius and other Church writers as the author of this book. This view however has only the value of a hypothesis. For the book still appears in many manuscripts anonymously and was therefore certainly at first issued without the name of the author. The entirely different style and the circumstance that Josephus in his Antiquities nowhere makes use of the second Book of Maccabees and thus seems not to know it while the work in question is entirely based upon it speak against his authorship. The first century after Christ is generally accepted as the date of composition chiefly because the book must have been written before the destruction of Jerusalem. Though the latter cannot be proved this view must be pretty nearly correct since a more recent book would no longer have been accepted by the Christian Church.

Eusebius speaking of the writings of Josephus says concerning the title and authorship Hist. eccl. iii. 10. 6: Πεπόνηται δὲ καὶ ἄλλο οὐκ ἀγεννὲς σπούδασμα τῷ ἀνδρὶ περὶ αὐτοκράτορος λογισμοῦ ὅ τινες Μακκαβαϊκὸν ἐπέγραψαν κ.τ.λ. Hieronymus De viris illustr. c. 13 (Vallarsi ii.

851): “Alius quoque liber ejus qui inscribitur περὶ αὐτοκράτορος λογισμοῦ valde elegans habetur in quo et Machabaeorum sunt digesta martyria.” The same contra Pelagianos ii. 6 (Vallarsi ii. 749): “Unde et Josephus Machabaeorum scriptor historiae frangi et regi posse dixit perturbationes animi non eradicari (= 4 Macc. 3:5).” The article in Suidas Lex. s.v. Ἰώσηπος is taken from the Greek translation of Hieron. de viris illustris c. 13. For other authors who attribute this book to Josephus see Grimm Handb. p. 293 sq. It is also frequently attributed to Josephus in the MSS. (Grimm as above. Freudenthal p. 117 sqq.). Its title as the fourth Book of Maccabees (Μακκαβαίων δ′) is found in Philostorgius and Syncellus and in some Scripture MSS. and indeed in the latter without the mention of Josephus as its author (so esp. cod. Alex. and Sin.). For further particulars see Freudenthal pp. 117–120. On the use of the book in Christian ascetic literature see above p. 214.

The manuscripts in which our book has come down are some of them manuscripts of Scripture some of Josephus. The former are not numerous since as a rule only three books of Maccabees were received as canonical (Freudenthal pp. 118 119). Still the two most important manuscripts for our book are Scripture MSS. viz. the codex Alexandrinus (No. iii. in Fritzsche) and Sinaiticus (No. x. in Fritzsche). On the editions of these manuscripts see above p. 166. More concerning them will be found in Fabricius-Harles Biblioth. graec. v. 26 sq. Grimm Handb. p. 294 Freudenthal pp. 120–127 169 sq. 173. Fritzsche Prolegom. p. xxi. sq. Collations chiefly in Havercamp’s edition of Josephus ii. 1. 497 sqq. ii. 2. 157 sqq. A fragment in Tischendorf Monumenta sacra inedita vol. vi. 1869. Various readings of a Florentine MS. (Acquis. ser. iii. No. 44) are given by Pitra Analecta sacra vol. ii. (1884) pp. 635–640.

The text is printed in accordance with the manuscripts on the one hand in some editions of the Septuagint and in separate editions of the Apocrypha on the other and chiefly in the editions of Josephus. Most of the editors have troubled themselves very little about the manuscripts. The first attempt at a recension of the text from the best authorities is made in Fritzsche’s edition of the Libri apocryphi Vet. Test. graece (Lips. 1871). For more on the editions see Grimm Handb. p. 294 sq. Freudenthal pp. 127–133.

Erasmus compiled a Latin paraphrase of this book (printed e.g. in Havercamp’s Josephus ii. 2. 148–156). Nothing reliable is as yet known of any ancient Latin translation on which it is based. See Grimm p. 296. Freudenthal p. 133 sqq. The old Syriac translation is published in Ceriani’s photo-lithographic edition of the Milan Peshito manuscript (see above p. 92).

Grimm has given a careful commentary on this book in his Exeget. Handb. zu den Apokryphen 4 parts Leipzig 1857. Freudenthal’s Die Flavius Josephus beigelegte Schrift Ueber die Herrschaft der Vernunft (4 Makkabäerbuch) eine Predigt aus dem ersten nachchristlichen Jahrhundert untersucht Breslau 1869 is a complete monograph. A German translation is contained in the Bibliothek der griechischen und römischen Schriftsteller über Judenthum und Juden in neuen Uebertragungen und Sammlungen 2 vols. Leipzig 1867.

Comp. in general: Gfrörer Philo ii. 173–200. Dähne Geshichtl. Darstellung der jüd.-alex. Religionsphilosophie ii. 190–199. Ewald Gesch. des Volkes Israel iv. 632 sqq. Langen Das Judenthum in Palästina (1866) pp. 74–83. Geiger Jüdische Zeitschr. für Wissensch. und Leben 1869 pp. 113–116. Fritzeche in Schenkel’s Bibellex. iv. 98–100. Keil Einl. in’s A. T. 3rd ed. (1873) p. 722 sqq. Grätz Monatsschr. für Gesch. und Wissensch. des Judenth. 1877 p. 454 sqq. Reuss Gesch. der heil. Schriften A. T.’s § 570. Zeller Die Philosophie der Griechen iii. 2 (3rd ed. 1881) pp. 275–277.

VI. APOLOGETICS

The peculiarity of the Jewish people involved the circumstance that the Jews were felt to be more than other Orientals an anomaly in the framework of the Graeco-Roman world. Denying all authority to other religions they were paid in the same coin and their right of existence upon the soil of Hellenistic culture disputed. The town municipalities tried to get rid of such inconvenient fellow-citizens; the populace was always ready to lift up a hand against them while by the educated they were despised and derided (see vol. ii. pp. 273–276 291). Hellenistic Judaism thus found itself continually at war with the rest of the Hellenistic world; it had ever to draw the sword in its own defence. Hence a large share of the entire Graeco-Jewish literature subserves apologetic purposes. Especially does the historic and philosophic literature essentially pursue the design of showing that the Jewish nation was by reason of the greatness of its history and the purity of its teaching if not superior at least equal to others. Besides these indirectly apologetic works there were also some which sought in a systematic manner to refute the reproaches with which Judaism was assailed. These were called forth by the sometimes utterly absurd fables propagated by certain Greek literati concerning the Jews and generally by the direct accusations brought against them in Greek and Latin literature. These accusations had their rise in Egypt (Joseph. contra Apion. i. 25). Alexandrian literati were the first to write against the Jews. From these turbid waters later writers especially Tacitus drew. In what follows we shall speak in the first place of literary opponents and afterwards of the apologetic works and the points of dispute themselves (Attack and Defence).

1. The Literary Opponents

1. Manetho (comp. Josephus contra Apion. i. 26–31). The Egyptian priest Manetho composed in the time of Ptolemy II. Philadelphus therefore about 270–250 B.C. a learned work on Egyptian history in the Greek language derived from the sacred records themselves (Joseph. contra Apion. i. 14: γέγραφε Ἑλλάδι φωνῇ τὴν πάτριον ἱστορίαν ἔκ τε τῶν ἱερῶν ὡς φησὶν αὐτός μεταφράσας. Ibid. i. 26: ὁ τὴν Αἰγυπτιακὴν ἱστορίαν ἐκ τῶν ἱερῶν γραμμάτων μεθερμηνεύειν ὑπεσχημένος). From these Αἰγυπτιακά of Manetho Josephus gives in two places long fragments which however as Josephus himself states are of very different character. The portions (from the second Book of the Αἰγυπτιακά) in i. 14–16 which treat of the rule of the Hyksos in Egypt make by the copiousness of their contents and the conciseness of their form the most favourable impression. Nothing in them gives occasion for doubting that their contents are really derived from the ancient records. Of quite another kind are the portions in i. 26 27. These do not indeed pretend to be authentic history but only give according to Manetho's own confession the legends current concerning the Jews (i. 16: ὁ Μανεθὼν οὐκ ἐκ τῶν παρ' Αἰγυπτίοις γραμμάτων ἀλλ' ὡς αὐτὸς ὡμολόγηκεν ἐκ τῶν ἀδεσπότως μυθολογουμένων προστέθεικεν. I. 26: μέχρι μὲν τούτων ἠκολούθησε ταῖς ἀναγραφαῖς ἔπειτα δὲ δοὺς ἐξουσίαν αὐτῷ διὰ τοῦ φάναι γράψειν τὰ μυθευόμενα καὶ λεγόμενα περὶ τῶν Ἰουδαίων λόγους ἀπιθάνους παρενέβαλεν). It is here related how King Amenophis of Egypt assembled in one place all the lepers of the country 80000 in number and sent them to work in the stone quarries east of the Nile. After they had laboured there a long time they petitioned the king to assign to them the town of Auaris which had formerly been inhabited by the Hyksos as a place of residence. The king granted their request. When however they had taken possession of the town they were attacked by the king and chose a priest of Heliopolis named Osarsiph as their head who gave them new laws in which they were especially commanded to worship no gods and to kill the sacred animals. He also invoked the aid of the Hyksos from Jerusalem as allies. With their assistance the lepers now drove away King Amenophis and ruled Egypt for thirteen

years. The priest Osarsiph then took the name of Moses. After the thirteen years the Hyksos and the lepers were driven out of Egypt by King Amenophis. This history concerning the origin of the Jews was therefore read in his text of Manetho by Josephus. Whether it is derived from Manetho himself is questionable. Many recent investigators e.g. Boeckh Carl Müller Kellner regard it as a later insertion. The possibility of its being such cannot be disputed since this much read work already existed in various recensions even in the time of Josephus. This view does not however appear to me to be probable in the case in question. For if an enemy of the Jews had subsequently inserted the passage he would scarcely have been so truthful as expressly to bring forward the fact that he was not giving a history accredited by ancient records but only τὰ μυθευόμενα καὶ λεγόμενα περὶ τῶν Ἰουδαίων. In these words we hear the strict investigator who indeed as an enemy of the Jews cannot deny himself the reporting of these tales but expressly distinguishes them as legends from authentic history. At any rate Josephus read the section in all the copies known to him of Manetho; for he says nothing of any difference in this respect.

The fragments of Manetho are best collected in Carl Müller Fragmenta historicorum Graecorum vol. ii. (1848) pp. 511-616. Comp. on Manetho in general: Böckh Manetho und die Hundssternperiode ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der Pharaonen Berlin 1845. Bähr in Pauly's Real-Enc. iv. 1477 sqq. Nicolai Griechische Literaturgeschichte 2nd ed. vol. ii. (1876) pp. 198-200. Krall "Die Composition und die Schicksale des Manethonischen Geschichtswerkes" (Sitzungsberichte der Wiener Akademie philos.-histor. Classe vol. xcv. yearly course 1879 pp. 123-226) treats pp. 152-169 especially of the fragments in Josephus.

On the fragments in Josephus: Hengstenberg Die Bücher Moses und Aegypten with an appendix: Manetho und die Hyksos Berlin 1841. Ewald Gesch. des Volkes Israel (3rd ed.) ii. 110 sqq. Kellner De fragmentis Manethonianis quae apud Josephum contra Apionem i. 14 and i. 26 sunt. Marburg 1859. J. G. Müller Des Flavius Josephus Schrift gegen den Apion (Basel 1877) pp. 120 sqq. 185 sqq. 214 sqq.

2. Apollonius Melon (or Molonis?). Among the literary opponents of Judaism Josephus frequently names one Ἀπολλώνιος ὁ Μόλων (contra Apion. ii. 14 ii. 36) in a later passage ὁ Μόλων Ἀπολλώνιος (comp. ii. 7: Apollonium Molonis) whose full name he also abridges so as to write either only Ἀπολλώνιος (ii. 14 and ii. 37 twice) or only Μόλων (ii. 2 ed. Bekker 226. 13; comp. ii. 33 and ii. 41: Μόλωνες). This adversary of the Jews in Josephus is undoubtedly identical with him from whom Alexander Polyhistor gives a passage (in Euseb. Praep. evang. ix. 19: ὁ δὲ τὴν συσκευὴν τὴν κατὰ Ἰουδαίων γράψας Μόλων). An orator of the same name (Apollonius Molon) is elsewhere frequently mentioned as the teacher of Cicero and Caesar and as a writer on rhetoric. It seems however that some discrepancies had already crept in concerning him among the ancients. For Strabo distinguishes two orators an Apollonius and a Molon evidently by reason of a more accurate knowledge of the matter. He mentions both (xiv. 2. 13 p. 655) as eminent men who lived in Rhodes and remarks that both came from Alabanda in Caria but that Molon came to Rhodes subsequently to Apollonius on which account Apollonius said to him "ὀψὲ μολών." Thus they were not only fellow-countrymen but contemporaries. Strabo also distinguishes them in another passage in which he is enumerating the eminent men of Alabanda (xiv. 2. 26 p. 661). Cicero too mentions both and indeed so that he calls the one only Apollonius and the other who was Cicero's tutor only Molon. Hence we must certainly distinguish between the two. Apollonius however was called by his full name Ἀπολλώνιος ὁ τοῦ Μόλωνος (Plutarch. Cicero 4 Caesar 3; Joseph. Apion. ii. 7); and he seems by placing his father's name beside his own according to a custom which may be pointed to elsewhere to have called himself Ἀπολλώνιος ὁ Μόλων. This gave rise to his being frequently

confounded with Molon. Cicero had probably heard both but his own teacher was Molon. We are here concerned not with the latter but with his older fellow-countryman Apollonius who according to Cicero was already a noted teacher 120 years before Christ.

There existed before the end of the second century before Christ in Caria and Rhodes sufficient occasion for the composition of a polemical work against the Jews by a living orator. For we know that just here the Jews were already numerously dispersed during the second century B.C. The work of Apollonius was according to Alexander Polyhistor a συσκευὴ κατὰ Ἰουδαίων (Euseb. Praep. evang. ix. 19). Hence it dealt not merely occasionally like Manetho's Αἰγυπτιακά but exclusively with the Jews. As Josephus says Apollonius did not like Apion heap up his accusations in one place but calumniated the Jews in many passages and throughout the work now in one manner now in another (contra Apion. ii. 14: τὴν κατηγορίαν ὁ Ἀπολλώνιος οὐκ ἀθρόαν ὥσπερ ὁ Ἀπίων ἔταξεν ἀλλὰ σποράδην καὶ διὰ πάσης τῆς συγγραφῆς … λοιδορεῖ) hence it must be supposed that the work was not a purely polemical one but that in connection with statements concerning the Jews it contained much polemical invective. This is also thoroughly confirmed by the fact that the fragment in Alexander Polyhistor (Euseb. Praep. evang. ix. 19) is occupied in a purely objective manner with the history of Abraham. It follows from the allusions of Josephus that the history of the exodus from Egypt was also treated of (contra Apion. ii. 2) and that the work "contained unjust and untrue reports concerning our legislator Moses and our laws" (ii. 14). In the latter respect we learn also that Apollonius reproached the Jews with "not worshipping the same gods as others" (ii. 7) with having no fellowship with those who believed differently (ii. 36) and with being therefore ἄθεοι and μισάνθρωποι also as at one time cowardly at another fanatic as the most incapable among barbarians and as having furnished nothing towards general culture (ii. 14). Josephus on his part repays Apollonius in his own coin reproaching him with gross want of sense arrogance and immoral conduct (ii. 36 37).

Comp. on Apollonius in general: C. Müller Fragm. hist. Graec. iii. 208 sq. Creuzer Theol. Stud. u. Krit. 1853 p. 83 sq. Teuffel in Pauly's Real-Enc. I. 2 (2nd ed.) p. 1318. J. G. Müller Des Flavius Josephus Schrift gegen den Apion (1877) p. 230. Riese "Molon oder Apollonius Molon?" (Rheinisches Museum vol. xxxiv. Jahrg. 1879 pp. 627-630).

3. Lysimachus (comp. Josephus contra Apion. i. 34-35). The fragment which Josephus ibid. gives from the work of a certain Lysimachus relates to the departure of the Jews from Egypt and narrates concerning it similar fables but still more absurd than those told by Manetho. The few occasional notices which Josephus elsewhere (contra Apion. ii. 2 twice and ii. 14) gives refer to the same fact. According to contra Apion. ii. 2: Ἀπίων … τὸν αὐτὸν Λυσιμάχῳ σχεδιάσας he seems to have been Apion's predecessor. From the tenor of the fragment it may be assumed that he was an Egyptian. According to Cosmas Indicopleustes the work from which the fragment is taken is said to have been a "History of Egypt." Since however Cosmas evidently derives his information only from Josephus and erroneously reckons Apollonius Molon among the Αἰγυπτιακὰ συγγραψάμενοι and nothing else is known of the Αἰγυπτιακά of Lysimachus the matter must be left uncertain. Two works Θηβαϊκὰ παράδοξα and Νόστοι (returns reversiones i.e. of Greek heroes from Troy) of an author named Lysimachus are frequently cited elsewhere in ancient literature. As the author of the Νόστοι seems to have been an Alexandrian and to have lived in the first century before Christ he is probably identical with this Lysimachus.

The fragments of Lysimachus (both those from Josephus and those of the Φηβαϊκὰ παράδοξα and the Νόστοι) are collected in C. Müller Fragm. historicorum Graecorum iii. 334-342. The fragments of the Θηβ. παράδ. are also in Westermann Παραδοξογράφοι (Brunsvigae 1839) p.

xxx. sq. 164 sq. Comp. in general: Westermann in Pauly's Real-Enc. iv. 1311. Stiehle "Die Nosten des Lysimachos" (Philologus vol. iv. 1849 pp. 99–110; v. 1850 p. 382 sq.). J. G. Müller Des Flavius Josephus Scrhift gegen den Apion p. 208.

4. Chaeremon (comp. Josephus contra Apion. i. 32–33). The fragment from Chaeremon also refers to the departure of the Jews from Egypt and is with respect to its contents nearer to the narrative of Manetho than Lysimachus is. Josephus in this case expressly says that the fragment was taken from the Αἰγυπτιακὴ ἱστορία of Chaeremon (contra Apion. i. 32) This Chaeremon is also elsewhere known as an author on Egyptian matters. In the letter of Porphyrius to the Egyptian Anebon from which Eusebius Praep. evang. iii. 4 and v. 10 gives extracts two portions which relate to the Egyptian mythology and theology are cited from Chaeremon. In the second (Euseb. v. 10. 5 ed. Gaisford) Porphyrius designates Chaeremon as ἱερογραμματεύς. In the work of Porphyrius which has come down to us De abstinentia iv. 6–8 a detailed description of the life of Egyptian priests is given from Chaeremon which Porphyry introduces with the words: "Chaeremon the Stoic in treating of the Egyptian priests who as he says are esteemed philosophers among the Egyptians relates that they chose the sanctuaries as the place for philosophizing (Τὰ γοῦν κατὰ τοὺς Αἰγυπτίους ἱερέας Χαιρήμων ὁ Στωικὸς ἀφηγούμενος οὓς καὶ φιλοσόφους ὑπειλῆφθαί φησι παρ' Αἰγυπτίοις ἐξηγεῖται ὡς τόπον μὲν ἐξελέξαντο ἐμφιλοσοφῆσαι τὰ ἱερά).… Despising every other occupation and human pursuit they devote their whole life to the contemplation of things divine" etc. At the end of this account Porphyrius calls Chaeremon a truth-loving trustworthy and intelligent Stoic philosopher (iv. 8 fin.: ἀνδρὸς φιλαλήθους τε καὶ ἀκριβοῦς ἔν τε τοῖς Στωικοῖς πραγματικώτατα φιλοσοφήσαντος). All these portions may well have stood in an "Egyptian History." From it are also derived the communications from Chaeremon in a treatise of Psellus published by Sathas (1877). The same Chaeremon also wrote a work which is taken up in explaining the hieroglyphics (διδάγματα τῶν ἱερῶν γραμμάτων). From this the Byzantine Tzetzes has given extracts in his historical work (v. 403 in Müller Fragm. iii. 499) and in his commentary on the Iliad (ed. Gottfr. Hermann 1812 pp. 123 and 146). Tzetzes also designates Chaeremon as ἱερογραμματεύς and says that according to Chaeremon's view "the φυσικὸς λόγος concerning the gods their physical signification is allegorically exhibited in the hieroglyphics" (Zeller). This also characterizes Chaeremon as a Stoic. Hence there can be no doubt that he is identical with our ἱερογραμματεύς who in a few other citations (e.g. in Origen's contra Celsum I. 59. Euseb. Hist. eccl. vi. 19. 8) is simply called Στωικός. He is on this account a very remarkable personage for his age: an Egyptian priest and at the same time a Stoic philosopher. Since he was according to Suidas the instructor of Nero (Suidas' Lex. s.v. Ἀλέξανδρος Αἰγαῖος) and also the instructor and predecessor of Dionysius of Alexandria who lived from Nero to Trajan (Suidas' Lex. s.v. Διονύσιος Ἀλεξανδρεύς) he must have lived towards the middle of the first century after Christ. He was according to Suidas the predecessor of Dionysius in the office of librarian at Alexandria. He cannot by reason of the chronology stated be identical with the Chaeremon who is mentioned by Strabo (xvii. 1. 29 p. 806) as a contemporary of Aelius Gallus. Besides the latter has been described as a man who made himself ridiculous by his ostentation and ignorance which are certainly not characteristics of a philosopher.

The fragments of Chaeremon are collected in C. Müller Frag. hist. graec. iii. 495–499. To these are to be added: (1) the extracts given in Tzetzes Draconis Stratonicensis liber de matris poeticis et Joannis Tzetzae exegesis in Homeri Iliadem 1st ed. Godofr. Hermannus Lips. 1812 pp. 123 and 146; and (2) those in the treatise of Psellus published by Sathas (Bulletin de correspondance hellénique vol. i. 1877 pp. 121–133 194–208 309–314). Comp. in general: Bähr in Pauly's Real-Enc. ii. 298 sq. Birch "On the lost book of Chaeremon on Hieroglyphics"

(Transactions of the Royal Society of Literature second series vol. iii. 1850 pp. 385-396). Bernays Theophrastos' Schrift über die Frömmigkeit (1866) pp. 21 sq. 150 sq. Zeller "Die Hieroglyphiker Chäremon und Horapollo" (Hermes vol. xi. 1876 pp. 430-433). Nicolai Griechische Literaturgesch. 2nd ed. ii. 559 561 677 690 iii. 383. J. G. Müller Des Flavius Josephus Schrift gegen den Apion (1877) p. 203 sqq.

5. Apion (comp. Josephus contra Apion. ii. 1-13). Apion the grammarian who was distinguished among all the opponents of the Jews for his special malevolence and was therefore treated with special harshness by Josephus was a contemporary and fellow-countryman of Chaeremon. His full name was Ἀπίων ὁ Πλειστονίκης. According to Suidas Πλειστονίκης was the name of his father (Lex. s.v. Ἀπίων ὁ Πλειστονίκου) which he afterwards took as a surname. When Julius Africanus (in Euseb. Praep. evang. x. 10. 16 ed. Gaisford; and in Syncellus ed. Dindorf i. 120 and 281) and after him the pseudo-Justinian Cohortatio ad Graecos c. 9 call the name of the father Ποσειδώνιος this is certainly but a corruption of Πλειστονίκης. According to Josephus (contra Apion. ii. 3) Apion was born in the oasis of Egypt and hence was not as he gave himself out to be a native of Alexandria. He afterwards however received the rights of Alexandrian citizenship (Jos. l.c.) and acquired some fame in Alexandria as a grammarian. He taught temporarily in Rome also in the time of Tiberius and Claudius (Suidas Lex. s.v. Ἀπίων). In the reign of Caligula he travelled through Greece as an itinerant orator delivering lectures on Homer (Seneca epist. 88). It was also under Caligula that on the occasion of the sanguinary conflict of the Alexandrians with the Jews he came to Rome as the ambassador of the former (Joseph. Antt. xviii. 8. 1). According to Josephus (contra Apion. ii. 3) his death was caused by ulcers in the genitals against which circumcision was of no avail. He is described as having been ridiculously vain. Tiberius called him cymbalum mundi. He himself said without embarrassment that those to whom he addressed a work became thereby immortal and congratulated Alexandria on having such a citizen as he was (Joseph. c. Apion. ii. 12).

The works of Apion were manifold. The best known seem to have been his works on Homer (Commentaries and a Dictionary). We are here only concerned with his Egyptian History (Αἰγυπτιακά) which according to Tatian comprised five books of which Josephus cites the third Tatian and his successors the fourth and Gellius the fifth book. This Egyptian History evidently contained all those attacks upon the Jews to which the reply of Josephus refers (c. Apion. ii. 1-3). Josephus says at the beginning of his discussion that it was not easy to go through the discourse (τὸν λόγον) of Apion because he brought forth all in the greatest disorder. But that about three points might be distinguished: (1) the fables concerning the departure of the Jews from Egypt (2) the malicious assertions concerning the Alexandrian Jews and (3) the accusations in respect of worship and legal customs. Of the latter Josephus says that they are mixed up with the accusations of the first two categories (ἐπὶ τούτοις μέμικται ii. 1 fin.). Thus it appears that a single λόγος of Apion containing all these accusations and divided by Josephus for the sake of order into three categories was in question. Josephus after entering successively into all three categories (c. Apion. ii. 2-3 relates to the first ii. 4-6 to the second ii. 7-13 to the third) leaves Apion and begins to give a positive delineation of the Mosaic legislation. At its commencement he once more touches incidentally upon Apion and says of him that he has heaped his indictments all together (ii. 14: τὴν κατηγορίαν … ἀθρόαν … ἔταξεν) in distinction from Apollonius Molon whose polemic pervades his whole work. There can therefore be no doubt that the polemic of Josephus refers to only one work of Apion's and indeed to only one section of a larger work. This work was as Josephus expressly says in the beginning of his discussion (ii. 2) the Egyptian History. In it Apion apparently took occasion in narrating the departure of the Jews from Egypt to give a hostile description of them in like manner as Tacitus

does in his Histories (Hist. v. 1-12). When consequently Clemens Alexandrinus and later Church authors mention a special work of Apion κατὰ Ἰουδαίων this rests only upon a mistaken inference from the information of Josephus. It is just the silence of Josephus which proves that no such work ever existed. That these Church authors also had no actual acquaintance with it is made evident by a more accurate comparison of the text. For Clemens Alexandrinus in the passage where he mentions it is in fact only copying from Tatian who on his part is only quoting Apion's Egyptian History. And all subsequent writers who pretend to know anything of a work of Apion κατὰ Ἰουδαίων obtain their information from either Clement or Josephus.

Tatian Oratio ad Graecos c. 38 (= Euseb. Praep. evang. x. 11. 14 ed. Gaisford): Μετὰ δὲ τοῦτον Ἀπίων ὁ γραμματικός ἀνὴρ δοκιμώτατος ἐν τῇ τετάρτῃ τῶν Αἰγυπτιακῶν (πέντε δέ εἰσιν αὐτῷ γραφαί) πολλὰ μὲν καὶ ἄλλα φησὶ δὲ ὅτι• Κατέσκαψε τὴν Αὔαριν Ἄμωσις κατὰ τὸν Ἀργεῖον γενόμενος Ἴναχον ὡς ἐν τοῖς Χρόνοις ἀνέγραψεν ὁ Μενδήσιος Πτολεμαῖος.

Clemens Alex. Strom. i. 21. 101 (= Euseb. Praep. evang. x. 12. 2 ed. Gaisford): Ἀπίων τοίνυν ὁ γραμματικὸς ὁ Πλειστονίκης ἐπικληθεὶς ἐν τῇ τετάρτῃ τῶν Αἰγυπτιακῶν ἱστοριῶν καίτοι φιλαπεχθημόνως πρὸς Ἑβραίους διακείμενος ἅτε Αἰγύπτιος τὸ γένος ὡς καὶ κατὰ Ἰουδαίων συνπάξασθαι βιβλίον Ἀμώσιος τοῦ Αἰγυπτίων βασιλέως μεμνημένος καὶ τῶν κατ' αὐτὸν πράξεων μάρτυρα παρατίθεται Πτολεμαῖον τὸν Μενδήσιον καὶ τὰ τῆς λέξεως αὐτοῦ ὧδε ἔχει• "Κατέσκαψε δὲ τὴν κ.τ.λ." (here follows verbally the same quotation as in Tatian whom Clemens had just before expressly quoted).

Julius Africanus in Euseb. Praep. evang. x. 10. 16 and in Syncell. ed. Dindorf i. 120 and 281: Ἀπίων δὲ ὁ Ποσειδωνίου περιεργότατος γραμματικῶν ἐν τῇ κατὰ Ἰουδαίων βίβλῳ καὶ ἐν τῇ τετάρτῃ τῶν ἱστοριῶν φησὶ κατὰ Ἴναχον Ἄργους βασιλέα Ἀμώσίος Αἰγυπτίων βασιλεύοντος ἀποστῆναι Ἰουδαίους ὧν ἡγεῖσθαι Μωσέα.

Pseudo-Justin. Cohortatio ad Graec. c. 9: Οὕτω γάρ Πολέμων τε ἐν τῇ πρώτῃ τῶν Ἑλληνικῶν ἱστοριῶν μέμνηται καὶ Ἀππίων ὁ Ποσειδωνίου ἐν τῇ κατὰ Ἰουδαίων βίβλῳ καὶ ἐν τῇ τετάρτῃ τῶν ἱστοριῶν λέγων κατὰ Ἴναχον Ἄργους βασιλέα Ἀμώσιδος Αἰγυπτίων βασιλεύοντος ἀποστῆναι Ἰουδαίους ὧν ἡγεῖσθαι Μωϋσέα. Καὶ Πτολεμαῖος δε ὁ Μενδήσιος τὰ Αἰγυπτίων ἱστοριῶν ἅπασι τούτοις συντρέχει.

The mention of Apion's supposed work κατὰ Ἰουδαίων was first introduced in this connection by means of Clement. But Clement only says that Apion wrote such a work; for the rest he simply quotes as Tatian does Apion's Egyptian History as his authority for the statement that Amosis reigned in the time of Inachus. Julius Africanus on the contrary now ventures to assert on the foundation of the passage of Clement that this statement was found in both the supposed works of Apion and at the same time drags in Moses also who is not even spoken of in the passage quoted from Apion. Finally the author of the Cohortatio again copies only from Julius Africanus. This latter fact I have I think proved in Brieger's Zeitschrift für Kirchengesch. ii. (1878) pp. 319-331. Comp. also Donaldson History of Christian Literature ii. 96 sqq. Harnack Texts und Untersuchungen vol. i. Nos. 1 2 1882 p. 157. Neumann Theol. Literaturzeitung 1883 p. 582. Renan Marc-Aurèle 1882 p. 107 note. The dependence of the Cohortatio upon the text to which Julius Africanus had access is at any rate indubitable. Hence Gutschmid starting from the mistaken assumption that the Cohortatio was more ancient than Julius Africanus supposed that both had a common source (Jahrbb. fü class. Philologie 1860 pp. 703-708). Some moderns also acquiesce in this view more through faith in Gutschmid than on sufficient grounds. So Völter Zeitschr. für wissensch. Theol. 1883 p. 180 sqq. Dräseke Zeitschr. für Kirchengesch. vol. vii. p. 257 sqq.

Eusebius Hist. eccl. iii. 9. 4 in enumerating the works of Josephus says that his work Ueber das hohe Alter der Juden (i.e. contra Apion.) was written "against Apion the grammarian" who had then composed a λόγος against the Jews (πρὸς Ἀπίωνα τὸν γραμματικὸν κατὰ Ἰουδαίων τηνικάδε συντάξαντα λόγον). Evidently this is only inferred from Josephus. The same applies also to Hieronymus De viris illustr. c. 13 (Opp. ed. Vallarsi ii. 851): adversum Appionem grammaticum Alexandrinum qui sub Caligula legatus missus ex parte gentilium contra Philonem etiam librum vituperationem gentis Judicae continentem scripserat. The account of Eusebius which Jerome as his custom is copies is here only enlarged by the combination that Apion's book was directed against Philo. This combination is founded on Joseph. Antt. xviii. 8. 1. From the Greek translation of Jerome (Sophronius) again arise the statements in Suidas Lex. s.v. Ἰώσσηπος. When it is at last said in the Clementine Homilies that Apion wrote πολλὰ βιβλία against the Jews this statement must of course not be taken seriously.

Comp. on Apion in general: Burigny "Mémoire sur Apion" (Mémoires de l'Academie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres ancient series vol. xxxviii. 1777 pp. 171–178). Lehrs "Quid Apio Homero praestiterit" (Quaestiones Epicae 1837 pp. 1–34). Cruice De Flavii Josephi in auctoribus contra Apionem offerendis fide et auctoritate (Paris 1844) p. 9. Schliemann Die Clementinen (1844) p. 111 sqq. C. Müller Fragm. hist. Graec. iii. 506–516. Volkmann in Pauly's Real-Enc. i. 1 (2nd ed.). p. 1243 sq. Creuzer Theol. Stud. und Krit. 1853 p. 80 sq. Paret Des Flavius Josephus Werke übersetzt 7 vols. (1856) pp. 741–745. Hausrath Neutestamentliche Zeitgeschichte 2nd ed. ii. 187–195. Nicolai Griech. Literaturgesch. 2nd ed. ii. 345–347. J. G. Müller Des Fl. Josephus Schrift gegen den Apion (1877) pp. 14–17. Lightfoot art. "Apion" in Smith and Wace Dictionary of Christian Biography i. 128–130.

6. The literary opponents of the Jews hitherto mentioned have been here treated of more thoroughly because the polemic of Josephus is directed chiefly against them. An exhaustive enumeration of all the Greek and Roman authors who from the beginning of the second century after Christ expressed themselves in a hostile manner against the Jews would furnish a list of distinguished names. Almost all the authors who have to speak of the Jews at all do so in a hostile manner. Among pre-Christian Greek authors Josephus chiefly names the distinguished historian and philosopher Posidonius as an adversary of the Jews (c. Apion. ii. 7). In his great historical work (see on it Div. i. vol. i. § 3) he probably somewhere seized the opportunity of giving a polemical excursus against the Jews and afterwards many subsequent writers as Diodorus (xxxiv. 1) and Trogus Pompeius who comes down to us through the extract of Justin (xxxvi. 2 3) drew either directly or indirectly from his much read work. The works too of Nikarchus (Müller Fragm. iii. 335) and Damokritus (Müller Fragm. iv. 377) which are scarcely known by name were also polemical. Of Roman historians besides Trogus Pompeius already mentioned prominence must be given to Tacitus whose description of the Jews (Hist. v. 2 sqq.) is dictated by the most profound contempt. The Roman satirists Horace Juvenal and Martial have also notably made the Jews the butt of their wit.

2. Apologetic

Jewish Apologetic followed a twofold way of defence a direct and an indirect one against the many attacks which Judaism had to undergo. A large portion of the historic and philosophic literature of Hellenistic Judaism is of an indirectly apologetic character; it seeks to show that the Jewish nation need in no respect shrink from a comparison with other nations. But this was not thought enough; the attempt was also sometimes made to refute point after point in a systematic manner the accusations raised against the Jews. Two of such systematically apologetic works are known to us one (that of Philo) only by a short fragment the other (that of

Josephus) in the complete text. (1) Eusebius gives in the Praep. evang. viii. 11 the description of the Essenes from Philo's ἀπολογία ὑπὲρ Ἰουδαίων. From this however we can form no idea of its whole design. The work of Philo περὶ Ἰουδαίων mentioned in Euseb. Hist. eccl. ii. 18. 6 is certainly identical with it. (2) The work of Josephus to he mentioned in this connection is known to us by the title of contra Apion. This title which did not originate with Josephus himself gives an erroneous idea of its contents. For it is by no means occupied with Apion alone but undertakes a comprehensive and systematic defence of the Jewish people against all the accusations raised against them (further particulars Div. i. vol. i. § 3).

In endeavouring in what follows to give a sketch of the main substance of the indictment and defence we must chiefly restrict ourselves to the material afforded by Josephus his work being the only one handed down to us which both contains a survey of the points of accusation and furnishes a view of the method of apologetic demonstration. The disposition of the Graeco-Roman world towards the Jews has been already described (). Here only the actual accusations and the Jewish answer to them will be brought forward.

1. Extensive and learned matter is furnished by Josephus in the first section (i. 1–23) to prove that the Jewish nation was not inferior in point of antiquity to other cultured nations. He says that to maintain that it is of recent origin because the Greek historians say nothing of it is foolish even if the assumption were correct. For even the silence of all the Greek historians would prove nothing against the early existence of the nation since the Jews as dwelling in an inland country might easily remain unknown to the Greeks. In truth however the Jewish nation was already known in very ancient times by the best historians of he Egyptians Phoenicians Chaldaeans (Manetho Dios Menander Berosus and others) nay even by Greek historians themselves. The zeal which Josephus exhibits and the large amount of matter he brings forward show how important this point was in his eyes. The assertion of modern origin was equivalent to the assertion of historical insignificance. A nation which had but recently appeared upon the stage of history had of course also no importance in history. It received its culture from the more ancient nations. But this was to strike at the roots of Jewish honour and hence the Jewish apologist regarded it as his first duty thoroughly to repel such an insult.

2. While the Greeks in general were satisfied with denying the high antiquity of the Jewish nation the Alexandrians related very unfair things concerning the origin of the Jews. The quintessence of their fictions was that the Jews were leprous Egyptians who succeeded in a very dishonourable manner in forming themselves into a separate nation in leaving Egypt and settling in Palestine. Josephus felt himself master of the situation in opposing these fables. With dignified superiority he pointed out to the Alexandrians the absurdity and the internal discrepancy of their assertions (i. 24–35 ii. 1–3).

3. With the imputation of recentness of origin was connected the assertion that the Jews had done nothing for culture. Apollonius Molon said that they were the most incapable of barbarians and had therefore contributed no useful invention to general culture (contra Apion. ii. 14: ἀφυεστάτους εἶναι τῶν βαρβάρων καὶ διὰ τοῦτο μηδὲν εἰς τὸν βίον εὕρημα συμβεβλῆσθαι μόνους). Apion said that they had produced no eminent men such as inventors of arts or men distinguished for wisdom (contra Apion. ii. 12: θαυμαστοὺς ἄνδρας οὐ παρεσχήκαμεν οἷον τεχνῶν τινῶν εὑρετὰς ἢ σοφίᾳ διαφέροντας). These reproaches were encountered with the older Jewish legend that the Jews were on the contrary the originators of all culture. According to Eupolemus Moses was the first sage the inventor of alphabetic writing (see above p. 203). According to Artapanus Abraham instructed the Egyptians in astrology Joseph undertook the improved cultivation of the land and Moses introduced culture of every kind (p. 206). The

philosopher Aristobulus already declares Moses to be the father of Greek philosophy and that Pythagoras Socrates Plato and the rest all derived their philosophy from him (p. 240 sq.). The same assertion is repeated by Philo and Josephus takes just the same tone though making no use in his Apology of the legends of Eupolemus and Artapanus. He lays the chief stress upon proving besides the high antiquity the wisdom and excellence of the Mosaic legislation.

4. The special accusations against Judaism were above all in respect of its religious worship which was always connected with the refusal to acknowledge any other worship as legitimate. This last was in the era of heathenism a thing unheard of. "To live and let live" was the motto in the province of religion. The most opposite kinds of religious worship were readily tolerated if only the adherents of one cultus would hold others legitimate. Especially was it taken for granted as a thing self-evident that the citizens of the same town should besides any private worship of their own participate in honouring the gods of the town. What an abnormity then must it have been felt that the Jews should entirely reject every kind of worship except their own and absolutely refuse to take part in any other! From the standpoint of Hellenism this was synonymous with Atheism. If they are citizens why do they not worship the gods of the city? This accusation of ἀθεότης of contempt for the gods recurs in almost all adversaries of the Jews from Apollonius Molon and Posidonius to Pliny and Tacitus; and from it certainly arose in great part the conflicts of municipalities with the Jews especially in the towns where they possessed rights of citizenship. It was easy in theory but difficult in practice for apologetic to hold its ground in presence of this accusation. With an educated reader it was not very difficult to make manifest the advantages of the monotheistic and spiritual view of the nature of God especially as Greek philosophy offered an abundance of thoughts which came in this respect to the aid of Jewish apologists. In this sense does Josephus proceed simply exhibiting the Jewish idea of God in its superiority (contra Apion. ii. 22). In practice however the masses were not to be influenced by such considerations. For the reproach still adhered to the Jews that they absolutely rejected what others regarded as the worship of God. Hence the chief weapon of Jewish apologetic upon this point was a vigorous attack. When the Jews were reproached for despising the gods they showed on their part what kind of gods they were whom others honoured; weak images of wood stone silver or gold the work of men's hands or animals of every kind or at best beings who were affected with manifold human weaknesses. The Jews might well feel themselves superior to the worshippers of such gods (comp. e.g. pseudo-Aristeas in Havercamp's Josephus ii. 2. 116. Sap. Salomonis c. 13–15. The Epistle of Jeremiah Joseph. contra Apion. ii. 33–35 and especially the Sibyllines).

Of less practical importance than the charge of ἀθεότης were certain ridiculous fables which were related concerning the Jewish worship; that they paid divine honours to an ass's head and that they annually sacrificed a Greek and fed upon his entrails (see above § 31 notes 23 24 25 Such fables were indeed believed only in small circles and Josephus very easily proves their absurdity (contra Apion. ii. 7–9).

5. Of greater weight on the other hand was another point connected with the ἀθεότης of the Jews viz. their refusal of the worship of the emperor. Subsequently to Augustus all the provinces emulated each other in the practice of this cult (see sq.). Zeal for this was the standard of a loyal and Rome-loving disposition its entire rejection was synonymous with not showing due respect to the authorities. Such was at least the view of the Hellenistic population who according to the customs of the Hellenistic period freely offered their worship to the emperor. The Jews were in a favourable position in this respect inasmuch as the emperors of the first centuries with the sole exception of Caligula did not directly demand this worship. Nor

apart from the short episode under Caligula was it ever required of the Jews whose mode of worship received legal protection together with the legal recognition of their communities from Caesar onwards (see above). For the adversaries of the Jews however it was always a welcome point of attack that they proved themselves bad citizens by their refusal of worship to the emperor. Jewish apologists could in answer to this charge appeal to the fact that a sacrifice was daily offered for the emperor in the temple at Jerusalem (Joseph. c. Apion. ii. 6 fin.; Bell. Jud. ii. 10. 4; comp.) and that on special occasions even hecatombs were offered for the Roman emperor (Philo Leg. ad Caj. § 45 Mang. ii. 598). Thus in fact was a certain equivalent furnished for that worship of the emperor which was impossible to Jews. Josephus besides does not neglect pointing on every occasion to the favour which the Jews enjoyed both from the Ptolemies and from Caesar (c. Apion. ii. 4 5; Antt. xiv. 10 xvi. 6). This surely would have been impossible unless they had been loyal citizens!

6. With this religious isolation was connected a certain amount of social isolation. Judaism expressly repudiated the idea now more and more making its way in Hellenism that all men are brethren and therefore equal before God. It saw in the unbeliever only the sinner who has incurred the judgment of God and referred the fatherly love of God only to the seed of Abraham on which account only the children of Abraham are brethren to each other. If this particularism was not held in its full rigour by philosophic and Hellenistic Judaism in general it gained on the other hand a support from the view that the heathen as such were unclean that in the interest of Levitical purity intercourse with them was as far as possible to be avoided and from the anxiety with which contact with everything that stood in any kind of relation to idolatry was abhorred (comp. Div. ii. vol. i. pp. 51-56). If then the Jew was already directed in theory to regard the non-Jew as only an “alien” it was also impossible to him in practice if he desired to observe the law to live in any close social intercourse with the heathen. This theoretical and practical ἀμιξία which was in opposition to the entire tendency of the Hellenistic period was constantly and very specially made a reproach against the Jews. To the Greeks and Romans who were unacquainted with its deeper motives it appeared only as a want of humanity of true philanthropy nay as criminal misanthropy. And it may indeed not infrequently have really manifested itself in such forms. The process adopted in this respect by apologetic writers was on the one hand chiefly that of pointing to the humane appointments of the law especially with regard to strangers (Joseph. c. Apion. ii. 28-29) and on the other that of showing how the ancient laws of other States went much farther in the exclusion of strangers than the Mosaic law did (c. Apion. ii. 36-37).

7. The peculiarities of the Jews already mentioned viz. their ἀθεότης and their ἀμιξία are those which came forward the most prominently in public life. It was on this account that the Jews appeared to be the enemies of such public regulations and institutions as had then been formed nay as the opponents of all other human intercourse. Hence it is on these points that attacks are most seriously directed. Other peculiarities gave occasion rather to derision and contempt than to actual accusations. Among these were (a) circumcision (b) abstinence from swine’s flesh and (c) the observance of the Sabbath. Even the most malicious of their other opponents did not venture upon the reproach of that special immorality to which Tacitus alludes. Apologetic writers oppose to the derision shown towards these several peculiarities an ideal picture of the entire Mosaic code. As Philo by his idealistic representation of the Mosaic legislation (see above p. 219 sq.) already gave an indirect apology for it so also does Josephus endeavour by a connected and positive statement to show that the precepts of the Mosaic law are in every respect the purest and most ideal (c. Apion. ii. 22-30). In doing this he does not enter into these objectionable points but contents himself with referring his opponent the Egyptian Apion to the

fact that the Egyptian priests also were circumcised and abstained from swine's flesh (Ap. ii. 13). To show the value and excellency of the law he points out in general its high antiquity (ii. 15) the blameless character of Moses the lawgiver and also the fact that this law really fulfilled its object being known and obeyed by all which astonishing result arose from its being not only taught but practised (ii. 16–19). Finally Josephus brings forward the circumstance that no Jew is ever unfaithful to his law which is again a proof of its excellence (ii. 31–32 38). The deficiencies found in this treatise inasmuch as it does not further enter into those points which were objected to by the heathen are abundantly compensated for by Philo who in his special delineation of the Mosaic law treats all these points very thoroughly and everywhere proves their reasonableness.

VII. JEWISH PROPAGANDA UNDER A HEATHEN MASK

At the close of our survey we have still to discuss a class of literary productions highly characteristic of Hellenistic Judaism viz. Jewish works under a heathen mask. The works which belong to this category differ greatly so far as their literary form is concerned but have all the common feature of appearing under the name of some heathen authority whether of a mythological authority as the sibyl or of persons eminent in history as Hecataeus and Aristeas. The very choice of this pseudonymic form shows that all these works were calculated for heathen readers and designed for the propagation of Judaism among the heathen. For only with heathen readers were such names a standard authority and only on their account could this form have been chosen by Jewish authors. Hence the tendency which is peculiar to a large portion of the Graeco-Jewish literature in general viz. the tendency to influence non-Jewish readers here obtains significant expression. In one respect or another its intention was to carry on among the heathen a propaganda for Judaism. The special design however certainly differed in different cases. The Sibyllines desire to effect a propaganda properly so called. They set forth directly before the heathen world the folly of idolatry and the depravity of its moral conduct; they threaten punishment and ruin in case of impenitence and promise reward and eternal happiness in case of conversion and they thus seek to win adherents to the Jewish faith in the midst of the heathen world. An effect however of quite a different kind is aimed at in other works of this category; their purpose is not so much to propagate the faith as the honour and credit of the Jews. Thus pseudo-Aristeas e.g. seeks in his whole narrative of the translation of the Jewish law into Greek to show what a high opinion was entertained by the learned Ptolemy II. of this law and of Jewish wisdom in general and with what great honour he treated Jewish scholars. A directly missionary purpose does not come forward in this author; he cares more to create a favourable disposition towards Judaism and the Jewish law. And thus throughout this category now one now the other purpose comes more into the foreground – at one time that of winning believers at another that of creating a favourable impression. Still in one way or the other and in the wider meaning all subserve the propagation of Judaism. And since they all make choice of a heathen mask for this purpose they all belong however much they may differ otherwise in form and contents to one category.

We begin our discussion with the Sibylline oracles not because these are the oldest works of this class but because they are the most important both with respect to extent and actual effect.

1. The Sibyllines

The sibyl was in heathen antiquity "the semi-divine prophetess of the orders and counsels of the gods concerning the fate of cities and kingdoms" (Lücke). She was distinguished from the official priestly order of prophets by representing a free and non-official prophetic power being indeed first of all a personification of the Deity as revealing itself in nature. She is represented

as a nymph dwelling by streams and grottoes. The most ancient authors speak only of a sibyl; so Heraclitus who is the first to mention one at all (in Plutarch de Pythiae oraculis c. 6); so also Euripides Aristophanes Plato. The fact that her voice was said to have been perceived in different places then led to the supposition that she wandered from place to place. At last this was not found sufficient and different sibyls said to dwell in different places were distinguished. Their number is very differently stated. There are learned combinations which have been made now in one manner now in another. The statement of Pausanias (Descr. Graec. x. 12) who distinguishes four sibyls is worthy of notice. These are: (1) The Herophile who came from Marpessus in the region of Troy prophesied in various parts of Asia Minor and Greece and was falsely stated by the Erythraeans to have been an Erythraean; (2) a more ancient one probably the Libyan (Maass p. 7) but whose abode in consequence of a gap in the text of Pausanias cannot be determined; (3) the Cumanian; and (4) the Hebrew who is also called the Babylonian or Egyptian. It seems as if Pausanias purposed thus to state the four chief kinds of sibyl: the Libyan as the most ancient that of Greek Asia Minor the Roman and the Oriental. He expressly designates the latter as the most recent. It is highly probable that the information relating to this subject is already a deposite of the Jewish sibyl fiction. Among other computations the most noted is that of Varro who names ten sibyls. In the Roman period the most famous were the Erythraean (from Erythraea on the Ionian coast opposite the island of Chios) and the Cumanian (in Lower Italy).

Written records of supposed Sibylline oracles were here and there in circulation; but such remains of them as have come down to us through occasional quotations in authors such as Plutarch Pausanias and others are brief and scanty and furnish no distinct notion of them. In Asia Minor and Greece these pieces circulated only in private possession without being publicly supervised or officially used. But their credit and influence must not be on that account slightly estimated. They attained quite a different importance in Rome where they arrived by way of Cumae from Asia Minor. King Tarquin Superbus is said to have obtained a collection of Sibylline oracles which were preserved in the temple of Jupiter Capitolinus. These having perished in the conflagration of the Capitol B.C. 83 the Senate at the instigation of the consul C. Curio sent an embassy B.C. 76 to Asia Minor which again made in Erythraea and other places a collection of about a thousand verses which was again deposited in the Capitol. The collection was afterwards occasionally enlarged and expurgated and was in existence in the fourth century after Christ. Besides this official collection Sibylline verses in private possession were also circulated but these by reason of the misuse made of them were frequently confiscated and destroyed by the authorities. The official collection was kept secret and only consulted on important occasions chiefly to ascertain what expiations were required on the occurrence of public misfortunes.

This Sibyllism was from its very nature specially adapted for being turned to account in the interest of religious propaganda. The oracles being of apocryphal origin in private possession and circulating without control might be completed and added to at pleasure. What had been done in this respect by Greek hands might as easily be undertaken by Jewish. Besides the oracles like the mysterious in general enjoyed a high reputation among religiously disposed minds. It might then be hoped that entrance to extensive circles would be obtained under this form. Hence it was a happy hit when Jewish propaganda took possession of this form to turn it to account for its own purposes. As far as can be ascertained it was in the second century before Christ that an extensive Sibylline oracle of Jewish origin was first put in circulation from Alexandria. The result seems to have been favourable for imitators soon arose at first among the Jews and subsequently among the Christians. For Christians were in this respect also the

apt scholars of Hellenistic Judaism. They not only made willing use of the Jewish Sibylline oracles and highly esteemed them but also copiously increased what they found extant. Production in this department continued down to later imperial times and it is just to the tradition of the Christian Church that we are indebted for the possession of the older Jewish Sibylline oracles also.

The first edition of the Judaeo-Christian Sibyllines (Basle 1545) which have come down to us was prepared by Xystus Betuleius after an Augsburg now a Munich manuscript and comprised eight books. The later editions show the same number down to and including that printed in Gallandi's Bibliotheca patrum (vol. i. Venice 1788). Angelo Mai was the first to publish from a Milan manuscript a fourteenth book (1817) and afterwards from two Vatican manuscript books eleven to fourteen (1828). All are combined in the modern editions of Alexandre (1st ed. in 2 vols. 1841–1856 2nd ed. 1 vol. 1869) and Friedlieb (1852).

The form of these Judaeo-Christian Sibylline oracles is the same as that of the ancient heathen ones. The Jewish and Christian authors respectively make the ancient Sibyl speak to heathen nations in Greek hexameters and in the language of Homer. The contents subserve throughout the purposes of religious propaganda. The Sibyl prophesies the fate of the world from the beginning to the times of the author for the purpose of then uniting with it both threats and promises for the immediate future; she rebukes the heathen nations for the sinfulness of their idolatry and blasphemy and exhorts them to repent while yet there is time for that fearful judgments will fall upon the impenitent.

The collection as we have it is a chaotic wilderness to sift and arrange which will ever baffle the most acute criticism. For unfortunately it is not the case that each book forms of itself an original whole but that even the single books are some of them arbitrary aggregates of single fragments. The curse of pseudonymous authorship seems to have prevailed very specially over these oracles. Every reader and writer allowed himself to complete what existed after his own pleasure and to arrange the scattered papers now in one now in an opposite manner. Evidently much was at first circulated in detached portions and the collection of these afterwards made by some admirer was a very accidental one. Hence duplicates of many portions are found in different places. And the manuscripts which have come down to us exhibit great discrepancies in the arrangement.

Such being the nature of the whole it is not possible always to distinguish with certainty between Jewish and Christian matter. The oldest portions are at all events Jewish worked up perhaps with single small heathen oracles. The main body of the later books is certainly Christian. But neither the one nor the other appears in large and closely connected masses. As a rule we have always but small portions quite loosely strung together and often without any connection. Hence it is only with respect to single and comparatively small portions that we can pass a certain judgment as to whether they are Jewish or Christian. Much is of so neutral a character that it may just as well have proceeded from one side as from the other. The following portions may with some probability be distinguished as Jewish.

1. The most ancient and certainly Jewish portions are in any case contained in the third book. All critics since Bleek concur in this opinion. Views however differ widely as to any nearer determination whether of the date of composition or of the extent of the Jewish portions. According to Bleek Book iii. 97–807 (according to another computation iii. 35–746) is the work of an Alexandrian Jew of the time of the Maccabees (170–160 B.C.) and contains also a working up of older Jewish fictions (97–161 433–488 [= 35–99 371–426]) and later Christian interpolations

(350-380 [= 289-318]). The majority of Bleek's successors regard the whole as Jewish. Gfrörer Lücke and Friedlieb concur with Bleek with regard to the date of composition. Hilgenfeld on the ground of an ingenious exposition of the difficult section iii. 388-400 places the whole (iii. 97-817) about 140 B.C. and is followed herein by Reuss Badt and Wittichen. Zündel also accepted his exposition of iii. 388-400 but kept to Bleek's view of the earlier date of composition. Ewald went a little farther forward than Hilgenfeld by placing the composition of Book iii. 97-828 at about 124 B.C. But while all hitherto mentioned agree in assuming a Jewish authorship Alexandre ascribes only the portions iii. 97-294 489-817 to an Alexandrian Jew of about 168 B.C. and the intermediate portion 295-488 on the contrary to a Christian writer. Larocque while going still farther in the division agrees with Alexandre in regarding the bulk of Book iii. 97-294 489-828 as written about 168 B.C. but admits also later interpolations in the last section and considers the sections iii. 1-96 and 295-488 as "subordinate collections of heterogeneous pieces" of which only certain individual portions belong to the author of the two first-named large portions. Delaunay also esteems the portions iii. 97-294 and 489-817 not as single productions but as aggregates of separate unconnected oracles of different periods ranging from about the beginning to the middle of the second century B.C.

For the purpose of forming a judgment we will first give a survey of the contents with the omission of the section iii. 1-96 which certainly does not belong to what follows. The rest is clearly divided by means of the recent additions in vers. 295 and 498 into three groups (97-294 295-488 489-828). The beginning of the first group is wanting. It commences abruptly by recalling the building of the Tower of Babel and the Confusion of Tongues as the causes of the dispersion of mankind in all lands (97-100). When the whole earth was peopled the sovereignty over it was divided between Chronos Titan and Japetos. All three at first ruled peacefully near each other but a quarrel arose between Chronos and Titan which was only settled for a time by an assembly of the gods (or as the Jewish author expresses it by an assembly of the βασιλεῖς) and resulted in the contest between the Chronides and Titans and the destruction of both these races. After their annihilation arose successively the kingdoms of the Egyptians Persians Medes Ethiopians Assyrians Babylonians Macedonians then again of the Egyptians and lastly of the Romans (110-161). Now first does the Sibyl begin to prophesy; in the first place the prosperity of the Solomonian kingdom then the Graeco-Macedonian lastly the many-headed (πολύκρανος) kingdom of the Romans. After the seventh king of Egypt of the Hellenic race the people of God again attain to sovereignty and will be to all mortals a leader of life (162-195). The judgment of God will fall upon all the kingdoms of the world from the Titans and Chronides onwards. Even the pious men of Solomon's kingdom will be visited by misfortune. Here the author takes occasion to give a sketch of the Jewish people their reverence for God and the main points of their history from their departure from Egypt down to Cyrus (196-294). The second group is almost entirely taken up with announcements of judgments and calamities: Against Babylon (295-313) against Egypt (314-318) against Gog and Magog (319-322) against Libya (323-333). After the signs which forebode calamity have been stated there follow proclamations of woe to single towns and countries concluding with the promise of a universal condition of Messianic prosperity and peace in Asia and Europe (341-380). Then follow oracles concerning Antiochus Epiphanes and his successors (381-400) concerning Phrygia Troy (interspersed with polemic against Homer) Lycia Cyprus Italy and other countries towns and islands (401-488). The third group begins with oracles concerning Phoenicia Crete Thrace Gog and Magog the Hellenes (489-572); it then points to the people of Israel who cleave to the law of God and do not devote themselves to idolatry and unnatural crimes (573-600). Hereupon follows a second prophecy of judgment upon the sinful world terminating in promises (601-623) and an exhortation to conversion with a description of the ruin which will come upon the ungodly

world and especially upon Hellas (624-651). The promise of the Messianic King a prophecy of judgment and a detailed description of Messianic prosperity interspersed with exhortations to Hellas to cease from their presumption and references to omens of the last judgment form the conclusion (652-807). The Sibyl says in the epilogue that she came from Babylon but was wrongly regarded by the Greeks as a native of Erythraea (808-817) also that she was a daughter of Noah and had been with him in the ark at the time of the Deluge (818-828).

This survey of the contents shows that in any case we have not to deal with a single composition. In the second group especially the different portions are entirely unconnected with each other. Hence it is in any case a collection of separate oracles. Nevertheless it is at least possible that the greater number of them are the work of one author. For there is not sufficient support for accepting either a heathen or a Christian origin of the pieces. The mythological portion at the beginning which kindly makes the heathen gods guiltless human kings of antiquity may very well have been written by a Jew nay this kind of intermixture of Greek and Jewish legends just corresponds with the character of Hellenistic Judaism. There exists however no reason for supposing that it contains Christian elements since instead of υἱὸν θεοῖο in ver. 775 the correct reading is probably νηὸν θεοῖο (see vol. ii. p. 139). The circumstance that the time of the seventh Ptolemy is referred to in all three groups (vers. 191-193 316-318 608-610) speaks for their virtual connection. Hence the inference attained with respect to the date of composition of the separate portions may with a certain amount of probability be extended to the whole.

For determining the date of composition the following limits exist. The author is acquainted with the Book of Daniel (vers. 388-400) and the expeditions of Antiochus Epiphanes to Egypt (vers. 611-615). On the other hand Rome is still a republic (ver. 176: πολύκρανος). But the most accurate limit is furnished by the threefold recurrence of the assurance that the end will appear under the seventh king of Egypt of Hellenic race (vers. 191-193 316-318 608-610). Hence the author wrote under Ptolemy VII. Physcon who at first reigned together with his brother Ptolemy VI. Philometor (170-164 B.C.) was then banished from Egypt but attained after his brother's death to the sole sovereignty (145-117 B.C.). When Zundel thinks that because the king is called βασιλεὺς νέος (ver. 608) only the years from 170-164 B.C. can be thought of since Ptolemy Physcon could by no means be any longer called young after the year 145 it must be answered that νέος means not only "young" but "new." The proper sovereignty however of Ptolemy Physcon did not begin till the year 145. And that the author intended just this period of sole sovereignty is already in and by itself probable; for he would have designated the joint government of the two brothers as the sixth kingship. This too is confirmed by the plain allusions to the destruction of Carthage and Corinth (vers. 484 sq. 487 sq.) both which cities were as is well known destroyed in the year 146 before Christ. The section vers. 388-400 also leads according to the ingenious but not indeed quite certain explanation of Hilgenfeld to the same period (Apokalyptik p. 69 sq.; Zeitschr. 1860 p. 314 sqq. 1871 p. 35). Here Antiochus Epiphanes is first referred to and his overthrow then prophesied: "He will himself destroy their race through whose race his race also will be destroyed. He has a single root which also the manslayer (Ares) will eradicate out of ten horns. But he will plant another shoot beside it. He will eradicate the warlike progenitor of a royal race. And he himself is exterminated by the sons. And then will a horn planted near rule." The race which Antiochus Epiphanes will destroy is that of his brother Seleucus IV. The sole root of Antiochus Epiphanes viz. his son Antiochus V. Eupator is murdered by Demetrius I. son of Seleucus IV. or as the author expresses it he is eradicated out of ten horns i.e. as the last of ten kings. The shoot which the god of war plants near is Alexander Balas. He will exterminate the warlike progenitor of a royal race viz. Demetrius I. But he will be himself destroyed by Demetrius II. and Antiochus VII. Sidetes sons of Balas. And then

will the upstart Trypho rule (146-139 B.C.). According to this explanation of Hilgenfeld our author would have written about 140 B.C. And to this we must in any case adhere even if the details of the explanation should not be all correct. Traces of a later time can scarcely be found. For the western nation which according to vers. 324 328 sq. is to take part in the destruction of the temple is not the Roman but according to Ezek. 38:5 the Libyan (so Lücke Hilgenfeld). Only vers. 464-470 seem to turn upon later Roman times and to be an insertion (Hilgenfeld Apokal. p. 72; Zeitschr. 1871 p. 35 sq.).

The conclusion arrived at is also confirmed by external testimony. For according to the information of Euseb. Chron. ed. Schoene i. 23 = Syncell. ed. Dindorf i. 81 = Cyrill. adv. Julian. ed. Spanh. p. 9 the prophecy of the Sibyl concerning the building of the Tower of Babel and the conflict between the Chronides and Titans which followed it was already expressly quoted under the name of the Sibyl (Σίβυλλα δέ φησιν etc.) by Alexander Polyhistor and therefore in the first half of the first century before Christ in his Χαλδαϊκά. Such are also found especially from the third book among the oldest patristic quotations.

2. To the oldest Jewish Sibylline oracles undoubtedly belong also the two extensive fragments (together eighty-four verses) communicated by Theophilus ad Autol. ii 36. Single verses from them are also quoted by other Fathers. These are not found in our manuscripts. In the editions they are generally printed at the head of the whole collection because Theophilus says that they stood at the beginning of the Sibyl's prophecy (ἐν ἀρχῇ τῆς προφητείας αὐτῆς). But the present first and second books being very recent and placed quite by accident at the beginning of the collection and the third book being certainly the oldest part it may be assumed beforehand that these pieces formed the introduction to our third book. This supposition probable in itself becomes a certainty through the fact that Lactantius among his numerous citations calls only such portions as are found in the Theophilus fragments and in our third book prophecies of the Erythraean Sibyl nay evidently quotes both as parts of one book. The contents of these verses may be called the special programme of all Jewish Sibyllism: they contain an energetic direction to the only true God and as energetic a polemic against idolatry. From no portion can the tendency of Jewish Sibyllism be better perceived than from this proem.

3. Section iii. 36-92 (according to another computation: vers. 36-62 of the intermediate section between Books ii. and iii. and Book iv. 1-30) now standing at the beginning of the third book is also a Jewish fragment of the prae-Christian period. Bleek already perceived that this fragment proceeded from an Alexandrian Jew of the time of the first triumvirate (40-30 B.C.) and he has justly found general acquiescence So Gfrörer Lücke Friedlieb Hilgenfeld (Apokal. p. 241) Reuss Larocque (at least for vers. 26-52) and Wittichen. Only Badt (pp. 54-61) goes as far as 25 B.C. thinking according to a suggestion made by Frankel that the Σεβαστηνοί of ver. 63 must mean inhabitants of Sebaste-Samaria. Alexandre and Ewald indeed ascribe the oracle to a Christian author of the time of the Antonines (Alexandre) or even of about A.D. 300 (Ewald). Bleek's view is however the best founded. The piece begins with a cry of woe to the wicked race which is full of all crimes. With this is combined the prophecy that when Rome rules over Egypt also then will begin the judgment and the rule of the Messianic King. Even this definition of time: "when Rome rules over Egypt also" (ver. 46: Αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ Ῥώμη καὶ Αἰγύπτου βασιλεύσει) points to a period when the rule of Rome over Egypt was something new therefore to the time of Antony soon after 40 B.C. The date becomes perfectly clear by the allusion to the triumvirate of Antony Octayius and Lepidus (ver. 52: Τρεῖς Ῥώμην οἰκτρῇ μοίρῃ καταδηλήσονται) and by the mention of the widow under whose hands the world finds itself being governed by her and obeying her in all things i.e. Cleopatra (vers. 75-80). Hence the oracle was written between 40 and 30 B.C. To

go farther down is inadmissible the end being expected during the lifetime of Cleopatra. The mention of the Σεβαστηνοί (ver. 63) on account of which Badt would place the oracle as late as 25 B.C. may safely be laid to the account of a later interpolator. It is probable as Bleek and Lücke suppose that the bracketed words in vers. 60–63 should be expunged —

Ἥξει γὰρ ὁπόταν θείου διαβήσεται ὁδμὴ

Πᾶσιν ἐν ἀνθρώποισιν [Ἀτὰρ τὰ ἕκαστ' ἀγορεύσω

Ὅσσαις ἐν πόλεσιν μέροπες κακότητα φέρουσιν

Ἐκ δὲ Σεβαστηνῶν ἥξει] Βελίαρ μετόπισθεν.

4. Opinions are more divided concerning the fourth book than with regard to the passages hitherto treated of. The majority of older critics regard it as Christian. Friedlieb Ewald Hilgenfeld (Zeitschr. 1871 pp. 44–50) and especially Badt (1878) admit a Jewish author and place its composition about A.D. 80. This view must be allowed to pass as correct. For there is nothing at all specifically Christian in the book. The Sibyl who at the commencement calls herself the prophetess of the true God proclaims by His commission manifold calamities through war earthquakes and other natural events to the cities countries and peoples of Asia and Europe. Unless they repent God will destroy the whole world by fire and will then raise men from the dead and sit in judgment sending the ungodly to Tartarus and bestowing a new life on earth upon the godly. There is nothing in these particulars to recall the Christian sphere of thought although it would hardly be possible to a Christian author to avoid mentioning Christ when writing on eschatology. Nor are there any grounds for supposing the author to have been an Essene (so Ewald and Hilgenfeld). For the polemic against animal sacrifices (ver. 29) is only directed against heathen sacrifices; and the baptism to which the heathen are summoned is merely Jewish proselyte baptism (comp.). For determining the date of composition it is decisive that the destruction of Jerusalem (vers. 115–127) and the eruption of Vesuvius of A.D. 79 (vers. 130–136) are presupposed. The author also believes with many of his contemporaries in Nero's flight across the Euphrates and his impending return (vers. 117–124 137–139). Consequently the oracle must have been composed about A.D. 80 or not much later and more probably in Asia Minor (so e.g. Lightfoot and Badt) than in Palestine (so Freudenthal). The patristic quotations from this book begin with Justin. It is also noteworthy that two verses included in it (97–98) are already mentioned by Strabo p. 536 as oracular sayings.

5. Very divergent are the decisions of critics concerning the fifth book. Bleek distinguishes the following portions as Jewish: — (a) vers. 260–285 481–531 written about the middle of the second century before Christ by an Alexandrian Jew; (b) vers. 286–332 by a Jew of Asia Minor soon after A.D. 20; (c) perhaps also vers. 342–433 by a Jewish author about A.D. 70. While Lücke entirely and Gfrörer at least partly agree with Bleek Friedlieb ascribes the whole fifth book to a Jew of the beginning of Hadrian's reign and Badt to a Jew of about A.D. 130; Ewald Hilgenfeld (Zeitschr. 1871 pp. 37–44) and Hildebrandt regard at least Book v. 52–531 as the work of a Jew of about A.D. 80 (Ewald) or a few years earlier (Hilgenfeld Hildebrandt); while Alexandre Reuss and Dechent (Zeitschr. f. Kirchengesch. ii. 497 sqq.) attribute the book to a Christian Jew. It seems to me a vain effort to attempt to settle in detail the origin and date of composition of the pieces combined in this book. For it is palpable that we have here no compact whole but a loose conglomerate of heterogeneous portions. The greater number are certainly of Jewish origin; for the sections in which Jewish interests and views are brought more or less plainly forward run through the whole book (comp. especially vers. 260–285 328–332 344–360 397–413 414–433

492–511). On the other hand the remarkable passage vers. 256–259 in which “the excellent man coming from heaven who spreads out his hands on the fruit-bearing tree” (Jesus) is identified with Joshua (Jesus the son of Nave) is certainly Christian. Thus Jewish and Christian pieces are at all events combined in this book. The summing up of the discrepant elements under the common term “Judaeo-Christian” is as unhappy an expedient as it is e.g. in the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs. When however the mixture of Jewish and Christian pieces in this fifth book is acknowledged it cannot in many instances where religion is a matter of indifference be determined to which side they belong. So much only is certain that the Jewish element preponderates. With such characteristics it is also impossible to determine the respective dates of composition. In the Jewish pieces the destruction of the temple at Jerusalem (397–413) and apparently the destruction also of the Onias-temple in Egypt (so far as vers. 492–511 refer to this) are lamented. These pieces and consequently the main body of the book might then have been written in the first century after Christ. On the other hand the chronological oracle at the beginning (vers. 1–51) certainly leads as far as to the time of Hadrian. Quotations are first found in Clemens Alexandrinus.

6. Of the remaining books vi vii. and viii. are generally and correctly esteemed to be of Christian authorship. The origin on the other hand of Books i–ii and xi–xiv is doubtful. Most investigators regard these also as Christian. Lücke Friedlieb and Dechent on the contrary ascribe Book xi. and Friedlieb Book xiv. also to a Jewish author. Dechent attempts as Friedlieb also partly does to point out in Books i. and ii. Jewish pieces of greater extent. How difficult it is to find sure footing in this respect is proved by the circumstance that Lücke in a later section of his work (Einl. die Offenb. des Joh. p. 269 sqq.) retracted his view concerning Book xi. and ascribed it to a Christian author. This eleventh book is really not worth contesting. It is a religiously colourless versified history of Egypt down to the beginning of the Roman supremacy and may just as well be Jewish as Christian. Nor is it very different with the other pieces. The portions separated by Dechent from Books i and ii. may in fact be Jewish but they may just as well be Christian and their entire lack of attestation by the Fathers of the first three centuries rather speaks for a later i.e. a Christian origin.

The most ancient author who quotes a Jewish Sibylline book (and indeed Sib. 3:97 sqq. ed. Friedlieb) is Alexander Polyhistor about 80–40 B.C. See the passage from his Χαλδαϊκά in Euseb. Chron. ed. Schoene i. 23 = Syncell. ed. Dindorf i. 81 = Cyrill. adv. Julian. ed. Spanh. p. 9. The almost verbally identical passage in Josephus Antt. i. 4. 3 (= Euseb. Praep. evang. ix. 15) is copied from Alexander Polyhistor without mention of his name. Comp. p. 282 above.

On the use of the Sibyllines by the Fathers see Vervorst De carminibus Sibyllinis apud sanctos Patres disceptatio Paris 1844. Besançon De l’emploi que les Pères de l’église ont fait des oracles sibyllins Montauban 1851. Alexandre’s 1st ed. vol. ii. (1856) pp. 254–311. A collection of the most ancient quotations is also given in Harnack’s Patres apostol. note on Hermas Vis. ii. 4. A thorough discussion of the numerous citations in Lactantius is given by Struve Fragmenta librorum Sibyllinorum quae apud Lactantium reperiuntur Regiom. 1817. A manuscript collection by the Scotchman Sedulius (ninth century) of the quotations in Lactantius is printed in Montfaucon’s Paleogr. gr. lib. iii. cap. vii. pp. 243–247 and from this in Gallandi’s Biblioth. patr. i. 400–406 comp. his proleg. p. lxxxi.

Whether Clemens Romanus has quoted the Sibyllines is doubtful. For it is said in the pseudo-Justinian Quaestt. et response ad orthodoxos quaest. 74 (Corp. apolog. ed. Otto 3rd ed. vol. v. p. 108): εἰ τῆς παρούσης καταστάσεως τὸ τέλος ἐστὶν ἡ διὰ τοῦ πυρὸς κρίσις τῶν ἀσεβῶν

καθά φασιν αἱ γραφαὶ προφητῶν τε καὶ ἀποστόλων ἔτι δὲ καὶ τῆς Σιβύλλης καθώς φησιν ὁ μακάριος Κλήμης ἐν τῇ πρὸς Κορινθίους ἐπιστολῇ. The Sibyl not being mentioned in the received text of the Clementine Epistles the καθώς must probably be taken as parallel to the καθά and thus the words ἔτι δὲ καὶ τὴς Σιβύλλης are not the words of Clement but of the pseudo-Justin. Comp. Harnack's 2nd ed. of the Clementine Epistles Proleg. p. xl.; Otto in his note on the passage is of the contrary opinion. Hermas Vis. ii. 4 mentions only the Sibyl and not the Sibylline books. Quotations from the latter are on the other hand given in the Predicatio Petri et Pauli in Clemens Alex. Strom. vi. 5. 42–43 (see also Lücke Einl. in die Offenb. Joh. p. 238; Hilgenfeld Nov. Test. extra canon. rec. fasc. iv. 2nd ed. pp. 57 63 sq.). Gnostics in Hippolyt. Philosophum. v. 16. Justin. Apol. i. 20. Athenagoras Suppl. c. 30. Theophilus ad Autol. ii. 3. 31 36. Tertullian ad nationes ii. 12. Pseudo-Melito Apol. c. 4 (in Otto Corp. apolog. vol. ix. pp. 425 463 sq.). Pseudo-Justin. Cohortat. ad Graec. c. 16 37–38. Const. Apost. v. 7. Constantini Oratio ad sanct. coet. (= Euseb. Vita Const. v.) c. 18–19. Quotations abound most in Clemens Alex. and Lactantius.

Clemens Alexandrinus quotes: (1) The prooemium: Protrept. ii. 27. Protr. vi. 71 = Strom. v. 14. 108. Protr. viii. 77 = Strom. v. 14. 115. Strom. iii. 3. 14. (2) The third book: Protr. vi. 70 vii. 74. (3) The fourth book: Protrept. iv. 50 and 62. Paedag. ii. 10. 99 iii. 3. 15. (4) The fifth book: Protrept. iv. 50. Paedag. ii. 10. 99. Comp. also Strom. i. 21. 108 132. It is seen from these statistics that just the three books which on internal grounds we esteem (or at least their greater part) to be Jewish and these only were known to Clement. Other patristic quotations too down to Clement refer to these books alone. They thus evidently form the most ancient Jewish body of Sibylline oracles.

Lactantius quotes about fifty passages from our Sibyllines most frequently from Book viii. next to this from Book iii. only sometimes from Books iv. v. vi. and vii. from the rest not at all. See the material in Struve and Alexandre. Hence it seems that he was acquainted with only Books iii. to viii. of our present collection. He must however have had in them somewhat which is lacking in our MSS.; for apart from the passages from the prooemium which indeed is only preserved to us by Theophilus other quotations are also found in Lactantius which cannot be pointed out in our texts Lact. vii. 19. 2 viii. 24. 2. The verses too cited by Lactantius ii. 11. 18 and very probably belonging to the prooemium are not contained in Theophilus. lactantius expresses himself in general on the books known to him as follows: Inst. 1 6 (after an enumeration of the ten Sibyls) Harum omnium Sibyllarum carmina et feruntur et habentur praeterquam Cymaeae cujus libri a Romanis occuluntur nec eos ab ullo nisi a quindecimviris inspectos habent. Et sunt singularum singuli libri qui quia Sibyllae nomine inscribuntur unius esse creduntur; auntque confusi nec discerni ac suum cuique adsignari potest nisi Erythraeae quae et nomen suum verum carmini inseruit et Erythraeam se nominat ubi praelocuta est quum esset orta Babylone.

Celsus also testifies to the credit of the Sibyllines among Christians (Orig. c. Cehus vi. 61 vii. 53 56). Celsus however already charges the Christians with having forged the oracles nor were such charges subsequently wanting. Comp. the allusions in Constantine's Oratio ad sand. coet. (= Euseb. Vita Const. v.) c. 19. 1. Lactant. Inst. iv. 15. 26. Augustine de civ. Dei xviii. 46.

On the credit and use of the Sibyllines in the Middle Ages see Alexandre's 1st ed. ii. 287–311. Lücken "Die sibyllinischen Weissagungen ihr Ursprung und ihr Zusammenhang mit den afterprophetischen Darstellungen christlicher Zeit" (Katholische Studien No. V.) Würzb. 1875. Vogt "Ueber Sibyllenweissagung" (Beiträge zur Gesch. der deutschen Sprache und Literatur edited by Paul and Braune vol. iv. 1877 pp. 48–100). Bang Voluspá und die sibyllinischen Orakel translated from the Danish Wien 1880.

On the manuscripts see Friedlieb De codicibus Sibyllinorum manuscriptis in usum criticum nondum adhibitis commentatio Vratislav. 1847. Friedlieb's edition Introd. p. lxxii. sqq. and App. pp. ix.-xii. Alexandre's 1st ed. vol. i. p. xliii. sqq.; his 2nd ed. pp. xxxviii-xlii Volkmann Lectiones Sibyllinae Pyritz 1861. Bernhardy Grundriss der griech. Literatur ii. 1 (3rd ed. 1867) p. 452 sq.

On the editions see Gallandi Biblioth. patr. i. p. 81. Fabricius Biblioth. graec. ed. Harles i. 257-261. Bleek i. p. 123 sq. Alexandre's 1st ed. vol. i. pp. xxx-xliii The first edition superintended by Xystus Betuleius according to an Augsburg now a Munich manuscript was brought out by Oporinus in Basle 1545. The same with a Latin translation by Seb. Castalio (which first appeared separately in 1546) Basle 1555. The most esteemed among the older editions is that of Opsopöus Paris 1599 (repeated in 1607; the account by the bibliographers of a supposed edition of 1589 rests upon a mistake). The edition of Gallaeus Amsterdam 1689 is less esteemed. The Sibyllines have appeared besides in various collections e.g. in Gallandi's Bibliotheca veterum patrum vol. i. (Venetiis 1788) pp. 333-410; comp. Proleg. pp. lxxvi-lxxxii. All these editions contain only the first eight books. The fourteenth book was first published from a Milan manuscript by Angelo Mai (Sibyllae liber xiv. editore et interprete Angelo Maio Mediolan. 1817); and afterwards Books xi. to xiv. from two Vatican manuscripts by the same (Scriptorum veterum nova collectio ed. ab Angela Maio vol. iii. 3 1828 pp. 202-215). Everything hitherto known is combined in the editions of Alexandre (Oracula Sibyllina curante C. Alexandre 2 vols. Paris 1841-1856. Editio altera ex priore ampliore contracta integra tamen et passim aucta multisque locis retractata Paris 1869 [the copious Excursi of the first edition are omitted in this second one]) and of Friedlieb (Die sibyllinischen Weissagungen vollständig gesammelt nach neuer Handschriften-Vergleichung mit kritischen Commentare und metrischer deutscher Uebersetzung Leipzig 1852). A Latin translation is added to most editions a German one to that of Friedlieb. A French one has been commenced by Bouché Leclercq (Revue de l'histoire des religions vol. vii. 1883 pp. 236-248; vol. viii. 1883 pp. 619-634 etc.).

Contributions to textual criticism: Volkmann De oraculis Sibyllinis dissertatio supplementum editionis a Friedliebio exhibitae Lips. 1853. The same Specimen novae Sibyllinorum editionis Lips. 1854 (containing the first book). A discussion of Alexandre's edition in the Philologus vol. xv 1860 p. 317 sqq. The same Lectiones Sibyllinae Pyritz 1861. X: "Zur Textkritik der sibyllin. Bücher" (Zeitschr. für wissensch. Theol. 1861 pp. 437-439). Meineke "Zu den sibyllinischen Büchern" (Philologus vol. xxviii. 1869 pp. 577-598). Ludwich. "Zu den sibyllinischeu Orakeln" (Neue Jahrbb. für Philol. und Pädagogik vol. cxvii. 1878 pp. 240-245). Nauck "Kritische Bemerkungen" (Mélanges gréco-romains tirés du bulletin de l'académie impériale des sciences de St. Pétersbourg vol. ii. 1859-1866 p. 484 sq.; iii. 1869-1874 pp. 278-282; iv. 1875-1880 pp. 155-157 630-642). Rzach "Zur Kritik der Sibyllinischen Weissagungen" (Wiener Studien vol. iv. 1882 pp. 121-129). More in Engelmann's Biblioth. script. class. ed. Preuss.

Lists of the literature on the Sibyllines in general are given in Fabricius Biblioth. graec. ed. Harles i. 227-290. Bleek i. 129-141. Reuss Gesch. der heil. Schriften Neuen Testaments § 274. Alexandre's 1st ed. ii. 2. 71-82 also 2nd ed. p. 418 sq. Engelmann Bibliotheca scriptorum classicorum (8th ed. revised by Preuss) Div. i. 1880 p. 528 sq. The first to investigate the collection according to correct critical principles was: Bleek "Ueber die Entstehung und Zusammensetzung der uns in 8 Büchern erhaltenen Sammlung Sibyllinischer Orakel" (Theologische Zeitschrift edited by Schleiermacher de Wette and Lücke No. 1 1819 pp. 120-246; No. 2 1820 pp. 172-239). Comp. also his notice of Lücke's Einl. in the Stud. und Krit. 1854 pp. 972-979. Gfrörer Philo vol. ii. 1831 pp. 121-173. Lücke Versuch einer vollständigen Einleitung in die Offenbarung des Johannes (2nd ed. 1852) pp. 66-89 248-274. Friedlieb's

Introd. to his edition (1852). Alexandre's 1st ed. ii. 312–439; 2nd ed. p. 21 sqq. Hilgenfeld Die jüdische Apokalyptik in ihrer geschichtlichen Entwickelung (1857) pp. 51–90. The same Zeitschr. für wissenchaftl. Theologie vol. iii. 1860 pp. 313–319; xiv. 1871 pp. 30–50. Ewald "Abhandlung über Entstehung Inhalt und Werth der Sibyllischen Bucher" (Transactions of the Göttinger Gesellsch. der Wissensch. vol. viii. 1858–1859 hist.-philol. Class pp. 43–152 also separately). Frankel "Alexandrinische Messiashoffnungen" (Monatsschr. für Gesch. und Wissensch. des Judenth. 1859 pp. 241–261 285–308 321–330 359–364). Volkmann in the "Philologus" vol. xv. 1860 pp. 317–327. Bernhardy Grundriss der griechischen Literatur ii. 1 (3rd ed. 1867) pp. 441–453. Reuss art. "Sibyllen" in Herzog's Real-Enc. 1st ed. xiv. 1861 pp. 315–329 (2nd ed. xiv. 1884 pp. 179–191). The same Gesch. der heil. Schriften Alten Testaments 1881 § 489 490 537. Zündel Kritische Untersuchungen über die Abfassungszeit des Buches Daniel 1861 pp. 140–172. Langen Das Judenthum in Palästina zur Zeit Christi 1866 pp. 169–174. Badt De oraculis Sibyllinis a Judaeis compositis Bresl. 1869. The same Ursprung Inhalt und Text des vierten Buches der sibyllinischen Orakel Breslau 1878. Larocque "Sur la date du troisième livre des Oracles sibyllins" (Revue archéologique new series vol. xx. 1869 pp. 261–270). Wittichen Die Idee des Reiches Gottes 1872 pp. 134–144 160 sq. Dechent Ueber das erste zweite und elfte Buch der sibyllinischen Weissagungen Frankf. 1873. The same "Charakter und Geschichte der altchristlichen Sibyllenschriften" (Zeitschr. für Kirchengesch. vol. ii. 1878 pp. 481–509). Hildebrandt "Das römische Antichristenthum zur Zeit der Offenbarung Johannis und des fünften sibyllinischen Buches" (Zeitschr. f. wissensch. Theol. 1874 pp. 57–95). Delaunay Moines et Sibylles dans l'antiquité judeogrecque Paris 1874. Renan Journal des Savants 1874 pp. 796–809. Delitzsch "Versuchte Lösung eines sibyllischen Räthsels" [on i. 137–146] Zeitschr. für luth. Theol. 1877 pp. 216–218. The Edinburgh Review No. 299 July 1877 pp. 31–67. Drummond The Jewish Messiah 1877 pp. 10–17. Nicolai Griechische Literaturgeschichte vol. iii. 1878 pp. 335–338.

2. Hystaspes

Ammianus Marcellinus (xxiii. 6. 32–33) relates of Hystaspes the Mede the father of King Darius that during his sojourn among the Indian Brahmins he learned from them "the laws of the motions of the world and stars and pure religious customs" (purosque sacrorum ritus) and then imparted some of these to the native Magi who handed them down to posterity. A Greek work under the name of this Hystaspes who was thus regarded by antiquity as an authority in religious matters was known to the Fathers by whom the following indications concerning it are given. According to Justin the future destruction of the world by fire was therein predicted. In the Praedicatio Petri et Pauli cited by Clemens Alex. it is asserted that Hystaspes plainly referred to the Son of God and to the conflict of Messiah and his people with many kings and to his stedfastness (ὑπομονή) and glorious appearing (παρουσία). Lastly according to Lactantius the destruction of the Roman Empire was foretold in it and also that in the tribulation of the last times the pious and believing would pray to Zeus for assistance and that Zeus would hear them and destroy the ungodly. Lactantius finds fault here only with the circumstance that what God will do is ascribed to Zeus and at the same time laments that in consequence of the deceit of the daemons nothing is here said of the sending of the Son of God. From these notices it is evident that the work was of an apocalyptic and eschatological tenor. Since Lactantius expressly says that the sending of the Son of God to judge the world is not mentioned in it we must regard it as rather Jewish than Christian. The choice too of Zeus as the name of God corresponding more with the literary usages of Hellenistic Judaism than with those of Christianity speaks for its Jewish origin. What the author also of the Praedicatio Petri et Pauli says concerning the appearance of the Messiah prophesied of in Scripture does not go beyond

the framework of Jewish expectation. The apparent contradiction between his statement and that of Lactantius may be explained by remembering that Lactantius only misses the co-operation of the Messiah at the day of judgment. Yet it may be also possible that the author of the Praedicatio Petri et Pauli had an inter polated copy before him. The limits of the date of composition are fixed by the appearance on the one side of the Roman Empire as the power hostile to God on the other by Justin's acquaintance with the work.

Justin. Apol. i. 20: Καὶ Σίβυλλα δὲ καὶ Ὑστάσπης γενήσεσθαι τῶν φθαρτῶν ἀνάλωσιν διὰ πυρὸς ἔφασαν. Comp. also c. 44.

Praedicatio Petri et Pauli in Clemens Alex. Strom. vi. 5. 42-43 (comp. Lucke Einl. in die Offenb. Joh. p. 238; Hilgenfeld Nov. Test. extra canonem rec. fasc. iv. 2nd ed. pp. 57 63 sq.): Λάβετε καὶ τὰς Ἑλληνικὰς βίβλους ἐπίγνωτε Σίβυλλαν ὡς δηλοῖ ἕνα θεὸν καὶ τὰ μέλλοντα ἔσεσθαι καὶ τὸν Ὑστάσπην λαβόντες ἀνάγνωτε καὶ εὑρήσετε πολλῷ τηλαυγέστερον καὶ σαφέστερον γεγραμμένον τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ καθὼς παράταξιν ποιήσουσι τῷ Χριστῷ πολλοὶ βασιλεῖς μισοῦντες αὐτὸν καὶ τοὺς φορούντας τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ καὶ τοὺς πιστοὺς αὐτοῦ καὶ τὴν ὑπομονὴν καὶ τὴν παρουσίαν αὐτοῦ.

Lactantius Inst. vii. 15. 19: Hystaspes quoque qui fuit Medoruin rex antiquissimus … admirabile somnium sub interpretatione vaticinantis pueri ad memoriam posteris tradidit sublatum iri ex orbe imperium nomenque Romanum multo ante praefatus quam illa Troiana gens conderetur. Ibid. vii. 18. 2-3: Hystaspes enim quem superius nominavi descripta iniquitate saeculi hujus extremi pios ac fideles a nocentibus segregatos ait cum fletu et gemitu extensuros esse ad coelum manus et imploraturos fidem Jovis; Jovem respecturum ad terram et auditurum voces hominum atque impios extincturum. Quae omnia vera sunt praeter unum quod Jovem dixit illa lacturum quae Deus faciet. Sed et illud non sine daemonum fraude subtractum est missum iri a patre tune filium Dei qui deletis omnibus malis pios liberet.

Comp. in general: Walch "De Hystaspe" (Commentationes societatis scientt. Gotting vol. ii. 1780). Fabricius-Harles Biblioth. graec. i. 108 sq. A. G. Hoffmann in Ersch and Gruber's Alllgem. Encykl. § 2 vol. xiii. 1836 p. 71 sq. Lücke. Einl. in die Offenbarung des Johannes 2nd ed. pp. 237-240. Otto's Anmerkung zu Justin as above (in his edition of the Corpus apologet.)

3. Forged Verses of Greek Poets

Both Jewish and Christian apologists repeatedly appeal to the most eminent Greek poets to prove that the more intelligent among the Greeks held correct views concerning the nature of God His unity spirituality and supramundane character. Many such quotations especially in Clemens Alexandrinus are really taken from the genuine works of these poets and have been skilfully selected and explained by the apologists. But among these genuine quotations are also to be found not a few which have been palpably forged in the interest of either Jewish or Christian apologetic. The works where such forged verses have been discovered are chiefly the following: 1. Aristobulus in Eusebius Praeparatio evangelica xiii. 12. 2. Clemens Alexandrinus Strom. v. 14; also given in Euseb. Praep. evang. xiii. 13; comp. also Protrept. vii. 74. 3. The pseudo-Justinian Cohortatio ad Graecos c. 15 and 18. 4. The pseudo-Justinian work De monarchia c. 2-4 (the two latter in Otto's Corpus apologetarum Christian. vol. iii.). The authors to whom the verses are ascribed are: the great tragic poets Aeschylus Sophocles Euripides; the writers of comedies Philemon Menander Diphilus; a large fragment is ascribed to Orpheus; and certain verses on the Sabbath to Hesiod Homer and Linus (or Callimachus).

In forming a judgment concerning the origin of these pieces the following considerations are of importance. Almost all the portions which come under notice are found both in Clemens Al. Str. v. 14. 113–133 (= Eus. Pr. xiii. 13. 40–62 ed. Gaisford) and in the pseudo-Justinian work De monarchia c. 2–4. Aristobulus and the Cohortatio ad Graecos have only single verses and such as are found in the others also. Both in Clement and in the work De monarchia however the suspicious portions stand pretty thick together; in the De monarchia indeed almost without other accessories. It is thus clear that either one made use of the other or that both drew from a common source. A strict observation shows however that the former supposition cannot be accepted. For though the pieces quoted are almost all identical they are more completely and accurately given now by one now by another. It is then indubitable that both drew from a common source in which all the suspected pieces were probably found together. What this source was moreover we are directly told by Clement: it was the work of the pseudo-Hecataeus on Abraham. For Clement introduces the first of the suspected quotations a supposed portion of Sophocles with the words (Strom. v. 14. 113 = Eus. Pr. xiii. 13. 40 ed. Gaisford): Ὁ μὲν Σοφοκλῆς ὥς φησιν Ἑκαταῖος ὁ τὰς ἱστορίας συνταξάμενος ἐν τῷ κατ' Ἄβραμον καὶ τοὺς Αἰγυπτίους ἄντικρυς ἐπὶ τῆς σκηνῆς ἐκβοᾷ. Böckh already showed that he on the whole correctly perceived the state of matters by ascribing all the quotations from the scenic poets (tragic and comic) to the pseudo-Hecataeus. Hence it was no advance when Nauck e.g. (in his edition of the Fragm. tragic.) and Otto (in his notes in the Corp. apologet.) again spoke of Christian forgeries for the work of the pseudo-Hecataeus is certainly Jewish. The verdict of Böckh must however be also extended to the large portion from Orpheus and to the verses of Hesiod Homer and Linus on the Sabbath which are already cited by Aristobulus (in Euseb. xiii. 12) and the forgery of which is therefore set by many e.g. Valckenaer and also Böckh to the credit of Aristobulus. The Orphean piece is also found both in Clem. Alex. Strom. v. 14. 123 sqq. (= Euseb. xiii. 13. 50 sqq.) and in the work De monarchia c. 2 in the midst of the forged verses of the tragic and comic poets. And the testimonies of Hesiod and Homer concerning the Sabbath stand at least near in Clement (Strom. v. 14. 107 = Euseb. xiii. 13. 34) and in juxtaposition along with the Orphean piece certainly in Aristobulus. It is hence very probable that these forgeries also belong to the pseudo-Hecataeus.

If our conjecture is correct these forgeries belong to the third century before Christ; for such is the date of the pseudo-Hecataeus (see next paragraph). It seems that numerous passages from Greek poets were collected in his work as testimonies to the true belief in God that among them many were certainly genuine but that these not seeming sufficiently powerful to the author he enhanced and completed them by verses of his own making. The work was certainly in the hands of Clemens Alex and the author of De monarchia in the original.

Comp. in general: Valckenaer Diatribe de Aristobulo Judaeo (Lugd. Bat. 1806) pp. 1–16 73–125. Böckh Graecae tragoediae principum Aeschyli Sophoclis Euripidis num ea quae supersunt et genuina omnia sint et forma primitiva servata an eorum familiis aliquid debeat ex iis tribui (Heidelb. 1808) pp. 146–164 (treats especially on the Jewish forgeries). Gfrörer Philo ii. 74 sqq. (on the Orphean verses). Dähne Geschichtliche Darstellung der jüdisch-alexandrinischen Religions-Philosophie ii. 89–94 225–228. Meineke Menandri et Philemonis reliquiae Berol. 1823. The same Fragmenta comicorum Graecorum vol. iv. Berol. 1841 (among others the Fragments of Philemon Menander Diphilus). Nauck Tragicorum Graecorum fragmenta Lips. 1856. Cobet in Λόγιος Ἑρμῆς ἐκδ. ὑπὸ Κόντου vol. i. (Leyden 1866) pp. 176 454 459–463 524. Dindorf's notes on the passages in question in his edition of Clem. Alex. Otto's notes on the passages in question in his edition of the Corpus apologet. christ. vol. iii. Herzfeld Gesch. des Volkes Jisrael iii. 566–568 (on the verses quoted by Aristobulus). Freudenthal Alexander Polyhistor pp. 166–

169. Huidekoper Judaism at Home (New York 1876) pp. 336-342.

The several portions are (according to their order in the pseudo-Justinian work De monarchia) as follows: —

1. Twelve verses of Aeschylus (Χώριζε θνητῶν τὸν θεόν) on the elevation of God above every creature De monarchia c. 2 (Otto's Corpus apologetarum 3rd ed. vol. iii. p. 130); Clemens Alex. Strom. v. 14. 131 = Euseb. Praep. ev. xiii. 13. 60 ed. Gaisford. Böckh p. 150 sq. Nauck Tragicorum Graec. fragm. p. 100.

2. Nine verses of Sophocles (Εἷς ταῖς ἀληθείαισιν) on the unity of God who made heaven and earth and on the folly of idolatry De monarchia c. 2 (Otto's Corpus apolog. 3rd ed. vol. iii. p. 132); Clemens Alex. Strom. v. 14. 113 = Euseb. Praep. evang. xiii. 13. 40 ed. Gaisford; Clem. Protrept. vii. 74; Pseudo-Justin. Cohort. ad. Graec. c. 18; Cyrill. Alex. adv. Julian. ed. Spanh. p. 32; Theodoret Graecarum affectionum curatio c. vii. s. fin. (Opp. ed. Schulze iv. 896); Malalas ed. Bonnens. p. 40 sq. Cedrenus ed. Bonnens. i. 82. The two first verses are also in Athenagoras Suppl. c. 5. Böckh p. 148 sq. Nauck Trag. Graec. Fragm. p. 284 sq. Müller Fragm. hist. Graec. ii. 196. Dindorf's note to Clem. Strom. v. 14. 113.

3. Two verses ascribed in De monarchia c. 2 to the comic poet Philemon but in Clemens Alex. Protrept. vi. 68 to Euripides (Θεὸν δὲ ποῖον) treat of God as one who sees everything but is himself unseen. On their spuriousness see Meineke Fragmenta comicorum Graec. iv. 67 sq. Nauck Trag. Graec. Frag. p. 552. Otto Corp. Apologet. 3rd ed. vol. iii. p. 132 note 21. Dindorf's note to Clem. Protr. l.c.

4. A long piece attributed to Orpheus is extant in two different recensions which materially differ from each other. The shortest is that in the two pseudo-Justinian works de monarchia and Cohort. ad graec. c. 15. The text is identical in both only that in De monarchia the two introductory verses are omitted. The Cohortatio also gives the text with an abbreviation in the midst (Cyrill. Alex. adv. Julian. ed. Spanheim p. 26). The contents of the piece (one-and-twenty verses in the Cohort.) turn upon the thought that there is but one God who made and still governs all things who is enthroned in supramundane glory in heaven invisible yet everywhere present. If further proof of the Jewish origin of these verses were needed it is clearly found in the thought borrowed from Isa. 66:1 that heaven is God's throne and earth His footstool —

Οὗτος γὰρ χάλκειον ἐπ' οὐρανὸν ἐστήρικται

Χρυσέῳ ἐνὶ θρόνῳ γαίης δ' ἐπὶ ποσσὶ βέβηκε.

It is worthy of remark that the author lays stress on the notion that evil too is sent by God —

Οὗτος δ' ἐξ ἀγαθοῖο κακὸν θνητοῖσι δίδωσι

Καὶ πόλεμον κρυόεντα καὶ ἄλγεα δακρυόεντα.

The whole instruction is addressed to Musaeus the son of Orpheus (to the latter according to Cohort. c. 15). According to Monarchia c. 2 it is contained in the "Testament of Orpheus" in which repenting of his former teaching of 360 gods he proclaimed the one true God (μαρτυρήσει δέ μοι καὶ Ὀρφεύς ὁ παρεισαγαγὼν τοὺς τριακοσίους ἑξήκοντα θεούς ἐν τῷ Διαθῆκαι ἐπιγραφομένῳ βιβλίῳ ὁπότε μετανοῶν ἐπὶ τούτῳ φαίνεται ἐξ ὧν γράφει). Comp. also

Cohort. c. 15 and 36 and especially in Theophilus ad Autol. iii. 2: τί γὰρ ὠφέλησεν … Ὀρφέα οἱ τριακόσιοι ἑξήκοντα πέντε θεοί οὓς αὐτὸς ἐπὶ τέλει τοῦ βίου ἀθετεῖ ἐν ταῖς Διαθήκαις αὐτοῦ λέγων ἕνα εἶναι θεόν.

(b) A longer recension of the same Orphean fragment is given by Aristobulus in Euseb. Praep. evang. xiii. 12. 5. At its commencement it coincides on the whole with the before-named recension but adds considerably more towards the close especially a reference to the Chaldaean (Abraham) who alone attained to the true knowledge of God. The passage according to which God is also the inflicter of evil is here corrected into its opposite –

Αὐτὸς δ' ἐξ ἀγαθῶν θνητοῖς κακὸν οὐκ ἐπιτέλλει

Ἀνθρώποις• αὐτῷ δὲ χάρις καὶ μῖσος ὀπηδεῖ

Καὶ πόλεμος καὶ λοιμὸς ἴδ' ἄλγεα δακρυόεντα.

Aristobulus names as the source the poems of Orpheus κατὰ τὸν ἱερὸν λόγον (Euseb. Praep. xiii. 12. 4: ἔτι δὲ καὶ Ὀρφεὺς ἐν ποιήμασι τῶν κατὰ τὸν Ἱερὸν Λόγον αὐτῷ λεγομένων οὕτως ἐκτίθεται).

(c) The quotations in Clemens Alex. Protrept. vii. 74; Strom. v. 12. 78 and especially Strom. v. 14. 123–127 = Euseb. Praep. evang. xiii. 13. 50–54 ed. Gaisford represent a third recension. Theodoret Graecarum affectionum curatio ii. (Opp. ed. Schulze iv. 735 sq.) again draws from Clement. Clement gives the text only piecemeal and broken up into separate quotations. But taking all these together it is clearly seen that not only the whole portion given by Aristobulus but also considerably more was in his hands. Much as he agrees in the main with Aristobulus (especially in having the passage concerning the Chaldee) this only on the other hand makes the coincidences in many details with the pseudo-Justinian works the more striking. Clement also has in particular the passage concerning the infliction of evil by God in its original form like the pseudo-Justinian works (Strom. v. 14. 126 = Euseb. Praep. xiii. 13. 53). On the work of Orpheus from which the passage is taken Clement agrees with the others in saying that Orpheus "after teaching the orgies and the theology of idols made a recantation conformable with truth by singing though late the truly holy doctrine" (Protrept. vii. 74: Ὀρφεὺς μετὰ τὴν τῶν ὀρλίων ἱεροφαντίαν καὶ τῶν εἰδώλων τὴν θεολογίαν παλινῳδίαν ἀληθείας εἰσάγει τὸν ἱερὸν ὄντως ὀψέ ποτε ὅμως δ' οὖν ᾄδων λόγον).

On the relation of the three recensions to each other Lobeck (Aglaophamus i. 438 sqq.) has brought forward the view that the recension of the Justinian works is the oldest that of Clemens a more recent and that of Aristobulus the most recent the latter being of a date subsequent to Clemens Alexandrinus (i. 448: dementis certe temporibus posteriorem). There is however no constraining reason for the last notion. We have ourselves acknowledged that the text of Aristobulus is in one point secondary in comparison with the other two. That is not however saying that it is so in every respect. It may be regarded as certain that none of the three recensions is directly the source of the others. Nor can the short portion in the Justinian works be the archetype for it is evidently only a fragment from a larger copy probably with abbreviations in the text. The three recensions will thus fall back upon a common source which has afterwards been subjected to manifold variations. And this source may very well have been the pseudo-Hecataeus. In any case this Orphean passage is one of the boldest forgeries ever attempted. It is a supposed legacy of Orpheus to his son Musaeus in which having arrived at the close of his life he expressly recalls all his other poems which are dedicated to polytheistic

doctrines and proclaims the alone true God. According to Suidas (Lex. s.v. Ὀρφεύς) there were ἱεροὺς λόγους ἐν ῥαψωδίαις κδ′ of Orpheus. This legacy to speak with Clement was to be his true ἱερὸς λόγος. Comp. on this Jewish piece: Gottfr. Hermann Orphica pp. 447–453 (the text). Valckenaer De Aristobulo pp. 11–16. 73–85. Lobeck Aglaophamus i. 438–465 (the most thorough investigation). Gfrörer Philo ii. 74 sqq. Dähne Geschichtliche Darstellung der jüd.-alex. Religionsphilosophie ii. 89–94 225–228. Abel Orphica pp. 144–148 (the text). On Orpheus and the Orphean literature in general: Fabricius Biblioth. graec. ed. Harles i. 140–181. Gottfr. Hermann Orphica Lips. 1805 (collection of the text and fragments). Lobeck Aglaophamus sive de theologiae mysticae Graecorum causis 2 vols. Regim. Pr. 1829 (chief work). Klausen art. "Orpheus" in Ersch and Gruber's Allgem. Encyclopädie § 3 vol. vi. 1835 pp. 9–42. Preller art. "Orpheus" in Pauly's Real-Enc. v. 992–1004. Bernhardy Grundriss der griech. Literatur ii. 1 3rd ed. 1867 pp. 408–441. Nicolai Griech. Literaturgesch. i. 445–447 iii. 330–335. Abel Orphica Lips. 1885 (texts and fragments). Still more literature in Engelmann's Biblioth. script. class. ed. Preuss.

5. The next Jewish piece quoted in De monarchia is eleven verses of Sophocles on the future destruction of the world by fire and the different lots of the righteous and unrighteous (Ἔσται γάρ ἔσται κεῖνος αἰώνων χρόνος) De monarchia c. 3 (Otto's Corp. apol. iii. 136). In Clemens Alex. Strom. v. 14 121–122 = Euseb. Pr. xiii. 13. 48 the same verses are cited as words of the τραγῳδία without naming Sophocles. In Clemens they are also divided into halves by the remark καὶ μετ' ὀλίγα αὖθις ἐπιφέρει while pseudo-Justin combines the two halves into a whole. Clement does not give the verses on the different lots of the righteous and unrighteous in this connection but in the preceding fragment which he quotes from Diphilus where they are more suitable (Strom. v. 14. 121 = Euseb. Praep. viii. 13. 47). Böckh p. 149 sq. Nauck Tragicorum Graec. fragm. p. 285 sq.

6. Ten verses of the comic poet Philemon on the certain punishment of even hidden sins by the all-knowing and just God (Οἴει σὺ τοὺς θανόντας) and ten verses of Euripides on the same theme (Ἄφθονον βίου μῆκος) De monarchia c. 3 (Otto's Corp. apolog. iii. 136–140). Part of the Euripidean verses is genuine the rest spurious (see Dindorf's note to Clemens and Nauck). In Clemens Alex. Strom. v. 14. 121 = Euseb. Praep. xiii. 13. 47 both pieces are attributed to the comic poet Diphilus. Theodoret Graec. affect. curatio c. vi. (Opp. ed. Schulze iv. 854 sq.) also gives the text of Clemens in the extract. Valckenaer De Aristobulo pp. 1–8. Böckh pp. 158–160. Meineke Fragm. comicorum Graec. iv. 67. Nauck Tragic. Graec. fragm. p. 496 sq.

7. Twenty-four verses of Philemon on the theme that a moral life is more needful and of more value than sacrifice (Εἴ τις δὲ θυσίαν προσφέρων) De monarchia c. 4 (Otto's Corp. apol. iii. 140 sq.). In Clemens Alex. Strom. v. 14. 119–120 = Euseb. Praep. ev. xiii. 13. 45–46 the same verses are attributed to Menander. Böckh p. 157 sq. thinks that the piece is based upon single genuine verses.

8. Among the other pieces cited from scenic poets in De monarchia and in Clement there are also a few more suspicious verses which are introduced in De monarchia c. 5. (Otto's Corp. apol. iii. 150 sq.) by the formula Μένανδρος ἐν Διφίλῳ. In Clemens Strom. v. 14. 133 = Euseb. Praep. ev. xiii. 13. 62 they are ascribed to Diphilus. They summon to the worship of the one true God. Comp. Meineke Fragm. com. Graec. iv. 429 sq. Perhaps too the verses of Sophocles in Clem. Strom. v. 14. 111 = Euseb. Praep. xiii. 13. 38 in which Zeus is represented in a very unflattering light are also spurious. Comp. Nauck Tragic. Graec. fragm. p. 285. Dindorf's note to Clemens.

9. Lastly in this connection must be noticed the verses on the Sabbath to which Aristobulus and Clement appeal Aristobulus in Euseb. Praep. ev. xiii. 12. 13–16. Clem. Alex. Strom. v. 14. 87 = Euseb. Praep. ev. xiii. 13. 34. They are – (a) two verses of Hesiod; (b) three verses of Homer; (c) five verses of Linus for whom Clement erroneously has Callimachus. The verses are a mixture of genuine and spurious. The divergences in the text between Clement and Aristobulus are but unimportant. Comp. Valckenaer De Aristobulo pp. 8 10 89–125. Herzfeld Gesch. des Volkes Jisrael iii. 568. Schneider Callimachea vol. ii. Lips. 1873 p. 412 sq.

4. Hecataeus

Hecataeus of Abdera (not to be confounded with the far more ancient geographer Hecataeus of Miletus about 500 B.C.) was according to Josephus a contemporary of Alexander the Great and of Ptolemy Lagos (Joseph. c. Apion. 22: Ἑκαταῖος δὲ ὁ Ἀβδηρίτης ἀνὴρ φιλόσοφος ἅμα καὶ περὶ τὰς πράξεις ἱκανώτατος Αλεξάνδρῳ τῷ βασιλεῖ συνακμάσας καὶ Πτολεμαίῳ τῷ Λάγου συγγενόμενος). This statement is also confirmed by other testimony. According to Diogenes Laert. ix. 69 Hecataeus was a hearer of the philosopher Pyrrho a contemporary of Alexander. According to Diodor. Sic. i. 46 he made in the time of Ptolemy Lagos a journey to Thebes. He was a philosopher and historian and seems to have lived chiefly at the court of Ptolemy. A work on the Hyperboreans (Müller Fr. 1-6) a History of Egypt (Müller Fr. 7-13) and in Suidas' Lex. s.v. Ἑκαταῖος a work περὶ τῆς ποιήσεως Ὁμήρου καὶ Ἡσιόδου of which no other trace is found are mentioned as his writings.

Under the name of this Hecataeus of Abdera there existed a book "on the Jews" or as it is also entitled "on Abraham" concerning which we have the following testimonies: – (1) Pseudo-Aristeas quotes Hecataeus as authority for the notion that profane Greek authors do not mention the Jewish law just because the doctrine held forth in it is a sacred one (Aristeas ed. Mor. Schmidt in Merx' Archiv. i. 259 = Havercamp's Josephus ii. 2. 107: διὸ πόρ'ῥω γεγόνασιν οἵ τε συγγραφεῖς καὶ ποιηταὶ καὶ τὸ τῶν ἱστορικῶν πλῆθος τῆς ἐπιμνήσεως τῶν προειρημένων βιβλίων καὶ τῶν κατ' αὐτὰ πεπολιτευμένων καὶ πολιτευομένων ἀνδρῶν διὰ τὸ ἁγνήν τινα καὶ σεμνὴν εἶναι τὴν ἐν αὐτοῖς θεωρίαν ὥς φησιν Ἑκαταῖος ὁ Ἀβδηρίτης. See the passage also in Euseb. Praep. ev. viii. 3. 3 and more freely rendered in Joseph. Antt. xii. 2. 3). (2) Josephus says that Hecataeus not only incidentally alluded to the Jews but also wrote a book concerning them (contra Apion. i. 22: οὐ παρέργως ἀλλὰ περὶ αὐτῶν Ἰουδαίων συγγέγραφε βιβλίον; comp. i. 23: βιβλίον ἔγραψε περὶ ἡμῶν). He then gives in the same passage (contra Apion. i. 22 = Bekker's ed. vol. vi. pp. 202 1-205 22) long extracts from this work concerning the relations between the Jews and Ptolemy Lagos their fidelity to the law the organization of their priesthood and the arrangement of their temple; lastly a passage is given at the close in which Hecataeus relates an anecdote of which he was himself a witness at the Red Sea: a Jewish knight and archer who belonged to the expeditionary corps shot a bird dead whose flight the augur was anxiously observing and then derided those who were angry for their awe concerning a bird who did not even foreknow its own fate. Eusebius (Praep. ev. ix. 4) also gives single pieces from these extracts of Josephus. From the same source Josephus (contra Apion. ii. 4) gives the information that Alexander the Great bestowed upon the Jews the country of Samaria as a district exempt from taxation as a reward for their fidelity. While according to all this there can be no doubt that the book treated on the Jews in general Josephus tells us in another passage that Hecataeus not only mentions Abraham but also wrote a book concerning him (Antt. i. 7. 2 = Euseb. Praep. ev. ix. 16: μνημονεύει δὲ τοῦ πατρὸς ἡμῶν Ἄβράμου Βηρωσσός … Ἑκαταῖος δὲ καὶ τοῦ μνησθῆναι πλέον τι πεποίηκε• βιβλίον γὰρ περὶ αὐτοῦ συνταξάμενος κατέλιπε). Is this identical with the work on the Jews? To the decision of this question the two following pieces of

testimony mainly contribute. (3) According to Clemens Alexandrinus the spurious verses of Sophocles were contained in the work of Hecataeus on Abraham and others (Clem. Al. Strom. v. 14. 113 = Euseb. Praep. ev. xiii. 40: ὁ μὲν Σοφοκλῆς ὥς φησιν Ἑκαταῖος ὁ τὰς ἱστορίας συνταξάμενος ἐν τῷ κατ' Ἄβραμον καὶ τοὺς Αἰγυπτίους ἄντικρυς ἐπὶ τῆς σκηνῆς ἐκβοᾷ). (4) Origen says that Hecataeus in his work on the Jews was so strong a partisan for the Jewish people that Herenius Philo (beginning of the second century after Christ) at first doubted in his work on the Jews whether the work was indeed the production of Hecataeus the historian but afterwards said that if it were his Hecataeus had been carried away by Jewish powers of persuasion and had embraced their doctrines (Orig. contra Cels. i. 15: καὶ Ἑκαταίου δὲ τοῦ ἱστορικοῦ φέρεται περὶ Ἰουδαίων βιβλίον ἐν ᾧ προστίθεται μᾶλλόν πως ὡς σοφῷ τῷ ἔθνει ἐπὶ τοσοῦτον ὡς καὶ Ἑρέννιον Φίλωνα ἐν τῷ περὶ Ἰουδαίων συγγράμματι πρῶτον μὲν ἀμφιβάλλειν εἰ τοῦ ἱστορικοῦ ἐστι τὸ σύγγραμμα• δεύτερον δὲ λέγειν ὅτι εἴπερ ἐστὶν αὐτοῦ εἰκὸς αὐτὸν συνηρπάσθαι ἀπὸ τῆς παρὰ Ἰουδαίοις πιθανότητος καὶ συγκατατεθεῖσθαι αὐτῶν τῷ λόγῳ). According to these testimonies of Clement and Origen there can be no doubt that the work "on the Jews" was as much forged by a Jew as that "on Abraham." We cannot therefore conclude – as according to the extracts in Josephus we might feel inclined – that the work on the Jews is genuine and that on Abraham spurious. The two are on the contrary very probably identical and the different titles to be explained by the circumstance that the work was indeed entitled περὶ Ἀβράμου but dealt in fact περὶ Ἰουδαίων.

Certain however as is especially according to the information of Origen the spuriousness of the work "on the Jews" it is still probable that it is founded on genuine portions of Hecataeus. In the extracts of Josephus we already get a partial impression of genuineness. To this is to be added that Diodorus Siculus gives a long portion from Hecataeus on the Jews their origin religious rites political constitution manners and customs which from its whole tenor is certainly not derived from the pseudo-Jewish Hecataeus but from the real Hecataeus and indeed not as Diodorus mistakenly states from Hecataeus of Miletus but from Hecataeus of Abdera. It is thus probable that the latter in his Egyptian history went into details concerning the Jews and that the Jewish counterfeiter thence derived a portion of his material.

The scanty fragments are not sufficient to give us a clear idea of the design of the whole work. Since it dealt in the first instance with Abraham it is probable that the life and acts of that patriarch served as the point of departure for a general description and glorification of Judaism. In this the honourable history of the Jews (e.g. the favour shown them by Alexander the Great and Ptolemy Lagos) as well as the purity of their religious ideas were referred to. In the description of the latter the forged verses of the Greek poets would be inserted for the purpose of proving that the nobler Greeks also were quite in harmony with the views of Judaism (see the preceding section). The work seems to have been tolerably extensive and to have contained much genuine as well as spurious material from the Greek poets. It thus became a mine for subsequent Jewish and Christian apologists.

Its date of composition may be approximately determined. It is already cited by pseudo-Aristeas who flourished not later than about 200 B.C. (see the next section). Thus pseudo-Hecataeus would have lived in the third century before Christ.

The fragments of both the real and the spurious Hecataeus of Abdera are collected in Müller Fragmenta historicorum Graecorum ii. 384-396. Comp. in general: Hecataei Abderitae philosophi et historici Eclogae sive fragmenta integri olim libri de historia et antiquitatibus sacris veterum Ebraeorum graece et latine cum notis Jos. Scaligeri et commentario perpetuo P. Zornii Altona 1730. Eichhorn's Allg. Bibliothek der bibl. Literatur v. 1793 pp. 431-443. Creuzer

Historicorum graec. antiquiss. fragm. (Heidelb. 1806) pp. 28–38. Kanngiesser in Ersch and Gruber's Allgem. Encykl. sec. ii. vol. v. (1829) p. 38 sq. Dähne Geschichtliche Darstellung der jüd.-alex. Religionsphilosophie ii. 216–219. Cruice De Flavii Josephi in auctoribus contra Apionem afferendis fide et auctoritate (Paris 1844) pp. 64–75. Vaillant De historicis qui ante Josephum Judaicas res scripsere (Paris 1851) pp. 59–71. Müller Fragm. hist. Graec. l.c. Creuzer Theol. Stud. und Krit. 1853 pp. 70–72. Klein Jahrbb. für class. Philol. vol. lxxxvii. 1863 p. 532. Ewald Gesch. des Volkes Israel ii. 131 sqq. iv. 320 sq. Freudenthal Alexander Polyhistor pp. 165 sq. 178. J. G. Müller Des Flavius Josephus Schrift gegen den Apion (1877) p. 170 sqq.

5. Aristeas

The celebrated Epistle of Aristeas to Philocrates on the translation of the Jewish law into Greek also belongs to the class of writings under consideration. The legend related forms only the external frame of the statement. The whole is in truth a panegyric upon Jewish law Jewish wisdom and the Jewish name in general from the mouth of a heathen. The two individuals Aristeas and Philocrates are not known to history. Aristeas in the narrative gives himself out as an official of King Ptolemy II. Philadelphus and as held in high esteem by that monarch (ed. Mor. Schmidt in Merx' Archiv. i. 261. 13–14 and 262. 8–10 = Havercamp's Josephus ii. 2. 108). Philocrates was his brother (Merx' Archiv i. 254. 10 275. 20–21 = Havercamp's Josephus ii. 2. 104 115) an earnest-minded man eager for knowledge and desiring to appropriate all the means of culture which the age afforded. It is self-evident that both were not Jews (Aristeas says of the Jews 255. 34–256. 2: τὸν γὰρ πάντων ἐπόπτην καὶ κτίστην θεὸν οὗτοι σέβονται ὃν καὶ πάντες ἡμεῖς δὲ μάλιστα προσονομάζοντες ἑτέρως Ζῆνα καὶ Δία). Aristeas then relates to his brother Philocrates — and indeed as one who was both an eye-witness and assistant — the manner in which the translation of the Jewish law into Greek took place. The librarian Demetrius Phalereus called the attention of King Ptolemy II. Philadelphus (for it is he who is intended p. 255. 6 and 17) to the fact that the law of the Jews was yet lacking in his great library and that its translation into Greek was desirable for the sake of its incorporation in the royal collection of books. The king obeyed this suggestion and presently sent Andreas the captain of his body-guard and Aristeas to Jerusalem to Eleazar the Jewish high priest with rich presents and with the request that he would send him experienced men capable of undertaking this difficult task. Eleazar was ready to fulfil the king's desire and sent him seventy-two Jewish scholars six from each of the twelve tribes. Aristeas then gives a full description of the splendid presents sent on the occasion by Ptolemy to Eleazar also a description of the town of Jerusalem of the Jewish temple the Jewish worship nay of the land all which he had himself seen on the occasion of this embassy. The whole description has evidently the tendency of glorifying the Jewish people with their excellent institutions and luxuriant prosperity. With the same purpose does Aristeas then communicate the purport of a conversation he had carried on with the high priest Eleazar concerning the Jewish law. Aristeas was by reason of this conversation so much persuaded of the excellency of the Jewish law that he held it necessary to explain to his brother Philocrates "its holiness and its naturalness (reasonableness)" (283. 12–13: τὴν σεμνότητα καὶ φυσικὴν διάνοιαν τοῦ νόμου προῆγμαι διασαφῆσαί σοι). Especially are the folly of idolatry and the reasonableness of the Jewish laws of purity thoroughly treated of. When the Jewish scholars arrived at Alexandria they were received with distinguished honours by the king and were for seven days invited day after day to the royal table. During these repasts the king continually addressed to the Jewish scholars in turn a multitude of questions on the most important matters of politics ethics philosophy and prudence which they answered so excellently that the king was full of admiration for the wisdom of these Jews. Aristeas himself too who was present at these repasts could not contain himself for astonishment at the enormous wisdom of these men who

answered off-hand the most difficult questions which with others usually require long consideration. After these festivities a splendid dwelling upon the island of Pharos far from the tumult of the city was allotted to the seventy-two interpreters where they zealously set to work. Every day a portion of the translation was despatched in such wise that by a comparison of what each had independently written a harmonious common text was settled (306. 22-23: οἱ δ' ἐπετέλουν ἕκαστα σύμφωνα ποιοῦντες πρὸς ἑαυτοὺς ταῖς ἀντιβολαῖς). The whole was in this manner completed in seventy-two days. When it was finished the translation was first read to the assembled Jews who acknowledged its accuracy with expressions of the highest praise. Then it was also read to the king who "was much astonished at the intelligence of the lawgiver" (308. 8-9: λίαν ἐξεθαύμασε τὴν τοῦ νομοθέτου διάνοιαν) and commanded that the books should be carefully preserved in his library. Lastly the seventy-two interpreters were dismissed to Judea and rich presents for themselves and the high priest bestowed upon them.

This survey of the contents shows that the object of the narrative is by no means that of relating the history in the abstract but the history so far as it shows what esteem and admiration were felt for the Jewish law and for Judaism in general by even heathen authorities such as King Ptolemy and his ambassador Aristeas. For the tendency of the whole culminates in the circumstance that praise was accorded to the Jewish law by heathen lips. The whole is therefore in the first place intended for heathen readers. They are to be shown what interest the learned Ptolemy the promoter of science felt in the Jewish law and with what admiration his highly placed official Aristeas spoke of it and of Judaism in general to his brother Philocrates. When then it is also remarked at the close that the accuracy of the translation was acknowledged by the Jews also this is not for the purpose of commending the translation to Jews who might still oppose it but to testify to the heathen that they had in the present translation an accurate version of the genuine Jewish law and it is they the heathen who are thus invited to read it.

No consensus concerning the date of this book has been arrived at by critics. It seems however tolerably certain to me that it originated not later than about 200 years before Christ. The legend that it was Demetrius Phalereus who suggested the whole undertaking to Ptolemy Philadelphus is unhistorical not only in its details but in the main point; for Demetrius Phalereus in the time of Ptolemy Philadelphus no longer lived at court at Alexandria (see above p. 161). When then the Jewish philosopher Aristobulus designates just Demetrius Phalereus as the originator of the undertaking (in Euseb. Praep. evang. xiii. 12. 2 see the passage above p. 160) it is very probable that the book in question was already in his hands. Now Aristobulus lived in the time of Ptolemy Philometor about 170-150 B.C. and the result thus obtained is supported on internal grounds also. The period when the Jewish people were leading a peaceful and prosperous existence under the conduct of their high priest and in a relation of very slight dependence upon Egypt i.e. the period before the conquest of Palestine by the Seleucidae evidently forms the background of the narrative. There is nowhere any allusion to the complications and difficulties which begin with the Seleucidian conquest. The Jewish people and their high priest appear as almost politically independent. At all events it is to a time of peace and prosperity that we are transferred. Especially is it worthy of remark that the fortress of Jerusalem is in the possession of the Jews (Merx' Archiv i. 272. 10 to 273. 4 = Havercamp's Josephus ii. 2. 113). Whether this stood on the same spot as the one subsequently erected by Antiochus Epiphanes (1 Macc. 1:33) or not the author is in any case acquainted with only the one in the possession of the Jews. The fortress however erected by Antiochus remained in the possession of the Seleucidae till the time of the high priest Simon (142-141 B.C. 1 Macc. 13:49-52). Of this fact the author has evidently as yet no knowledge and as little of the subsequent princely position of the high priest;

to him the high priest is simply the high priest and not also prince or indeed king. In every respect then it is the circumstances of the Ptolemaic age that are presupposed. If the author has only artificially reproduced them this is done with a certainty and a refinement which cannot be assumed in the case of a pseudonymous author living after it. Hence the opinion that the book originated not later than 200 B.C. is justified.

The legend of this book has been willingly accepted and frequently related by Jews and Christians. The first who betrays an acquaintance with it is Aristobulus in Euseb. Praep. evang. xiii. 12. 2. The next is Philo Vita Mosis lib. ii. § 5–7 (ed. Mangey ii. 138–141). Josephus reproduces Antt. xii. 2 a great portion of this composition almost verbally. Comp. also Antt. proem. 3 contra Apion. ii. 4 fin. In rabbinic literature also are found some echoes though quite confused ones of this legend. See Lightfoot Opp. ed. Roterod. ii. 934 sqq. Frankel Vorstudien zu der Septuaginta (1851) p. 25 sqq. Berliner Targum Onkelos (1884) ii. 76 sqq.

The passages of the Fathers and Byzantines are most conveniently found collected (with full verbal correctness) in Gallandi Bibliotheca veterum patrum vol. ii. (Venetiis 1788) pp. 805–824. The legend is here reproduced with various modifications especially the two following: — 1. That the interpreters translated independently of each other and yet verbally coincided (the exact opposite of which is found in Aristeas viz. that agreement was only obtained by comparison). 2. That not only the law but the entire Holy Scriptures were translated by the seventy-two (in Aristeas only the former is dealt with). See on the various forms of the legend: Eichhorn's Repertorium für bibl. und morgenländ. Literatur i. (1777) p. 266 sqq. xiv. (1784) p. 39 sqq. The passages given in Gallandi are the following: Justin. Apol. i. 31. Dial. c. Tryph. c. 71. Pseudo-Justin. Cohortatio ad Graec. c. 13. Irenaeus adv. haer. iii. 21. 2 (Greek in Euseb. Hist. eccl. v. 8. 11 sqq.). Clemens Alex. Strom. i. 22. 148 sq. Tertullian. Apologet. c. 18. Anatolius in Euseb. Hist. eccl. vii. 32. 16. Eusebius gives in his Praeparatio evangelica viii. 2–5 and 9 large portions of the book of Aristeas verbatim; comp. also viii. 1. 8 ix. 38. Chronic. ed. Schoene ii. 118 sq. (ad ann. Abrah. 1736). Cyrill. Hieros. cateches. iv. 34. Hilarius Pictav. prolog. ad librum psalmorum. The same tractat in psalmum ii. tractat in psalmum cxviii. Epiphanius De mensuris et ponderibus § 3 6 9–11 (fully and specially). Hieronymus Praefat. in version. Genes. (Opp. ed. Vallarsi ix. 3 sq.). The same Praefat. in librum quaestion. hebraic. (Vallarsi iii. 303). Augustinus De civitate dei xviii. 42–43. Chrysostomus Orat. i. adversus Judaeos. The same homil. iv. in Genes. Theodoret "praefat. in psalmos." Pseudo-Athanasii Synopsis scripturae sacrae c. 77. Cosmas Indicopleustes Topograph. christ. lib. xii. Joannes Malala Chronogr. lib. viii. ed. Dindorf p. 196. Chronicon paschale ed. Dindorf i. 326. Georgius Syncellus ed. Dindorf i. 516–518. Georgius Cedrenus ed. Bekker i. 289 sq. Joannes Zonaras Annal. iv. 16 (after Joseph. Antt. xii. 2). The five last-named are contained in the Bonn Corpus scriptorum historiae Byzantinae.

On the manuscripts of this book of Aristeas comp. Moriz Schmidt in Merx' Archiv für wissenschaftliche Erforschung des alten Testamentes i. 244 sqq.; and especially Lumbroso Recherches sur l'économie politique de l'Egypte sous les Lagides (Turin 1870) p. 351 sqq. The latter specifies seven other manuscripts besides the two Parisian ones compared by Moriz Schmidt.

On the editions (and translations) see Fabricius Biblioth. graec. ed. Harles iii. 660 sqq. Rosenmüller Handbuch für die Literatur der bibl. Kritik und Exegese vol. ii. (1798) p. 344 sqq. Moriz Schmidt's above-named work p. 241 sqq. Lumbroso's above-named work p. 359 sqq. The editio princeps of the Greek text was issued by Oporinus in Basle 1561. The book has since been often reprinted in Havercamp's edition of Josephus and elsewhere (ii. 2 pp. 103–132) and in Gallandi's Bibliotheca patrum (ii. 773–804). Much however remains to be done for

the establishment of a critical text. Moriz Schmidt has taken a first step towards it by his edition in Merx' Archiv für wissenschaftl. Erforschung des alten Testamentes vol. i. (1869) pp. 241-312 for which two Parisian manuscripts were compared.

The older literature on Aristeas is specified by Rosenmüller as above ii. 387-411; also in Fürst Biblioth. Jud. i. 51-53. Comp. especially: Hody Contra historiam Aristeae de LXX. interpretibus dissertatio Oxon. 1685. The same De bibliorum textibus originalibus versionibus Graecis et Latina vulgata Oxon. 1705 (in this larger work the earlier dissertation is reprinted and enriched with notes). Van Dale Dissertatio super Aristea de LXX. interpretibus Amstelaed. 1705. Rosenmüller Handbuch für die Literatur der bibl. Kritik und Exegese vol. ii. (1798) pp. 358-386. Gfrörer Philo ii. 61-71. Dähne Geschichtliche Darstellung der jüdisch-alexandr. Rel.-Philosophie ii. 205-215. Zunz Die gottesdienstl. Vorträge der Juden p. 125. Herzfeld Gesch. des Volkes Jisrael i. 263 sq. iii. 545-547. Frankel Monatsschr. für Gesch. und Wissensch. des Judenth. 1858 pp. 237-250 281-298. Ewald Gesch. des Volkes Israel iv. 322 sqq. Hitzig Gesch. des Volkes Israel p. 338 sqq. Nöldeke Die alttestamentliche Literatur (1868) pp. 109-116. Cobet in Λόγιος Ἑρμῆς ἐκδ. ὑπὸ Κόντου vol. i. (Leyden 1866) pp. 171 sqq. 177-181. Kurz Aristeae epistula ad Philocratem Bern 1872 (comp. Literar. Centralbl. 1873 No. 4). Freudenthal Alexander Polyhistor pp. 110-112 124 sq. 141-143 149 sq. 162-165 203 sq. Grätz "Die Abfassungszeit des Pseudo-Aristeas" (Monatsschr. für Gesch. und Wissensch. des Judenth. 1876 pp. 289 sqq. 337 sqq.). Papageorgios Ueber den Aristeasbrief München 1880 (comp. Hilgenfeld's Zeitschr. für wissensch. Theol. 1881 p. 380 sq.). Reuss Gesch. der heil. Schriften Alten Testaments (1881) § 515. The introductions to the Old Testament of Jahn Eichhorn Bertholdt Herbst Scholz Hävernicki De Wette-Schrader Bleek Keil Reusch Kaulen.

6. Phocylides

Phocylides of Miletus the old composer of apothegms lived (according to the statements in Suidas Lex. s.v. Φωκυλίδης and Euseb. Chron. ad Olymp. 60 ed. Schoene ii. 98) in the sixth century before Christ. Few of his genuine sayings have been preserved. He must however have been held as an authority in the department of moral poetry. For in the Hellenistic period a didactic poem (ποίημα νουθετικόν) was interpolated in his work by a Jew (or Christian?) giving in 230 hexameters moral instruction of the most diversified kind. Having frequently been used as a school-book in the Byzantine period it has been preserved in many manuscripts and often printed since the sixteenth century. The contents of these verses are almost exclusively ethical. It is but occasionally that we find the one true God and the future retribution also referred to. The moral doctrines which the author inculcates extend to the most various departments of practical life somewhat in the manner of Jesus the son of Sirach. In their details however they coincide most closely with the Old Testament especially with the Pentateuch echoes of which are heard throughout in the precepts on civil relations (property marriage pauperism etc.). Even such special precepts are found here as that which enjoins that when a bird's nest is taken only the young ones must be kept but the mother let fly (Deut. 22:6 7 = Phocylides vers. 84-85) or that the flesh of animals killed by beasts of prey may not be eaten (Deut. 14:21; Ex. 22:30 = Phocylides vers. 139 147-148). There can thus be no doubt that the author was either a Jew or a Christian. The former is the prevailing opinion since the fundamental investigation of Bernays; Harnack has recently advocated the latter. Both views have their difficulties. For there is nothing in the work either specifically Jewish or specifically Christian. The author designedly ignores the Jewish ceremonial law and even the Sabbatic command which is more striking here than in the Sibyllines because the author in other respects enters into the details of the Mosaic law. On the other side there is no kind of reference to Christ nor above all to any religious interposition for

salvation. It is just bare morality which is here preached. Hence a certain decision as to the Jewish or Christian origin of the poem is scarcely possible. The scale against the Christian origin of the poem seems to me especially turned by the fact that the author's moral teaching coincides only with the Old Testament and not with the moral legislation of Christ as we have it in the synoptists. Of the latter there is in this poem as far as I can see no certain traces. And this is scarcely conceivable in a Christian author who means to preach morality. If at the same time there are still single expressions or propositions in the poem which betray a Christian hand (like θεοί ver. 104) they must be set to the account of the Christian tradition and how freely this dealt with the text is shown us by the portion which by some chance or other got into the collection of the Sibyllines (Sibyll. ii. 56–148 = Phocylides 5–79). The text as there presented diverges pretty much from that elsewhere handed down and plainly shows the hand of a Christian reviser.

If then this poem is of Jewish origin it is of especial interest just through its lack of anything specifically Jewish. The design of the author is first of all to labour only for Jewish morality. He has not even the courage to speak strongly against idolatry. The two fundamental religious notions of Judaism the unity of God and the future retribution are indeed to be found in him also and he indirectly advocates them. But he does it in so reticent a manner as to make it evident that morality occupies the first place in his regards. His Judaism is even paler than that of Philo.

For the date of composition no other limits can be laid down than those which are given for Judaeo-Hellenistic literature in general. It could not have appeared later than the first century after Christ and in all probability considerably earlier. It might seem strange that it is not cited by Christian apologists by a Clement or a Eusebius who use so much else of this kind. But the strangeness disappears as soon as we consider the object for which such quotations are made viz. in the first place to produce heathen testimony to the religious ideas of Christianity to the notions of the unity of God and the future retribution and these were not expressed in Phocylides as forcibly as could be desired.

The most careful monograph on this poem is Bernays Ueber das Phokylideische Gedicht ein Beitrag zur hellenistischen Litteratur Breslau 1856 (reprinted in Bernays Gesammelte Abhandlungen published by Usener 1885 vol. i. pp. 191–261). The text of the poem with critical apparatus is best given in Bergk Poetae lyrici Graeci vol. ii. (3rd ed. 1866) pp. 450–475 (the same pp. 445–449 also the fragment of the genuine Phocylides). Bernays as above gives the text according to his own recension. On the older editions especially in the collections of gnomic writers see Schier in his separate edition Lips. 1751. Fabricius-Harles Biblioth. graec. i. 704–749. Eckermann art. "Phokylides" in Ersch and Gruber's Allgem. Encyklopädie § 3 vol. xxiv. (1848) p. 485. Fürst Biblioth. Judaica iii. 96 sqq. The separate edition: Phocylidis etc. carmina cum selectis adnotationibus aliquot doct. virorum Graece et Latine nunc denuo ad editiones praestantissimas rec. Schier Lips. 1751 must be brought forward. A German translation is given by Nickel Phokylides Mahngedicht in metrischer Uebersetzung Mainz 1833.

Comp. in general: Wachler De Pseudo-Phocylide Rinteln 1788. Rohde De veterum poetarum sapientia gnomica Hebraeorum imprimis et Graecorum Havn. 1800. Bleek Theol. Zeitschr. edited by Schleiermacher de Wette and Lücke i. 1819 p. 185 (in the article on the Sibyllines). Dähne Geschichtl. Darstellung der jüd.-alex. Religionsphilosophie ii. 222 sq. Eckermann art. "Phokylides" in Ersch and Gruber's Allg. Encyklop. § 3 vol. xxiv. (1848) pp. 482–485. Teuffel in Pauly's Real-Enc. v. 1551. Alexandre's 1st ed. of the Oracula Sibyllina ii. 401–409. Bernhardy Grundriss der griechischen Litteratur ii. 1 (3rd ed. 1867) pp. 517–523. Ewald Gesch. des Volkes Israel vi. 405 412. Freudenthal Die Flavius Josephus beigelegte Schrift über die Herrschaft der Vernunft (1869) p. 161 sqq. Leop. Schmidt's notice of Bernays' work in the Jahrbb. für class.

Philol. vol. lxxv. (1857) pp. 510-519. Goram "De Pseudo-Phocylide" (Philologus vol. xiv. 1859 pp. 91-112). Hart "Die Pseudophokylideia und Theognis im codex Venetus Marcianus 522" (Jahrbb. für class. Philol. vol. xcvii. 1868 pp. 331-336). Bergk "Kritische Beiträge zu dem sog. Phokylides" (Philologus vol. xli. 1882 pp. 577-601). Sitzler "Zu den griechischen Elegikern" (Jahrbb. für class. Philol. vol. cxxix. 1884 p. 48 sqq.). Phocylides Poem of Admonition with introd. and commentaries by Feuling trans. by Goodwin Andover Mass. 1879. Still more literature in Fürst Biblioth. Judaica iii. 96 sqq.; and in Engelmann's Bibliotheca scriptorum classicorum ed. Preuss.

7. Smaller Pieces Perhaps of Jewish Origin Under Heathen Names

1. Letters of Heraclitus? — Epistolography was a favourite kind of literature in the later times of antiquity. The letters of eminent rhetoricians and philosophers were collected as a means of general culture. Letters were composed and also feigned under the names of famous persons and generally for the purpose of furnishing entertaining and instructive reading. To the numerous species of the latter kind belong also nine supposed letters of Heraclitus to which Bernays has devoted very thorough research. In two of them the fourth and seventh he thinks he can recognise the hand of "a believer in Scripture" and indeed in such wise that the fourth is merely interpolated but the seventh entirely composed by such an one. In fact the austere polemic against the worship of images in the fourth letter sounds quite Jewish or Christian as does also the stern morality preached in the seventh in which especially the partaking of "live" flesh i.e flesh with the blood is denounced (τὰ ζῶντα κατεσθίετε; comp. on the Jewish and Christian prohibition Acts 15:29 and). It must however as Bernays himself acknowledges remain a question whether this "believer in the Scriptures" was a Jew or a Christian.

Bernays Die heraklitischen Briefe ein Beitrag zur philosophischen und religionsgeschichtlichen Litteratur (Berlin 1869) pp. 26 sqq. 72 sqq. 110 sq. Bernays gives also the text of the letters with a German translation. The latest edition of the Epistolographi in general is Hercher Epistolographi Graeci recensuit etc. Paris Didot 1873. A separate edition of the letters of Heraclitus: Westermann Heracliti epist. quae feruntur Lips. 1857 (Universitäts-progr.). Comp. on the entire epistolographic literature Fabricius-Harles Biblioth. graec. i. 166-703. Nicolai Griechische Literaturgeschichte 2nd ed. ii. 2 (1877) p. 502 sqq.

2. A letter of Diogenes? — Among the fifty-one supposed letters of Diogenes Bernays thinks that one the twenty-eighth may be referred to the same source as the seventh of Heraclitus. In fact it contains a similar moral sermon to the latter.

Bernays Lucian und die Kyniker (Berlin 1879) pp. 96-98. See the text in all the editions of the Epistolographi e.g. in Hercher Epistolographi Graeci pp. 241-243.

3. Hermippus? — Hermippus Callimachius who lived under Ptolemy III. and IV. and therefore in the second half of the third century before Christ composed a large number of biographies of eminent persons. Among the pieces of information thence obtained two arrest our attention. According to Origen contra Cels. i. 15 it was said in the first book "on the lawgivers" that Pythagoras derived his philosophy from the Jews (Λέγεται δὲ καὶ Ἕρμιππον ἐν τῷ πρώτῳ περὶ νομοθετῶν ἱστορηκέναι Πυθαγόραν τὴν ἑαυτοῦ φιλοσοφίαν ἀπὸ Ἰουδαίων εἰς Ἕλληνας ἀγαγεῖν). According to Josephus contra Apion. i. 22 a similar remark was contained in the first book "on Pythagoras." The notice of Josephus is however much more particular and accurate than that of Origen. For according to Josephus Hermippus relates that Pythagoras taught "not to go over a place where an ass had sunk on his knees to abstain from turbid water and to avoid

all slander and blasphemy" and on this Hermippus then remarked: "Pythagoras did and taught these things imitating and adopting the opinions of the Jews and Thracians" (ταῦτα δ' ἔπραττε καὶ ἔλεγε τὰς Ἰουδαίων καὶ Θρᾳκῶν δόξας μιμούμενος καὶ μεταφέρων εἰς ἑαυτόν). Thus Hermippus did not denote the philosophy of Pythagoras as a whole but only those special doctrines as borrowed from the Jews. For the words which follow in Josephus: λέγεται γὰρ ὡς ἀληθῶς ὁ ἀνὴρ ἐκεῖνος πολλὰ τῶν παρὰ Ἰουδαίοις νομίμων εἰς τὴν αὐτοῦ μετενεγκεῖν φιλοσοφίαν are no longer the words of Hermippus but of Josephus. In the reference of Josephus the words of Hermippus contain nothing which he might not actually have written. It is otherwise with the reference of Origen. If this had been accurate we should have had to conclude that a Jew had interpolated the work of Hermippus. But Origen himself intimates that he had not seen the work of Hermippus; he says only: "Hermippus is said to have declared." It is most probable that he is here relying solely on the passage of Josephus which he reproduces but incorrectly. Thus we have here not a Jewish forgery but only an inaccurate reference of Origen to authenticate.

C. Müller Fragm. hist. Graec. iii. 35-54 has admitted both passages among genuine fragments of Hermippus (Fr. 2 and 21). Comp. for and against their genuineness: Dähne Geschichtl. Darstellung der jüd.-alex. Religionsphilosophie ii. 219 sq. Kellner De fragmentis Manethonianis (1859) p. 42. Hilgenfeld Einl. in das N. T. p. 168 note. Freudenthal Alex. Polyh. pp. 178 192. J. G. Müller Des Flavius Josephus Schrift gegen den Apion (1877) p. 161 sqq.

4. Numenius? — The Pythagorean and Platonist Numenius (towards the end of the second century after Christ) as the genuine precursor of Neo-Platonism was acquainted with and after his fashion made use of the Jewish Scriptures nay of Jewish tradition (e.g. concerning Jannes and Jambres see above p. 149). Origen bears decided testimony to this when he says contra Cels. iv. 51 that he knows that Numenius quotes "in many passages of his works sayings of Moses and the prophets and convincingly explains them in an allegorical manner as e.g. in the so-called Epops in the books on numbers and in those on space" (ἐγὼ δ' οἶδα καὶ Νουμήνιον … πολλαχοῦ τῶν συγγραμμάτων αὐτοῦ ἐκτιθέμενον τὰ Μωϋσέως καὶ τῶν προφητῶν καὶ οὐκ ἀπιθάνως αὐτὰ τροπολογοῦντα ὥσπερ ἐν τῷ καλουμένῳ Ἔποπι καὶ ἐν τοῖς "περὶ ἀριθμῶν" καὶ ἐν τοῖς "περὶ τόπου"). Comp. also Orig. c. Cels. i. 15; Zeller Philos d. Griechen iii. 2. 217 sq. We have no reason to mistrust this testimony. It is not however credible that Numenius should have used just this expression: τί γάρ ἐστι Πλάτων ἢ Μωυσῆς ἀττικίζων which Clemens Alex. and others attribute to him. If it really stood in a work of Numenius it would certainly have to be laid to the account of a Jewish editor. We see however the real state of affairs from Eusebius who only says that this saying is ascribed to Numenius viz. by oral tradition. The saying then is not a Jewish forgery but only an exaggeration due to oral tradition of the real view of Numenius.

Comp. on this question: Freudenthal Alex. Polyhistor p. 173 note. On Numenius in general: Zeller Die Philosophie der Griechen iii. 2 (3rd ed. 1881) pp. 216-223.

5. Hermes Trismegistus? — The god Hermes and that as Trismegistus was first represented as an author by the Egyptians. According to Clem. Alex. Strom. vi. 4. 37 there were forty-two books of Hermes thirty-six of which contained the entire philosophy of the Egyptians the other six were devoted to medicine. Tertullian de anima c. 2 and 33 is already acquainted with books of Mercurius Aegyptius which taught a Platonizing psychology. From the latter circumstance it is seen that the later Platonists especially had already taken possession of this pseudonym. Thus then the works of Hermes which have come down to us are of Neo-Platonic origin. They are first cited by Lactantius and were probably of the third century after Christ. Their position with respect to the heathen popular religions is a thoroughly positive one. "Just the defence of

national and particularly of Egyptian religion is one of their chief objects" (Zeller iii. 2. 234 sq.). But all the pieces are not the work of one author nor are they even all of heathen origin. Neither can the co-operation of Jewish hands in the production of this literature be proved. On the contrary what is not of heathen seems to be of Christian origin (c. 1 and 13 of the so-called Poemander).

Comp. on this whole literature: Fabricius-Harles Biblioth. graec. i. 46-94. Bähr in Pauly's Real-Enc. iii. 1209-1214. Ueberweg Grundriss der Gesch. der Philosophie i. (4th ed. 1871) p. 256. Erdmann Grundriss der Gesch. der Philos. 3rd ed. 1878 vol. i. pp. 179-182. Zeller Die Philosophie der Griechen iii. 2 (3rd ed. 1881) pp. 224-235. Erdmann and Zeller did not enter into a thorough description of the Hermes works till the more recent editions of their works as cited above.

PHILO THE JEWISH PHILOSOPHER

I. THE LIFE AND WRITINGS OF PHILO

THE LITERATURE

Mangey's edition of the works of Philo the Prolegomena and especially the notes prefixed to the several works.

Fabricius Bibiotheca graeca ed. Harles vol. iv. (1795) pp. 721–750.

Scheffer Quaestionum Philonianarum part. I. sive de ingenio moribusque Judaeorum per Ptolemaeorum saecula Marburgi 1829. Idem De usu Philonis in interpretatione Novi Testamenti Marburgi 1831.

Gfrörer Philo und die alexandrinische Theosophie vol. i. (1831) pp. 1–113.

Creuzer "Zur Kritik der Schriften des Juden Philo" (Theol. Stud. und Krit. 1832 pp. 3–43).

Dähne "Einige Bemerkungen über die Schriften des Juden Philo" (Theol. Stud. und Krit. 1833 pp. 984–1040). Idem art. "Philon" in Ersch and Gruber's Allg. Encyklopädie § 3 vol. xxiii. (1847) pp. 435–454.

Grossman De Philonis Judaei operum continua serie et ordine chronologico Comment. Pts. i. ii. Lips. 1841–1842.

Steinhart art. "Philo" in Pauly's Real-Enc. der class. Alterthumswissensch. vol. v. (1848) p. 1499 sq.

J. G. Müller art. "Philo" in Herzog's Real-Enc. 1st ed. xi. (1859) pp. 578–603. Idem Ueber die Texteskritik der Schriften des Juden Philo Basel 1839 (printed in J. G. Müller Des Juden Philo Buch von der Weltschöpfung 1841 pp. 17–45).

Ewald Gesch. des Volkes Israel 3rd ed. vol. vi. (1868) pp. 257–312.

Ueberweg Grundriss der Gesch. der Philosophie 4th ed. i. (1871) pp. 240–249.

Hausrath Neutestamentliche Zeitgesch. 2nd ed. vol. ii. (1875) pp. 131–182

Delaunay Philon d' Alexandrie écrits historiques influence luttes et persécutions des juifs dans le monde romain 2nd ed. Paris 1870.

Treitel De Philonis Judaei sermone Bresl. 1872 (30 pp.).

Siegfried Die hebräischen Worterklärungen des Philo und die Spuren ihrer Einwirkung auf die Kirchenväter (37 pp. gr. 4) 1863. Idem "Philonische Studien" (Merx's Archiv für Erforschung des A. T. ii. 2 1872 pp. 143–163). Idem "Philo und der überlieferte Text der LXX." (Zeitschr. für wissenschaftl. Theol. 1873 pp. 217 sqq. 411 sqq. 522 sqq.). Idem Zur Kritik der Schriften Philo's

(Ebendas. 1874 p. 562 sqq.)

Siegfried Philo von Alexandria als Ausleger des Alten Testaments an sich selbst und nach seinem geschichtlichen Einfluss betrachtet. Nebst Untersuchungen über die Gräcität Philo's Jena 1875.

Nicolai Griechische Literaturgeschichte 2nd ed. ii. 2 (1877) pp. 653-659.

Grätz Gesch. der Juden vol. iii. (3rd ed. 1878) pp. 678-683.

Bernh. Ritter Philo und die Halacha eine vergleichende Studie Leipzig 1879.

Reuss Geschichte der heil. Schriften Alten Testaments (1881) § 566-568.

Hamburger Real-Enc. für Bibel und Talmud vol. ii. (1883) arts. "Philo" and "Religionsphilosophie."

Zöckler art. "Philo" in Herzog's Real-Enc. 2nd ed. xi. (1883) pp. 636-649.

Among Jewish Hellenists none other besides Josephus takes so eminent a position as Philo the Alexandrian. Even by reason of the extent of his works which have been handed down he is one of the most important to us. Of no other can we form even approximately so clear a picture of his thoughts and literary and philosophic labours. But he is also in himself evidently the most illustrious among all those who strove to unite Jewish belief with Hellenic culture to be the means of imparting to Jews the cultivation of the Greeks and to Greeks the religious knowledge of the Jews. No other Jewish Hellenist was so fully saturated with the wisdom of the Greeks; no other enjoyed equal consideration in history. This is testified by the immense influence which he exercised upon after times and above all upon Christian theology the inheritor of the Judaeo-Hellenistic.

We have but a few scanty notices concerning his life. The assertion of Jerome that he was of priestly race has no support from older sources nor does Eusebius know anything of it. According to Josephus he was a brother of the Alabarch Alexander and consequently a member of one of the most aristocratic families of Alexandrian Jews. The sole event in his life which can be chronologically fixed is his participation in the embassy to Caligula in A.D. 40 of which he has himself furnished an account in the work De Legatione ad Cajum. As he was then of advanced age he may have been born about the year 20-10 B.C. The Christian legend that he met St. Peter at Rome in the reign of Claudius is of no historical value.

Much has been lost of Philo's numerous works. But thanks to his being a favourite with the Fathers and Christian theologians the bulk of them has been preserved. Of the collective editions that of Mangey is notwithstanding its deficiencies the most valuable. Among recent contributions the works of Philo preserved only in Armenian published by Aucher are by far the most important. Greek portions of greater or less extent were given by Mai Grosamann and Tischendorf. Pitra has communicated material of various kinds from manuscripts. In the more recent hand editions these publications have been at least partially turned to account. A satisfactory collective edition is however as yet wanting. That planned long since by Grossmann has not been carried into execution. For a new edition a careful investigation also of the material offered by the as yet un-printed Florilegia (collections of extracts from the Fathers and more ancient authors) would be necessary.

A tolerably complete catalogue of Philo's works is already given by Eusebius in his Ecclesiastical History. Unfortunately however it is in such disorder as to afford no foothold for the correct classification of the works. In this respect we are almost exclusively referred to the contents of the works themselves a careful consideration of which evidently shows that they by no means form so unconnected a mass as appears from the titles in the editions. The great majority are on the contrary only sub-divisions of some few large works. And indeed as especially Ewald has correctly perceived three chief works on the Pentateuch may be distinguished which alone embrace more than three-quarters of what has come down to us as Philo's.

I. The Ζητήματα καὶ λύσεις Quaestiones et solutiones which first became more widely known through the publications of Aucher from the Armenian are a comparatively brief catechetical explanation of the Pentateuch in the form of questions and answers. It is not easy to ascertain how far they extended. In the time of Eusebius they were extant for only Genesis and Exodus (H. E. ii. 18. 1 and 5) and such other traces as may be regarded as certain extend only to these two books. The explanation of Genesis comprised probably six books at all events only so much can be certainly pointed out from the quotations. The explanation of Exodus comprised according to the testimony of Eusebius (H. E. ii. 18. 5) and Jerome five books. Of these are preserved (1) in the Armenian tongue about the half of these eleven books viz. four on Genesis (incomplete) and two on Exodus (also imperfect); and (2) a large fragment (comprising about half of the fourth book on Genesis) in an old Latin translation which was repeatedly printed in the beginning of the sixteenth century but entirely ignored by the publishers of the Greek works. Lastly (3) in Greek numerous small fragments still awaiting collection. By the help of the Armenian text it is now settled that many passages have been taken almost verbally from this work without mention of Philo's name by the Fathers and especially by Ambrose. The composition of these Quaestiones et solutiones is in some parts of earlier in other of later date than that of the large allegorical commentary as is shown by the allusions to each other in both works.

II. While this shorter explanation in a catechetical form was intended for more extensive circles Philo's special and chief scientific work is his large allegorical commentary on Genesis Νόμων ἱερῶν ἀλληγορίαι (such is the title given it in Euseb. Hist. eccl. ii. 18. 1 and Photius Bibliotheca cod. 103. Comp. also Origen Comment. in Matth. vol. xvii. c. 17; contra Celsum iv. 51). These two works frequently approximate each other as to their contents. For in the Quaestiones et solutiones also the deeper allegorical signification is given as well as the literal meaning. In the great allegorical commentary on the contrary the allegorical interpretation exclusively prevails. The deeper allegorical sense of the sacred letter is settled in extensive and prolix discussion which by reason of the copious adducting of parallel passages often seems to wander from the text. Thus the entire exegetic method with its dragging in of the most heterogeneous passages in elucidation of the idea supposed to exist in the text forcibly recalls the method of Rabbinical Midrash. This allegorical interpretation however has with all its arbitrariness its rules and laws the allegorical meaning as once settled for certain persons objects and events being afterwards adhered to with tolerable consistency. Especially is it a fundamental thought from which the exposition is everywhere deduced that the history of mankind as related in Genesis is in reality nothing else than a system of psychology and ethic. The different individuals who here make their appearance denote the different states of soul (τρόποι τῆς ψυχῆς) which occur among men. To analyse these in their variety and their relations both to each other and to the Deity and the world of sense and thence to deduce moral doctrines is the special aim of this great allegorical commentary. Thus we perceive at the same time that Philo's chief interest is not — as

might from the whole plan of his system be supposed — speculative theology for its own sake but on the contrary psychology and ethic. To judge from his ultimate purpose he is not a speculative theologian but a psychologist and moralist (comp. note 183).

The commentary at first follows the text of Genesis verse by verse. Afterwards single sections are selected and some of them so fully treated as to grow into regular monographs. Thus e.g. Philo takes occasion from the history of Noah to write two books on drunkenness (περὶ μέθης) which he does with such thoroughness that a collection of the opinions of other philosophers on this subject filled the first of these lost books (Mangey i. 357).

The work as we have it begins at Gen. 2:1: Καὶ ἐτελέσθησαν οἱ οὐρανοὶ καὶ ἡ γῆ. The creation of the world is therefore not treated of. For the composition De opificio mundi which precedes it in our editions is a work of an entirely different character being no allegorical commentary on the history of the creation but a statement of that history itself. Nor does the first book of the Legum allegorias by any means join on to the work De opificio mundi; for the former begins at Gen. 2:1 while in De opif. mundi the creation of man also according to Gen. 2 is already dealt with. Hence — as Gfrörer rightly asserts in answer to Dähne — the allegorical commentary cannot be combined with De opif. mundi as though the two were but parts of the same work. At most may the question be raised whether Philo did not also write an allegorical commentary on Gen. 1. This is however improbable. For the allegorical commentary proposes to treat of the history of mankind and this does not begin till Gen. 2:1. Nor need the abrupt commencement of Leg. alleg. i. seem strange since this manner of starting at once with the text to be expounded quite corresponds with the method of Rabbinical Midrash. The later books too of Philo's own commentary begin in fact in the same abrupt manner. In our manuscripts and editions only the first books bear the title belonging to the whole work Νόμων ἱερῶν ἀλληγορίαι. All the later books have special titles a circumstance which gives the appearance of their being independent works. In truth however all that is contained in Mangey's first vol. — viz. the works which here follow — belongs to the book in question (with the sole exception of De opificio mundi).

1. Νόμων ἱερῶν ἀλληγορίαι πρῶται τῶν μετὰ τὴν ἑξαήμερον. Legum allegoriarum liber i. (Mangey i. 43-65). On Gen. 2:1-17. — Νόμων ἱερῶν ἀλληγορίαι δεύτεραι τῶν μετὰ τὴν ἑξαήμερον. Legum allegoriarum liber ii. (Mangey i. 66-86). On Gen. 2:18-3:1. — Νόμων ἱερῶν ἀλληγορίαι τρίται τῶν μετὰ τὴν ἑξαήμερον. Legum allegoriarum liber iii. (Mangey i. 87-137). On Gen. 3:8-19. — The titles here given of the first three books as customary in the editions since Mangey require an important correction. Even the different extent of Books i. and ii. leads us to conjecture that they may properly be but one book. In fact Mangey remarks at the commencement of the third book (i. 87 note): in omnibus codicibus opusculum hoc inscribitur ἀλληγορία δευτέρα. Thus we have in fact but two books. There is however a gap between the two the commentary on Gen. 3:1-8 being absent. The commentary too on Gen. 3:20-23 is wanting for the following book begins with Gen. 3:24. As Philo in these first books follows the text step by step it must be assumed that each of the two pieces was worked up into a book by itself and this is even certain with respect to the second. Hence the original condition was very probably as follows: Book i. on Gen. 2:1-3 1 Book ii. on Gen. 3:1-3 8 Book iii. on Gen. 3:8-19 Book iv. on Gen. 3:20-23. With this coincides the fact that in the so-called Johannes Monachus ineditus the commentary on Gen. 3:8-19 is indeed more often quoted as τὸ γ′ τῆς τῶν νόμων ἱερῶν ἀλληγορίας (Mangey i. 87 note). When on the other hand the same book is entitled in the MSS. ἀλληγορία δευτέρα this must certainly be explained as showing that the actual second book was already missing in the archetype of these manuscripts.

2. Περὶ τῶν Χερουβὶμ καὶ τῆς φλογίνης ῥομφαίας καὶ τοῦ κτισθέντος πρώτου ἐξ ἀνθρώπου Κάϊν. De Cherubim et flammeo gladio (Mangey i. 138–162). On Gen. 3:24 and 4:1. From this point onwards the several books have been handed down no longer under the general title νόμων ἱερῶν ἀλληγορίαι but under special titles. According to our conjecture as above this book would be the fifth unless it formed the fourth together with the commentary on Gen. 3:20–23.

3. Περὶ ὧν ἱερουργοῦσιν Ἄβελ τε καὶ Κάϊν. De sacrificiis Abelis et Caini (Mangey i. 163–190). On Gen. 4:2–4. In the codex Vaticanus the title runs: Περὶ γενέσεως Ἄβελ καὶ ὧν αὐτὸς καὶ ὁ ἀδελφὸς αὐτοῦ Κάϊν ἱερουργοῦσιν. Frequently quoted in Johannes Monachus ineditus with the formula Ἐκ τοῦ περὶ γενέσεως Ἄβελ (see Mangey i. 163 note). Also in the Florilegium of the codex Coislinianus. The missing commentary on Gen. 4:5–7 would have formed either the conclusion of this book or a separate book.

4. Περὶ τοῦ τὸ χεῖρον τῷ κρείττονι φιλεῖν ἐπιτίθεσθαι. Quod deterius potiori insidiari soleat (Mangey i. 191–225). On Gen. 4:8–15. The book is already quoted by Origen under this special title (Comm. in Matth. vol. xv. c. 3). Eusebius mistakenly quotes under the same title several passages belonging to De confusione linguarum (Praep. Ev. xi. 15). In the Florilegium of Leontius and Johannes several passages are cited from our book with the formula ἐκ τοῦ ζ καὶ η τῆς νόμων ἱερῶν ἀλληγορίας. Also in Johannes Monachus ineditus (Mangey i. 191 note). The unusual formula ἐκ τοῦ ζ καὶ η must surely mean that the seventh book was according to another computation also called the eighth (ἐκ τοῦ ζ τοῦ καὶ η would thus be the more accurate). This book then is according to the usual numbering the seventh but was in consequence of De opificio mundi being placed first also called the eighth.

5. Περὶ τῶν τοῦ δοκησισόφου Κάϊν ἐγγόνων καὶ ὡς μετανάστης γίνεται. De posteritate Caini sibi visi sapientis et quo pacto sedem mutat (Mangey i. 226–261). On Gen. 4:16–25. This book was first published by Mangey from the cod. Vat. 381. Much more correctly from the same manuscript by Tischendorf Philonea pp. 84–143. Holwerda gave emendations in 1884 (see note 1 above). This book is in like manner as the former quoted with the formula ἐκ τοῦ η καὶ θ τῆς νόμων ἱερῶν ἀλληγορίας in Leontius and Johannes in the Florilegium of the codex Coislinianus and in Johannes Monachus ineditus (Mangey i. 226 note).

Of these hooks none is mentioned by its special title in the catalogue of Eusebius Hist. eccl. ii. 18 while all that follow are quoted under these titles evidently because Eusebius considers the former to be included and the latter not included in the joint title νόμων ἱερῶν ἀλληγορίαι. To this must be added that in the Florilegia also the quotations under the general title extend exactly thus far. It is therefore highly probable that Philo issued the following looks only under the special titles. Nay it is also evident why this was done viz. because from this point onwards the uninterrupted text was no longer commented on but only selected passages. The exegetic method is however quite the same in the following books.

6. Περὶ γιγάντων. De gigantibus (Mangey i. 262–272). On Gen. 6:1–4. – Ὅτι ἄτρεπτον τὸ θεῖον. Quod deus sit immutabilis (Mangey i. 272–299). On Gen. 6:4–12. These two paragraphs which are in our editions separated form together but one book. Hence Johannes Monachus ineditus cites passages from the latter paragraph with the formula ἐκ τοῦ περὶ γιγάντων (Mangey i. 262 note 272 note). Euseb. H. E. ii. 18. 4: περὶ γιγάντων ἢ [elsewhere καὶ] περὶ τοῦ μὴ τρέπεσθαι τὸ θεῖον.

7. Περὶ γεωργίας. De agricultura (Mangey i. 300–328). On Gen. 9:20. – Περὶ φυτουργίας Νῶε τὸ δεύτερον. De plantatione Noe (Mangey i. 329–356). On Gen. 9:20. The common title of

these two books is properly περὶ γεωργίας. Comp. Euseb. H. E. ii. 18. 2: περὶ γεωργίας δύο. Hieronymus De vir. illustr. 11: de agricultura duo. Euseb. Praep. Evang. vii. 13. 3 (ed. Gaisford): ἐν τῷ περὶ γεωργίας προτέρῳ. Ibid. vii. 13. 4: ἐν τῷ δευτέρῳ.

8. Περὶ μέθης. De ebrietate (Mangey i. 357–391). On Gen. 9:21. From the beginning of this book it is evident that another book preceded it in which τὰ τοῖς ἄλλοις φιλοσόφοις εἰρημένα περὶ μέθης were stated. This first book is lost but was still extant in the time of Eusebius Euseb. H. E. ii. 18. 2: περὶ μέθης τοσαῦτα (viz. two). Hieronymus vir. illustr. 11: de ebrietate duo. They seem to have been in the hands of Johannes Monachus ineditus in the reverse order. For what he quotes with the formula ἐκ τοῦ περὶ μέθης α′ is found in that which has come down to us; while what he cites with the formula ἐκ τοῦ περὶ μέθης δευτέρου λόγου is not found in it (Mangey i. 357 note).

9. Περὶ τοῦ ἐξένηψε Νῶε. De sobrietate (Mangey i. 392–403). On Gen. 9:24. – In the best manuscripts (Vaticanus and Mediceus) the title runs: περὶ ὧν ἀνανήψας ὁ νοῦς εὔχεται καὶ καταρᾶται (Mangey i. 392 note). Almost exactly the same Euseb. H. E. ii. 18. 2: περὶ ὧν νήψας ὁ νοῦς εὔχεται καὶ καταρᾶται. Hieronymus vir. illustr. 11: de his quae sensu precamur et detestamur.

10. Περὶ συγχύσεως διαλέκτων. De confusione linguarum (Mangey i. 404–435). On Gen. 11:1-9. – The same title also in Euseb. H. E. ii. 18. 2. In the Praep. evang. xi. 15 Eusebius quotes several passages from it with the mistaken statement that they are from: Περὶ τοῦ τὸ χεῖρον τῷ κρείττονι φιλεῖν ἐπιτίθεσθαι.

11. Περὶ ἀποικίας. De migratione Abrahami (Mangey i. 436–472). On Gen. 12:1-6. – The same title also in Eusebius H. E. ii. 18. 4.

12. Περὶ τοῦ τίς ὁ τῶν θείων πραγμάτων κληρονόμος. Quis rerum divinarum haeres sit (Mangey i. 437–518). On Gen. 15:1-18. – Euseb. H. E. ii. 18. 2: περὶ τοῦ τίς ὁ τῶν θείων ἐστὶ κληρονόμος ἢ περὶ τῆς εἰς τὰ ἴσα καὶ ἐναντία τομῆς. Hieronymus vir. illustr. 11 makes from this double title the two works: De haerede divinarum rerum liber unus De divisione aequalium et contrariorum liber. Suidas Lex. s.v. Φίλων also follows him. Johannes Monachus ineditus quotes this book with the formula ἐκ τοῦ τίς ὁ τῶν θείων κληρονόμος (Mangey i. 473 note). When he likewise quotes it with the formula ἐκ τοῦ περὶ κοσμοποιΐας (Mangey l.c.) we must not conclude from this that the latter was a general title which was applied to this book as well as others for we have here simply an error in quotation. In the commencement of this book a former composition is referred to in the words: Ἐν μὲν τῇ πρὸ ταύτης βίβλῳ περὶ μισθῶν ὡς ἐνῆν ἐπ' ἀκριβείας διεξήλθομεν. This composition is not lost as Mangey supposed (see his note on the passage) but is the book περὶ ἀποικίας which in fact treats περὶ μισθῶν. We see at the same time that Gen. 13–14 was not commented on by Philo.

13. Περὶ τῆς εἰς τὰ προπαιδεύματα συνόδου. De congressu quaerendae eruditionis causa (Mangey i. 519–545). On Gen. 16:1-6. – In Eusebius H. E. ii. 18. 2 the title runs: περὶ τῆς πρὸς τὰ παιδεύματα συνόδου. But the προπαιδεύματα which has come down in the Philo-manuscripts is preferable for the fact that Abraham cohabited with Hagar before he had issue by Sarah means according to Philo that we must become acquainted with propaideutic knowledge before we can rise to the higher wisdom and obtain its fruit namely virtue. Comp. also Philo's own allusion in the beginning of the following book (de profugis): Εἰρηκότες ἐν τῷ προτέρῳ τὰ πρέποντα περὶ τῶν προπαιδευμάτων καὶ περὶ κακώσεως κ.τ.λ.

14. Περὶ φυγάδων. De profugis (Mangey i. 546-577). On Gen. 16:6-14. – Euseb. H. E. ii. 18. 2: περὶ φυγῆς καὶ εὑρέσεως. And exactly so Johannes Monachus ineditus: ἐκ τοῦ περὶ φυγῆς καὶ εὑρέσεως (Mangey i. 546 note). This is without doubt the correct title. For the work deals with the flight and refinding of Hagar.

15. Περὶ τῶν μετονομαζομένων καὶ ὧν ἕνεκα μετονομάζονται. De mutatione nominum (Mangey i. 578-619). On Gen. 17:1-22. – The same title in Euseb. H. E. ii. 18. 3. Johannes Monachus ineditus quotes under this title much that is not found in this book nor in any of the preserved works of Philo (Mangey i. 578 note). In this book Philo alludes to a lost work: Τὸν δὲ περὶ διαθηκῶν σύμπαντα λόγον ἐν δυσὶν ἀναγέγραφα πράξεσι which was no longer extant in the time of Eusebius (comp. H. E. ii. 18. 3).

16. Περὶ τοῦ θεοπέμπτους εἶναι τοὺς ὀνείρους. De somniis lib. i. (Mangey i. 620-658). On Gen. 28:12 sqq. and 31:11 sqq. (the two dreams of Jacob). – Lib. ii. of the same work (Mangey i. 659-699). On Gen. 37 and 40-41 (the dreams of Joseph and of Pharaoh's chief butler and baker). – According to Euseb. H. E. ii. 18. 4 and Hieronymus vir. illustr. 11 Philo wrote five books on dreams. Thus three are lost. Those that have come down to us seem to judge from their openings to be the second and third. In any case our first was preceded by another which probably treated on the dream of Abimelech Gen. 20:3. Origenes contra Celsum vi. 21 fin. already mentions the paragraph on Jacob's ladder Gen. 28:12 (contained in the first of the preserved books).

III. The third chief group of Philo's works on the Pentateuch is a Delineation of the Mosaic Legislation for non-Jews. In this whole group indeed the allegorical explanation is still occasionally employed. In the main however we have here actual historical delineations a systematic statement of the great legislative work of Moses the contents excellence and importance of which the author desires to make evident to non-Jewish readers and indeed to as large a circle of them as possible. For the delineation is more a popular one while the large allegorical commentary is an esoteric and according to Philo's notions a strictly scientific work. The contents of the several compositions forming this group differ indeed considerably and are apparently independent of each other. Their connection however and consequently the composition of the whole work cannot according to Philo's own intimations be doubtful. As to plan it is divided into three parts. (a) The beginning and as it were the introduction to the whole is formed by a description of the creation of the world (κοσμοποιΐα) which is placed first by Moses for the purpose of showing that his legislation and its precepts are in conformity with the will of nature (πρὸς τὸ βούλημα τῆς φύσεως) and that consequently he who obeys it is truly a citizen of the world (κοσμοπολίτης) (de mundi opif. § 1). This introduction is next followed by (b) biographies of virtuous men. These are as it were the living unwritten laws (ἔμψυχοι καὶ λογικοὶ νόμοι de Abrahamo § 1 νόμοι ἄγραφοι de decalogo § 1) which represent in distinction from the written and specific commands universal moral norms (τοὺς καθολικωτέρους καὶ ὡσὰν ἀρχετύπους νόμους de Abrahamo § 1). Lastly the third part embraces (c) the delineation of the legislation proper which is divided into two parts: (1) that of the ten chief commandments of the law and (2) that of the special laws belonging to each of these ten commandments Then follow by way of appendix a few treatises on certain cardinal virtues and on the rewards of the good and the punishments of the wicked. This survey of the contents shows at once that it was Philo's intention to place before his readers a clear description of the entire contents of the Pentateuch which should be in essential matters complete. His view however is in this respect the genuinely Jewish one that these entire contents fall under the notion of the νόμος. The work begins with:

1. Περὶ τῆς Μωϋσέως κοσμοποιΐας. De mundi opificio (Mangey i. 1-42). – It was customary to place this work at the head of Philo's works before the first book of the Legum allegoriae. And this position has been resolutely defended especially by Dähne. Gfrörer on the other hand already convincingly showed that the book de Abrahamo must be immediately joined to de mundi opificio. He has only erred in the matter of declaring this whole group of writings older than the allegorical commentary (p. 33 sq.). It was easy to show in reply that this popular delineation of the Mosaic legislation is on the contrary more recent than the bulk of the allegorical commentary. On the other hand there is nothing to prevent our relegating the work de mundi opificio also to the more recent group. We have already shown p. 331 above that it is not connected with the allegorical commentary. On the contrary the beginning of the work de mundi opificio makes it quite evident that it was to form the introduction to the delineation of the legislation and it is equally plain that the composition de Abrahamo directly follows it. Comp. de Abrahamo § 1: Ὃν μὲν οὖν τρόπον ἡ κοσμοποιΐα διατέτακται διὰ τῆς προτέρας συντάξεως ὡς οἷόν τε ἦν ἠκριβώσαμεν. To refer this intimation to the whole series of the allegorical commentaries is both by reason of the expression κοσμοποιΐα and of the singular διὰ τῆς προτέρας συντάξεως quite impossible. – But however certain all this is the matter is not thus as yet settled. For on the other hand it is just as certain that the composition de mundi opificio was subsequently placed at the head of the allegorical commentaries to compensate for the missing commentary on Gen. 1. Only thus can it be explained that Eusebius Praep. evang. viii. 13 quotes a passage from this composition with the formula (viii. 12 fin. ed. Gaisford): ἀπὸ τοῦ πρώτου τῶν εἰς τὸν νόμον). It is just this which explains the transposition of this treatise into the catalogue of Eusebius Hist. eccl. ii. 18 (it was in his eyes comprised in the νόμων ἱερῶν ἀλληγορίαι) and also the peculiar form of citation: ἐκ τοῦ ζ καὶ η [resp. ἐκ τοῦ η καὶ θ] τῆς νόμων ἱερῶν ἀλληγορίας mentioned p. 333 above. – There still remains the question whether this supplementary insertion of the Legum allegoriae between de mundi opificio and de Abrahamo originated with Philo himself? This is especially the view of Siegfried. It seems to me however that the reasons brought forward are not conclusive. J. G. Müller has lately brought out a separate edition of this composition with a commentary.

2. Βίος σοφοῦ τοῦ κατὰ διδασκαλίαν τελειωθέντος ἢ περὶ τόμων ἀγράφων [α′] ὅ ἐστι περὶ Ἀβραάμ. De Abrahamo (Mangey ii. 1-40). – With this composition commences the group of the νόμοι ἄγραφοι i.e. the βίοι σοφῶν (de decalogo § 1) the biographies of virtuous men who exhibit by their exemplary behaviour the universal types of morality. Of such types there are twice three viz. (1) Enos Enoch Noah; (2) Abraham Isaac Jacob. Enos represents ἐλπίς Enoch μετάνοια καὶ βελτίωσις Noah δικαιοσύνη (de Abrahamo § 2 3 5). The second triad is more exalted: Abraham is the symbol of διδασκαλικὴ ἀρετή (virtue acquired by learning) Isaac of φυσικὴ ἀρετή (innate virtue) Jacob of ἀσκητικὴ ἀρετή (virtue attained by practice) see de Abrahamo § 11; de Josepho § 1 (Zeller iii. 2. 411). The first three are only briefly dwelt on. The greater part of this composition is occupied with Abraham. – In Eusebius H. E. ii. 18. 4 the title runs: βίου [read βίος] σοφοῦ τοῦ κατὰ δικαιοσύνην τελειωθέντος ἢ [περὶ] νόμων ἀγράφων. Δικαιοσύνην instead of the διδασκαλίαν furnished by the Philo manuscripts is here certainly incorrect. For Abraham is the type of διδασκαλικὴ ἀρετή. The number α′ must be inserted after ἀγράφων this book being only the first of the unwritten laws.

3. Βίος πολιτικὸς ὅπερ ἐστὶ περὶ Ἰωσήφ. De Josepho (Mangey ii. 41-79). – After the life of Abraham we next expect the biographies of Isaac and Jacob. That Philo wrote these is made certain by the opening of de Josepho. They seem however to have been very soon lost since not a trace of them is anywhere preserved. The beginning of de Josepho makes it also certain that this composition follows here which is strange since we might have expected that the

number of typical βίοι was exhausted with the triad Abraham Isaac and Jacob. Joseph however is made to succeed them because the examples of Abraham Isaac and Jacob refer only to the ideal cosmopolitan state of the world not to the empiric world with its various constitutions. The life of Joseph is therefore said to show "how the wise man has to move in actually existing political life." – In the editions the title is βίος πολιτικοῦ the manuscripts have βίος πολιτικός (Mangey ii. 41 note. Pitra Analecta ii. 317). Euseb. H. E. ii. 18. 6: ὁ πολιτικός. Photius Biblioth. cod. 103: περὶ βίου πολιτικοῦ. Suidas Lex. s.v. Ἀβραάμ• Φίλων ἐν τῷ τοῦ πολιτικοῦ βίῳ (Suidas in the article Φίλων following the Greek translator of Jerome writes περὶ ἀγωγῆς βίου).

4. Περὶ τῶν δέκα λογίων ἃ κεφάλαια νόμων εἰσί. De decalogo (Mangey ii. 180-209). – After the life of Joseph is generally inserted the life of Moses which certainly would according to its literary character be in place in this group. It is however nowhere intimated that this composition which comes forward quite independently is organically connected with the entire work now under discussion. Nay it would be an interruption in it. For in it Moses as a lawgiver stands alone he is thus no universally valid type of moral conduct nor is he depicted as such. – Hence the composition de decalogo with which the representation of the legislation proper (τῶν ἀναγραφέντων νόμων de decalogo § 1) begins reciting indeed first of all the ten commandments given by God Himself without the intervention of Moses must necessarily follow the life of Joseph. – The title of this composition vacillates very much in the manuscripts (Mangey ii. 180 note). The usual form περὶ τῶν δέκα λογίων resting on the cod. Augustanus is confirmed by Euseb. H. E. ii. 18. 5. Jerome in consequence of a careless abbreviation in the text of Eusebius has de tabernaculo et decalogo libri quattuor.

5. Περὶ τῶν ἀναφερομένων ἐν εἴδει νόμων εἰς τὰ συντείνοντα κεφάλαια τῶν δέκα λόγων α′ β′ γ′ δ′. On the special laws referring to the respective heads of the ten sayings Such is the title according to Euseb. H. E. ii. 18. 5 of the work de specialibus legibus; and with this agree the Philo-manuscripts with the sole exception that instead of εἰς τὰ συντείνοντα κεφάλαια τῶν δέκα λόγων its special contents are stated for each of the four books (e.g. εἰς τρία γένη τῶν δέκα λόγων τὸ τρίτον τὸ τέταρτον τὸ πέμπτον κ.τ.λ.). In this work Philo makes a very laudable attempt to reduce the special Mosaic laws to a systematic arrangement according to the ten rubrics of the decalogue. Thus he states in connection with the first and second commandments (the worship of God) the entire legislation concerning the priesthood and sacrifices in connection with the fourth (the sanctification of the Sabbath) all the laws concerning festivals in connection with the seventh (the prohibition of adultery) the marriage laws in connection with the remaining three the entire civil and criminal law. Herein notwithstanding the brevity of statement we frequently recognise an agreement with the Palestinian Halachah. Philo indeed has no professional acquaintance with it on which account we also meet with many divergences therefrom. According to the testimony of Eusebius H. E. ii. 18. 5 the whole work comprised four books which have it seems been preserved entire though needing to be restored from the mangling they have undergone in the manuscripts.

(a) Book I.: περὶ τῶν ἀναφερομένων ἐν εἴδει νόμων εἰς β′ κεφάλαια τῶν δέκα λογίων• τό τε μὴ νομίζειν ἔξω ἑνὸς θεοῦ ἑτέρους αὐτοκρατεῖς καὶ τὸ μὴ χειρότμητα θεὸν πλαστεῖν. This title which is missing in the editions stands in the cod. Mediceus at the head of the treatise de circumcisione (Mangey ii. 210 note). But even without this external evidence the commencement of the said treatise would of itself prove that this first book begins with it. The whole book comprises the following pieces: de circumcisione (Mangey ii. 210-212) de monarchia (Mangey ii. 213-222) de monarchia lib. ii. (Mangey ii. 222-232) de praemiis sacerdotum (ii. 232-237) de victimis (ii. 237-250) de sacrificantibus or de victimas offerentibus

(ii. 251-264) de mercede meretricis non accipienda in sacrarium (ii. 264-269).

(b) Book II.: περὶ τῶν ἀναφερομένων ἐν εἴδει νόμων εἰς τρία γένη τῶν δέκα λόγων τὸ τρίτον τὸ τέταρτον τὸ πέμπτον τὸ περὶ εὐορκίας καὶ σεβασμοῦ τῆς ἱερᾶς ἑβδομάδος καὶ γονέων τιμῆς. Under this title the editions give first only a small portion (Mangey ii. 270-277) and then add as a separate portion the treatise de septenario (Mangey ii. 227-298) which of course belongs to this book. The text of de septenario is however incomplete in Mangey and the treatise which we expect de colendis parentibus is entirely missing. The greater portion of this missing treatise was already given by Mai (De cophini festo et de colendis parentibus Mediolan. 1818 also in Classicor. auctor. vol. iv. 402-429); but the complete text of this book was first given by Tischendorf Philonea pp. 1-83.

(c) Book III.: περὶ τῶν ἀναφερομένων ἐν εἴδει νόμων εἰς δύο γένη τῶν δέκα λόγων τὸ ἕκτον καὶ τὸ ἕβδομον τὸ κατὰ μοίχων καὶ παντὸς ἀκολάστου καὶ τὸ κατὰ ἀνδροφόνων καὶ πάσης βίας (Mangey ii. 299-334). — According to Mangey ii. 299 note Philo here shows a knowledge of Roman law.

(d) Book IV.: περὶ τῶν ἀναφερομένων ἐν εἴδει νόμων εἰς τρία γένη τῶν δέκα λογίων τὸ η′ καὶ τὸ θ′ καὶ ί τὸ περὶ τοῦ μὴ ἐκικλέπτειν καὶ ψευδομαρτυρεῖν καὶ μὴ ἐπιθυμεῖν καὶ τῶν ἐς ἕκαστον ἀναφερομένων• καὶ περὶ δικαιοσύνης ἣ πᾶσι τοῖς λογίοις ἐφαρμόζει ὅ ἐστι τῆς συντάξεως (Mangey ii. 335-358). — This book was first published by Mangey from the cod. Bodleianus 3400. Some kind of word (such as τέλος) or the number δ′ is missing at the close of the title. In the editions the last sections also appear under the special titles: de judice (ii. 344-348) and de concupiscentia (ii. 348-358). That they are also integral portions of this book cannot considering their contents be doubtful. — To the same book too belongs as an appendix the treatise περὶ δικαιοσύνης de justitia (Mangey ii. 358-374) which again is in the editions wrongly divided into two sections: de justitia (ii. 358-361) and de creatione principum (ii. 361-374). The latter section does not deal exclusively with the appointment of authorities but is simply a continuation of the treatise de justitia. This whole treatise is closely connected with the fourth book de specialibus legibus nay forms part of it as is intimated by the closing words of the latter (Mang. ii. 358: νυνὶ δὲ περὶ τῆς … δικαιοσύνης λεκτέον) and especially by the title of the whole book in which it is expressly stated that it also treats περὶ δικαιοσύνης ἣ πᾶσι τοῖς λογίοις ἐφαρμόζει (Mangey ii. 335).

6. Περὶ τριῶν ἀρετῶν ἤτοι περὶ ἀνδρείας καὶ φιλανθρωπίας καὶ μετανοίας. De fortitudine (Mangey ii. 375-383) de caritate (ii. 383-405) de poenitentia (ii. 405-407). — The treatise de justitia the continuation of which is here given is referred to in the commencement of this book (περὶ δικαιοσύνης καὶ τῶν κατ' αὐτὴν ὅσα καίρια πρότερον εἰπὼν μέτειμι τὸ ἑξῆς ἐπ' ἀνδρίαν). This book then also belongs to the appendix of the work de specialibus legibus and it was only an external reason (viz. that of making the two books nearly equal in extent) which occasioned Philo to combine a portion of this appendix with the fourth book itself and to give the rest as a separate book. The title of this book is found as given by Mangey in cod. Bodleianus (Mang. ii. 375 note). Confirmed by Euseb. H. E. ii. 18. 2: περὶ τῶν τριῶν ἀρετῶν ἃς σὺν ἄλλαις ἀνέγραψε Μωϋσῆς. Hieronymus vir. illustr. 11: de tribus virtutibus liber unus. Two manuscripts the Mediceus and Lincolniensis have on the other hand: περὶ ἀρετῶν ἤτοι περὶ ἀνδρείας καὶ εὐσεβείας καὶ φιλανθρωπίας καὶ μετανοίας. It seems to speak in favour of this title that the treatise de caritate begins with the words (Mang. ii. 383): τὴν δὲ εὐσεβείας συγγενεστάτην καὶ ἀδελφὴν καὶ δίδυμον ὄντως ἑξῆς ἐπισκεπτέον φιλανθρωπίαν as though a treatise de pietate were missing between de fortitudine and de caritate. Still the words do not necessarily require this meaning. On the contrary the title of the Med. and Lincoln. seems to have arisen from this

incorrect meaning. — According to Gfrörer and Dähne only the treatise de fortitudine is in place here and the two others (de caritate and de poenitentia) must be entirely separated from it and added as an appendix to the Vita Mosis. The sole foundation however for this view is the bare fact that in the beginning of de caritate the Vita Mosis is cited. This is certainly too weak an argument to oppose to the testimony of the manuscripts to the connection of these three treatises with each other. Their contents on the contrary show that the treatises here placed together belong to the work de specialisms legibus. Those Mosaic laws also are here placed together which belong not to the rubrics of the ten commandments but to the rubric of certain cardinal virtues which latter indeed are only actually realized by the practice of the Decalogue in its entirety (compare the close of de concupiscentia ii. 358 Mangey).

7. Περὶ ἄθλων καὶ ἐπιτιμίων. De praemiis et poenis (Mangey ii. 408–428). — Περὶ ἀρῶν. De execrationibus (Mangey ii. 429–437). — These two pieces so inaptly separated from each other form in reality but one book. Comp. Euseb. H. E. ii. 18. 5: περὶ τῶν προκειμένων ἐν τῷ νόμῳ τοῖς μὲν ἀγαθοῖς ἄθλων τοῖς δὲ πονηροῖς ἐπιτιμίων καὶ ἀρῶν. — In the beginning of this composition Philo says that having in his former works treated of the three main categories of the Mosaic revelations (the κοσμοποιΐα the ἱστορικόν and the νομοθετικὸν μέρος) he now purposed to pass to the rewards appointed for the good and the penalties destined for the wicked. Hence this writing is later than the works of Philo hitherto discussed and joins on as a sort of epilogue to the delineation of the Mosaic legislation. — On the treatise de nobilitate which Mangey combines with this composition see below No. IV. 7.

IV. Besides these three large works on the Pentateuch Philo wrote several separate compositions of which the following have been preserved some entire some in fragments.

1. Περὶ βίου Μωσέως. Vita Mosis lib. i. (Mangey ii. 80–133) lib. ii. (Mangey ii. 134–144) lib. iii. (Mangey ii. 145–179). — The division into three books is already found in the manuscripts but is certainly a false one as is proved by the following quotation by Philo himself de caritate § 1 (Mangey ii. 383 sq.): δεδήλωται πρότερον ἐν δυσὶ συντάξεσιν ἃς ἀνέγραψα περὶ τοῦ βίου Μωϋσέως. Our books i. and ii. are in fact but one book as even their extent serves to show. The work is already quoted by Clemens Alexandrinus Strom. i. 23. 153: ᾗ φησι Φίλων ἐν τῷ Μωυσέως βίῳ. Comp. also Strom. ii. 19. 100. Hence it is the more remarkable that it should be absent from the catalogue of Eusebius. In its place appears (H. E. ii. 18. 5) a work περὶ τῆς σκηνῆς. Now as the tabernacle is fully described in the Vita Mosis the treatise περὶ τῆς σκηνῆς is certainly a portion of the Vita Mosis; probably however the text of Eusebius is imperfect. The date of composition of this work was according to Mangey ii. 141 (see the passage note 4 above) probably antecedent to that of the large work on the Mosaic legislation; but probably subsequent to de mundi opificio (see below note 8 and thus to speak more precisely between de mundi opif. and de Abrahamo. We have already seen (p. 342 sq.) that it is no integral element of the delineation of the Mosaic legislation though certainly connected with it by its entire literary character. For as in the larger work the Mosaic legislation so in this the life and acts of the legislator himself are wortrayed for heathen readers.

2. Περὶ τοῦ πάντα σπουδαῖον εἶναι ἐλεύθερον. Quod omnis probus liber (Mangey ii. 445–470). — This work is properly only one half of a larger one which worked out the thought suggested in the title in its two opposite aspects Euseb. H. E. ii. 18. 6: περὶ τοῦ δοῦλον εἶναι πάντα φαῦλον ᾧ ἑξῆς ἐστιν ὁ περὶ τοῦ πάντα σπουδαῖον ἐλεύθερον εἶναι. Philo himself alludes to the first and missing half in the opening of the second and preserved half. A long portion of the latter (on the Essenes) is given in Euseb. Praep. evang. viii. 12. The genuineness of the work has not been unassailed. The circumstance that the description of the Essenes differs in a few subordinate

points from that given by Philo himself in another work (Apologia pro Judaeis in Euseb. Praep. evang. viii. 11) has especially given rise to suspicion. Its genuineness is however according to the thorough investigations of Lucius surpassingly probable. The work may it is conjectured belong to Philo's earliest period and may not give the description of the Essenes according to his own inspection.

3. Εἰς Φλάκκον. Adversus Flaccum (Mangey ii. 517-544). — Περὶ ἀρετῶν καὶ πρεσβείας πρὸς Γάϊον. De legatione ad Cajum (Mangey ii. 545-600). — In these two books Philo relates the persecutions which the Jews had to endure especially at Alexandria in the time of Caligula. The narrative is so detailed and graphic that it could be written only by one who had himself participated in a prominent manner in the events. This circumstance makes these two books an authority of the first rank not only for the history of the Jews of those days but also for the history of Caligula. It cannot be perceived from the statements in Mangey how the titles run in the best manuscripts. On the title Φίλωνος εἰς Φλάκκον he only remarks (ii. 517): similiter codex Mediceus in reliquis vero manuscriptis scribitur Φίλωνος Ἑβραίου ἱστορία ὠφέλιμος καὶ πάνυ βίῳ χρήσιμος. Τὰ κατὰ τὸν Φλάκκον [sic: therefore not τοῦ Φλάκκου] ἤτοι περὶ προνοίας. Still more indefinite are Mangey's statements concerning the title of the second composition (ii. 545): in nonnullis codicibus sic legitur: ἱστορία χρήσιμος καὶ πάνυ ὠφέλιμος περὶ τῶν κατὰ τὸν Γάϊον καὶ τῆς αἰτίας τῆς πρὸς ἅπαν τὸ Ἰουδαίων ἔθνος ἀπεχθείας αὐτοῦ. According to the statements of Pitra (Analecta sacra ii. 318 sq.) the titles usual in the printed text Εἰς Φλάκκον and Περὶ ἀρετῶν καὶ πρεσβείας πρὸς Γάϊον appear to be also those which prevail in the manuscripts. In Photius Bibliotheca cod. 105 (ed. Bekker) it is said: Ἀνεγνώσθη δὲ αὐτοῦ καὶ λόγος οὗ ἡ ἐπιγραφὴ "Γάϊος ψεγόμενος" καὶ "Φλάκκος ἢ Φλάκκων ψεγόμενος" ἐν οἷς λόγοις κ.τ.λ. (therefore two λόγοι). So too Eusebius in the Chronicle. Comp. also Johannes Monachus ineditus (Mangey ii. 517): ἐκ τῶν κατὰ Φλάκκου. On the titles mentioned by Eusebius in the Ecclesiastical History see farther on. Only the two books which have come down to us seem to have been extant in the time of Photius. But the beginning of the first and the close of the second show that they are only portions of a larger whole. For the book adversus Flaccum begins (ii. 517): Δεύτερος μετὰ Σηιανὸν Φλάκκος Ἀουίλλιος διαδέχεται τὴν κατὰ τῶν Ἰουδαίων ἐπιβουλήν. Thus this book was preceded by another in which the persecutions inflicted on the Jews by Sejanus were narrated. The book de legatione ad Cajum moreover ends with the words: Εἴρηται μὲν οὖν κεφαλαιωδέστερον ἡ αἰτία τῆς πρὸς ἅπαν τὸ Ἰουδαίων ἔθνος ἀπεχθείας Γάϊου• λεκτέον δὲ καὶ τὴν παλινῳδίαν [πρὸς Γάϊον]. Hence another book must have followed in which Philo related the παλινῳδία i.e. the turn for the better in the fate of the Jews by the death of Caligula and the edict of toleration of Claudius. Now we know also from a notice in the Chronicle of Eusebius that the persecutions under Sejanus were related in the second book of this entire work. Consequently we should reckon not less than five books for the whole. And this is confirmed by the decided statement in the Ecclesiastical History of Eusebius ii. 5. 1: καὶ δὴ τὰ κατὰ Γάϊον οὗτος Ἰουδαίοις συμβάντα πέντε βιβλίοις παραδίδωσι. The brief survey too given by Eusebius of the contents of this work agrees exactly with these results. For he says that Philo here relates how in the time of Tiberius Sejanus made great exertions in Rome to destroy the whole nation and that in Judaea Pilate caused great commotion among the Jews because he desired to undertake something with respect to the temple which was contrary to their institutions. After the death however of Tiberius Caius who then came to the throne behaved indeed with the greatest arrogance to all but inflicted most injury on the whole Jewish nation. What is here said respecting Sejanus and Pilate cannot refer to some occasional declarations in the books preserved to us. For these treat only of the time of Caligula. The oppressions however of Sejanus and Pilate must according to the above intimations of Eusebius have been related in a separate paragraph before the events under

Caligula. From all that has been said the following must consequently have been the arrangement of the whole work. Book i. contained it may be presumed a general introduction. Book ii. related the oppressions in the reign of Tiberius by Sejanus in Rome and by Pilate in Judaea. Among the former must undoubtedly be placed the important measure of A.D. 19 by which all Jews were banished from Rome. Among the attempts of Pilate "to undertake something with respect to the temple contrary to Jewish institutions" the setting up of consecrated shields in the palace of Herod mentioned in the letter of Agrippa communicated by Philo cannot at all events be intended; we must rather regard them as the facts recorded by Josephus viz. that Pilate caused the soldiers to march into Jerusalem with the imperial ensigns and employed the temple-treasure in building an aqueduct. That the former act was also related by Philo is expressly testified by Eusebius. Book iii. is the preserved composition adversus Flaccum which relates the persecution of the Alexandrinian Jews arising from the initiative of the populace of that city in the commencement of Caligula's reign. It had as yet nothing to do with the setting up of the statue of the emperor in the Jewish synagogue nor with any edict of Caligula. In Book iv. on the contrary i.e. in the Legatio ad Cajum which is preserved are depicted the sufferings inflicted on the Jews in consequence of the edict of Caligula that Divine honours should everywhere be paid him. Lastly the lost Book v. treated of the παλινῳδία in the sense stated above.

The statements of Eusebius give rise also to some difficulties with regard to the title of the entire work. According to the passage from the Chronicle quoted above (note 6 the whole work seems to have been designated ἡ πρεσβεία. And Eusebius says also when giving the contents of the whole work that all this is written ἐν ᾗ συνέγραψε πρεσβείᾳ (H. E. ii. 5. 6). This title is therefore possible because Philo's account of the embassy to Caligula of which he was the leader forms in fact the kernel of the whole. The several books might then have had their special titles such as Φλάκκος or the like (see above p. 350). Now Eusebius says further towards the conclusion of his summary of the contents that Philo had related a thousand other sufferings which befell the Jews at Alexandria ἐν δευτέρῳ συγγράμματι ᾧ ἐπέγραψε "περὶ ἀρετῶν (H. E. ii. 6. 3). From this it appears to result that Philo had treated of these events in two works the title of one being ἡ πρεσβεία of the other περὶ ἀρετῶν. This inference is however precluded not only by its improbability but by the circumstance that Eusebius in his chief catalogue of Philo's writings H. E. ii. 18 only mentions the latter title. He says that Philo ironically gave to his work on the ungodly deeds of Caius the title περὶ ἀρετῶν (H. E. ii. 18. 8). No other work referring to these events is mentioned though the catalogue is in other respects a very complete one. We are thus I think constrained to admit that the δευτέρῳ is the gloss of a transcriber who could not make the different titles in ii. 5. 6 and ii. 6. 3 harmonize and that in fact both titles refer to one and the same work.

A special interest has always been attached to this work by reason of its importance as an historical authority. It has been repeatedly published separately translated into modern languages and made the subject of historical research. The dispute of its genuineness by Grätz scarcely deserves mention This book must not be confounded with the book de tribus virtutibus (see above p. 345) nor with that published by Mai de virtute ejusque partibus (see above note 1

4. Περὶ προνοίας. De providentia. – The title in Euseb. H. E. ii. 18. 6; Praep. evang. vii. 20 fin. viii. 13 fin. The work is only preserved in Armenian and has been published by Aucher with a Latin translation. Two Greek fragments a smaller and a very large one in Euseb. Praep. evang. vii. 21 and viii. 14. The Armenian text comprises two books. Of these however the first though on the whole genuine has at all events been preserved in only an abbreviated and in some

parts a touched up form. Eusebius seems to have been acquainted with only the second at least both fragments belong to this book and are introduced by Eusebius with the formula ἐν τῷ (Sing.) περὶ προνοίας. In the Ecclesiastical History the reading fluctuates between τὸ περὶ προνοίας and τὰ περὶ προνοίας. There are quotations also in Johannes Damascenus and Johannes Monachus ineditus.

5. Ἀλέξανδρος ἢ περὶ τοῦ λόγον ἔχειν τὰ ἄλογα ζῶα (this title in Euseb. H. E. ii 18. 6). De Alexandro et quod propriam rationem muta animalia habeant (so Jerome de viris illustr. c. 11). — This work too is preserved only in Armenian and has been published by Aucher. Two short Greek fragments are found in the Florilegium of Leontius and Johannes. The book belongs to Philo's later works the embassy to Rome being already contemplated p. 152 (ed. Aucher).

6. Ὑποθετικά. — Our knowledge of this work rests solely on the fragments in Euseb. Praep. evang. viii. 6-7 which are introduced by Eusebius with the words (viii. 5 fin.): Φίλωνος … ἀπὸ τοῦ πρώτου συγγράμματος ὧν ἐπέγραψεν Ὑποθετικῶν ἔνθα τὸν ὑπὲρ Ἰουδαίων ὡς πρὸς κατηγόρους αὐτῶν ποιούμενος λόγον ταῦτά φησιν. The title does not signify "suppositions concerning the Jews" but as Bernays has pointed out "counsels recommendations." For Ὑποθετικοὶ λόγοι are such dissertations as contain moral counsels or recommendations in contradistinction to theoretical investigations of ethic questions. Philo as the preserved fragments already show has devoted the main point of his work to the discussion of such Jewish precepts as he could recommend to the obedience of a non-Jewish circle of readers to whom the work is unmistakeably directed. As the work pursues apologetic aims we might be inclined to regard it as identical with the Apologia pro Judaeis to be forthwith mentioned but that Eusebius distinguishes the two by different titles.

7. Περὶ Ἰουδαίων. — This title in Euseb. H. E. ii. 18. 6. Ἡ ὑπὲρ Ἰουδαίων ἀπολογία from which Eusebius (Praep. evang. viii. 11) borrows the description of the Essenes is certainly identical with this work. The conjecture of Dähne that the piece de nobilitate (Mangey ii. 437-444) also belongs to this work is not improbable. It treats of true nobility i.e. of the wisdom and virtue of which the Jewish nation also was not devoid and is therefore a very suitable element in an apology for the Jews. The genuineness of the ἀπολογία has been recently disputed by Hilgenfeld (see above note 5

V. The last-named works are only known to us by fragments but the following books most of which have been already mentioned in this survey are entirely lost. (1) Of the Quaestiones et solutiones two books on Genesis and more than three on Exodus (see above p. 327). (2) Two books of the Legum allegoriae (see above p. 332). (3) The first book περὶ μέθης (see p. 335). (4) Both the books περὶ διαθηκῶν (see p. 337). (5) Three of the five books de somniis (see p. 337). (6) The two biographies of Isaac and Jacob (see p. 342). (7) The work περὶ τοῦ δοῦλον εἶναι πάντα φαῦλον (see p. 349). (8) The first second and fifth books of the work on the persecutions of the Jews under Caligula (see p. 350). (9) A work περὶ ἀριθμῶν to which Philo refers in the Vita Mosis and elsewhere. (10) A dialogue between Isaac and Ishmael on the difference between true wisdom and sophisticism of which it is not indeed certain whether Philo wrote or only intended to write it. (11) According to a remark in Quod omnis probus liber Philo intended to write a disquisition "On the government of the wise." We do not know whether this intention was carried out. (12) In the Florilegium of Leontius and Johannes a small piece is cited ἐκ τῶν περὶ τοῦ ἱεροῦ. Can a work known to us under some other name be intended?

VI. The following supposed works of Philo are now pretty generally regarded as spurious: —

1. Περὶ βίου θεωρητικοῦ ἢ ἱκετῶον ἀρετῶν. De vita contemplativa (Mangey ii. 471-486). — Eusebius twice cites the title in the following form (H. E. ii. 17. 3 and ii. 18. 7): περὶ βίου θεωρητικοῦ ἢ ἱκετῶν. The ἀρετῶν added at the end must therefore be expunged. Eusebius H. E. ii. 17 gives full information concerning the contents comp. also ii. 16. 2. This composition has since the time of Eusebius enjoyed special approbation in the Christian Church. Christian monks being almost universally recognised in the "Therapeutae" here described and glorified. The likeness is indeed surprising; but for that very reason the suspicion is also well founded that the author's design was under the mask of Philo to recommend Christian monachism. But apart from this there are other suspicious elements by reason of which even such critics as do not regard the Therapeutae as representing a Christian but as a Jewish ideal of life have denied the authorship of Philo. Upon the ground of the identification of the Therapeutae with Christian monks Lucius after the precedent of Grätz and Jost has declared this composition spurious. It is by his thorough and methodical investigation that the spuriousness of its authorship has been definitely decided.

2. Περὶ ἀφθαρσίας κόσμου. De incorruptibilitate mundi (Mangey ii. 487-516). — This composition is regarded as genuine by Grossmann and Dähne. But even the transmission of the manuscripts and the external testimony are unfavourable to its genuineness which since the investigations of Bernays has been generally given up. Bernays has also especially shown that the traditional text has fallen into disorder through the transposition of the pages. He has published the text in Greek and German according to the order restored by himself and furnished it with a commentary. Bücheler gives emendations of Bernays' text. Zeller attempts to show that the composition has been touched up.

3. Περὶ κόσμου. De mundo (Mangey ii. 601-624). — The spuriousness of this work has long been acknowledged. It is a collection of extracts from other works of Philo especially from the composition de incorruptibilitate mundi.

4. De Sampsone (Aucher Paralipomena Armena 1826 pp. 549-577). — De Jona (Aucher pp. 578-611). — A general agreement prevails as to the spuriousness of these two discourses which are published in Armenian and Latin by Aucher.

5. Interpretatio Hebraicorum nominum. Origen Comment. in Joann. vol. ii. c. 27 (Opp. ed. Lommatzsch i. 150) mentions an apparently anonymous work on this subject: εὕρομεν τοίνυν ἐν τῇ ἑρμηνείᾳ τῶν ὀνομάτων. Eusebius says that it is ascribed to Philo but the manner in which he speaks of it plainly shows that he was only acquainted with the work as an anonymous one H. E. ii. 18. 7: καὶ τῶν ἐν νόμῳ δὲ καὶ προφήταις Ἑβραϊκῶν ὀνομάτων αἱ ἑρμηνεῖαι τοῦ αὐτοῦ σπουδαὶ εἶναι λέγονται. Jerome says that according to the testimony of Origen Philo was the author. Hence he evidently saw the work only in an anonymous copy. He himself desired to translate it into Latin but found the text so barbarized that he considered it necessary to undertake an entirely new work. In the preface he expresses himself concerning the history of these Onomastica as follows: Philo vir disertissimus Judaeorum Origenis quoque testimonio conprobatur edidisse librum hebraicorum nominum eorumque etymologias juxta ordinem litterarum e latere copulasse. Qui cum vulgo habeatur a Graecis et bibliothecas orbis inpleverit studii mihi fuit in latinam eum linguam vertere Verurn tam dissona inter se exemplaria repperi et sic confusum ordinem ut tacere melius judicaverim quam reprehensione quid dignum scribere. Itaque.... singula per ordinem scripturarum volumina percucurri et vetus aedificium nova cura instaurans fecisse me reor quod a Graecis quoque adpetendum sit.... Ac ne forte consummato aedificio quasi extrema deesset manus novi testamenti verba et nomina interpretatus sum imitari volens ex parte Origenem quem post apostolos ecclesiarum magistrum nemo nisi

inperitus negat. Inter cetera enim ingeni sui praeclara monimenta etiam in hoc laboravit ut quod Philo quasi Judaeus omiserat hic ut christianus inpleret. According to this account of Jerome it must certainly be admitted that Origen already considered Philo to be the author. But the work being anonymous his testimony is not sufficient and the question of authorship cannot be decided on internal grounds because the work is no longer extant in its most ancient form. A tolerably copious list of Philonean etymologies may be collected from those works of Philo which have been preserved.

6. On a Latin work de biblicis antiquitatibus ascribed to Philo see Fabricius-Harles iv. 743 and especially Pitra Analecta sacra ii. 298 sq. 319–322. The pseudo-Philonian Breviarum temporum a forgery of Annius of Viterbo (Fabricius-Harles l.c.) must not be confounded with this. On the treatise de virtute ejusque partibus published by Mai under Philo's name see above note 1.

II. THE DOCTRINE OF PHILO

THE LITERATURE

Stahl "Versuch eines systematischen Entwurfs des Lehrbegriffs Philo's von Alexandrien" (Eichhorn's Allgemeine Bibliothek der biblischen Litteratur vol. iv. paragraph 5 1793 pp. 765–890).

Grossmann Questiones Philoneae. I. De theologiae Philonis fontibus et auctoritate quaestionis primae particula prima. II. De λόγῳ Philonis. Quaestio altera. Lips. 1829.

Gfrörer Philo und die alexandrinische Theosophie (also under the title Kritische Geschichte des Urchristenthums) 2 vols. Stuttgard 1831.

Dähne Geschichtliche Darstellung der jüdisch-alexandrinischen Religions-Philosophie 2 vols. Halle 1834. Comp. also his art. "Philon" in Ersch and Gruber's Encyklopädie.

Ritter Geschichte der Philosophi vol. iv. (1834) pp. 418–492.

Georgii "Ueber die neuesten Gegensätze in Auffassung der Alexandrinischen Religionsphilosophie insbesondere des Jüdischen Alexandrinismus" (Zeitschr. für die histor. Theol. 1839 No. 3 pp. 3–98 No. 4 pp. 3–98).

Lücke Commentar über das Evang. des Johannes vol. i. (3rd ed. 1840) p. 272 sqq.

Keferstein Philo's Lehre von den göttlichen Mittelwesen zugleich eine kurze Darstellung der Grundzüge des philonischen Systems Leipzig 1846.

Bucher Philonische Studien Tübingen 1848.

Niedner De subsistentia τῷ θείῳ λόγῳ apud Philonem tributa quaestionis Parts i. ii. Lips. 1848 1849 (also in the Zeitsch. für die histor. Theol. 1849).

Lutterbeck Die neutestamentlichen Lehrbegriffe vol. i. (1852) pp. 418–446.

Dorner Entwickelungsgesch. der Lehre von der Person Christi vol. i. pp. 21–57.

Wolff Die philonische Philosophie in ihren Hauptmomenten dargestellt 2nd ed. 1858.

Joel “Ueber einige geschichtliche Beziehungen des philonischen Systems” (Monatsschr. für Gesch. und Wissensch. des Judenth. 1863 pp. 19-31).

Frankel “Zur Ethik des jüdisch-alexandrinischen Philosophen Philo” (Monatsschr. für Gesch. und Wissensch. des Judenth. 1867 pp. 241-252 281-297).

Keim Gesch. Jesu i. 208-225.

Lipsius art. “Alexandrinische Religionsphilosophie” in Schenkel’s Bibellex. i. 85-99.

Zeller Die Philosophie der Griechen in ihrer geschichtlichen Entwicklung Part iii. Div. 2 (3rd ed. 1881) pp. 338-418.

Heinze Die Lehre vom Logos in der griechischen Philosophie (1872) pp. 204-297.

Stein Sieben Bücher zur Geschichte des Platonismus Part iii. (1875) pp. 3-17.

Soulier La doctrine du Logos chez Philon d’Alexandrie Turin 1876 (comp. Theol. Litztg. 1877 101).

Réville Le Logos d’après Philon d’Alexandrie Genève 1877 (see Bursian’s Philol. Jahresber. xxi. 35 sq.). The same La doctrine du Logos dans le quatrième évangile et dans les oeuvres de Philon Paris 1881.

Nicolas “Etudes sur Philon d’Alexandrie” (Revue de l’histoire desreligions vol. v. 1882 pp. 318-339; vol. vii. 1883 pp. 145-164; vol. viii. 1883 pp. 468-488 582-602 756-772).

Comp. also the works and articles mentioned above p. 321 sq. of Steinhart J. G. Müller Ewald Ueberweg Hausrath Siegfried Hamburger Zöckler.

The survey already given of Philo’s works is sufficient to show the many-sidedness of his culture and of his literary efforts. That which applies to the representatives of Judaeo-Hellenism in general viz. that they combined in themselves both Jewish and Hellenic culture is pre-eminently true of him. It must be admitted that Greek philosophy comes the most prominently into the foreground. He was a man saturated with every means of culture afforded in his age by the schools of the Greeks. His diction was formed by the Greek classical authors; and especially “may the influence of Plato’s works upon Philo in even a lexical and phraseological respect be called very considerable.” He was intimately acquainted with the great Greek poets Homer Euripides and others whom he occasionally quotes. But it is the philosophers whom he most highly esteems. He calls Plato “the great;” Parmenides Empedocles Zeno Cleanthes are in his eyes divine men and form a sacred society. But it is his own view of the world and of life which shows more than aught else how highly he esteemed the Greek philosophers. It agrees in the most essential points with the great teachers of the Greeks. Nay Philo has so profoundly absorbed their doctrines and so peculiarly worked them up into a new whole as himself to belong to the series of Greek philosophers. His system may on the whole be entitled an eclectic one Platonic Stoic and Neo-Pythagorean doctrines being the most prominent. Just in proportion as now one now the other was embraced has he been designated at one time a Platonist at another a Pythagorean. He might just as correctly be called a Stoic for the influence of Stoicism was at least as strong upon him as that of Platonism or Neo-Pythagoreanism.

Notwithstanding however this profound appropriation of Greek philosophy Philo remained a Jew: and the wisdom of the Greeks did not make him unfaithful to the religion of his fathers. Nor must his Jewish education be depreciated in presence of the philosophical culture which certainly appears the more prominent. He was not indeed fluent in the Hebrew tongue and he read the Old Testament exclusively in the Greek translation. Still he had a respectable knowledge of Hebrew as is shown by his numerous etymologies which indeed often appear absurd to us but are in truth not worse than those of the Palestinian Rabbis. He had indeed no accurate knowledge of the Palestinian Halachah. But that he had a general acquaintance with it is proved not only by a single decided intimation but especially by his whole work de specialibus legibus. In the Haggadic interpretation of Scripture he was quite a master. For the whole of his allegorical commentary is with respect to form nothing else than a transference of the method of the Palestinian Midrash to the region of Hellenism. It is just by this means that Philo gains the possibility of showing that his philosophical doctrine already exists in the Old Testament. Many close approximations are also found with respect to substance though these are much slighter than the agreement in method. For his legendary embellishment of the life of Moses Philo expressly appeals to the tradition of the πρεσβύτεροι who "always combined oral tradition with what was read aloud."

Philo has nowhere given a systematic statement of his system. He has at most developed single points such as the doctrine of the creation of the world with some degree of connection. As a rule he gives the ideas he has worked out in conjunction with the text of the Old Testament This is consistent with the formal principle of his whole theology viz. the assumption of the absolute authority of the Mosaic law. The Thorah of Moses is to him as to every Jew the supreme nay the sole and absolutely decisive authority: a perfect revelation of Divine wisdom. Every word written in Holy Scripture by Moses is a divine declaration. Hence no word in it is without definite meaning. The Scriptures also of the other prophets in conjunction with those of Moses contain Divine revelations. For all the prophets are God's interpreters who makes use of them as instruments for the revelation of the Divine will. With this formal principle of the absolute authority of Holy Scripture and especially of the Mosaic law is connected the further assumption that all true wisdom was actually contained just in this source of all knowledge. In other words Philo deduces formally from the Old Testament all those philosophical doctrines which he had in fact appropriated from the Greek philosophers. Not in Plato Pythagoras and Zeno but above all in the writings of Moses is to be found the deepest and most perfect instruction concerning things divine and human. In them was already comprised all that was good and true which the Greek philosophers subsequently taught. Thus Moses is the true teacher of mankind and it is from him – as Philo like Aristobulus presupposes – that the Greek philosophers derived their wisdom.

The scientific means by which it was possible for Philo to adhere to and carry out these assumptions is allegorical interpretation. This was no invention of Philo but one which had already been perfected and wielded by others. Hence it was for him a quite self-evident process which he nowhere thought it necessary to justify although he occasionally extols its value and declares it indispensable. By the help of this process he was able to read out of the primitive history of Genesis those profound philosophical theories especially in the department of Psychology and Ethic which really grew up in the soil of Greek philosophy. The most external occurrences of scriptural history become in his hands mines of instruction concerning the supreme problems of human existence.

Only by means of this method could the double mission be in fact fulfilled which Philo saw

allotted to him. He thus became to his Jewish co-religionists with whom he shared the presupposition of the Divine authority of the Mosaic law the medium of the philosophic culture of the Greeks; showing them that Moses had taught just what appeared to him true and valuable in Greek philosophy. On the other hand he proved to the Greeks by the same means that all the knowledge and intuition for which they so highly esteemed their own philosophers were already to be found in the writings of Moses. It was not they but Moses who was both the best of lawgivers and the first and greatest of philosophers. These two tendencies are it may be plainly perceived the mainsprings of Philo's extensive literary activity. Being himself both Jew and Greek he desired to act upon both to make the Jews Greeks and the Greeks Jews. His religious assumptions are in the first place those of Judaism with its belief in revelation. But these religious assumptions underwent a powerful and peculiar modification by the elements which he derived from the Greek philosophy. And as he combined both in himself he desired to set up a propaganda on both sides.

No strictly completed system of Philo can in truth be spoken of. The elements of which his view of the world is compounded are too heterogeneous to form a strictly completed unity. Nevertheless his several views exhibit a connected whole whose members mutually condition one another. In the following attempt to give a brief sketch of this whole we shall leave out of consideration his specifically Jewish assumptions and confine ourselves to his philosophical views. The characteristic feature of his standpoint is just this that his philosophy i.e. his entire view of the world may be completely stated without the necessity of mentioning any Jewish particularistic notions. His Judaism virtually consists in the formal claim that the Jewish people are by reason of the Mosaic revelation in possession of the highest religious knowledge — one might almost say of the true religious illumination. In a material respect Greek views have gained the upper hand. For even his theology is only so far Jewish as to insist on monotheism and on the worship of God apart from images. In this however it stands in opposition only to the polytheism of the heathen religions but not to the idea of God of Greek philosophy which on the contrary Philo very closely follows. Thus his Judaism is already very powerfully modified. Moreover the specifically Jewish i.e. the particularistic notions are embraced by him in a form which is tantamount to their denial. It is just this which makes it possible entirely to disregard them in a sketch of his view of the world. — The following survey follows chiefly the excellent exposition of Zeller certainly the best we now have.

1. The Doctrine of God. The fundamental thought from which Philo starts is that of the dualism of God and the world. God alone is good and perfect the finite as such is imperfect. All determinations which are adapted to finite existence are therefore to be denied of God. He is eternal unchangeable simple free self-sufficing. He is not only free from human faults but exalted above human virtuss He is better than the good and the beautiful. Nay since every determination would be a limitation He is devoid of qualities ἄποιος without a ποιότῃς and thus His nature is undefinable. We can only say that He is not what He is. — It is true that together with these purely negative definitions which advance almost to an absence of attributes is found also a series of positive assertions on the nature of God by which assertions of the former kind are again abolished. This contradiction however is not to be wondered at. For the object of this assertion of an absence of attributes is merely to remove all limitation all imperfection from God. And therefore Philo makes no difficulty in placing beside it the other assertion: that all perfection is combined in God and derived from Him He fills and comprises everything. All perfection in the creature is derived solely and only from Him

2. The Intermediate Beings. God as the absolutely Perfect cannot enter into direct contact with

matter. All contact therewith would defile Him. An acting therefore of God upon the world and in the world is according to Philo only possible through the intervention of intermediate causes of interposing powers who establish an intercourse between God and the world. For the more precise definition of these intermediate beings four notions suited to this purpose offered themselves to Philo; two belonging to the philosophical two to the religious region. These were the Platonic doctrine of ideas the Stoic doctrine of active causes the Jewish doctrine of angels and the Greek doctrine of daemons. All these elements but chiefly the Stoic doctrine of powers were used by Philo in constructing his peculiar doctrine of intermediate beings. Before the creation of this world of the senses he teaches God created the spiritual types of all things. These types or ideas must however be conceived of as active causes as powers which bring disordered matter into order. It is by means of these spiritual powers that God acts in the world. They are His ministers and vicegerents the ambassadors and mediums between God and things finite the λόγοι or partial powers of the universal reason. By Moses they are called angels by the Greeks daemons. If according to this they appear to be conceived of as independent hypostases nay as personal beings other assertions again forbid us to take them for decidedly such. It is expressly said that they exist only in the Divine thought. They are designated as the infinite powers of the infinite God and thus regarded as an inseparable portion of the Divine existence. But it would again be a mistake on the ground of these assertions to deny definitely the personification of the λόγοι or δυνάμεις. The truth is just this that Philo conceived of them both as independent hypostases and as immanent determinations of the Divine existence. And it is an apt remark of Zeller's that this contradiction is necessarily required by the premisses of Philo's system. "He combines both definitions without observing their contradiction nay he is unable to observe it because otherwise the intermediary rôle assigned to the Divine powers would be forfeited even that double nature by reason of which they are on the one hand to be identical with God that a participation in the Deity may by their means be possible to the finite and on the other hand different from Him that the Deity notwithstanding this participation may remain apart from all contact with the world."

With this ambiguous view of the nature of the δυνάμεις the question as to their origin must also necessarily remain undecided. It is true that Philo frequently expresses himself in an emanistic sense. But yet he never distinctly formulates the doctrine of emanation. The number of the δυνάμεις is in itself unlimited. Yet Philo sometimes gives calculations when comprising the individual powers under certain notions of species. He mostly distinguishes two supreme powers: goodness and might which again are combined and reconciled by the Divine Logos which so far as it is reckoned among the powers at all is the chief of all the root from which the rest proceed the most universal intermediary between God and the world that in which are comprised all the operations of God.

3. The Logos. "By the Logos Philo understands the power of God or the active Divine intelligence in general; he designates it as the idea which comprises all other ideas the power which comprises all powers in itself as the entirety of the supersensuous world or of the Divine powers." It is neither uncreated nor created after the manner of finite things. It is the vicegerent and ambassador of God; the angel or archangel which delivers to us the revelations of God; the instrument by which God made the world. The Logos is thus identified with the creative word of God. But not only is it the mediator for the relations of God to the world but also for the relations of the world to God. The Logos is the High Priest who makes intercession for the world to God. But notwithstanding this apparently undoubted personification of the Logos what has been said above of the Divine powers in general applies here also. "The definitions which according to the presuppositions of our thought would require the personality of the Logos are crossed in Philo

by such as make it impossible and the peculiarity of his mode of conception consists in his not perceiving the contradiction involved in making the idea of the Logos oscillate obscurely between personal and impersonal being. This peculiarity is equally misunderstood when Philo's Logos is regarded absolutely as a person separate from God and when on the contrary it is supposed that it only denotes God under a definite relation according to the aspect of His activity. According to Philo's opinion the Logos is both but for this very reason neither one nor the other exclusively; and he does not perceive that it is impossible to combine these definitions into one notion." "But Philo cannot dispense with these definitions. With him the Logos like all the Divine powers is only necessary because the supreme God Himself can enter into no direct contact with the finite; it must stand between the two and be the medium of their mutual relation; and how can it be this unless it were different from both if it were only a certain Divine property? In this case we should have again that direct action of God upon finite things which Philo declares inadmissible. On the other hand the Logos must now indeed be again identical with each of the opposites which it was to reconcile it must likewise be a property of God as a power operative in the world. Philo could not without contradiction succeed in combining the two."

Philo was as it seems the first to postulate under the name of the Logos such an intermediate being between God and the world. Points of contact for his doctrine lay in both Jewish theology and Greek philosophy. In the former it was chiefly the doctrine of the wisdom of God and in the second place that of the Spirit and the Word of God which Philo took up. From the Platonic philosophy it was the doctrine of ideas and of the soul of the world which he utilized for his purpose. But it is the Stoic doctrine of the Deity as the active reason of the world which is the nearest to his. "We need only to strip off from this Stoic doctrine of the Logos its pantheistic element by distinguishing the Logos from the Deity and its materialistic element by distinguishing it from organized matter to have the Philonean Logos complete."

4. The creation and preservation of the world. All existence cannot however the intermediate beings notwithstanding be traced back to God. For the evil the imperfect can in no wise not even indirectly have its cause in God. It originates from a second principle from matter (ὕλη or stoically οὐσία). This is the formless lifeless unmoved unordered mass devoid of properties from which God by means of the Logos and the divine powers formed the world. For only a forming of the world and not creation in its proper sense is spoken of in Philo since the origin of matter is not in God but it is placed as a second principle beside Him. And the preservation of the world as well as its formation is effected by means of the Logos and the Divine powers. Nay the former is in truth but a continuation of the latter; and what we call the laws of nature are but the totality of the regular Divine operations.

5. Anthropology. It is in anthropology where Philo chiefly follows the Platonic doctrine that the dualistic basis of his system comes most strongly to light. Philo here starts from the assumption that the entire atmosphere is filled with souls. Of these it is the angels or demons dwelling in its higher parts who are the mediums of God's intercourse with the world. Those on the contrary who remain nearer to the earth are attracted by sense and descend into mortal bodies. Consequently the soul of man is nothing else than one of those Divine powers of those emanations of Deity which in their original state are called angels or daemons. It is only the life-sustaining sensitive soul that originates by generation and indeed from the aeriform elements of the seed; reason on the contrary enters into man from without. The human πνεῦμα is thus an emanation of Deity: God breathed His spirit into man. — The body as the animal part of man is the source of all evil it is the prison to which the spirit is banished the corpse which the soul drags about with it the coffin or the grave from which it will first awake to true life. Sense as such

being evil sin is innate in man No one can keep himself free from it even if he were to live but a day.

6. Ethic. According to these anthropologic assumptions it is self-evident that the chief principle of ethic is the utmost possible renunciation of sensuousness the extirpation of desire and of the passions. Hence among philosophical systems the Stoic must be most of all congenial to Philo in the matter of ethic. It is this that he chiefly embraces not only in its fundamental thought of the mortification of the senses but also in single statements as in the doctrine of the four cardinal virtues and of the four passions. Like the Stoics he teaches that there is only one good morality; like them he requires freedom from all passions and the greatest possible simplicity of life; like them he also is a cosmopolitan. But with all this affinity Philo's ethic still essentially differs from the Stoic. The Stoics refer man to his own strength; according to Philo man as a sensuous being is incapable of liberating himself from sensuousness: for this he needs the help of God. It is God who plants and promotes the virtues in the soul of man. Only he who honours Him and yields himself to His influence can attain to perfection. True morality is as Plato teaches the imitation of the Deity. In this religious basis of ethic Philo is very decidedly distinguished from the Stoics. Political activity and practical morality in general have a value only so far as they are a necessary medium for contending against evil. But knowledge also must subserve this one object and hence ethic is the most important part of philosophy. Nevertheless the purity of life attained by such self-knowledge is not the ultimate and supreme object of human development. On the contrary the origin of man being transcendental the object of his development is likewise transcendental. As it was by falling away from God that he was entangled in this life of sense so must he struggle up from it to the direct vision of God. This object is attainable even in this earthly life. For the truly wise and virtuous man is lifted above and out of himself and in such ecstasy beholds and recognises Deity itself. His own consciousness sinks and disappears in the Divine light; and the Spirit of God dwells in him and stirs him like the strings of a musical instrument. He who has in this way attained to the vision of the Divine has reached the highest degree of earthly happiness. Beyond it lies only complete deliverance from this body that return of the soul to its original incorporeal condition which is bestowed on those who have kept themselves free from attachment to this sensuous body.

Philo's influence upon the two circles which he had chiefly in view viz. Judaism and heathenism was impaired by the fact that from his time onward Jewish Hellenism in general gradually lost in importance. On the one hand the Pharisaic tendency gained strength in the Dispersion also on the other Hellenistic Judaism was in respect of its influence upon heathen circles repressed nay altogether dissolved by Christianity which was now in its prime. Hence Judaeo-Hellenistic philosophy had gradually to give place to its stronger rival in both regions. Its influence was nevertheless still considerable. Jewish Rabbis and heathen neo-Platonists were more or less affected by it. Its strongest and most enduring influence was however exercised in a direction which still lay outside Philo's horizon upon the development of Christian dogma. The New Testament already shows unmistakeable traces of Philonean wisdom; and almost all the Greek Fathers of the first century the apologists as well as the Alexandrians the Gnostics as well as their adversaries and even the great Greek theologians of subsequent centuries have some more some less either directly or indirectly consciously or unconsciously drawn from Philo. But to follow out these traccs lies beyond the province of this work.

SCOPE AND LITERATURE

IN the fullness of time the Christian religion sprang out of Judaism; as a fact, indeed, of divine revelation, but also inseparably joined by innumerable threads with the previous thousand years of Israel's history. No incident in the gospel story, no word in the preaching of Jesus Christ, is intelligible apart from its setting in Jewish history, and without a clear understanding of that world of thought-distinction of the Jewish people.

Thus it becomes the bounden duty of Christian theologians to examine into and describe that realm of thought and history in which the universal religion of Christ grew up. Nor is it enough to know simply that older literature which has been collected together in the canon of the Old Testament. On the contrary, the gospel of Jesus Christ is much more closely connected with its immediately contemporary surroundings, and the tendencies of thought prevailing in that particular age. The recognition of this has already led many investigators to devote special attention to the History of the Times of Jesus Christ. Besides such scholars as have continued the history of Israel in a comprehensive manner down to the period of Christ and His apostles, Schneckenburger and Hausrath, in particular, have treated separately of that era under the title, History of New Testament Times. The present work, too, in its first edition, was published under that designation. Though the name is now abandoned on account of its indefiniteness, the purpose and scope of the work remain practically the same. The task, however, which we set before us is more limited than that proposed by Schneckenburger and Hausrath. While Schneckenburger undertakes to describe the condition of the Jewish and Gentile world in the times of Christ, and Hausrath even adds to that the history of primitive Christianity, we shall here attempt to set forth only the History of the Jewish People in the Times of Jesus Christ, for this alone in the strict and proper sense constitutes the presupposition of the earliest history of Christianity.

The predominance of Pharisaism is that which most distinctly characterized this period. The legalistic tendency inaugurated by Ezra had now assumed dimensions far beyond anything contemplated by its originator. No longer did it suffice to insist upon obedience to the commandments of the scripture Thora. These divine precepts were broken down into an innumerable series of minute and vexatious particulars, the observance of which was enforced as a sacred duty, and even made a condition of salvation. And this exaggerated legalism had obtained such an absolute ascendency over the minds of the people, that all other tendencies were put entirely in the background.

This Pharisaic tendency had its origin in conflicts of the Maccabean age. During the course of those national struggles the legalistic party not only obtained the victory over those favourably inclined toward Greek learning and customs, but also secured the entire confidence of the people, so that they were encouraged to put forth claims of the most extravagant and immoderate description. The scribes were now the rulers of the people. No other intellectual or political force was sufficiently strong to counteract their influence in any appreciable degree. — The battles of the Maccabean age, however, were also epoch-making in the political history of the Jews. By them was the foundation laid for the construction) of an independent Jewish commonwealth, and for its emancipation from the dominion of the Seleucidae. This deliverance was wholly effected in consequence of the Syrian empire. Judea became an independent state under native princes, and continued in this position until conquered by the Romans. — On the

ground, therefore, of spiritual development and political history, we are justified in beginning our exposition with the history of the Maccabean age.

In determining also the point at which we should close our investigations, a glance at the spiritual as well as the political history will lead to the same result. Political independence was in some measure preserved under the domination of the Romans. In place of the priestly dynasty of the Maccabees, the new order of the Herodians made its appearance. After this line of rulers had been set aside by the Romans, Palestine was for a long period governed by a series of imperial procurators. But even under them there was still a native aristocratic senate, the so-called Sanhedrim, which exercised most of the functions of government. It was not until the time of Nero and Vespasian that all political independence was taken from the Jewish people in consequence of the great revolt which they had endeavoured to carry out. The complete abolition of all Jewish national freedom was finally effected on the suppression of the outbreak under Hadrian. — And just as the concluding of our inquiry with the age of Hadrian recommends itself on outward or political grounds, so also it will be found to correspond to the course of the spiritual development of the people. For it was just during the reign of Hadrian that the Jewish scholars for the first time committed to writing the hitherto only really communicated traditional law, and in this way laid the foundation of the Talmudical code. With the age of Hadrian, therefore, a new epoch begins also for the intellectual and spiritual development of the people, the Talmudic, in which no longer the Thora of Moses, but the Talmud, forms the basis of all juristic discussion. All the same, this, too, is the period in which Pharisaism, in consequence of the overthrow of the Jewish commonwealth, becomes a purely spiritual and moral power, without, however, thereby losing, but rather gaining in its influence over the people. For with the overthrow of the temple the Sadducean priesthood was also set aside, and in the Dispersion the lax and inconsistent Hellenistic Judaism could not permanently maintain itself over against the strict and consistent Judaism of the Pharisees.

The state of the sources of information at our disposal makes it impossible for us to follow step by step the inner development of the people in connection with each particular institution that comes under consideration. We are therefore under the necessity of appending to the outline of the political history a description of the inner condition of the people in a separate division. The political history falls into two main periods: the period of independence, and the period of the Roman domination. In reference to the internal conditions, the following points should be kept prominently in mind.

We shall have to describe, first of all, the general character of the culture prevailing throughout Palestine, with a particularly careful account of the spread of Hellenism on the confines of the Jewish territory and within that territory itself (§ 22). Then, as supplementary to the political history, the church constitution of the Gentile communities of Palestine as well as of the Jewish people must be explained, which belongs to the inner or spiritual history, inasmuch as it brings into consideration the self-administration of the communities in contradistinction to the political schemes and undertakings of the whole land. The exposition of the Jewish communal constitution gives the opportunity also to add the history of the Sanhedrim and of the Jewish high priest (§ 23). The two chief factors in the internal development, however, are, on the one hand, the priesthood and the temple services (§ 24), and, on the other hand, the institution of Scribism (§ 25). Inasmuch as the priests occupying prominent and official positions during the Greek era were more absorbed by worldly and political than by religious interests, those who were still zealous for the law now formed themselves into an opposition party under the leadership of the scribes. The party of the Sadducees grouped themselves around the official

priests, while around the scribes gathered the party of the Pharisees (§ 26). The erection of schools and synagogues served to preserve and spread the knowledge of the law among all classes of the people (§ 27). In order to give a general view of the results to which the efforts of the scribes and Pharisees led, we have sought in another section to describe life under the law (§ 28). Zeal for the law, however, has its nerve-centre in the Messianic hope. For the gracious reward of God, which one regards himself as being made worthy of receiving by a life in accordance with the law, is thought of pre-eminently as one that lies in the future and is heavenly (§ 29). Zeal for the law and the Messianic hope are therefore the two centres around which the life of the Israelite moves. Then, after the exposition of the inner conditions of the everyday Palestinian Judaism in its main features has been concluded by a description of those two powerful tendencies just mentioned, it remains for us to glance at the Jewish monastic institution of the Essenes (§ 30), and at the much more influential, and even for the early history of Christianity much more important, Judaism of the Dispersion (§ 31). Finally, we have to show from what remains of the Jewish literature of our period how, in spite of the predominance of Pharisaism, the intellectual interests and spiritual struggles of Judaism spread out in various directions. This is seen even in the Palestinian literature (§ 32), but in a still higher degree in the Hellenistic literature (§ 33); and last of all, though really belonging to this group just named, the Jewish philosopher Philo, on account of his very peculiar importance, may have his writings and his speculation treated of in a distinct section (§ 34).

LITERATURE

PRIDEAUX, The Old and New Testament connected in the history of the Jews and neighbouring nations from the declension of the kingdom of Israel and Judah to the time of Christ. 2 vols. London 1716–1718. 10th ed. 1749. — This once celebrated work, which appeared both in German and in French translations, though necessarily inadequate, may still be referred to on many points with advantage.

EWALD, History of Israel. 8 vols. London 1867–1886. Vol. v. The History of Ezra and of the Hagiocracy in Israel to the time of Christ. Vol. vi. The Life and Times of Christ. Vol. vii. The Apostolic Age. Vol. viii. The Post-Apostolic Age. — In these volumes the history of Christ and the Apostles is connected with the history of the people of Israel.

HAUSRATH, History of New Testament Times: The Time of Jesus. 2 vols. London 1878. — This work treats not only of the Jewish history of the period, but also of the life of Jesus; while later volumes, not yet translated, discuss the history of primitive Christianity, and introduce many details of Roman history.

RAPHALL, Post-Biblical History of the Jews from the close of the Old Testament, about the year 420, till the destruction of the Second Temple in the year 70. 2 vols. London 1856.

MILMAN, The History of the Jews from the earliest period down to modern times. 3 vols. 3rd ed. London 1863. — The first volume closes with the suppression of Jewish worship by Antiochus Epiphanes; the second continues the history from the appearance of Mattathias down to the third century of the Christian era.

JOST, History of the Jews from the Maccabees to the present day. New York 1848. — From the rationalistic standpoint of Reform-Judaism.

STANLEY, Lectures on the History of the Jewish Church. Third series: From the Captivity to the

Christian Era. London 1876.

REDFORD, Four Centuries of Silence; or, from Malachi to Christ London 1885.

STAPFER, Palestine in the Time of Christ. London 1886. — More archaeological than historical. A "series of studies on the social and religious life of the Jews in the first century," using as sources the New Testament, the writings of Josephus, and the Talmud.

KEIM, History of Jesus of Nazareth. 6 vols. London 1873-1884. — In the first volumes this work deals with the history of Herod and the Roman Procurators, and with the state of the Jews generally during that period.

WIESELER, Chronological Synopsis of the Four Gospels. London 1864.

DÖLLINGER, The Gentile and the Jew in the Courts of the Temple of Christ. 2 vols. London 1862. — The exposition here given of Judaism is much shorter than that given of Heathenism. In the discussion of the state of the heathen world the special value of this work lies.

PRESSENSÉ, The Ancient World and Christianity. London 1888. — Confined to an examination of the pagan religion and the state of the heathen world in the times of Christ.

LECHLER, The Apostolic and Post-Apostolic Times. 3rd ed. 2 vols. Edin. 1886. Vol. i. pp. 67-87, Relation of Jewish Christians to the Israelite People; pp. 144-160, Relation of Jewish Christians with non-Christians.

SCHNECKENBURGER, Vorlesungen über Neutestamentliche Zeitgeschichte. Edited from his MS. by Löhlein. Frankfort 1862.

HOLTZMANN, Judenthum und Christenthum in Zeitalter der apokryphischen und neutestamentlichen Literatur. Also under the title, Geschichte des Volkes Israel, by Weber and Holtzmann. 2 vols. 1867. — Extends from the time of Alexander the Great to Hadrian, after the manner of Ewald, but considerably shorter, connecting the history of primitive Christianity with the history of the Jewish people.

HITZIG, Geschichte des Volkes Israel von Anbeginn bis zur Eroberung Masada's im J. 72 nach Chr. 2 vols. Leipzig 1869. — Treats of the later history from the time of Alexander the Great with comparative fulness.

WELLHAUSEN, Die Pharisäer und die Sadducäer. A contribution to the inner history of Judaism. Greifswald 1874. — This short monograph gives more information about the inner history of Judaism during our period than many an extensive work.

REUSS, Die Geschichte der heiligen Schriften alten Testaments. 1881. — Properly only a history of the literature; it gives this in connection with the history of the people.

SEINECKE, Geschichte des Volkes Israel. Vol. ii. From the Exile to the Destruction of Jerusalem by the Romans. 1884.

HERZFELD, Geschichte des Volkes Israel. From the completion of the Second Temple down to the Deposition of Simon Maccabee from the Priesthood and Government. 2 vols. Nordhausen 1855. — The first volume treats of the political history from the completion of the Second Temple

down to B.C. 135; the second volume gives the inner history of the same period.

JOST, Geschichte des Judenthums und seiner Secten. 3 Bde. 1857–1859. — Gives a history of the inner development of Judaism from the exile to the present day. The first volume reaches to the destruction of Jerusalem.

GRÄTZ, Geschichte der Juden von den ältesten Zeiten bis auf die Gegenwart. Bd. iii–xi. 1853–1870. — Deals with period from B.C. 160 to A.D. 1848. Bd. iii. 3 Aufl. 1878 appeared also under the title: Geschichte der Juden von dem Tode Juda Makkabi's bis zum Untergang des jüdischen Staates. Bd. iv. 2 Aufl. 1866 appeared also under the title: Geschichte der Juden vom Untergang des jüdischen Staates bis zum Abschluss des Talmud. — Bd. i. ii., the latter in two divisions, appeared later, 1874–1876. The second division of the second volume goes from the Babylonian exile to the death of Judas Maccabaeus.

GEIGER, Urschrift und Uebersetzungen der Bibel in ihrer Abhängigkeit von der innern Entwickelung des Judenthums. 1857. — Seeks particularly to show how the inner development of Judaism in the postexilian period has been peculiarly influential upon the formation of the Old Testament text.

GEIGER, Das Judenthum und seine Geschichte. Bd. i.–iii. 1864–1871. — Describes only the main features of the inner development of Judaism. Vol. i. carries the history down to the destruction of the Second Temple; vol. ii. down to the end of the twelfth century; vol. iii. to the end of the sixteenth century. The concluding vol. iv. has not yet appeared. — Compare also: Innere Geschichte der zweiten Tempelperiode und deren Behandlung (Jüd. Zeitschrift für Wissensch. und Leben, 1868, pp. 247–277).

SALVADOR, Histoire de la domination Romaine en Judée et de la ruine do Jérusalem. 2 vols. Paris 1847. Also in German under the title: Salvador, Geschichte der Römerherrschaft in Judäa und der Zerstörung Jerusalems. 2 Bde. 1847. — Treats of the period from Pompey to the destruction of Jerusalem; but gives almost nothing beyond a bare reproduction of documents.

WIESELER, Beiträge zur neutestamentlichen Zeitgeschichte (Studien und Kritiken, 1875, pp. 516–556). Compare also: Beiträge zur richtigen Würdigung der Evangelien und der evangelischen Geschichte. 1869.

HIMFEL, Politische und religiöse Zustände des Judenthums in den letzten Jahrhunderten vor Chr. In Tüb. Theol. Quartalschrift, 1858, pp. 63–85.

BAUMGARTEN, Der nationaljüdische Hintergrund der neutestamentlichen Geschichte nach Josephus. In Jahrbb. für Deutsche Theologie, 1864–1865. — In four divisions: I. The Literary Character of Josephus, 1864, pp. 616–648. II. The Idumean-Roman Rule in Judea, 1865, pp. 605–635. III. Last Struggle and Defeat of the Jewish Nation, 1865, pp. 636–668. IV. Outlines of the Effects produced on one another by the last Struggles of the Jewish Nation on the one hand, and the New Testament history on the other, 1865, pp. 668–693.

DERENBOURG, Essai sur l'histoire et la géographie de la Palestine, d'après les Thalmuds et les autres sources rabbiniques. P. I. Histoire de la Palestine depuis Cyrus jusqu' à Adrien. Paris 1867. — Does not give a history of the people of Israel during the period named, but only a collection of rabbinical traditions relating to that history.

BOST, L'Époque des Maccabées, histoire du peuple juif depuis le retour de l'exil jusqu' à la destruction de Jérusalem. Strassbourg 1862.

LEDRAIN, Histoire d'Israël. 2 vols. Paris 1879-1882. — Treats most fully of the Graeco-Roman Age.

DE SAULCY, Histoire des Machabées ou princes de la dynastie asmonéenne. Paris 1880.

CHAMPAGNY, Rome et de la Judée au temps de la chute de Neron. From A.D. 66 to A.D. 72. 2 vols. Paris 1865.

LOOMAN, Geschiedenis der Israëliten van de babylonische ballingschap tot op de komst van den Heere Jezus Christus. Meteen aanhangsel, inhoudende de geschiedenis der Israëliten van den dood van Herodes 1 tot op de verwoesting van Jeruzalem. Amsterdam 1867.

On Jewish doctrines and customs during the times of Christ: —

DRUMMOND, The Jewish Messiah. A critical history of the Messianic idea among the Jews from the rise of the Maccabees to the closing of the Talmud. London 1877.

STANTON, The Jewish and Christian Messiah: a Study in the Earliest History of Christianity. Edinburgh 1886.

VITRINGA, The Synagogue and the Church. Condensed from the original work, De Synagoga vetere, of A.D. 1726. London 1842.

REVILLE, A Manual of Religious Instruction. London. Pt. i. ch. v., Judaism, pp. 52-73.

KUENEN, The Religion of Israel to the Fall of the Jewish State. 3 vols. London 1881-1882.

HARTMANN, Die enge Verbindung des Alten Testaments mit dem Neuen. Hamburg 1831. — Seeks to show how the Old Testament was treated and expounded in the time of Christ, and in this connection discusses very thoroughly the Sanhedrim and the Synagogue.

GFROERER, Das Jahrhundert des Heils. 2 vols. Stuttgart 1838. Also under the title: Geschichte des Urchristenthums. Bd. i. ii. — Gives a systematic view of Judaism in the time of Christ.

LUTTERBECK, Die Neutestamentlichen Lehrbegriffe oder Untersuchungen üs Zeitalter der Religionswende, die Vorstufen des Christenthums und die erste Gestaltung desselben. 2 vols. 1852. The first volume treats chiefly of the religious condition of Judaism in the time of Christ.

NOACK, Der Ursprung des Christenthums. Seine vorbereitenden Grundlegungen und sein Eintritt in die Welt. 2 vols. 1857. — The first volume treats of preparatory circumstances and conditions, but in a very superficial manner.

LANGEN, Das Judentlum in Palästina zur Zeit Christi. 1866. — Gives, like Gfroerer, a systematic description of the Jewish theology in the time of Christ, but is distinguished from Gfroerer by declining to use as sources the later Jewish literature of the Talmud and Midrashim.

WEBER, System der altsynagogalen palästinisehen Theologie aus Targum, Midrasch und Talmud dargestellt. Edited after the author's death by Delitzsch and Schnedermann. Leipzig

1880. — A good independent account, drawn from the sources of Jewish theology in the Talmudic Age.

NICOLAS, Des doctrines religieuses des Juifs pendant les deux siècles antérieurs à l'ère chrétienne. Paris 1860.

REVILLE, Le peuple juif et le judaïsme au temps de la formation du Talmud (Revue des Deux Mondes, 1867, Nov. number, pp. 104–137). Also Le judaïsme depuis la captivité de Babylone, d'après Kuenen (in the same Review, 1872, March, pp. 114–141).

STAPFER, Les idées religieuses en Palastine à l'époque de Jésus-Christ. 2nd ed. Paris 1878.

Contributions to the Jewish history of our period will be found in the following Dictionaries, Encyclopaedias, and Magazines: —

SMITH, Dictionary of the Bible, comprising its antiquities, biography, geography, and natural history. 3 vols. London 1860–1863. The American edition, New York 1871, in 4 vols., by Hackett & Abbot, is considerably enlarged and improved.

FAIRBAIRN, Imperial Bible Dictionary, historical, biographical, geographical, and doctrinal. 2 vols. London 1864–1866.

KITTO, Cyclopaedia of Biblical Literature, 3rd ed., re-edited and recast by Dr. W. Lindsay Alexander. 3 vols. London 1869–1876.

SCHAFF-HERZOG, A Religious Encyclopaedia; or Dictionary of biblical, historical, doctrinal, and practical theology. 3 vols. Edinburgh 1884. A condensed reproduction of the great work of Herzog, Plitt, and Hauck, in 18 vols. Leipzig 1877–1888.

M'CLINTOCK and STRONG, Cyclopaedia of Biblical Theology and Ecclesiastical Literature. New York 1866 ff.

RIEHM, Handwörterbuch des biblischen Alterthums füldete Bibelleser. 2 vols. 1874–1884.

WINER, Biblisches Realwörterbuch. 2 vols. 3rd ed. Leipzig 1847–1848.

SCHENKEL, Bibel-Lexikon. Realwörterbuch zum Handgebrauch fütliche und Gemeindeglieder. 5 vols. Leipzig 1869–1875.

HAMBURGER, Real-Encyclopaedie fül und Talmud. Division I. Biblical Articles, 1870. Division II. Talmudical Articles, 1883.

THE JEWISH QUARTERLY, editüed by Abrahams and Montefiore, London; begun in 1888, "devoted to the interests of Jewish literature and theology, history and religion."

WISSENSCHAFTLICHE ZEITSCHRIFT FÜR JÜDISCHE THEOLOGIE, edited by Geiger. 6 vols. 1835–1848.

DER ORIENT, Berichte, Studien und Kritiken für jüdische Geschichte und Literatur. Together with "Literaturblatt des Oriente," edited by Fürst. 12 vols. 1840–1851.

ZEITSCHRIFT FÜR DIE RELIGIÖSEN INTERESSEN DES JUDENTHUMS, edited by Frankel. 3 vols. 1844-1846.

MONATSSCHRIFT FÜR GESCHICHTE UND WISSENSCHAFT DES JUDENTHUMS, edited from 1851 to 1868 by Frankel; from 1869 by Grätz.

JÜDISCHE ZEITSCHRIFT FÜR WISSENSCHAFT UND LEBEN, edited by Geiger. 11 vols. 1862-1875.

JAHRBÜCHER FÜR JÜDISCHE GESCHICHTE UND LITERATUR, edited by Brüll, vol. i. 1874, vol. ii. 1876, vol. iii. 1877, vol. iv. 1879, vols. v. and vi. 1883, vol vii. 1885, vol. viii. 1887.

MAGAZIN FÜR DIE WISSENSCHAFT DES JUDENTHUMS, edited by Berliner and Hoffmann, beginning in 1876.

REVUE DES ETUDES JUIVES, Quarterly publication of the Société des études juives. Paris 1880 sqq.

AUXILIARY SCIENCES

BY way of supplement to the literature given in § 1, we mention here the more important works under those departments which may he regarded as auxiliary to that branch of study now before us. To this class belong the following: – I. Biblical and Jewish Antiquities or Archaeology, which has to describe the religious and civil institutions, manners, and customs of the Jewish people. II. The Geography of Palestine. III. Jewish Chronology. IV. Jewish Numismatics. V. Jewish Inscriptions. The Geography and Chronology afford us the framework, not to speak of space and time, in which the history with which we are concerned is contained; the Numismatics and Inscriptions afford the original documentary materials.

A. – JEWISH ARCHAEOLOGY

A rich collection of older monographs on Biblical and Jewish Archaeology was made by Ugolini in his Thesaurus antiquitatum sacrum, in 34 folio vols., Venice 1744-1769. The shorter handbooks treat for the most part either of the whole range of "Antiquities," or of particular departments, such as the religious worship of the civil law and constitution. The material of Archaeology is also dealt with in the various Biblical Dictionaries and Encyclopaedias. Finally, expositions of Jewish institutions and usages in post-Talmudic times afford supplementary details.

A very complete list of the older literature is given by Meusel, Bibliotheca historica, i. 2. 118-207. Lists of the more recent literature are given in Winer, Handbuch der theol. Literatur, i. 133 ff.; Rüetschi in Herzog's Real-Encyclopaedie, 2 Aufl. i. 608 f.

KEIL, Manual of Biblical Archaeology. 2 vols. Edinburgh 1887-1888.

EWALD, The Antiquities of Israel. London 1876.

JAHN, Biblical Antiquities. 3rd ed. Oxford 1836.

MICHAELIS, Commentaries on the Law of Moses. 4 vols. London 1814.

RELAND, Antiquitates sacrae veterum Hebraeorum. Utrecht 1708, Jena 1713. – Notas adj. Eb. Rau, Herborn 1743. – A. Blasio Ugolino amplissimo commentario illustratae, in Ugolini Thes. t. ii. 1744. – Edited, with the notes by Rau and Ugolini, by Vogel. Halle 1769.

IKEN, Antiquitates hebr. secundum triplicem Judaeorum statum, ecclesiasticum politicum et oeconomicum. Bremen 1730.

WAEHNER, Antiquitates Ebraeorum de Israeliticae gentis origine, fatis, rebus sacris civilibus et domesticis. 2 vols. Göttingen 1743.

CARPZOV, Apparatus historico-criticus antiquitatum sacri codicis. Frankfort 1748. Properly a reprint of an older work: Goodwin's "Aaron and Moses" of 1616, but with notes which in extent and importance far exceed the original text.

DE WETTE, Lehrbuch der hebrisch-jdischen Archäologie nebst einem Grundriss der hebräisch-

jüdischen Geschichte, new ed. by Räbiger. Leipzig 1864.

SAALSCHÜTZ, Das Mosaische Recht, nebst den vervollständigenden Talmudisch-Rabbinischen Bestimmungen. 2nd ed. 2 vols. Berlin 1853. — Also by same author, Archaeologie der Hebräer. 2 vols. Königsberg 1855–1856.

SCHOLZ, Die heiligen Alterthümer des Volkes Israel. In 2 parts. Regensburg 1868.

HANEBERG, Die religiösen Alterthümer der Bibel. Munich 1869.

SCHEGG, Biblische Archaeologie, edited by Wirthmüller. Freiburg 1887.

BODENSCHATZ, Kirchliche Verfassung der heutigen Juden, sonderlich derer in Deutschland. 4 vols. 1748–1749.

SCHRÖDER, Satzungen und Gebräuche des talmudisch-rabbinischen Judenthums. Bremen 1851.

B. — GEOGRAPHY

The exploration of the Holy Land has been conducted during the present century with such energy that it is difficult out of the enormous literature to select the works that are most important. We distinguish among these two classes — 1. Comprehensive treatises by authors who have not been themselves upon the scene, but who work up the materials brought them; and 2. The researches carried on in the land itself. Under the former category there are two great works which stand out from all the rest in the rich abundance of their materials, Reland presenting the older material, and Ritter the more recent. These two works will long be indispensable to the student. A convenient handbook is that of Raumer, of which, however, we have no more recent edition than that of 1860. Among treatises that embody original research, mention should be made, first of all, of the American Robinson's epoch-making work, which furnished a profusion of new and important facts. Still more completely and systematically has the French scholar Guérin explored and described the whole of the country west of the Jordan from place to place. Both of these writers, along with a communication of the results of their research, give a very full account of the historical associations. The Memoirs, which accompany by way of explanation the large English map, deal simply with the Palestine of the present day. The topography of Jerusalem forms a science by itself. — Two magazines, an English and a German, are devoted to the recording of the more recent discoveries. — Among historical atlases which show clearly the political history from step to step, that of Menke is to be specially recommended. In the department of map-drawing, all earlier productions have been put in the shade by the great English map, in twenty-six sheets, produced on the spot by the Palestine Exploration Society during the years 1872–1877, according to exact topographical measurement of the country west of the Jordan. The English have also supplied the best groundwork for a topography of Jerusalem. In the years 1864–1865 Sir Charles Wilson made a topographical survey of Jerusalem, and in the years 1867–1870 the English Palestine Exploration Society conducted the most thorough excavations and measurements on the site of the temple, to which the labours of the Germans could only contribute some further details.

A complete list of the older Palestinian literature is to be found in Meusel, Bibliotheca historica, i. 2. 70–118. A good survey of that literature down to 1840 is given in Robinson, Biblical Researches in Palestine, iii., Appendix A, pp. 1–28. — An oppressively complete list of

Palestinian literature is given in Tobler, Bibliographia geographica Palaestinae, Leipzig 1867. A yet fuller catalogue of the earlier travellers' accounts down to the tenth century after Christ than is given there, may be found in Tobler's Bibliographia geographica Palaestinae ab anno CCCXXXIII. usque ad annum, M. Dresdae, 1875 (reprinted as a separate monograph from Petzholdt's Neue Anzeiger für Bibliographie und Bibliothekwissenschaft, 1875). — Continuations of and additions to Tobler's work have been made by Ph. Wolff in the Jahrbücher für deutsche Theologie, 1868 and 1872; Röhricht and Meisner, Deutsche Pilgerreisen nach dem heiligen Lande, Berlin 1880, pp. 541-648; and Socin and Jacob in their yearly summaries and reviews, in the Zeitschrift des deutschen Palästina-Vereins, Bd. i-ix., by Socin; later volumes by Jacob. — A sketch and review of the literature is also given by F. W. Schultz, in article "Palästina," in Herzog, Real-Encyclopaedie, 2 Aufl. Bd. xi. (1883) pp. 800-804.

1. Treatises Presenting Results

RELAND, Palaestina ex monumentis veteribus illustrata. Utrecht 1714.

RITTER, The Comparative Geography of Palestine and the Sinaitic Peninsula. 4 vols. Edin. 1866. This is a translation of portions of Die Erdkunde im Verhältniss zur Natur und zur Geschichte des Menschen, 2nd ed., greatly enlarged and partly rewritten. Parts xiv.-xvii. Berlin 1848-1855. Of this work Part xiv. (1848) treats of the Sinai Peninsula; xv. 1 (1850), of the Great Depression of the Jordan Valley, the Course and the Region of the Jordan; xv. 2 (1851), of the country west of the Jordan and the Dead Sea (Perea); xvi. (1852), of Judea, Samaria, Galilee; xvii. 1 (1854), of Phoenicia, Lebanon, and the mountain lands of Northern Syria; xvi. 2 (1855), the Course of the Orontes in the flat country of Northern Syria with the Amanus Range.

PORTER, Holy Land, Syria, Palestine, Peninsula of Sinai, Edom, Syrian Deserts, Petra, Damascus, and Palmyra; with Maps and Plans. In Murray's Handbook Series.

SOCIN, Traveller's Handbook to Palestine and Syria. In Baedeker's Series. London 1876.

HENDERSON, Handbook on Palestine. Edin. [1886].

RAUMER, Palästina. 4th ed. Leipzig 1860.

QUANDT, Judäa und die Nachbarschaft im Jahrhundert vor und nach der Geburt Christi. Gütersloh 1873. — Short, but independent.

BOETTGER, Topographisch-historisches Lexicon zu den Schriften des Josephus. Leipzig 1879. — Collects all the material out of Josephus.

NEUBAUER, La géographie du Talmud. Paris 1868. — Gathers together material from rabbinical literature, but by no means in a complete or thorough way.

In the Dictionaries of Smith, Fairbairn, Kitto, M'Clintock and Strong, Winer, Schenkel, Riehm, place-names occurring in the Bible are dealt with.

2. Records of Original Research

ROBINSON, Biblical Researches in Palestine, Mount Sinai, and Arabia Petrea. A journal of travels in the year 1838 by E. Robinson and E. Smith, undertaken in reference to biblical geography. 3 vols. London 1841. Also: Later Biblical Researches in Palestine and the adjacent

Regions. A journal of travels in the year 1852 by E. Robinson, E. Smith, and others. Drawn up from the original diaries, with historical illustrations by E. Robinson. London 1856. Physical Geography of the Holy Land. London 1865.

STANLEY, Sinai and Palestine in Connection with their History. London 1856.

WILSON, Lands of the Bible visited and described in an extensive journey undertaken with special reference to the promotion of biblical research. 2 vols. Edin. 1847.

VAN DE VELDE, Journey through Sinai and Palestine. 2 vols. Edin. 1854.

VAN LENNEP, Bible Lands and Customs. 2 vols. London 1875.

THOMSON, The Land and the Book; or, biblical illustrations drawn from the manners and customs, the scenes and scenery of the Holy Land. London 1859.

THE SURVEY OF WESTERN PALESTINE. This is the general title of the work, the several portions of which have the following special titles: Special Papers on topography, archaeology, manners and customs, etc., contributed by Wilson, Warren, Conder, Kitchener, Palmer, George Smith, Greville-Chester, Clermont-Ganneau, etc. London 1881. — Arabic and English Name Lists, collected by Conder and Kitchener, transliterated and explained by Palmer. London 1881. — Memoirs of the topography, orography, hydrography, and archaeology, by Conder and Kitchener. 3 vols. London 1881-1883. — Jerusalem, by Warren and Conder. London 1884. — The Fauna and Flora of Palestine, by Tristram. London 1884. — All together in 7 vols., with the large map referred to below and the large plans of excavations in Jerusalem. See two papers in the Expositor, one by Socin criticizing the work of the English Exploration Society (Expos., third series, vol. ii. pp. 241-262), the other a defence by Conder (Expos., third series, vol. iii. pp. 321-335).

CONDER, Tent Work in Palestine. Published by Palestine Exploration Fund Committee. 2 vols. London 1878.

TRISTRAM, Topography of the Holy Land. London 1876.

TRELAWNEY SAUNDERS, An Introduction to the Survey of Western Palestine: its waterways, plains, and highlands. London 1881.

MERILL, A record of travels and observations in the countries of Moab, Gilead, and Bashan during 1875-1877. New York 1881.

TOBLER, Bethlehem in Palästina. 1849. — Golgotha: seine Kirchen und Klöster. 1851. — Die Siloahquelle und der Oelberg. 1852. — Denkblätter aus Jerusalem. 1853. — Zwei Bücher Topographie von Jerusalem und seinen Umgebungen. 2 vols. 1853-1854. — Dritte Wanderung nach Palästina im Jahre. 1857. Rittdurch Philistäa, Fussreisen im Gebirge Judäas und Nachlese in Jerusalem. 1859. Nazareth in Palästina. 1868.

SEPP, Jerusalem und das heilige Land; Pilgerbuch nach Palästina, Syrien und Aegypten. 2 vols. 2nd ed. Schaffhausen 1873-1876.

DE SAULCY, Voyage en Terre Sainte. 2 vols. Paris 1865. Jerusalem. Paris 1882. — On earlier works of De Saulcy, see Tobler, Bibliographia geographica, p. 180 f.

GUÉRIN, Description géographique, historique et archéologique de la Palestine. I. Judé. 3 vols. Paris 1868-1869. II. Samarie. 2 vols. Paris 1874-1875. III. Galiée. 2 vols. Paris 1880. — The volume promised on Jerusalem has not yet appeared.

3. Topography of Jerusalem

Topographical descriptions of Jerusalem are given in the books above mentioned of Ritter, Raumer, Robinson, Socin, de Saulcy, Sepp, and Tobler.

In addition to these we may name the Monographs of Olshausen, Schultz, Krafft, etc. WILLIAMS, The Holy City. London 1845. 2nd ed. 1849. THRUPP, Ancient Jerusalem. London 1855. BESANT and PALMER, Jerusalem, the city of Herod and Saladin. London 1871. CASPARI, Chronological and Geographical Introduction to the Life of Christ. Edinburgh 1876. Appendix: Topography of Jerusalem, pp. 256-308. Also various essays in the Zeitschrift des deutschen Palästina-Vereins, by Schick (vol. i. 15-23), Alten (i. 61-100, ii. 18-47, 189-200, iii. 116-176), Klaiber (iii. 189-213, iv. 18-56, xi. 1-37), and Spiess (xi. 46-59); and of these Klaiber makes contributions of special value.

Materials for the topography, especially in reference to the site of the Temple, are given in the reports of the Excavations and Researches of the English Society. A good general sketch will be found in: WILSON and WARREN, The Recovery of Jerusalem, edited by Morrison, London 1871; and Our Work in Palestine, being an account of the different expeditions sent out to the Holy Land by the Palestine Exploration Fund since 1865. London 1877. WARREN, Underground Jerusalem. London 1876. Schick, Beit el Makdas oder der alte Tempelplatz zu Jerusalem wie er jetzt ist. Jerusalem 1887.

4. Atlases, Charts, and Plans

SMITH and GROVE, Atlas of Ancient Geography, biblical and classical, intended to illustrate Smith's Classical Dictionaries, and especially the Dictionary of the Bible. London 1875 (43 maps).

MENKE, Bibelatlas in acht Blättern. Gotha 1868.

KIEPERT, Bibelatlas. Berlin 1847. 3rd ed. 1854

OORT, Atlas voor bijbelsche en kerkelijke geschiedenis. Groningen 1884.

VAN DE VELDE, Map of the Holy Land, with memoir to accompany it. London 1858. — The best map before that of the English Society had appeared.

MAP OF WESTERN PALESTINE, in 26 sheets, from surveys conducted for the Committee of the Palestine Exploration Fund by Conder and Kitchener during the years 1872-1877. Photozincographed for the Committee at the Ordnance Survey Office, Southampton. London 1880. — This map is of the highest value, but the printing is not so clear as could be wished. The scale is 1 inch to the mile. — Another smaller edition on the scale of 3/8 of an inch to a mile has been issued under a similar title. London 1881. — This map, in 6 sheets, is most suitable for ordinary use. In clearness of printing it is far behind that of Van de Velde.

WILSON, Ordnance Survey of Jerusalem during 1864-1865. — This plan of the Jerusalem of

today in respect of accuracy and exactness supersedes all earlier attempts.

WARREN, Plans, Elevations, Sections, etc., showing the results of the excavations at Jerusalem, 1867–1870, executed for the Committee of the Palestine Exploration Fund by Warren. London 1884. — Contains fifty plans on a large scale, with the most minute details on the topography of the Temple site.

5. Journals

Palestine Exploration Fund. Quarterly Statement. — Issued since 1869.

Zeitschrift des deutschen Palästina-Vereins, edited by the Committee carrying on the work under the direction of Hermann Guthe. — Issued since 1878.

C. — CHRONOLOGY

The various methods of time-reckoning among all nations and in all ages have been collected and set forth by Ideler in his Handbook, which, notwithstanding the great amount of research since his day, has not yet been antiquated. For Roman chronology the Fasti consulares form unquestionably the most reliable source of information. — Chronological surveys of Hellenistic and Roman history, with references to the original sources, will be found in the works of Clinton, Fisher, and others.

IDELER, Handbuch der mathematischen und technischen Chronologie. 2 vols. Berlin 1825–1826. Lehrbuch der Chronologie. Berlin 1831.

GUMPACH, Hülfsbuch der rechnenden Chronologie. 1853.

MOMMSEN, Die römische Chronologie bis auf Cäsar. 2 Aufl. Berlin 1859.

MARQUARDT, Römische Staatsverwaltung, Bd. iii. (2 Aufl. bes. von Wissowa 1885), pp. 281–298, 567 ff. — An excellent summary account of the Roman Calendar.

MATZAT, Römische Chronologie. 2 vols. Berlin 1883–1884.

MÜLLER, art. “Aera,” in Pauly’s Real-Encyclop. der class. Alterthums-wissenschaft, i. 1, 2 Aufl. pp. 404–422.

BOUCHET, Hémérologie. Paris 1868.

On the Jewish Calendar, see Appendix iii. at the end of vol. ii.

Fasti consulares ab A.U.C. CCXLV. ad A.U.C. DCCLXVI. qui supersunt inter se collati cura Th. Mommseni (Corp. Inscr. Lat. t. i. pp. 481–552).

KLEIN, Fasti consulares inde a Caesaris nece usque ad imperium Diocletiani. Lips. 1881.

CLINTON, Fasti Hellenici: The civil and literary chronology of Greece and Rome, vol. iii. From the CXXIV Olympiad to the death of Augustus. Oxford 1830. 2nd ed. 1851.

CLINTON, Fasti Romani: the civil and literary chronology of Rome and Constantinople from the

death of Augustus to the death of Justin II. 2 vols. Oxford 1845–1850.

FISCHER, Römische Zeittafeln von Roms Gründung bis auf Augustus' Tod. Altona 1846.

PETER, Zeittafeln der römischen Geschichte zum Handgebrauch. 4 Aufl. Halle 1867. — Considerably shorter than Fischer.

ZUMPT, Annales veterum regnorum et populorum imprimis Romanorum. ed. 3. Berol. 1862. — A summary sketch without quotation of authorities.

KNAAKE, Wie rechnet Josephus die Jahre der römischen Kaiser? (Zeitschrift für luth. Theol. 1871, pp. 224–247).

WIESELER, Ueber die Regierungsjahre der römischen Kaiser nach Josephus (Zeitschrift für luth. Theol. 1872, pp. 55–63).

SEYFFARTH, Chronologie der römischen Kaiser von Cäsar bis Titus in Bezug auf das Neue Testament (Zeitschrift für luth. Theol. 1873, pp. 50–76).

On Biblical Chronology

LEWIN, Fasti Sacri; or, a Key to the Chronology of the New Testament London 1865. — An able survey, in the form of annals, not only of the biblical, but also of the Roman and Jewish history, from B.C. 70 to A.D. 70, with abundant quotations from original sources after the style of Clinton.

CASPARI, Chronological and Geographical Introduction to the Life of Christ. Edinburgh 1876.

WIESELER, Chronological Synopsis of the Four Gospels, translated by Venables. London 1864. [German original. Hamburg 1843.]

FAIRBAIRN, Hermeneutical Manual or Introduction to the Exegetical Study of the New Testament Scriptures. Edinburgh 1858.

SEYFFARTH, Summary of Recent Discoveries in Biblical Chronology. New York 1882.

ELLICOTT, Historical Lectures on the Life of our Lord Jesus Christ, being Hulsean Lectures for 1859. London 1860.

WURM, Astronomische Beiträge zur genäherten Bestimmung des Geburtsund Todesjahres Jesu. In Bengel's Archiv für die Theologie, 1816, pp. 1–39; 1817, pp. 261–313.

WIESELER, Beiträge zur richtigen Würdigung der Evangelien der evangelischen Geschichte. Gotha 1869.

SEYFFARTH, Chronologia sacra, Untersuchungen über das Geburtsjahr des Herrn und die Zeitrechnung des Alten und Neuen Testamentes. Leipzig 1846.

QUANDT, Zeitordnung und Zeitbestimmungen in den Evangelien (also under the title: Chronologisch-geographische Beiträge zum Verständniss der heiligen Schrift, i. 1). Gütersloh 1872.

SEVIN, Chronologie des Lebens Jesu. 2 Aufl. Tübingen 1874.

LJUNGBERG, Chronologie de la vie de Jésus, deux études. Paris 1879. (1. On the day of Jesus' death, 2. On the year of Jesus' birth, see Lit. Centralbl. 1879, p. 537.)

MÉMAIN, La connaissance des temps évangéliques. Paris 1886 (543 pp.). — A French companion treatise to Wieseler's Synopsis.

The following works treat specially of the year of Jesus' birth and the year of Herod's death: —

SANCLEMENTE, De vulgaris aerae emendatione. Romae 1793. — The classical work on the subject.

RÖSCH, Zum Geburtsjahr Jesu, in Jahrbb. für deutsche Theologie, 1866, pp. 3-48. Compare also his reviews of the work of Caspari, Zumpt, and Sevin in the Stud. und Krit. 1870, pp. 357-388; 1871, pp. 515-538; 1875, pp. 585-596.

ZUMPT, Das Geburtsjahr Christi. Leipzig 1869.

RIESS (S. J.), Das Geburtsjahr Christi. Freiburg 1880.

SCHEGG, Das Todesjahr des Königs Herodes und das Todesjahr Jesu Christi. 1882.

RIESS, Nochmals das Geburtsjahr Jesu Christi. 1883.

EWALD, History of Israel. London 1885. Vol. vii. "The Apostolic Age," especially pp. 37-43, "The Chronology of this Period."

WURM, Ueber die Zeitbestimmungen im Leben des Apostels Paulus (Tübinger Zeitschrift für Theologie, 1883, 1 Heft, pp. 3-103).

ANGER, De temporum in actis apostolorum ratione. Lips. 1833.

WIESELER, Chronologie des apostolischen Zeitalters. Göttingen 1848 (in which also on pp. 6-9 we shall find lists of more of the older literature).

LEHMANN, Chronologische Bestimmung der in der Apostelgeschichte, Cap. 13-28, erzählten Begebenheiten (Theol. Stud. und Krit. 1858, pp. 312-339).

ABERLE, Zur Chronologie der Gefangenschaft Pauli (Theol. Quartalschr. 1883, pp. 553-572).

D. — NUMISMATICS

A rich abundance of coins, which is being constantly increased by new discoveries, is helpful in illustrating: 1. The History of the Seleucidae; 2. The History of the Phoenician and Hellenistic cities; 3. The Jewish History. The Jewish Numismatics in particular has been developed with special zeal since A.D. 1854, when De Saulcy's Recherches sur la Numismatique judaïque appeared.

1. Seleucid Coins

GOUGH, Coins of the Seleucidae, Kings of Syria; from the establishment of their reign under Seleucue Nicator to the termination of it under Antiochus Asiaticus. With historical memoirs of each reign. Illustrated with twenty-four plates of coins, from the cabinet of the late Matthew Duane. London 1803.

GARDNER, Catalogue of the Greek Coins in the British Museum. The Seleucid Kings of Syria. With twenty-eight plates. London 1878. — Rich in material, and extremely serviceable. The twenty-eight plates give good photographs, with coin, portraits of the successive Seleucid kings.

BUNBURY, Rare and unpublished Coins of the Seleucidan Kings of Syria. In the Numismatic Chronicle, 1883, pp. 65-107.

HEAD, Historia numorum, a Manual of Greek Numismatics, London 1887, pp. 637-649.

ECKHEL, Doctrina numorum veterum, t. iii. (1794) pp. 209-249. — The classical work on the subject.

MIONNET, Description des médailles antiques, t. v. (1811) pp. 1-109. Supplément, t. viii. (1837) pp. 1-81. — The classical work on the subject.

TRÉSOR, de numismatique et de glyptique (edited under the direction of Lenormant), Numismatique des rois grecs, Paris 1849, pp. 83-114, planches xxxiv.-lv. (folio).

DE SAULCY, Mémoire sur les monnaies datées des Séleucides. Paris 1871 (publication de la Société française de Numismatique et d'archéologie).

DE SAULCY, Monnaies des Séleucides munies de contremarques (Mélanges de Numismatique, t. i. 1875, pp. 45-64).

DE SAULCY, Monnaies inédites de Tryphon, frappées dans les villes maritimes de la Phénicie (Mélanges de Numismatique, t. ii. 1877, pp. 76-84).

FRIEDLÄNDER and SALLET, Das königliche Münzkabinet [at Berlin]. Geschichte und Uebersicht der Sammlung nebst erklärender Beschreibung der auf Schautischen ausgelegten Auswahl (2 Aufl. 1877), pp. 122-131.

FRIEDLÄNDER in Sallet's Zeitschr. für Numismatik, vi. 1879, p. 7; vii. 1880, pp. 224-227. — On coins of Antiochus VIII. and IX.

IMHOOF-BLUMER, Monnaies grecques (in Verhandelingen der koninkl. Akademie van Wetenschappen, Afdeeling Letterkunde, veertiende deel, Amsterdam 1883), pp. 422-438.

IMHOOF-BLUMER, Porträtköpfe auf antiken Münzen hellenischer und hellenisirter Völker, Leipzig 1885, pp. 28-32, Tafel iii. n. 8-28; iv. n. 1-13 (admirable photographs).

2. Coins of the Free Cities

a. Phoenician

HEAD, Coinage of Lydia and Persia. In the International Numismata Orientalia. London 1878. At p. 31 ff., Phoenician coins with figures of Persian kings.

SIX, Observations sur les monnaies phéniciennes. In Numismatic Chronicle, 1877, pp. 177-241. — The most complete treatise on the subject.

BRANDIS, Das Münz-, Maass- und Gewichtswesen in Vorderasien. Berlin 1866.

REICHARDT, Beiträge zur phönischen Numismatik (Wiener Numismat. Zeitschrift, ii. 1870, pp. 1-16).

IMHOOF-BLUMER, Monnaies grecques, 1883, pp. 440-449.

L. MÜLLER, Numismatique d'Alexandre le Grand. Copenhagen 1855. — The bilingual coins of Alexander form the transition from the Phoenician to the Greek. On the Alexander coins of Akko, in Div. ii. vol. i. p. 91.

b. Greek and Roman

REICHARDT, Unpublished Greek Imperial Coins. In Numismatic Chronicle, 1862, pp. 104-122.

HEAD, Historia numorum, London 1887, pp. 662-681.

ECKHEL, Doctrina numorum veterum, iii. pp. 328-445.

HUBER, Unedirte Bronzemünze in Tiberias Galilaeae unter Commodus geprägt (Wiener Numismat. Zeitschr., Bd. i. 1869, pp. 401-414).

MIONNET, Description des médailles antiques, v. 281-552. Supplément, viii. 192-377.

DE SAULCY, Numismatique de la Terre Sainte, Description des monnaies autonomes et impériales de la Palestine et de l'Arabie Pétrée. Paris 1874.

3. Jewish Coins

The more recent literature, since A.D. 1849, is enumerated by Madden in Numismatic Chronicle, 1876, pp. 222-234; and in Coins of the Jews, pp. 317-324.

a. Comprehensive Treatises

MADDEN, Coins of the Jews. London 1881. — Now the classical work on Jewish Numismatics. We have here an earlier work: History of Jewish Coinage of money in the Old and New Testament, London 1864, rewritten, with all more recently discovered material incorporated, including various papers exhibited to the Numismatic Chronicle, 1874, 1875, 1876.

ECKHEL, Doctrina numorum veterum, iii. 445-498.

LEVY, Geschichte der jüdischen Münzen. Leipzig 1862.

MERZBACHER, Untersuchungen über althebräische Münzen (Sallet's Zeitschr. für Numismatik, iii. 1876, pp. 183-215; iv. 1877, pp. 350-365; v. 1878, pp. 151-176, 292-319).

MIONNET, Description des médailles antiques, v. 552-576. Supplément, viii. 377-381.

TRÉSOR, De numismatique et de glyptique (edited under the direction of Lenormant), Numismatique des rois grecs, Paris 1849, pp. 118–130, planches lvii.-lxii.

CAVEDONI, Biblische Numismatik oder Erklärung der in heil. Schrift erwähnten alten Münzen. From Italian. 2 Thl. Hannover 1855, 1856.

DE SAULCY, Catalogue raisonné de Monnaies Judaïques recueillies à Jérusalem en Novembre 1869 (Numismatic Chronicle, 1871, pp. 235–255).

DE SAULCY, Recherches sur la Numismatique judaïque. Paris 1854. — Contributes a large abundance of new material.

b. Shorter Treatises on Matters of Detail

REICHARDT, Inedited Coins of Judea, in Numismatic Chronicle, 1862, pp. 268–277. — Also: Remarks on some Jewish coins and some inedited coins of Phoenicia, Judea, etc., in Numismatic Chronicle, 1864, pp. 174–189. — Also: Unpublished coins of John Hyrcanus, in Numismatic Chronicle, 1882, pp. 306, 307.

POOLE, article "Money," in Smith's Dictionary of the Bible, 1863. — Very complete.

MADDEN, Coins of the two revolts of the Jews, in Numismatic Chronicle, 1866, pp. 36–65. — Also: Rare and unpublished Jewish coins, in Numismatic Chronicle, 1879, pp. 13–22. Also: article "Money," in Kitto's Cyclopedia of Biblical Literature.

HEAD, Historia numorum, a Manual of Greek Numismatics, London 1887, pp. 681–685.

LEWIS, Shekel of the year five, in Numismatic Chronicle, 1876, p. 322.

The Academy, vol. vi. (July–December 1874) pp. 277 (5th Sept.), 296 (12th Sept.), 321 (19th Sept.), 459 (24th Oct.), 486 (31st Oct.), 536 (14th Nov.). — Correspondence in regard to the genuineness of a Jewish Shekel found by Besant, Evans, and Conder at Jericho.

EWALD, Recension von de Saulcy's Recherches, in den Gött. gel. Anzeigen 1855, 641–655. — Also: Ueber das Zeitalter der ächten Münzen althebräischer Schrift, in dem Gott. "Nachrichten" 1855, pp. 109–122.

ARNOLD, article "Gold," in Herzog, Real-Encyclopaedie, 1 Aufl. iv. 1856, 763 ff. In 2 Aufl. revid. von Rüetechi, v. 32–37.

ZUCKERMANN, Ueber talmudische Gewichte und Münzen. 1862.

HERZFELD, Metrologische Voruntersuchungen zu einer Geschichte des ibräischen resp. altjüdischen Handels, Thl. i. 1863 (im Jahrb. für Geschichte der Juden).

CAVEDONI, Neuere Untersuchungen über die antiken jüdischen Münzen, übers, von Werlhof (Münzstudien, herausg. von Grote, v. 1867, pp. 9–37).

REICHARDT, Ueber die Münzen Simons des Makkabäerfürsten (Wiener Numismat. Monatshefte, herausg. von Egger, Bd. ii. 1866, pp. 137–143). — Also: Ueber die Münzen der Makkabäerfürsten (ebendas. iii. 1867, pp. 103–116). — Drei merkwürdige Münzen der Könige

Agrippa I. und II. (Wiener Numismat. Zeitschrift, iii. 1871, pp. 83-90).

MOMMSEN, Zu den Münzen Agrippa's I. und II. (Wiener Numismat. Zeitschrift, Bd. iii. 1871, pp. 449-457).

MERZBACHER, De siclis nummis antiquissimis Judaeorum. Berol. 1873. — Also: Jüdische Aufstandsmünzen aus der Zeit Nero's und Hadrian's (Zeitschrift für Numismatik, Bd. i. 1874, pp. 219-237). — Also: Jüdische Sekel (Zeitschrift für Numismatik, Bd. iii. 1876, pp. 141-144).

HULTSCH, Griechische und römische Metrologie (2 Bearbeit. 1882), pp. 456 ff., 602 ff.

HAMBURGER, Real-Encyclopädie für Bibel und Talmud, 2 Abtheil, 1883, art. "Munzen."

STICKEL, Jüdische Münzen aus Jerusalem (Zeitschrift des deutschen Palästina-Vereins, vii. 1884, pp. 211-214).

GRÄTZ, Bedeutung der jüdischen Münzen mit dem Feststrauss (Lulab) und dem Portale (Monatsschr. für Gesch. und Wissensch. des Judenthums, 1887, pp. 145-176). — Also: Les monnaies de Simon du temps de l'insurrection des juifs sous Adrien (Revue des études juives, t. xvi. 1888, pp. 161-169).

DE SAULCY, Lettre à M. de la Saussaye sur les monnaies de cuivre frappées à Jérusalem par l'ordre des gouverneurs romains de la Judée depuis le règne d'Auguste jusqu' à celui de Néron (Revue Numismatique, 1853, pp.186-201). — Also: Nouvelles observations sur la numismatique judaïque (Revue Num. 1864, pp. 370-400). — Lettre à M. J. de Witte sur la numismatique judaïque (Revue Num. 1865, pp. 29-55). — Also: Étude chronologique de la vie et des monnaies des rois juifs Agrippa I. et Agrippa II. (Mémoire de la Société française de Numismatique et d'Archéologie, Section d'histoire et d'ethnographie, 1869. This same part contains other two treatises, pp. 3-25, and the above named, pp. 26-56. The several memoirs are, as a rule, published separately under a special title). — Also: Note sur quelques monnaies d'Ascalon (Annuaire de la Société française de Numismatique et d'Archéologie, t. iii. 1868-1873, pp. 253-258). — Notes sur les monnaies de Philippe le tétrarque (ibid. pp. 262-265). — Numismatique de Tibériade (ibid. pp. 266-270). — Also: Numismatique des Macchabées (Revue archéologique, nouv. série, vol. xxiii. 1872, pp. 1-19). — Also: Description de quelques monnaies judaïques nouvelles insuffisamment connues (Mélanges de Numismatique, t. ii. 1877, pp. 85-94).

DE VOGÜÉ, Monnaies Juives, Eléasar (Revue Numismatique, 1860, pp. 280-292).

RÉVILLOUT, Note sur les plus anciennes monnaies hébraïques (Annuaire de la Société française de Numismatique et d'Archéologie, t. viii. 1884, pp. 113-146. Revised reprint from Revue Egyptologique). — Seeks to show that the Hebrew-Phoenician shekel was first reckoned equal to four drachmas by the Ptolemies, whereas the old Hebrew shekel was only half the weight, viz. two drachmas. — Compare also the correspondence between Lenormant and Révillout in Annuaire, viii. 1884, p. 210 sqq.; ix. 1885, p. 89 sqq.

REINACH, Une monnaie hybride des insurrections juives (Revue des études juives, t. xv. 1887, pp. 56-61). — Les monnaies juives (Revue des études juives, 1887, p. cxxxi.-ccxix.).

RENAN, L'église chrétienne, 1879, pp. 546-551. — On the coins of Barcochba.

SALLET, Die Silbermünzen des Barcochba (Zeitschrift für Numismatik, Bd. v. 1878, pp. 110-114).

GARRUCCI, Monete delle due rivolte giudaiche (Dissertazioni archeologiche di vario argomento, vol. ii., Roma 1865, pp. 31-39).

E. – INSCRIPTIONS

The inscriptions falling under our consideration here are of various kinds: Non-Jewish and Jewish, Palestinian and extra-Palestinian; written in Greek, Latin, Hebrew, and Aramaic. – 1. The non-Jewish Greek and Latin inscriptions from Palestine and neighbouring countries have been collected in the Corpus Inscriptionum Graecarum, vol. iii., and in the Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum, vol. iii. Both collections, especially the former, have meanwhile been largely supplemented by the discoveries of Wetzstein, Waddington, and others. The inscriptions referred to afford highly important information regarding the state of civilisation and culture in the pagan districts of Palestine (see § 22). Besides the Palestinian inscriptions, many that have been found in other places are of interest in connection with the history of our period, as are also many Semitic inscriptions in Palestine and outside of it, among which the Nabatean inscriptions collected by De Vogüé and Euting are specially important. – 2. Of the Jewish inscriptions, those in Hebrew have been collected by Chwolson in the Quarterly edited by him. More numerous are those in Greek and Latin, mostly epitaphs on tombstones in Palestine and outside of it; and most numerous and important of all are those taken from the Jewish catacombs at Rome.

1. Non-Jewish Inscriptions

Corpus Inscriptionum Graecarum, t. iii. 1853, n. 4444-4669.

Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum, t. iii. 1873, n. 86-211, 6027-6049.

Additional inscriptions from the Haurân and the eastern desert of Syria, communicated by G. C. Graham, and edited with a preface and notes by John Hogg (Transactions of the Royal Society of Literature, second series, vol. vi., London 1859, pp. 270-323).

ALLEN, Greek and Latin inscriptions from Palestine (American Journal of Philology, vi. 1885, pp. 190-216).

WETZSTEIN, Ausgewählte griechische und lateinische Inschriften, gesammelt auf Reisen in den Trachonen und um das Haurângebirge (Abhandlungen der Berliner Akademie, 1863, philol.-histor. Classe, pp. 255-368). – Compare also: Wetzstein, Reisebericht über Hauran und Trachonen. Berlin 1860.

MORDTMANN, Griechische Inschriften aus Arabia (Trachonitis) (Rhein. Museum, xxvii. 1872, pp. 146-148, 496). – Only six inscriptions, mostly fragmentary, of which two, the most complete, were previously given by Waddington. – Also: Griechische Inschriften aus dem Hauran (Archäol.-epigr. Mittheilungen aus Oesterreich, viii. 1884, pp. 180-192). – Also: Beiträge zur Inschriftenkunde Syriens (Zeitschrift des deutschen Palästina-Vereins, vii. 1884, pp. 119-124).

GILDEMEISTER, Bemerkungen zu den griechischen Inschriften Frei's und Schuhmacher's (Zeitschrift des deutschen Palästina-Vereins, xi. 1888, pp. 38-45).

WADDINGTON in: Le Bas et Waddington, Inscriptions grecques et latines recueillies en Grèce et en Asie Mineure. The inscriptions from Syria are in vol. iii. 1870; the text in Pt. 1, pp. 449-625, the explanations in Pt. 2, pp. 435-631. — The number of new discoveries communicated by Waddington is very considerable.

CLERMONT-GANNEAU, Inscriptions grecques inédites du Haurân et des régions adjacentes (Revue archéologique, troisième série, t. iv. 1884, pp. 260-284). — Single inscriptions may be found quoted in various reports of travel in Palestine.

Inscriptions referring to the Herodian princes have been collected by me in Hilgenfeld's Zeitschrift für Wissenschaftl. Theologie, 1873, pp. 248-255. — To this collection may be added: Corpus Inscriptionum Atticarum, t. iii. pars 1, 1878, n. 550, 551, 556. Corpus Inscriptionem Graecarum, n. 2502 (Herod Antipas in Coos). Bulletin de corres. hellénique, t. iii. 1879, p. 365 sq. (Herod Antipas in Delos). Archäolog.-epigr. Mittheilungen aus Oesterreich, viii. 1884, p. 189 f.=Zeitschrift des deutschen Palästina-Vereins, vii. 1884, p. 121 f. (Agrippa II.).

The Roman inscriptions referring to the Jewish history from Vespasian to Hadrian have been collected by Darmesteter, Revue des études juives, t. i. 1880, pp. 32-55.

The Semitic inscriptions have been collected in the most complete manner in the Corpus Inscriptionum Semiticarum, which has been in course of publication at Paris since 1881.

Up to the present only the Phoenician inscriptions have been issued. With reference to one of these, the inscription of Eschmunazar which gives dates important for the history, see Div. ii. vol. i. pp. 88, 89. The most interesting in relation to our subject of the non-Jewish Semitic inscriptions are the Nabatean, which have been made available to us in the editions of DE VOGÜÉ, 1868, and Euting, 1885. For further particulars regarding these, see Appendix II. at close of second volume. — It is only the slightest possible sort of connection with our subject that can be claimed for the numerous Aramaic and Greek inscriptions of Palmyra (edited by DE VOGÜÉ, Syrie Centrale, Inscriptions sémitiques. Paris 1868), among which, especially the bilingual Tariff of Taxes of Palmyra, discovered in 1881, belonging to the age of Hadrian, is most important. The Aramaic text is edited in the best style by Schroeder, Sitzungsb. der Berliner Akad. 1884, pp. 417-436; the Greek text by Dessau, in Hermes, Bd. xix. 1884, pp. 486-533.

2. Jewish Inscriptions

MADDEN gives a list of Jewish Inscriptions in his Coins of the Jews, pp. 34-39.

CHWOLSON, Corpus Inscriptionum Hebraicarum, containing epitaphs from the Crimea and other epitaphs and inscriptions in the old Hebrew square characters, as well as specimens from manuscripts of ninth and fifteenth centuries. St. Petersburg 1882. — Besides the epitaphs from the Crimea, it gives a collection of all inscriptions in the Hebrew square characters down to the eleventh century after Christ. — A partial list is also given by Merx, Archiv für wissenschaftl. Erforschung des A. T. i. 360-362.

Among the oldest inscriptions collected by Chwolson, the following are elsewhere treated of separately: — 1. The epitaph of the Benê Chesir on the so-called tomb of St. James at Jerusalem, belonging to the Herodian period (de Vogüé, Revue archéologique, nouv. série, t. ix. 1864, pp. 200-209). Also: Le temple de Jérusalem, pp. 45, 130 sqq., pl. xxxvii. n. 1. De Saulcy,

Revue archéolog., nouv. série, t. xi. 1865, pp. 137-153, 398-405. Merx, Archiv für wissenschaftl. Erforschung des A. T. i. 360 sq.). — 2. Some Synagogue Inscriptions in the north of Galilee, from the time of the Roman Emperors (Renan, Mission de Phénicie, pp. 761-783). To these may also be added a similar one from Palmyra, which contains the beginning of the Jewish Schma Deut. 6:4-9 (Landauer, Sitzungsberichte der Berliner Akademie, 1884, p. 933 ff.). — 3. The numerous Jewish Epitaphs. Among the latter are those from the Crimea of a much later date than previously Chwolson, on the basis of false dates attached to them by Firkowitsch, supposed them to be (for the literature, see Div. ii. vol. ii. p. 219); the Palestinian inscriptions are older, but very short. On these, partly in. Hebrew, partly in Greek, the following authors, before and after Chwolson, specially treat: —

CLERMONT-GANNEAU, Nouveaux ossuaires juifs avec inscriptions grecques et hébraïques (Revue archélogique, nouv. série, t. xxv. 1873, pp. 398-414). — Also: Ossuaire juif de Joseph fils de Jean (Revue archéol., nouv. série, t. xxxvi. 1878, pp. 305-311). Hebraic.

VIKTOR SCHULTZE, Sarkophage und Grabinschriften aus Jerusalem (Zeitschrift des deutschen Palästina-Vereins, iv. 1881, pp. 9-14).

GRÄTZ, Die jüdischen Steinsarkophage in Palästina (Monatsschrift. für Gesch. und Wissensch. des Judenthums, 1881, pp. 529-539). — Treats not so much of the inscriptions, as of the tablets on which they are engraved.

CLERMONT-GANNEAU, Epigraphes hébraïques et grecques sur des ossuaires juifs inédits (Revue archéol., troisième série, t. i. 1883, pp. 257-276). — Also: Un nouveau titulus funéraire de Joppe (Revue critique, 1885, n. 27, p. 14 sq.). Greek.

EUTING, Epigraphische Miscellen (Sitzungsberichte der berliner Akademie, 1885, pp. 669-688, Tafel vi.-xii.). — Principally Palmyrene inscriptions and Hebrew-Greek epitaphs from Palestine.

Apart from the epitaphs, Greek inscriptions of Jewish origin are rarely met with in Palestine. The most interesting are the Warning Tablet on the entrance to the Outer Court of the Temple (see Div. ii. vol. i. p. 266, note 16 and the Greek inscription among the ruins of the synagogue at Casiun (Renan, Mission de Phénicie, p. 774=Guérin, Galilée, ii. 447 sq.).

The extra-Palestinian Greek and Latin inscriptions, in so far as they are of any value at all, are given in § 31, i. and ii. 1 (Div. ii. vol. ii. pp. 220-242). Special attention may be called to the great inscription of Berenice (Div. ii. vol. ii. p. 231). Something may also be learned from Caspari, Quellen zur Geschichte des Taufsymbols, iii. 1875, pp. 268-274 — Among these, too, the majority are epitaphs. Most numerous are the inscriptions from the Catacombs of Rome and Venosa, which, together with some others, are collected in the following works: —

BURGON, Letters from Rome, 1862, pp. 168-174. Quoted by Madden in his Coins of the Jews.

GREPPO, Notice sur des inscriptions antiques tirées de quelques tombeaux juifs à Rome. Lyons 1835.

Corpus Inscriptionum Graecarum, t. iv. n. 9894-9926 (edited by Kirchhoff).

LEVY, Epigraphische Beiträge zur Geschichte der Juden, in Jahrbuch für die Geschichte der Juden (edited by Goldschmidt), Bd. ii. 1861, pp. 259-324.

LENORMANT, Essai sur la propagation de l'Alphabet Phénicien dans l'ancien Monde, vol. i. pp. 264-267.

GARRUCCI, Cimitero degli antichi Ebrei scoperto recentemente in Vigna Randanini. Roma 1862. — These inscriptions from the newly-discovered Catacombs of the Vigna Randanini have very considerably enriched our materials. — Also: Dissertazioni archeologiche di vario argomento, vol. ii., Roma 1865, pp. 150-192. — Forms a useful supplement to the preceding work.

HIRSCHFELD, Bullettino dell' Institute di corrisp. archeol. 1867, pp. 148-152. — Gives the first notice of the Catacombs of Venosa in South Italy, discovered in 1853.

FIORELLI, Catalogo del Museo Nazionale di Napoli. Raccolta epigrafica, ii. Iscrizioni Latine (Napoli 1868), n. 1954-1965. — Describes the inscriptions now to be found in the Museum of Naples from the Catacombs of Rome.

ENGESTRÖM, Om Judarne i Rom under äldre tider och deras Katakomber. Upsala 1876.

SCHÜRER, Die Gemeindeverfassung der Juden in Rom in der Kaiserzeit nach den Inschriften dargestellt. With forty-five Jewish inscriptions. Leipzig 1879.

ASCOLI, Iscrizioni inedite o mal note greche, latine, ebraiche di antichi sepolcri giudaici del Napolitano. Torino e Roma 1880. — Gives the inscriptions from the Catacombs of Venosa; of the Greek and Latin inscriptions, however, only those which also have a Hebrew paraphrase. Compare Theolog. Literaturzeitung, 1880, 485-488; Grätz, Monatsschr. 1880, pp. 433-451; Chwolson, Corp. Inscr. Hebr. col. 149 sqq.; also: Div. ii. vol. ii. p. 240.

Corpus inscriptionum Latinarum, t. ix. 1883, n. 647, 648, 6195-6241. — The Greek and Latin inscriptions from Venosa are given more completely than in Ascoli.

LENORMANT, La catacombe juive de Venosa (Revue des études juives, t. vi. 1883, pp. 200-207). — Gives a part of the inscriptions after new copies.

NIC. MÜLLER, Le catacombe degli Ebrei presso la via Appia Pignatelli (Mittheilungen des kaiserlich deutschen archäolog. Instituts, Römische Abtheilung, Bd. i. 1886, pp. 49-56). — A communication in regard to a newly-discovered Jewish catacomb. According to a statement on p. 49, the author seems to entertain the idea of writing a Monograph on "The Old Jewish Cemeteries of Italy." — For an explanation of the inscriptions communicated by Müller, compare also the remarks of Gomperz in: Archäologisch-epigraphische Mittheilungen aus Oesterreich-Ungarn, x. 1886, p. 231 f.

THE SOURCES

THE chief sources of information in regard to the spiritual and intellectual life of the Jewish people during our period must evidently be such literary works of the Jews as had their origin in that period, and have come down to us. In regard to these, we can here only refer to the accounts of that literature given in § 32–34. Among these documents is included the New Testament, in so far as it was composed by Jewish writers or makes reference to Jewish affairs. The coins and inscriptions, of which the literature has been given in the last section, are also to be ranked among the documents of primary importance.

All these works and documents, however, would not afford us material for writing a history of our period if we had not been possessed of the two Books of Maccabees and the works of Josephus, which relate the main incidents in the course of events, and, indeed, often go into very minute details. They form the most important, yea, almost the only, source of information in regard to the political history. As supplementary to them, we have, on the one hand, the Greek and Roman writers, who treat in a comprehensive way of the general history of that age; and, on the other hand, the rabbinical literature, contained in Mishna, Talmud, Midrash, Targum, which sets forth the results and preliminary summing up of the work of the scribes, who were at the very height of their activity during this period, and is, in so far at least, an indirect witness to the state of matters at that time. – Before considering the information supplied us by Josephus, we shall take a general view of the non-extant sources, partly in order that we may obtain a glimpse into the circumstances and conditions of an earlier age, partly and mainly in order to secure solid material for answering the question about the sources drawn upon by Josephus. This will give us the following five divisions: – 1. The two Books of Maccabees; 2. The non-extant Documents; 3. Josephus; 4. Greek and Roman Writers; and 5. The Rabbinical Literature.

A. – THE TWO BOOKS OF MACCABEES

The First Book of Maccabees is the main source to be relied upon for the first forty years of our history, from B.C. 175 to B.C. 135. The second book treats only of the first fourteen of those years, B.C. 175 to B.C. 161; but in respect of credibility stands far below the first, and can scarcely be said to be of independent value except in regard to the period that precedes the rise of the Maccabees. On the character of both of these works and the circumstances of their origin, all that is necessary will be found under § 32 and 33, in Div. ii. vol. iii. pp. 6–13, 211–216. All that we are required to do here is to determine what is to be regarded as the starting-point of the Seleucid era, in accordance with which both of these books fix their dates. The usual Seleucid era begins with autumn 312 B.C. But it is open to question whether in the two Books of Maccabees, or whether even in one of them, this usual starting-point is presupposed. In order to help to a decision, we set down in order the examples of dating by months given in the First Book of Maccabees: –

Chap. 1:54: τῇ πεντεκαιδεκάτῃ ἡμέρᾳ Χασελεῦ.

Chap. 1:59: τῇ πέμπτῃ καὶ εἰκάδι τοῦ μηνός.

Chap. 4:52: τῇ πέμπτῃ καὶ εἰκάδι τοῦ μηνὸς τοῦ ἐννάτου, οὗτος ὁ μὴν Χασελεῦ.

Chap. 7:43: τῇ τρισκαιδεκάτῃ τοῦ μηνὸς Ἀδάρ.

Chap. 7:49: τὴν τρισκαιδεκάτην τοῦ Ἀδάρ.

Chap. 9:3: τοῦ μηνὸς τοῦ πρώτου ἔτους τοῦ δευτέρου καὶ πεντηκοστοῦ καὶ ἑκατοστοῦ.

Chap. 9:54: μηνὶ τῷ δευτέρῳ.

Chap. 10:21: τῷ ἑβδόμῳ μηνὶ ἔτους ἑξηκοστοῦ καὶ ἑκατοστοῦ ἐν ἑορτῇ σκηνοπηγίας.

Chap. 13:51: τῇ τρίτῃ καὶ εἰκάδι τοῦ δευτέρου μηνὸς ἔτους ἑνὸς καὶ ἑβδομηκοστοῦ καὶ ἑκατοστοῦ. For the same occurrence the Megillath Taanith gives the date 23rd Ijjar.

Chap. 14:27: ὀκτωκαιδεκάτῃ Ἐλοὺλ, ἔτους δευτέρου καὶ ἑβδομηκοστοῦ καὶ ἑκατοστοῦ.

Chap. 16:14: ἐν μηνὶ ἑνδεκάτῳ, οὗτος ὁ μὴν Σαβάτ.

From these dates it is put beyond all doubt that the author reckoned the months from the spring season. With him Ijjar or Zif is the second mouth (chap. 13:51); Tizri, therefore, the month of the Feast of Tabernacles, was the seventh (chap. 10:21); Chisleu is the ninth (chap. 4:52), and Shebat is the eleventh (chap. 16:14). The numbering of the months, therefore, begins with Nisan or Abib, that is, in the spring (see list in Appendix III. at the end of vol. ii.). From this it seems to be put beyond all reasonable doubt that the year by which the author reckoned also began in the spring season. But the Seleucid era, according to which he reckons, is usually supposed to start with autumn, just as it was customary in Syria generally to commence the year in the season of harvest. Among the Jews, too, it was the custom in very early times (Ex. 23:16, 34:22) to begin the year in autumn, – a custom older probably than that of starting with the spring. In the post-exilian times we certainly have both of these methods of reckoning the beginning of the year existing side by side. The cycle of religious festivals begins in the spring season; and so from it the months are counted in the First Book of Maccabees as well as in the Priestly Code. But just as even the Priestly Code could not prevent the celebrating of the new moon of the month Tizri with a religious festival (Lev. 23:23–25; Num. 29:1–6), in later times the beginning of the year came to be counted from that day, רֹאשׁ הַשָּׁנָה. The Mishna, indeed, says distinctly that “for the year” simply, therefore for the numbering of its months, the beginning is made with the 1st of Tizri. According to Josephus, too, the beginning of the year with Nisan, as ordained by Moses, holds good with reference only to sacred things; whereas, on the other hand, “for buying and selling and other business,” the year begins with Tizri according to the more ancient pre-Mosaic ordinance. In these circumstances it is quite possible that the First Book of Maccabees too, notwithstanding the numbering of the months from the spring season, may have reckoned its dates from the autumn. We should indeed have felt ourselves obliged, if no very decided reasons could be adduced against such a supposition, to accept this as the most probable explanation, seeing that it is from autumn as a rule that the dates in the Seleucid era are reckoned. This is the view taken by Wernsdorff, Clinton, and myself in the first edition of this work. But now it seems to me that weighty grounds can be given for thinking that the era of our book begins with the spring.

1. According to 1 Macc. 7:1, Demetrius I. withdrew from Rome in the year 151 of the Seleucid era, and became king of Syria. After this we meet with no other note of time in the First Book of Maccabees until we come to the 43rd and 49th verses of the 7th chapter, where we are told that Nicanor lost the battle and his life in fighting against Judas on the 13th Adar. The year is not

thereby determined. But in chap. 9:3 it is further said that in the first month of the year 152 of the Seleucid era a new army was sent by Demetrius into Palestine. According to this statement, it must then be assumed that the defeat of Nicanor took place on the 13th Adar of the year 151 of the Seleucid era. Since, then, by the "first month" of the year 152, after what had just been stated, the month Nisan of that year must evidently be understood, and since, further, Nisan follows immediately after Adar, if we suppose the year to begin, not on 1st Nisan but on 1st Tizri, a space of three months would intervene between the one event and the other. But according to the context of the story it is much more probable that the one followed almost immediately upon the other, and that therefore the beginning of the year was counted from 1st Nisan.

2. According to 1 Macc. 10:1, Alexander Balas raised himself to the Syrian throne in the year 160 of the Seleucid era. According to chap. 10:21, Jonathan put on the high priest's garments for the first time "in the seventh month" of this same year 160 of the Seleucid era, at the Feast of Tabernacles, therefore on the 15th Tizri. If, therefore, the year had begun on 1st Tizri, it would follow that all the occurrences reported in 1 Macc. 10:1–21 would have taken place within fourteen days, which is impossible. Should we insist upon putting the beginning of the year in the autumn, we would be obliged to set it later than the Feast of Tabernacles, and then that festival would be thrown into the end of the year, as indeed is presupposed in the old legislation of Ex. 23:16, בְּצֵאתְהַשָּׁנָה. But after what has been said above about the New Year Festival on the 1st Tizri, on the supposition of the year beginning generally in the autumn, for our period only the 1st of Tizri can come into consideration.

3. When in the year 150 of the Seleucid era, which date is given us in 1 Macc. 6:20 and 7:1, Antiochus V. Eupator and Lysias came into Palestine with a great army, the garrison of Bethzur was obliged to submit to them, and those besieged in the fortress of Mount Zion suffered the direst privations (1 Macc. 6:48–54). And both of these disasters happened from their being deprived of the means of sustenance on account of the Sabbatical year, "the year of rest to the land" (1 Macc. 6:49, 53). This seventh year of rest was counted from autumn to autumn, as is shown in the passage quoted above from Rosch haschana i. 1. The want of victuals, however, could not have been felt before the middle of the seventh year, after the stores of the previous year had been used up and no new fruits were coming in during spring and summer. On the other hand, at the time when these events occurred, the Sabbath year had not yet expired (chap. 6:49: σάββατον ἦν τῇ γῇ; 6:53: διὰ τὸ ἕβδομον ἔτος εἶναι). They must therefore have taken place in the period between spring and 1st of Tizri. But we know that the siege of Jerusalem by Herod and Sosius also occurred during a Sabbath year (Josephus, Antiq. xiv. 16. 2; comp. xv. 1. 2). That siege, however, is certainly to be dated in the summer of B.C. 37 (see below, § 14). Thus the year B.C. 38–37 was a Sabbath year. If, then, we reckon back from this, we shall find that the year B.C. 164–163 reckoned from autumn to autumn was also a seventh year of rest. The occurrences in question must therefore fall to the summer of B.C. 163. But the year B.C. 163–162 corresponds with the year 150 of the Seleucid era. Had that been counted from autumn, this reckoning would not tally. It will agree only if the Seleucid era is made to begin with spring.

As a confirmation of our understanding of the Sabbath year, may be quoted the somewhat late rabbinical note that it was מוֹצָאֵישְׁבִיעִית when the temple was destroyed by Titus (Seder Olam, ed. Meyer, p. 91 ff.: אותו היום מוצאי שבת היה ומוצאי שביעית היתה. So, too, Arachin 11b, Taanith 29a). By מוֹצָאֵי שְׁבִיעִית, according to the well-established usage, is certainly to be understood the year after the Sabbath

year (see Schebiith v. 5, vi. 4; Sota vii. 8; Machschirin ii. 11; comp. מוצאי שבת, meaning the day after the Sabbath, and ערב שבת, meaning the day before the Sabbath, in Chullin i. fin.). Accordingly the year A.D. 68–69 was a Sabbath year. And if we reckon back from this, we shall find that also the years B.C. 164–163 and B.C. 38–37 were Sabbath years.

Only one historical date on a Sabbath year stands opposed to the views that have been here set forth. According to 1 Macc. 16:14, Simon Maccabeus died in the month Shebat of the year 177 of the Seleucid era. Since Shebat corresponds in part with our February, this date, whether one counts the Seleucid year from spring or from autumn, must be rendered February B.C. 135. But, according to the report of Josephus, after the murder of Simon, John Hyrcanus besieged Simon's murderer in the fortress of Dagon, and was then obliged after some time to raise the siege when the Sabbath. year came round in which the Jews are required to rest. His words are these: "The year of rest came on upon which the Jews rest every seventh year as they do on every seventh day" (Wars of the Jews, i. 2. 4). "That year on which the Jews used to rest came on; for the Jews observe this rest every seventh year as they do every seventh day" (Antiq. xiii. 8. 1). The year B.C. 135–134 must therefore have been a Sabbath year, whereas according to our calculations we should have expected it to have been B.C. 136–135. The statement of Josephus, however, is open to suspicion on other grounds. The reason given there to show the necessity of raising the siege is that rest is enjoined during the seventh year as on the seventh day. This was indeed the idea that prevailed among Gentile writers. So Tacitus says, Hist. v. 4: dein blandiente inertia septimum quoque annum ignaviae datum. But in the Pentateuch rest in general during the seventh year is by no means enjoined, but only the leaving of the fields unsown (see Lev. 25:1–7). And so far as my knowledge goes, even the later refinements on the interpretation of the law have never gone farther than this. There is therefore good reason for the suspicion that Josephus, who is in this place following Gentile authorities, as is certain on other grounds, has simply transcribed without sifting the statements which were before him. It would also appear that the real occasion of the raising of the siege was not the coming round of the Sabbath year, but the failure of provisions during the course of that year of rest to the land. If this interpretation be accepted, then B.C. 136–135 will be the Sabbath year in full agreement with the other dates. — Wieseler, who indeed places the Sabbath year in B.C. 136–135, sets down the death of Simon as occurring in Shebat, or February B.C. 136; and seeing that this, according to our reckoning, would be the Shebat of the year 176 of the Seleucid era, he makes the Seleucid year of the First Book of Maccabees begin in accordance with the Roman practice in January, — an eccentricity of view that need not now be seriously criticized.

Against the cycle of the Sabbath year here adopted I argued in the first edition of this work that the year A.D. 40–41 could not have been a Sabbath year, as according to our cycle it must have been. For the Jews omitted to sow the seed in the last month before Caligula's death, during November A.D. 40, not because it was the Sabbath year, but because for weeks they were going in great crowds to lay before Petronius their complaints on account of the profanation threatened to the temple (Antiq. xviii. 8. 3; Wars of the Jews, ii. 10. 5). From this it would appear that the sowing of the fields during that year had been expected. But we are obliged to admit that this indirect argument, when put over against other possible explanations that may still be given, is not strong enough to overturn the very positive proofs that have been advanced in favour of regarding this year as a Sabbath year.

Compare generally on the reckoning of the historically attested Sabbath year in our periods (which by many are made about a year later than by us): Anger, De temporum in actis apostolorum ratione, Lips. 1833, p. 38 (and the earlier works of Scaliger, Petavius, etc., there

quoted). — Gumpach, Ueber den altjüdischen Kalender, Brussels 1848. — Herzfeld, Geschichte des Volkes Jisrael, ii. 458 ff. — Zuckermann, Ueber Sabbathjahrcyklus und Jobelperiode, Breslau 1857 (and the older literature quoted there, pp. 2, 3). — Grätz, Geschichte der Juden, Bd. iii. (3 Aufl. 1878) pp. 636-639, note 7. — Wieseler, art "Aere," in Herzog's Real-Encyclop. 1 Aufl. i. 159 f. Also: Stud. und Krit. 1875, p. 527 ff. — Caspari, Chronological and Geographical Introduction to the Life of Christ, 1876, pp. 23-28. Also: Die geschichtlichen Sabbathjahre (Stud. und Krit. 1877, pp. 181-190). — Rösch, Stud. und Krit. 1870, p. 361 f., and 1875, p. 589 ff. — Sevin, Chronologie des Lebens Jesu, 2 Aufl. 1874, p. 58 ff. — Riess, Das Geburtsjahr Christi, 1880, pp. 45 f., 229-236.

Besides the reasons which we have adduced for believing that the Seleucid years of our book begin with the spring, we may also add the important fact that it is also from the spring that it numbers the months. Even had it not been otherwise impossible to suppose that its cycle of years began in autumn, this circumstance would have caused very great difficulty, especially in those passages in which the name of the month is not mentioned, but only the number of the month and the year. Thus we read "in the first month of the year 152, " chap. 9:3, etc. This form of expression would scarcely have been adopted unless a uniform mode of determining the order of the month had prevailed.

We assume then, with the great majority of critics, that the Seleucid era of the First Book of Maccabees begins, not in autumn, but in spring. And however extraordinary it may at first sight appear that in Palestine they had a Seleucid era which differed to the extent of about half a year from that current in the rest of Syria, this will no longer appear extraordinary to one who is acquainted with the circumstances. Almost every one of the more important cities in the neighbourhood of Palestine had during the Graeco-Roman period its own era, yea, even its own calendar (see § 23). It is therefore quite conceivable that the Jews on adopting the imperial era should modify it in accordance with their calendar. We find, too, that exactly this same era was in use in the city of Damascus. The year began in Damascus and in the Roman province of Arabia in the spring (see Ideler, Handbuch der Chronologie, i. 413, 437). But the coins of Damascus are dated according to the Seleucid era. And although on an inscription discovered in recent times a specifically Damascene era is spoken of, this can mean nothing else than the Seleucid era beginning in spring, just as in our book.

By all that has been said, the question is not yet settled as to whether the era of our book begins half a year before or half a year after the date usually assigned, whether in spring B.C. 312 or in spring B.C. 311. The French scholar Gibert pronounces in favour of the former view. But the opinion generally accepted, that spring of B.C. 312 is the starting-point, can be proved to be certainly the right one. It will be enough here, apart from all other grounds, to refer to the remarks made in reference to the Sabbath year. If the year 150 of the Seleucid era were to be regarded, as Gibert desires, as equivalent to B.C. 162-161, then the Sabbath year must be fixed a year later, which would be in direct conflict with the date of the siege of Jerusalem by Herod and Sosius, with which Gibert can reconcile himself only by very artificial and far-fetched reasoning.

The era of the Second Book of Maccabees is still more open to dispute than that of the first book. We have also an apologetic interest in determining the era, inasmuch as certain dates of the second book are reconcilable with those of the first only if the years in each era were reckoned according to different eras. And, indeed, the era of the second book seems to have a later starting-point than that of the first. But in regard to this matter, too, the most diverse opinions prevail. Some assume half a year's difference, some a whole year's, and some a year

and a half. The last mentioned is the view of Ideler, who dates the epoch of the first from spring B.C. 312, and that of the second from autumn B.C. 311. The dates upon which arguments are based are indeed very few; practically only the following two: – 1. The death of Antiochus Epiphanes is set down in 1 Macc. 6:16 at the year 149 of the Seleucid era; whereas, according to 2 Macc. 11:33, he must have died at the latest in the year 148 of the Seleucid era, for there a decree of his successor Eupator is quoted, bearing the date of that year. 2. The second campaign of Lysias, according to 1 Macc. 6:20, was undertaken in the year 150 of the Seleucid era; whereas, according to 2 Macc. 13:1, it is placed in the Seleucid year 149. But in reference to the former date, the facts of the case are different from what at first appears. The subject treated of in 2 Macc. 11:33 is not really the date of the death of Antiochus Epiphanes, but rather the date of the first campaign of Lysias. And although 2 Macc. 11:33 assigns that event to the Seleucid year 148, this is quite reconcilable with 1 Macc. 4:28, 52. The difference consists, therefore, not in a diverse mode of reckoning time, but simply in this, that the Second Book of Maccabees erroneously sets down the first campaign of Lysias after the death of Antiochus Epiphanes, while both books agree in assigning it to the year 148 of the Seleucid era. In the other pair of passages, however, – 1 Macc. 6:20 and 2 Macc. 13:1, – we actually do come upon a diversity of dates. But Grimm on 2 Macc. 13:1 has justly remarked, after repeating his own earlier opinion, that one "certainly does too much honour to the abounding historical and chronological errors of which the author of the second book has been convicted, by a great expenditure of combinations either in reconciling diversities, or in seeking, by the assumption of a different beginning of the Seleucid era, to explain the chronological difference between him and the First Book of the Maccabees." – There is therefore no sufficient ground for assuming a special era for the Second Book of the Maccabees. We have therefore before us the choice of regarding the era of that book as the Palestinian Seleucid era employed in the First Book of the Maccabees, or as the Seleucid era prevailing throughout the rest of Syria.

Compare on the eras of the two Books of Maccabees: Froelich, Annales compendiarii regum et rerum Syriae (ed. 2, 1750), Proleg. p. 22 sqq. – Wernsdorff, De fide historica librorum Maccabaicorum, 1747, pp. 18–31 (contests the view previously maintained by Scaliger, Petavius, Usher, Prideaux, Foy-Vaillant, des-Vignoles, Froelich, and others, that the era of the First Book of Maccabees begins with a spring year). – Gibert, Mémoire sur la chronologie de l'histoire des Machabées (Mémoires de l'Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres, alte série, t. xxvi. 1759, pp. 112–156). – Clinton, Fasti Hellenici, iii. 375–382. – Ideler, Handbuch der Chronologie, i. 531–534. – Wieseler, Die 70 Wochen und die 63 Jahrwochen des Propheten Daniel, 1839, p. 110 ff. Also: Chronological Synopsis of the Four Gospels, 1864. Also: art. "Aere," in Herzog's Real-Encyclop. 1 Aufl. i. 159 f. Also: Stud. und Krit. 1875, pp. 520–532; and 1877, p. 510 ff. – Grimm, Exegetisches Handbuch zu den Apokryphen, iii. 11 f., iv. 186 f. Also: Bissel and Wace (in Speaker's Comm.) in their Introductions to Maccabees.

B. – NON-EXTANT SOURCES

The following survey embraces – 1. All special works on the Jewish history of our period known to us only through quotations or fragments, whether they are used by Josephus or not; and 2. Those of the more general historical works now lost, to which the exposition of Josephus is directly or indirectly indebted. To one or other of these categories belong all the works enumerated in the following paragraphs: –

1. Jason of Cyrene

He wrote a work in five books on the history of the Maccabean rising, from its beginning down to

the victory of Judas over Nicanor in B.C. 161. All this period is treated of in one book in our so-called Second Book of Maccabees: “All these things being declared by Jason of Cyrene in five books, we shall essay to abridge in one volume,” 2 Macc. 2:23. He is supposed to have lived not long after the events which he narrates, somewhere about the middle of the second century B.C.; comp. Div. ii. vol. iii. p. 211.

2. The History of John Hyrcanus

A history of John Hyrcanus was known to the writer of the First Book of Maccabees: “The chronicle of his priesthood,” 1 Macc. 16:24. This book, in a style similar to that of the First Book of Maccabees, described his long and honourable career. It seems to have got lost at an early date, for it was evidently unknown even to Josephus. Comp. Div. ii. vol. iii. p. 13.

3. Posidonius of Apamea

The celebrated Stoic philosopher and historian Posidonius, from Apamea in Syria, lived chiefly in Rhodes, where he founded a Stoic School. He is hence called “the Rhodian.” Since he was also a scholar of Panätius, who at latest must have died B.C. 110, he cannot have been born later than B.C. 130. In the seventh consulship of Marius, B.C. 86, he went as ambassador to Rome, and there saw Marius shortly before his death (Plutarch’s Marius, chap. xlv.). Immediately after Sulla’s death (B.C. 78), Cicero heard him in Rhodes (Plutarch’s Cicero, chap. iv.). Pompey visited him there repeatedly. During the consulship of Marius Marcellus, B.C. 51, he went once more to Rome (Suidas, Lexicon, art. Ποσειδώνιος). He may therefore be described as having flourished between B.C. 90 and B.C. 50. According to Lucian. Macrob. chap. xx. he lived to the great age of eighty-four years. Of his numerous writings, it is his great historical work that here interests us. It is frequently quoted in the historical sketches of Athenäus, Strabo, Plutarch, and others. From the criticisms in Athenäus it would appear to have consisted of at least forty-nine books. It is not, therefore, open to doubt that Suidas (Lexicon, under the word Ποσειδώνιος) has this work in view when he makes the erroneous remark about the Alexandrian Posidonius: ἔγραψεν Ἱστορίαν τὴν μετὰ Πολύβιον ἐν βιβλίος νβ′. The extant fragments, too, make it probable that the work begins where Polybius ends, with B.C. 146. How far down it carried the history is uncertain. It went on, according to Suidas, ἕως τοῦ πολέμου τοῦ Κυρηναϊκοῦ καὶ Πτολεμαίου. Müller (Fragm. hist. graec. iii. 250) believes that instead of this we ought to read ἕως τοῦ Πτολεμαίου τοῦ Κυρηναϊκοῦ, that is, down to Ptolemäus Apion of Cyrene, who died B.C. 96. The fact, too, that the fragments that have been preserved from the 47th and 49th books refer to the period from B.C. 100 to B.C. 90, goes to confirm this supposition. But, according to a fragment of considerable extent quoted by Athenäus, it appears that Posidonius also gave a detailed account of the history of the Athenian demagogue Athenio or Aristion, B.C. 87-86. And further, according to a notice in Strabo (xi. 1. 6), he also treated of the history of Pompey: τὴν ἱστορίαν συνέγραψε τὴν περὶ αὐτόν. From this Müller concludes that Posidonius had dealt with the period after B.C. 96 in a “second part,” or a continuation of his great work. This elaborate hypothesis, however, has no substantial support in the evidently corrupted words of Suidas. The fifty-two books may have quite easily embraced the period from B.C. 87-86, and the work, as Scheppig maintains, may have been brought down to that time. Arnold would have it carried down even to B.C. 82. Much further it certainly could not have extended, since in the 47th and 49th books the writer had got no farther than the period B.C. 100-B.C. 90. The history of Pompey must therefore have formed a separate work.

The great work of Posidonius was held in high esteem by later historians, who seemed to have used it as they did Polybius, as a principal source for the period of which it treats. It is certain

that Diodorus has drawn upon it (Müller, Fragmenta, t. ii. p. 20, t. iii. p. 251). But even Trogus Pompeius refers to it as an authority (see Heeren in: Com. Soc. Sc. Gött. t. xv. 1804, pp. 185-245; Teuffel, History of Roman Literature, § 258. 4, and the literature given there). And so probably it was used by most who treated of this period. It is therefore highly probable that the passages in Josephus which deal with that time are essentially based upon Posidonius, – not indeed directly, but indirectly, as he had found him quoted and used by Strabo and Nicolaus Damascenus.

Josephus used Strabo and Nicolas as authorities of the first order for the period referred to. That Strabo had made use of Posidonius in the composition of his history is abundantly evident, for he quotes him frequently and with great respect in his Geography (ii. 102, xvi. 753). In Nicolaus Damascenus, too, there are unmistakeable traces of use having been made of Posidonius (Müller, iii. 415). – Josephus mentions Posidonius only once, in his Treatise against Apion, ii. 7. Strongly marked resemblances, however, are discernible between his exposition and that of Diodorus and Trogus Pompeius. Compare the account of the conquest of Jerusalem by Antiochus Sidetes in Josephus, Antiq. xiii. 8. 2-3, and in Diodorus, xxxiv. 1; and that of the Parthian war of Demetrius II. in Josephus, Antiq. xiii. 5. 11, and in Justin, i.e. Trogus Pompeius, xxxvi. 1. 3. If, then, these two – Diodorus and Trogus Pompeius – rely upon Posidonius, then so also does Josephus. Further details in Nussbaum, Observ. in Fl. Jos. Antiq. xii. 3-xiii. 14; Destinon, Die Quellen, § 52; J. G. Müller on Josephus "Against Apion," 214 ff., 258 f.

The historical and geographical fragments of Posidonius are collected by C. Müller, fragmenta historicorum Graecorum, iii. 245-296. Compare generally, Fabricius, Bibliothec. graec. ed. Harles, iii. 572-574, iv. 34. – Bake, Posidonii Rhodii reliquae doctrinae, Lugd. Bat. 1810. – Clinton, Fasti Hellenici, vol. iii. under years 143, 86, 78, 62, 60, 51. – Forbiger, Handbuch der alten Geographie, i. 1842, 357-363. – Toepelmann, De Posidonio Rhodio rerum scriptore, Bonnae 1867. – Scheppig, De Posidonio Apamensi rerum gentium terrarum scriptore, Halis Sax. 1869. – Nicolai, Griechische Literaturgeschichte, ii. 182 f., 242 f. – Blass, De Gemino et Posidonio, Kiel 1883. – Arnold, Untersuchungen über Theophanes von Mytilene und Posidonius von Apamea, in Jahrbb. für class. Philologie, 13 Supplementalband, 1884, pp. 75-150 (seeks to prove that Appian in his Mithridatica has used both of these authors). – Schühlein, Studien zu Posidonius Rhodius, Freising 1886; a careful sifting and arranging of biographical detail. Zimmermann in: Hermes xxxiii. pp. 103-130; on the use made of Posidonius in the Geography of Strabo. – On Posidonius as a philosopher, see Ueberweg, History of Philosophy, vol. i. pp. 185, 189; and Zeller, The Stoics, Epicureans, and Sceptics, London 1869. Also: Wendland, Posidonius Werk περί θεῶν (Archiv für Geschichte der Philos., Bd. i 1888, pp. 200-210).

4. Timagenes of Alexandria

Timagenes, by birth probably a Syrian, had been taken prisoner in Alexandria by Gabinius during his Egyptian campaign in B.C. 55. He was then carried off to Rome, where he continued ever afterwards to reside (Suidas, Lexicon, under the word Τιμαγένης). He was notorious for his loose tongue, on account of which he was forbidden by Augustus to enter his house. He was nevertheless held in high esteem, and enjoyed the intimate friendship of Asinius Pollio. Seneca in his de ira, iii. 23, says: Timagenes in contubernio Pollionis Asinii consensuit, ac tota civitate dilectus est: nullum illi limen praeclusa Caesaris domus abstulit. His numerous works were much prized on account of their learning and their elegant rhetorical form. Ammianus Marcellinus, xv. 9, speaks of Timagenes as et diligentia Graecus et lingua. Even Quintilian, x. 1. 75, names him among the most famous historians. The few extant fragments are not sufficient

to lead us to form any definite judgment upon the contents and style of his work. — The quotations in Josephus are confined to the history of Antiochus Epiphanes (Treatise against Apion, ii. 7), of the Jewish king Aristobulus I. (Antiq. xiii. 11. 3), and of Alexander Jannäus (Antiq. xiii. 12. 5). It is evident, however, that Josephus did not use the work of Timagenes at first hand, but borrowed his references from other historians. In Antiq. xiii. 11. 3, he introduces a quotation in this fashion: "as Strabo bears witness in the name of Timagenes, who says thus." So, too, the quotation in Antiq. xiii. 12. 5 is taken from Strabo, who is himself immediately afterwards quoted in Antiq. xiii. 12. 6.

The fragments of Timagenes are collected by C. Müller, Fragmenta historicorum graecorum, iii. 317-323. Comp. also Clinton, Fasti Hellenici, iii. 2nd ed. p. 573 ff. — Westermann in Pauly's Real-Encyclop. vi. 2. 1971, and the literature quoted there. — Nicolai, Griechische Literaturgesch. ii. 188. — Gutschmid in a paper on "Trogus and Timagenes," in Rhein. Museum, vol. xxxvii. 1882, pp. 548-555, seeks to show that Trogus Pompeius is only a Latin reproduction of an original Greek work, and assumes that the latter was the work of Timagenes.

5. Asinius Pollio

C. Asinius Pollio, the well-known friend of Caesar and Augustus, composed, besides other works, a history of the civil war between Caesar and Pompey, in 17 books, in the Latin tongue. This, at least, is the most probable rendering of the confused statements in Suidas' Lexicon, under the names Πωλίων and Ἀσίνιος (see Teuffel, History of Roman Literature, § 221. 3). Plutarch, Appian, and others made use of the work (Plutarch. Pompeius, c. 72; Caesar, c. 46; Appian. Civ. ii. 82). Since it was an authority of the first order, as being the work of a contemporary man of affairs, an investigator like Strabo naturally did not allow it to escape him. From a notice in Josephus it would appear that Strabo had used it and quoted from it in the history of Caesar's Egyptian campaign. In his Antiq. xiv. 8. 3, Josephus thus introduces a quotation: "Strabo of Cappadocia bears witness to this, when he says thus in the name of Asinius."

Compare on Asinius Pollio generally, Teuffel in Pauly's Real-Encyclop. i. 2, 2 Aufl. pp. 1859-1865; Teuffel, History of Roman Literature, § 221, and the literature quoted in both places. — Something may also be found in Hübner, Grundriss zu Vorlesungen über die römische Literaturgesch. 1878, p. 181. — On the history of the Civil War, Thouret, De Cicerone, Asinio Pollione, C. Oppio rerum Caesarianarum scriptoribus (Leipz. Stud. zu class. Philol., Bd. i. 1878, pp. 303-360; on Asinius Pollio, pp. 324-346). A discussion is being carried on in regard to the authorities used by Appian, but nothing definite has been reached as to how far he may have employed the work of Asinius Pollio.

6. Hypsikrates

Hypsikrates, a writer otherwise unknown, is quoted twice by Strabo in his Geography. The one quotation refers to the history of Asander, a governor of the Bosporus under King Pharnaces II., in the time of Caesar (Strabo, vii. 4. 6). The other quotation refers to the ethnology of the Caucasian nations (Strabo, xi. 5. 1). In a third passage a quotation about the natural history of Libya is attributed to Iphikrates, but this name is most likely to be read Hypsikrates (Strabo, xvii. 3. 5). According to Lucian. Macrob. c. 22, Hypsikrates was a native of Amisus in Pontus, and lived to the age of ninety-two years. Since he treats of the times of Caesar he cannot have been much older than Strabo. — According to a statement in Josephus, Strabo had borrowed from this Hypsikrates in his account of the Egyptian campaign of Caesar: "The same Strabo says thus

again, in another place, in the name of Hypsikrates," Antiq. xiv. 8. 3.

Compare generally, Müller, Fragmenta historicorum Graecorum, iii. 493 ff. — Bähr in Pauly's Real-Encyclopaedie, iii. 1560.

7. Dellius

Dellius, a friend of Antonius, wrote a work on the Parthian campaign of Antonius, in which he had himself taken part. (Strabo, xi. 13. 3, p. 523: ὥς φησιν ὁ Δέλλιος ὁ τοῦ Ἀντωνίου φίλος, συγγράψας τὴν ἐπὶ Παρθυαίους αὐτοῦ στρατείαν, ἐν ᾗ παρῆν καὶ αὐτὸς ἡγεμονίαν ἔχων. Plutarch. Anton. c. 59: πολλοὺς δὲ καὶ τῶν ἄλλων φίλων οἱ Κλεοπάτρας κόλακες ἐχέβαλον … ὧν καὶ Μάρκος ἦν Σιλανὸς καὶ Δέλλιος ὁ ἱστορικός).

It is possible, as Bürcklein and Gutschmid surmise, that all the accounts of later historians regarding the Parthian campaign of the years B.C. 41-36, and so, too, that of Josephus, are drawn either directly or indirectly from this work. Josephus mentions Dellius in Antiq. xiv. 15. 1; xv. 2. 6; Wars of Jews, i. 15. 3; not, however, as a historian, but as a comrade of Antony.

Compare Bürcklein, Quellen und Chronologie der römischparthischen Feldzüge in den Jahren, 713-718. An Inaugural Dissertation, 1879 (on Josephus, pp. 41-43). — Gutschmid, Geschichte Irans und seiner Nachbarländer, 1888, p. 97. Generally, Haakh in Pauly's Real-Encyclopaedie, ii. 899. Teuffel, History of Roman Literature, § 255. 3.

8. Strabo

Besides his Geography, which has come down to us, and will be treated of under § 3. D, among extant authorities, Strabo was the author of a large historical work which, with the exception of a few fragments, has been lost. It had been completed before Strabo began his Geography. In the introduction to this latter work he refers to his history: Διόπερ ἡμεῖς πεποιηκότες ὑπομνήματα ἱστορικὰ χρήσιμα, ὡς ὑπολαμβάνομεν, εἰς τὴν ἠθικὴν καὶ πολιτικὴν φιλοσοφίαν. From another quotation which he makes, it appears that the 5th book of that history began where the work of Polybius ended, i.e. with B.C. 146: εἰρηκότες δὲ πολλὰ περὶ τῶν Παθικῶν νομίμων ἐν τῇ ἕκτῃ τῶν ἱστορικῶν ὑπομνημάτων βίβλῳ, δευτέρᾳ δὲ τῶν μετὰ Πολύβιον. This overlapping of the narrative explains how it is that the character of the first four books is different from that of the books μετὰ Πολύβιον; the former being summary in the style, the latter detailed and full. In the earlier books the times of Alexander the Great must have been treated of, for Strabo says in a third passage that he had come to see the untrustworthiness of the reports about India when he was engaged upon the history of Alexander the Great: καὶ ἡμῖν δ' ὑπῆρξεν ἐπὶ πλέον κατιδεῖν ταῦτα ὑπομνηματιζομένοις τὰς Ἀλεξάνδρου πράξεις. According to an explanatory note by Suidas, Lexicon, under the name Πολύβιος, the work "after Polybius" was composed of forty-three books: "Strabo," it is said, "wrote the μετὰ Πολύβιον in forty-three books;" while the whole work was made up of forty-seven books. From the quotations in Josephus it may be concluded that the history had been carried down at least to the conquest of Jerusalem by Herod in B.C. 37. It may therefore have closed with the establishment of sole and absolute monarchy under Augustus. The most of the quotations are made by Josephus, who evidently used this work as his main authority for the history of the Asmonaeans from John Hyrcanus to the overthrow of Antigonus, B.C. 135-37, because he culls from this large general history the passages and allusions that have reference to the history of Palestine. Such notices will be found in Antiq. xiii. 10. 4, 11. 3, 12. 6; xiv. 3. 1, 4. 3, 6. 4, 7. 2, 8. 3; xv. 1. 2. Compare also a statement with reference to Autiochus Epiphanes in the Treatise against Apion, ii. 7. This history of Strabo is

also expressly cited by Plutarch, Sulla, c. 26; Lucull. c. 28; Caesar, c. 63; and by Tertullian, de anima, c. 46. But much as the loss of this work is to be regretted, it is at least some satisfaction to know that Josephus used it along with Nicolaus Damascenus as one of his principal authorities. For Strabo was a thoroughgoing investigator, who employed the best sources with circumspection, subjecting them to a careful critical examination. Even in the few fragments preserved in Josephus he three times cited his authorities by name, Timagenes, Asinius Pollio, and Hypsikrates. That he made use of the great work of Posidonius cannot be doubted. And though his name is not once mentioned, we cannot say how much Strabo may have been indebted to him for the information given in his comprehensive work. Josephus frequently calls attention to the agreement between Strabo and Nicolaus Damascenus. "Now Nicolas of Damascus and Strabo of Cappadocia both describe the expeditions of Pompey and Gabinius against the Jews, while neither of them says anything new that is not in the other," Antiq. xiv. 6. 4. But it is not probable that the one had made use of the other, seeing that they were contemporaries. Nicolaus Damascenus is quoted by Strabo in his Geography (xv. 1. 72, 73). On the other hand, the historical work of Strabo is rather older than that of Nicolas. The agreement between them to which Josephus calls attention must therefore have resulted from their using the same authorities.

It was a decided mistake on the part of Lewitz (Quaest. Flav. specimen, 1835) to describe Strabo the historian and Strabo the geographer as two different persons. Josephus does indeed speak of his authority as a Cappadocian, whereas the geographer belonged to Amasia in Pontus. But the district of Pontus is also called by Strabo ἡ πρὸς τῷ Πόντῳ Καππαδοκία (xiii. 1. 4); and Pliny names Amasia among the cities of Cappadocia (Nat. Hist. vi. 3. 8). Mithridates, king of Pontus, is styled on an inscription: Μιθραδάτης Καππαδοκίας βασιλεύς. See Le Bas and Waddington, Inscriptions, iii. 136a. Kuhn, Die Städtische und bürgerlich Verfassung des röm. Reichs, ii. 148.

The fragments of Strabo's historical work are collected by Müller, Fragmenta historicum graecorum, iii. 490–494.

9. Commentaries of Herod

Like other royal personages of that age, such as Augustus and Agrippa (Teuffel, History of Roman Literature, § 220), Herod the Great wrote Commentaries or Memoirs, which are once referred to by Josephus. "This account we give the reader as it is contained in the Commentaries of King Herod," Antiq. xv. 6. 3. Whether Josephus had actually seen them himself is extremely doubtful, since in his own history of Herod he follows Nicolaus Damascenus as his chief authority, and besides him used only a source that was unfavourable to Herod. The preterite περιείχετο awakens the suspicion that the work cited did not then lie before the writer, but was known to him only at second hand.

On the philosophical, rhetorical, and historical studies of Herod, see the fragment from the Autobiography of Nicolaus Damascenus in Müller, Fragm. hist. graec. iii. 350. — The view which I had myself at one time advocated, that Josephus had made a direct use of the Commentaries of Herod, does not now appear to be tenable. This is the opinion also of Destinon, Die Quellen des Fl. Josephus, 1882, 121 ff. But we have not the materials for arriving at any final and definite result.

10. Ptolemäus

In the work of Ammonius, De adfinium vocabulorum differentia, the following statement is made under the word Ἰδουμαῖοι: "Idumaeans and Jews (Ἰουδαῖοι) differ from one another, as Ptolemäus says in the first book of his Life of King Herod. For the Jews are the original inhabitants; but the Idumaeans were originally not Jews, but Phoenicians and Syrians." The work of one Ptolemäus on Herod, here referred to, is otherwise quite unknown. The statements quoted about the semi-Judaism of the Idumaeans are without doubt taken from an independent and unbiassed investigation as to the descent of Herod, such as a royal historiographer would never have ventured to publish. Compare Josephus, Antiq. xiv. 1. 3. The author cannot therefore have belonged to the court officials of Herod, among whom we meet with two men of the name of Ptolemy. One of these was a brother of Nicolaus Damascenus, who, after Herod's death, took the side of Antipas, as we are told in Antiq. xvii. 9. 4, and Wars of the Jews, ii. 2. 3. The other, after Herod's death, joined the party of Archelaus along with Nicolaus Damascenus, and is spoken of in Antiq. xvii. 8. 2, 9. 3, 5, and in Wars of the Jews, i. 33. 8; ii. 2. 1, 4. Seeing that our author can be neither of these two, one naturally thinks of the grammarian Ptolemy of Ascalon, the only writer of the name of Ptolemy mentioned by Ammonius in De adfin. vocab. differentia in any other passage than the one above quoted. Stephanus Byzantinus indeed (s.v. Ἀσκάλων) speaks of this Ptolemy as a contemporary of Aristarchus; and if this were so, he must have lived in the second century before Christ. But Bäge (De Ptolemaeo Ascalonita, 1882) has made it highly probable that this statement of Stephanus is erroneous, and that Ptolemy had lived rather in the early part of the first century after Christ. In that case he would be, in respect of time, in the very best position for writing a biography of Herod.

Many accomplished scholars, as Fabricius in Biblioth. graec., v. 296, Ammon in his note on the passage from Ammonius, and Westermann in his edition of Vossius, De historicis graecis, p. 226, regard Ptolemy of Ascalon as the author of Herod's biography. Compare in regard to him generally, the literature given in Div. ii. vol. i. pp. 28, 29. — Müller, Fragm. hist. graec., is inclined to look for the author among the courtiers of Herod.

The statement about the Idumaeans, quoted above, is found also in an abbreviated form in a writing ascribed to Ptolemy of Ascalon, περὶ διαφορᾶς λέξεων, which has recently been published in a complete form by Heylbut in Hermes, vol. xxii. 1887, pp. 388–410. In this work the passage runs as follows: "Jews (Ἰουδαῖοι) and Idumaeans (Ἰδουμαῖοι) are not the same; for the Jews are the original inhabitants, but the Idumaeans were originally not Jews, but Phoenicians and Syrians." But this passage, as well as all the rest of this reputed work of Ptolemy, appears to be nothing else than an extract from Ammonius, who had on his part quoted from the genuine work of Ptolemy of Ascalou.

11. Nicolaus Damascenus

No writer has been used by Josephus who yields such abundance of good material for the post-Biblical period as Nicolas of Damascus, the trusted friend and counsellor of Herod. He belonged to a distinguished non-Jewish family in Damascus. His father, Antipater, held the highest official appointments there. Since Nicolas, immediately after the death of Herod, in B.C. 4, speaks of himself as about sixty years of age, he must have been born about B.C. 64. He acquired a thorough Greek education, and in his philosophical views followed mainly Aristotle. Hence in the Fragments collected by Müller he is called "Nicolas the Peripatetic," "one of the Peripatetic philosophers." According to Sophronius, patriarch of Jerusalem in the beginning of the seventh century after Christ, he is said to have been the tutor of the children of Antony and Cleopatra. When Augustus was in Syria in B.C. 20, Nicolas saw in Antioch the Indian ambassadors who came there (Strabo, xv. 1. 73). Probably even then, but at the very latest by B.C. 14, he lived in

the closest intimacy with King Herod, by whom he was employed in some important diplomatic negotiations. In B.C. 14 he was in the retinue of Herod when he visited Agrippa in Asia Minor. At a later period he went with Herod to Rome. When Herod, on account of his proceedings in Arabia, had fallen into disfavour with Augustus, Nicolas was sent to Rome as his ambassador. Also in his conflicts with his sons, Alexander, Aristobulus, and Antipater, Nicolas occupied a prominent place as counsellor of the king. After the death of Herod he represented the interests of Archelaus before the emperor at Rome. All these particulars are derived from his autobiography, as given in Müller's Fragments and the corresponding sections of Josephus. He seems to have spent his last years in Rome.

Of the tragedies and comedies which Nicolas is supposed to have written, no single vestige now remains. Even of his philosophical productions very little has been preserved. Undoubtedly by far the most important of his writings were his historical works, regarding which Suidas, in his Lexicon, under the name Νικόλαος, makes the following remark: "He wrote a general history in eighty books, and an account of the life of Caesar, and also of his own life and career." Besides these three works, he wrote, according to Photius, Biblioth. cod. 189, a παραδόξων ἐθῶν συναγωγή. Of all the four works we possess fragments of greater or less extent.

We owe the greater number of the fragments that are preserved to the great undertaking of the Emperor Constantinus Porphyrogennetus, A.D. 912-959, who had the most trustworthy statements of the old historians collected into certain volumes. There were in all fifty-three volumes or heads among which those collections were distributed. Only a few of those fifty-three books have been preserved, and of those that are extant, only two come into consideration at present (1) The extracts De virtutibus et vitiis, edited by Valesius in A.D. 1634; and (2) the extracts De insidiis, first edited by Feder, from a codex Escurialensis, in A.D. 1848-1855, with other extracts, in 3 vols. At the same time, and independently of Feder, Müller edited the same manuscript in his Fragm. hist. graec. iii. 1849. — Compare on the undertaking of Constantinus Porphyrogennetus generally, Fabricius-Harles, Biblioth. graec. viii.; Schulze, De excerptis constantinianis quaestiones criticae, Bonn 1866. De Boor, Zu den Excerptensammlungen des Konstantin Porphyrogennetos (Hermes, Bd. xix. 1884, pp. 123-148).

1. The great historical work of Nicolas contained 144 books (Athenaeus, vi. p. 249). When Suidas speaks of only eighty books, this must be explained either by assuming an error in the MSS. of Suidas, or by supposing that only eighty books were known to Suidas. The extensive fragments preserved in the Constantine excerpts, de virtutibus and de insidiis, are taken exclusively from the first seven books, and refer to the early history of the Assyrians, Medes, Greeks, Lydians, and Persians, down to the times of Croesus and Cyrus. Of books 8-95 we possess as good as nothing. Of book 96 some fragments have been preserved by Josephus and Athenaeus. Books 96, 103, 104, 107, 108, 110, 114, 116, 123, 124 are distinctly quoted. In books 123 and 124 an account is given of the negotiations with Agrippa in Asia Minor in favour of the Jews residing there, in which Herod and Nicolaus Damascenus represented the Jewish interests (Josephus, Antiq. xii. 3. 2; comp. xvi. 2. 2-5). These negotiations were carried on in the year B.C. 14. The remaining twenty books would undoubtedly treat of the following ten years, down to the beginning of the reign of Archelaus, in B.C. 4. One only requires to read Josephus connectedly in order to see immediately that the uncommonly complete and detailed authority which he follows in books xv.-xvii. on the life of Herod, breaks off at the beginning of the reign of Archelaus. What he tells regarding that reign in book xviii. is so desperately poor and meagre, that it is utterly impossible that he could have had at his disposal a document like that upon

which he drew for books xv.-xvii. But this complete and detailed authority can have been no other than the work of Nicolas of Damascus, who is expressly cited in Antiq. xvi. 7. 1, and who in his autobiography gives a historical statement that reads almost like an extract from Josephus. Hence it is evident that it gives in briefer form the story of the events recorded at greater length by the author in his larger historical work. — But the historical work of Nicolas is used by Josephus, not only for the history of Herod, but also for the history of the Asmonaeans, in a similar way to that in which he uses the historical work of Strabo (Antiq. xiii. 8. 4, 12. 6; xiv. 4. 3, 6. 4). Josephus also expressly cites Nicolas' work for the history of primitive times (Antiq. i. 3. 6, 3. 9, 7. 2), for the history of David (Antiq. vii. 5. 2), and the history of Antiochus Epiphanes (Treatise against Apion, ii. 7).

2. Of the biography of Augustus, Βίος Καίσαρος, there are still extant two large fragments, of which the one in the Constantine excerpts, de virtutibus, treats of the history of Octavian's youth and education; while the other, which is particularly extensive, in the Constantine excerpts, de insidiis, refers to the time immediately subsequent to Caesar's assassination, there being added to it, in the form of a large note or excursus, c. 19-27, a complete account of the conspiracy against Caesar, and of the circumstances that preceded his murder. This second fragment, which was first made known in the publications of Feder, Müller, and Piccolos, makes it possible fairly to estimate the historical value of the work, which, notwithstanding its general panegyristic character, is considerable.

3. The autobiography, of which several fragments are preserved in the excerpts de virtutibus, and upon which probably Suidas mainly relies for the facts given in his Lexicon articles on the names Ἀντίπατρος and Νικόλαος, is interesting on account of the undisguised self-complacency and conceit of its author, which he shows in the unbounded praise lavished upon all his own achievements.

4. The collection of "Remarkable Habits and Customs," Παραδόξων ἐθῶν συναγωγή, which was seen by Photius (Biblioth. cod. 189), is known to us only from the extracts in the Florilegium of Stobaeus.

A complete collection of the fragments of Nicolas, with the exception of the philosophical fragments, was first issued by Müller in his Fragmenta historicorum graecomm, iii. 1849, pp. 343-464, and iv. pp. 661-664. Compare generally, Clinton, Fasti Hellenici, ed. 2, vol. iii. p. 574 f. — Grätz, Geschichte der Juden, ed. 2, vol. iii. p. 483, note 20, proving that Nicolas was not a Jew. — Nicolai, Geschichte Literaturgeschichte, ii. 536 f. — On his exposition of early history, books i.-vii.: Steinmetz, Herodot und Nicolaus Damascenus, Lüneburg 1861. — On Nicolas as an authority with Josephus: Bloch, Die Quellen des Flavius Josephus, 1879, pp. 106-116. Destinon, Die Quellen des Flavius Josephus, 1882, pp. 91-120.

The Βίος Καίσαρος was separately edited by Piccolos, Nicolas de Damas., vie de César, fragment récemment découvert, etc., Paris 1850. — It is discussed by the following: Bürger, De Nicolai Damasceni fragmento Escurialensi quod inscribitur Βίος Καίσαρος, Bonnae 1869; and O. E. Schmidt, who writes in the Jahrbb. für class. Philologie, 1884, pp. 666-687, on Nicolaus Damascenus and Suetonius Tranquillus, supporting, in opposition to Bürger, the historical importance of the Βίος Καίσαρος, and seeking to show that Suetonius had made use of it.

The fragments of the Παραδόξων ἐθῶν συναγωγή have also been collected and edited in a separate issue by Westermann, Παραδοξογράφοι, 1839, pp. 166, 167. — On the passage referring to the Lacedaemonians, see Trieber, Quaestiones Laconicae, pars I.: De Nicolai

Damasceni Laconicis, Berol. 1867.

Of the philosophical writings of Nicolas there remain only a number of titles and short fragments. See Clinton, Fasti Hellenici, ed. 2, iii. p. 574 ff. — Roeper, Lectiones Abulpharagianae, Danzig 1844, pp. 27, 35–43. — Müller, Fragm. histor. graec. iii. 344. — Zeller, Stoics, Epicureans, and Sceptics, London 1869. — Zell in Pauly's Real-Encyclopaedie, i. 2, 2 Aufl. p. 1679 f., art. "Aristoteles." — Diels, Doxographi graeci, 1879, p. 84, Anm. 1. — The pseudo-Aristotelian writing de plantis has been ascribed by E. H. F. Meyer to Nicolaus Damascenus, and published under his name. — Another pseudo-Aristotelian tract, περὶ κόσμου, has been by several scholars in earlier and later times attributed to Nicolas. The grounds for so doing are very insufficient. Becker, Bernays, and Zeller, however, still incline to ascribe it to our author. On its later reproduction by Apuleius, see Teuffel, History of Roman Literature, § 367. 6. — So far as we can judge from the quotations and fragments of the philosophical works of Nicolas, they are closely related to those of Aristotle, and were not so much independent works as short expositions or compendia and illustrations of the several departments of the Aristotelian philosophy. Roeper, Lectiones Abulpharagianae, pp. 35–43, and Usener in: Bernays' Ges. Abhandlungen, ii. 281. Roeper gives the most complete collection of quotations and fragments. This is the view also taken of them by Ueberweg in his History of Philosophy, vol. i. p. 184.

12. The Commentaries of Vespasian

In the 65th chapter of his Life, Josephus refers to the Commentaries of Vespasian as vouching the correctness of his statements: "Nor is it only I who say this: but so it is written in the Commentaries of Vespasian the emperor." At the same time he brings the charge against his opponent, Justus of Tiberias, that he could not have read those commentaries, since his statements are in direct contradiction to this in the emperor's work: "For neither wast thou concerned in that war, nor hast thou read the Commentaries of Caesar, of which we have evident proof, because thou hast contradicted those Commentaries of Caesar in thy history." In the Treatise against Apion he engages in a polemic against those who judged unfavourably of his History of the Jewish War, and denies to them the right of making such a criticism: "How impudent must those deserve to be esteemed who undertake to contradict me about the true state of those affairs, who, although they pretend to have made use of both the emperor's own memoirs, yet they could not be acquainted with our affairs who fought against them." These memoirs "of the emperor's" are evidently identical with the Commentaries of Vespasian referred to in the Life. Nothing more than this is known about them. Compare Teuffel, History of Roman Literature, § 311. 2. Josephus evidently came to know them only after he had composed his work on the Wars of the Jews, since he does not mention them among his authorities for that work (Treatise against Apion, i. 9–10).

13. Antonius Julianus

Minucius Felix, in his Octavian. c. 33. 4, refers for proof of his statement that the Jews had brought their misfortunes upon themselves by their own evil deeds, to their own writings and those of the Romans: "Read again their writings, or if you prefer those of the Romans, look into those of Antonius Julianus, and you will find that their own wickedness has occasioned their calamities." The work of Antonius Julianus treated probably of the war of Vespasian. For a Μάρκος Ἀντώνιος Ἰουλιανός is also mentioned by Josephus as Procurator of Judea during the time of the Vespasian war (Wars of the Jews, vi. 4. 3).

Bernays (Ueber die Chronik des Sulpicius Severus, 1861, p. 56) conjectures that this work of Antonius Julianus may have been used by Tacitus, on whom again the work of Sulpicius Severus depends. This is possible. But it should not be forgotten that there were yet other works on the Vespasian war. Josephus, indeed, distinguishes such books into two classes. To the one class belonged those who knew the events of the war at first hand from having themselves been engaged in it, but through prejudice in favour of the Romans or against the Jews, told the story in a false and garbled manner. To the other class belonged those who knew the matter only from report, and were often misled by the incorrect and inconsistent reports on which they relied. "Some men who were not concerned in the affair themselves have gotten together vain and contradictory stories by hearsay, and have written them down after a sophistical manner; and those who were then present have given false account of things, and this rather out of humour of flattery to the Romans or of hatred to the Jews," Josephus, Wars of the Jews, preface 1. Compare also the remarks at the end of the preface to the Antiquities, in the Treatise against Apion, 1. 8 at the end, and in the letter of Agrippa, quoted in chap. 65 of the Life of Josephus.

14. Justus of Tiberias

About the life of Justus of Tiberias we know only what Josephus has told us in his Life (chaps. 9, 12, 17, 35, 37, 54, 65, 70, 74). He was a Jew who had received a Greek education (c. 9), and along with his father Pistus occupied a conspicuous position in his native city of Tiberias during the Jewish war of A.D. 66-67. Being a man of moderate tendencies, he attached himself more under compulsion than voluntarily to the revolution party, but quitted his native town even before the subjugation of Galilee, and fled to Agrippa (c. 70). Condemned to death by Vespasian, and given over to Agrippa for execution, he had his sentence commuted by him, through the intercession of Berenice, to a long period of imprisonment. He seems then to have gone again to reside in Tiberias, but led, according to Josephus, a rather mysterious and doubtful sort of life. Agrippa sentenced him twice to imprisonment, and had him repeatedly banished his native city. Once he pronounced against him sentence of death, and pardoned him only at the entreaty of Berenice. In spite of all this, Agrippa entrusted him with the τάξις ἐπιστολῶν. But in this office, too, Justus proved himself unserviceable, and was at last, for good and all, dismissed by Agrippa (Josephus' Life, c. 65). He was still alive in the beginning of the second century after Christ, for his Chronicle reaches down to the death of Agrippa in the third year of Trajan, A.D. 100. His works are: 1. A History of the Jewish War, against which the polemic of Josephus in his Life is directed. The later writers who mention this work, Eusebius, Jerome, his translator Sophronius, and Suidas, obtained their knowledge of it only from Josephus. It is also very doubtful whether Steph. Byz. s.v. Τιβεριάς, drew directly from this work. — 2. A Chronicle of the Jewish Kings from Moses to Agrippa II. It was known to Photius, and is briefly described by him (Biblioth. cod. 33). Also Julius Africanus, from whom the quotations in the Chronicle of Eusebius and in Syncellus are borrowed, made use of it. A notice in Diogenes Laertius, ii. 5. 41, has probably to be referred to another work of Justus. — 3. The existence of the Commentarioli de scripturis, mentioned by Jerome in his de viris illustr. c. 14, is very questionable, since no other author knows anything about it.

In regard to the part played by Justus during the Jewish war utterly false opinions have very widely prevailed, owing to the misleading statements of Josephus. He has generally been regarded as an extreme patriot and bitter foe of the Romans. So especially by Baerwald, Josephus in Galiläa, 1887. But a critical examination of all these assertions of Josephus affords us an essentially different picture. On the one hand, Josephus describes him as a chief agitator

in pressing on the war, and affirms that he had moved his native city of Tiberias to revolt from Agrippa and the Romans (Life, 9, 65, 70). For proof of this Josephus adduces his campaign against the cities of Decapolis, Gadara, and Hippos, on account of which lie was accused by the representatives of those cities to Vespasian, and by him given over to be punished to Agrippa, so that he escaped death only through the intercession of Berenice (c. 9 at the end, 65, 74). Further, his connection with the revolutionary chiefs, John of Gischala (c. 17) and Jesus, son of Sapphias (c. 54), is advanced as evidence against him. But in spite of this effort to brand Justus as one mainly to blame for the revolutionary rising in Galilee, Josephus is yet guileless enough to confess even at the outset that Justus belonged neither to the Roman nor to the revolutionary party, but to a middle party which "pretended to be doubtful about going to war" (c. 9). And a whole series of facts prove that Justus was by no means enthusiastically in favour of war. His nearest relatives m Gainala were murdered by the revolutionary party (c. 35, 37). He himself was one of the prominent men who opposed the destruction of the palace of Herod in Tiberias (c. 12). Indeed, he was one of the councillors whom Josephus had put in prison just because they would not join in the revolution, to whom he also then declared that he did indeed know the might of the Romans, but that for the present they could do nothing else than join "the robbers," that is, the revolutionists (c. 35. Comp. Wars of the Jews, ii. 21. 8-10; Life, 32-34). Justus also left Tiberias when the revolution there was just at its height, and went over to Agrippa and the Romans (c. 65 and 70). He was therefore quite correct in his statement that Josephus was mainly chargeable with the revolutionary movement in Tiberias, and in affirming that Tiberias had been drawn into the revolt only under compulsion (c. 65). The real facts of the case are thus perfectly clear. Justus was a man of precisely the same style and tendency as Josephus. Both had taken part in the revolt, but both did so only under the pressure of circumstances. In reality neither of them wished to have anything to do with it, and so now the one seeks to throw the blame upon the other.

The work which Josephus in his Life so vehemently attacks cannot have been the same as the Chronicle described by Photius. For, according to Photius, that Chronicle was "very meagre and brief, and passed over much that was important and even necessary;" but the work referred to by Josephus evidently entered into minute details, and is simply characterized by Josephus as a History of the Jewish War. "For he was not unskilful in the learning of the Greeks, and in dependence on that skill it was that he undertook to write a history of these affairs" (Life, c. 9). "Justus, who hath himself written a history concerning these affairs.... Justus undertook to write about these facts and about the Jewish war" (c. 65). In this same chapter (Life, c. 65) Josephus speaks of his astonishment at the impudence of Justus, who claimed to be the best narrator of these occurrences; whereas he knew nothing at first hand, either of the proceedings in Galilee, or of the siege of Jotapata, or of the siege of Jerusalem. He therefore evidently treated in that work of the whole history of the war. It was not published by Justus until twenty years after it had been completed, when Vespasian, Titus, and Agrippa II. were dead (Life, c. 65). It must therefore have been completed during the lifetime of Agrippa, and so, again, it must be distinguished from the Chronicle which reaches down to Agrippa's death. – Eusebius, Jerome, and others derived their grounds of accusation against Justus from Josephus. He is charged (Eusebius, Hist. Eccles. iii. 10. 8; Jerome, de viris illustr. c. 14) with having written a history of Jewish affairs in a distorted manner to suit his own personal ends, and is declared to have been convicted by Josephus of falsehood. The article in Suidas' Lexicon on Ἰούστος is taken verbatim, from Sophronius, the Greek translator of Jerome. Probably also the notice in Stephanus Byzantinus on the name Tiberias is grounded upon Josephus.

On the Chronicle of the Jewish Kings, Photius in his Biblioth. cod. 33, remarks as follows:

Ἀνεγνώσθη Ἰούστου Τιβεριέως χρονικόν, οὗ ἡ ἐπιγραφὴ Ἰούστου Τιβεριέως Ἰουδαίων βασιλέων τῶν ἐν τοῖς στέμμασιν. Οὗτος ἀπὸ πόλεως τῆς ἐν Γαλιλαίᾳ Τιβεριάδος ὡρμᾶτο. Ἄρχεται δε τῆς ἱστορίας ἀπὸ Μωϋσέως, καταλήγει δὲ ἕως τελευτῆς Ἀγρίππα τοῦ ἑβδόμου μὲν τῶν ἀπὸ τῆς οἰκίας Ἡρώδου, ὑστάτου δὲ ἐν τοῖς Ἰουδαίαν Βασιλεῦσιν, ὃς παρέλαβε μὲν τὴν ἀρχὴν ἐπὶ Κλαυδίου, ηὐξήθη δε ἐπὶ Νέρωνος καὶ ἔτι μᾶλλον ὑπὸ Οὐεσπασιανοῦ, τελευτᾷ δὲ ἔτει τερίτῳ Τραϊανοῦ, οὗ καὶ ἡ ἱστορία κατέληξεν. Ἔστι δὲ τὴν φράσιν συντομώτατός τε καὶ τὰ πλεῖστα τῶν ἀναγκαιοτάτων παρατρέχων. – From this work also are taken the quotations in the Chronicle of Eusebius and those made by Georgius Syncellus, which undoubtedly made their way to Eusebius and Syncellus through the medium of Julius Africanus. In the preface to the second book of the Chronicle, Eusebius speaks as follows: “That Moses flourished in the times of Inachus is affirmed by such famous teachers as Clement, Africanus, Tatian from among ourselves, and by Josephus and Justus from among the Jews, each after his own fashion supporting the statement from primitive histories.” This passage from the preface of Eusebius is not only expressly quoted by Syncellus, but also made use of elsewhere in several other passages. – Eusebius further mentions Justus in his Chronicle, ad ann. Abrah. 2113, during the reign of the Emperor Nerva, as a well-known Jewish writer. In Syncellus again the same notice stands at the beginning of the account of Trajan’s reign. This also must have been the original position given to him in the Chronicle of Africanus. For undoubtedly the statement rests upon the assumption that the Chronicle of Justus reached down to the beginning of the reign of Trajan. – The notice in Scaliger, Thesaurus, ἱστοριῶν συναγωγή ad Ol. ΣΙΦ, Δ: ἐνταῦθα λήγει τὸ Ἰούστου Τιβεριέως χρονικόν, rests only upon Photius, Biblioth. cod. 33. – If, then, it is rendered certain from what has been adduced that Julius Africanus made use of the Chronicle of Justus, the theory is thoroughly confirmed that certain notices about Jewish history in the Chroniclers dependent on Africanus, which are not derived from Josephus, are to be traced back to Justus. See below, § 10, note 3 and Gelzer, Julius Africanus, i. 246-265. Gutschmid had also previously guessed that Africanus had made use of Justus. See Div. ii. vol. iii. p. 222.

In the biography of Socrates in Diogenes Laertius, ii. 5. 41, we meet with the following statement: “Justus of Tiberias tells that at his trial Plato went up to the platform and said, O men of Athens, being the youngest of those who have gone up to the platform, and that the judges cried out: Go down, go down.” It is extremely improbable that so special a notice regarding details in the history of Socrates and Plato should have had place in a brief chronicle of Jewish kings. But even a comparison of the wording of the title as given by Photius with that given by Diogenes Laertius, leads one to suppose that Justus had written other works besides the Chronicle of the Jewish Kings. The title (Photius, Biblioth. cod. 33): Ἰουδαίων βασιλέων τῶν ἐν τοῖς στέμμασιν, cannot mean: “History of the crowned kings of the Jews,” although στέμμα, usually means crown. But as στέμμα also means a genealogical table, this title is rather to be rendered: “History of the kings of the Jews enumerated in the Tables.” But what στέμματα are meant? The Chronicle of Julius Africanus consisted, it is well known, in great part of lists of kings, Greek, Oriental, and Roman. Is it not likely that the older work of Justus should have been similarly constructed? Then there would have been, only a part of the whole work known to Photius, namely, the history of the kings of the Jews designated in the στέμματα of Justus, while to Diogenes Laertius there was known another στέμμα, therefore another part of the whole work.

Compare on Justus generally, Vossius, De historicis graecis, 1838. – Fabricius, Biblioth. graec. ed. Harles, v. 61, x. 691. – Müller, Fragmenta histor. graec. iii. 523. – Vaillant, De Historicis qui ante Josephum Judaicas res scripsere, Paris 1851. – Creuzer, Theol. Stud. und Krit. 1853, pp. 57-59. – Grätz, Das Lebensende des Königs Agrippa II., des Justus von Tiberias und des

Flavius Josephus und die Agrippa-Münzen (Monatsschr. für Gesch. und Wissensch. des Jud. 1877, p. 337 ff.), gives an impossible explanation of the Photius passage. Baerwald, Josephus in Galiläa, sein Verhältniss zu den Parteien, insbesondere zu Justus von Tiberias und Agrippa II., Breslau 1877.

15. Aristo of Pella

On Aristo of Pella and his literary work we have only two independent witnesses, Eusebius and Maximus Confessor. — 1. According to Eusebius, Ecclesiastical History, iv. 6. 3, it was told in a work of Aristo of Pella, that after the conquest of Bitther and the overthrow of Barcochba, "it was enjoined by regular legal enactments of Hadrian upon the whole Jewish race, that they should on no pretext enter within the region round about Jerusalem, the emperor wishing that they should not be able, even from a distance, to look upon their native soil." (τὸ πᾶν ἔθνος ἐξ ἐκείνου καὶ τῆς περὶ τὰ Ἱεροσόλυμα γῆς πάμπαν ἐπιβαίνειν εἴργεται, νόμου δόγματι καὶ διατάξεσιν Ἀδριανοῦ, ὡς ἂν μηδ' ἐξ ἀπόπτου θεωροῖεν τὸ πατρῷον ἔδαφος ἐγκελευσαμένου. Ἀρίστων ὁ Πελλαῖος ἱστορεῖ.) On this passage in Eusebius is founded what is said in the Chronicon paschale, and by the Armenian historian, Moses of Chorene, respecting Aristo of Pella. — 2. In the Scholia of Maximus Confessor on Dionysius the Areopagite, De mystica theologia, written about A.D. 630-650, we meet with the following notice: "I have also read the expression 'seven heavens' in the dialogue of Papiscus and Jason, composed by Aristo of Pella, which Clement of Alexandria, in the sixth book of his Hypotyposes, says was written by St. Luke." (Ἀνέγνων δὲ τοῦτο "ἑπτὰ οὐρανοὺς" καὶ ἐν τῇ συγγεγραμμένῃ Ἀρίστωνι τῷ Πελλαίῳ διαλέξει Παπίσκου καὶ Ἰάσονος, ἣν Κλήμης ὁ Ἀλεξανδρεὺς ἐν ἕκτῳ βιβλίῳ τῶν Ὑποτυπώσεων τὸν ἅγιον Λουκᾶν φησιν ἀναγράψαι.) According to Maximus Confessor, therefore, Aristo was the author of the Dialogue between Jason and Papiscus, which is also elsewhere quoted, but always as an anonymous work. He was already known to the heathen philosopher Celsus, as well as to Origen and Jerome. We obtain most information from the still extant preface to a Latin translation made by a certain Celsus, according to Harnack, belonging probably to the fifth century after Christ, contained in some manuscripts of the works of Cyprian. At the close of the main section, cap. 8, he names himself Celsus. According to the statement here given concerning it, Jason was the representative of the Christian view, Papiscus was the representative of Judaism. But the Christian so convincingly proves to the Jew the Messiahship of Jesus, that the latter is soon converted and baptized.

Seeing that the Dialogue, as it lay before Celsus, Origen, Jerome, and the Latin translator, was evidently anonymous, for no one is named by them as its author, it is very questionable whether the testimony of Maximus in favour of the authorship of Aristo is worthy of credit. Whence should a writer of the seventh century obtain correct information about the author of whom all earlier writers knew nothing? The guess of Maximus, however, is by no means improbable. In Tertullian's work, adversus Judaeos, c. 13, at the beginning, we have the imperial edict forbidding the Jews to enter the environs of Jerusalem, given in terms almost literally identical with those of the passage quoted by Eusebius from Aristo (interdictum est ne in confinio ipsius regionis demoretur quis-quam Judaeorum.... post expugnationem Hierusalem prohibiti ingredi in terram vestram de longinquo eam oculis tantum videre permissum est). Since Tertullian brings this forward in an anti-Jewish controversial treatise, it is highly probable that he had extracted the notice from a similarly anti-Jewish work. But such precisely was the character of the Dialogue between Jason and Papiscus (comp. also Harnack's Texte und Untersuchungen, i. 1-2, p. 127 ff.).

If, then, on the basis of what has been adduced, it is conjectured that the notice in Eusebius is

taken from the Dialogue between Jason and Papiscus, we cannot ascribe to Aristo a special history on the Hadrian war; and it is not probable that the other statements in Eusebius about the Hadrian war are drawn from Aristo, who rather makes only passing reference to that one edict. — As to the date of Aristo, he may be put down somewhere about the middle of the second century.

In the Chronicon paschale, on the year A.D. 134, the remark is made: "In this year Apelles and Aristo, whom (ὧν) Eusebius Pamphilus mentions in his Ecclesiastical History, presents (ἐπιδίδωσιν) the draft of an apology concerning our religion to the Emperor Hadrian." Since the author refers expressly to Eusebius, his testimony has no independent value. The singular ἐπιδίδωσιν makes it probable that he wrote ὁ Πελλαῖος Ἀρίστων, out of which Ἀπελλῆς καὶ Ἀρίστων arose through corruption of the text. — At any rate, the Armenian historian, Moses of Chorene, derived his information from Eusebius. He indeed states that Aristo reports the death of King Artases, a contemporary of Hadrian; but then in his history of Barcochba he closely follows Eusebius. See Routh, Reliquiae Sacrae, i. 101 ff. Langlois, Collection des Historiens de l'Arménie, t. i. [= Müller, Fragmenta hist. graec. v. 2] p. 391 sqq. Harnack, Texte und Untersuchungen, i. 1-2, p. 126.

The Dialogue between Jason and Papiscus was probably largely used in the Altercatio Simonis Judaei et Theophili christiani, published by Martène in his Thesaurus novus anecdotorum, vol. v., Paris 1717, and again rescued from oblivion by Harnack, Texte und Untersuchungen, vol. i. div. 3, 1883, especially pp. 115-130.

On Aristo generally, compare Fabricius, Biblioth graec., ed. Harles, vii. 156 ff. — Grabe, Spicilegium Patrum, ii. 127-133. — Routh, Reliquiae sacrae, i. 91-109. — Gieseler, Ecclesiastical History, Edin. 1846, vol. i. 156. — Smith and Wace, Dictionary of Christian Biography, London 1877, vol. i. pp. 160, 161. — Pauly'sReal-Encyclop. i. 2, 2 Aufl. p. 1597. — Müller, Fragm. hist. graec. iv. 328. — Corpus apologetarum, ed. Otto, t. ix. 1872, pp. 349-363. — Harnack, Die Ueberlieferung der griechischen Apologeten des zweiten Jahrhunderts in der alten Kirche und im Mittelalter, 1882. — Zahn, Forschungen zur Geschichte des neutestamentl. Kanons, vol. iii. 1884, p. 74.

16. Papyrus Parisiensis, n. 68

Among the Greek Papyrus texts of the Louvre at Paris we meet with certain fragments which refer to the revolt of the Jews in Alexandria during the time of the Roman Empire. The texts, however, are so fragmentary that it is quite impossible to determine with any exactness the date of the revolt referred to. Were they more complete, they would have afforded us invaluable historical information. For they had contained, as we can make out beyond question, among other things, one or two rescripts of the emperor addressed to the Jews of Alexandria with reference to the outbreak, as well as a letter addressed to the emperor by a man who had been already under sentence of death, and now, face to face with death, "will not shrink from telling the truth."

The fragments are published as Papyrus Paris. n. 68, by Brunet de Presle, in Notices et extraits des Manuscrits … publiés par l'Institut de France, vol. xviii. part 2, Paris 1865, pp. 383-390. See also Atlas attached thereto, sheet xlv.

17. Teucer Cyzicenus

Suidas in his Lexicon, under the name Τεῦκρος ὁ Κυζικηνός, says that he wrote: "On the Gold-yielding Earth; on Byzantium; on the Mithridate war, in five books; on Tyre, in five books; on the Arabians, in five books; on Jewish History, in six books, and various other works." (Τεῦκρος ὁ Κυζικηνὸς, ὁ γράψας Περὶ χρυσοφόρου γῆς, Περὶ τοῦ Βυζαντίου, Μιθριδατικῶν πράξεων βιβλία ε′, Περὶ Τύρου ε′, Ἀραβικῶν ε′, Ἰουδαϊκὴν ἱστορίαν ἐν βιβλίοις ς′, Ἐφήβων τῶν ἐν Κυζίκῳ ἄσκησιν γ′ καὶ τὰ λοιπά.) Of this Teucer Cyzicenus there are only two small fragments now extant, which discuss the etymology of the names of two places in Epirus and Euboea. Otherwise nothing whatever is known of him. Whether he is identical with some other writers of the name of Teucer who have been occasionally mentioned, must continue undetermined. Comp. Müller, Fragmenta historicorum graecorum, iv. 508.

18. Various Works Ἰουδαίων

Special treatises on the history of the Jews were also written by the Jewish Hellenists, Demetrius, Eupolemus, Artapanus, Aristeas, Cleodemus-Malchus, and the classical Philo. But these can scarcely come under consideration here, since they mainly, if not exclusively, treat of the earlier periods of the history (see Div. ii. vol. iii. pp. 200–210). The book of the pseudo-Hecateus on the Jews seems to have dealt in more detail than those just named with the condition of the people in his own days (see Div. ii. vol. iii. pp. 302–306). — The five books of Philo on the persecution of the Jews under Tiberius and Caligula would have been an important document for the history of his times, which ought to be mentioned here, because the work is no longer extant (see Div. ii. vol. iii. pp. 350–354).

Pagan authors, even from very early times, made passing allusions to the Jews. A collection of these may be found in Freudenthal, Alexander Polyhistor, pp. 177–179, and in Josephus, Treatise, against Apion, i. 14–23. But from the beginning of the first century before Christ special works on the Jews by non-Jewish authors came to be written. 1. The oldest non-Jewish history of the Jews known to us is the συσκευὴ κατὰ Ἰουδαίων of Apollonius Molon (see Div. ii. vol. iii. pp. 251–254). — 2. Not much later is the learned compilation of Alexander Polyhistor, περὶ Ἰουδαίων, to which we are indebted for valuable excerpts from the writings of Jewish Hellenists (see Div. ii. vol. iii. pp. 197–200). — 3. In the age of Hadrian lived Philo Byblius, also called Herennius Philo, who, besides other works, wrote a treatise, περὶ Ἰουδαίων. In it, according to the statement of Origen, he referred to the book of the pseudo-Hecateus on the Jews, and in regard to it expressed the opinion that either the book was not the work of the historian Hecateus, or that if Hecateus were indeed the author, he must have out and out accepted the Jewish doctrine (Origen, contra Celsum, i. 15; see the passage referred to in Div. ii. vol. iii. p. 304). Two fragments in Eusebius, Praeparatio evangel. i. 10, are avowedly taken from the same treatise, περὶ Ἰουδαίων. The contents of those fragments, however, refer expressly to the Phoenician mythology, and the second of them is quoted by Eusebius in another place (Praeparatio evangel. iv. 16) with the formula, ἐκ δὲ τοῦ πρώτου συγγράμματος τῆς Φίλωνος Φοινικικῆς ἱστορίας. It was therefore generally assumed that the treatise, περὶ Ἰουδαίων, was simply an excursus to the large work of Philo, Φοινικικὴ ἱστορία. So, e.g., Freudenthal, Alexander Polyhistor, p. 34. But, when we consider the contents of the Eusebian fragments, this is not probable. It would rather seem that Eusebius, i. 10, inadvertently ascribed the passages taken by him from the Phoenician history to the treatise περὶ Ἰουδαίων, with which, too, he was acquainted. Comp. on Philo generally, Müller, Fragmenta histor. graec. iii. 560–576. Baudissin, in art. "Sanchuniathon," in Herzog, xiii. 364. — 4. A treatise, περὶ Ἰουδαίων, was also written by a certain Damocritus. From the brief statement regarding it in Suidas, under the name Δαμόκριτος (comp. also Müller, Fragmenta histor. graec. iv. 377), this only seems clear, that its

standpoint was one of deadly enmity to the Jews. — 5. The same may be said of the work of a certain Nicarchus, περὶ Ἰουδαίων (Bekker, Anecdota, p. 380=Müller, Fragmenta histor. graec. iii. 335). — 6. As a writer on Jewish affairs, Alexander Polyhistor also mentions one Theophilus (Eusebius, Praeparatio evangel. ix. 34), one Timochares, ἐν τοῖς περὶ Ἀντιόχου (Eusebius, ix. 35), and an anonymous Συρίας σχοινομέτρησις (Eusebius, ix. 36). But all the three had evidently spoken of Jewish matters only in passing. Theophilus treated of Solomon's relation to the king of Tyre; the other two gave interesting details about the topography of Jerusalem. Comp. on all the three: Müller, Fragmenta histor. graec. iii. 209; also on Theophilus, Müller, iv. 515 ff.

19. The Chronographers

For a detailed account of the plundering of the Temple by Antiochus Epiphanes, Josephus refers, in his Treatise against Apion, ii. 7, among others to the chronographers Apollodorus and Castor. To Castor he also refers in order to determine the date of the battle of Gaza (Treatise against Apion, i. 22). Since it is possible that he also elsewhere derived various chronological information for these treatises, it is most important that we should here examine carefully the notices that we have regarding these two.

1. Apollodorus of Athens lived about the middle of the second century before Christ, and besides other works wrote the Χρονικά, which treated in chronological order of the most important events in universal history down to the time of King Attalus II. of Pergamum, in the middle of the second century before Christ.

A collection of the fragments of this historical work, which is not to be confounded with the extant Βιβλιοθήκη under Apollodorus' name, is to be found in Müller, Fragmenta historicorum graecorum, i. 435–439. Compare also Müller, l.c. p. 43; Pauly's Real-Encyclopaedie, i. 2, 2 Aufl. p. 1302 f.

2. Castor's Chronicle is known to us mainly through the quotations in the works of the Christian chroniclers Eusebius and Syncellus. The first book of the Eusebian Chronicle, extant now only in an Armenian translation, gives us particularly valuable extracts. What is therein contained makes it certain that the work of Castor was carried down to the consulship of M. Valerius Messala and M. Piso, B.C. 61; that is, down to the year in which Pompey celebrated his Asiatic triumph, by which the subjection of Further Asia was finally settled (nostrae regionis res praeclaraque gesta cessarunt). Since the author concludes at that particular point of time, his work cannot have been written much later than the middle of the first century before Christ. It consisted, according to Eusebius, of six books. — We meet with many individuals bearing the name of Castor during the time of Caesar and Cicero. But it is doubtful whether the chronographer is to be identified with any of these, and so nothing can with certainty be determined as to the circumstances of his life.

The fragments are collected by Müller in the Appendix to the edition of Herodotus, Paris 1844, Appendix, pp. 153–181. — Eusebius mentions the work in the list of his authorities in the following terms: "The six books of Castor, in which he collects materials for history from the ninth to the one hundred and eighty-first Olympiad." — The termination of the work is precisely stated in passages expressly quoted by Eusebius. "We set down in order the consuls, beginning with Lucius Junius Brutus and Lucius Tarquinius Collatinus, and ending with Marcus Valerius Messala and Marcus Piso, who were consuls in the times of Theophemus, archon of Athens" (Eusebius, Chronicon, ed. Schoene, i. 295). — "The archous of Athens end with Theophemus, in

whose days the famous deeds and the renown of our land were brought utterly to an end" (Euseb. Chron. i. 183).

Compare generally, Müller, Herodotus, Paris 1844, Appendix, pp. 153-155. — Westermann in Pauly's Real-Encyclopaedie, ii. 207 f. — Bornemann, De Castoris Diodori Siculi chronicis fonte ac norma, Lübeck 1878. — Stiller, De Castoris libris chronicis, Berlin 1880. — Gelzer, Julius Africanus, ii. 1, 1885, pp. 63-79; on the person of Castor, p. 70 ff.

C. — JOSEPHUS

Josephus, whose works form a principal authority for our history, gives in his Life and in the History of the Wars of the Jews several important particulars from the story of his own career. He was born at Jerusalem in the first year of the reign of Caligula, A.D. 37-38. His father was called Matthias, and was descended from a distinguished priestly family, whose ancestors Josephus can trace back to the times of John Hyrcanus. One of his forefathers, called Matthias, had married a daughter of the high priest Jonathan (= Alexander Januaeus?). See Life, 1, and Wars of the Jews, preface 1; Antiquities, xvi. 7. 1. The young Josephus obtained a careful rabbinical education, and even as a boy of fourteen years old had acquired so great a reputation for his knowledge of the law, that the high priests and the chief men of the city came to him in order to receive from him instruction in regard to difficult points of law. Yet he was hot himself satisfied with such attainments, but, on his attaining his sixteenth year, made a pilgrimage through the various schools of the Pharisees, Sadducees, and Essenes. But even this did not suffice to quench his thirst for knowledge. He now withdrew into the wilderness, and visited a hermit called Banus, in order to receive from him the finishing stroke in his education. After he had spent three years with him, he returned to Jerusalem, and in his nineteenth year openly joined the party of the Pharisees (Life, c. 2). In his twenty-sixth year (μετ' εἰκοστὸν καὶ ἕκτον ἐνιαυτόν), which corresponds to A.D. 64, he took a journey to Rome in order to obtain the release of certain priests nearly related to him, who had been carried thither as prisoners on account of some trifling matter. Having, by means of an introduction from a Jewish actor Alityrus, secured the favour of the Empress Poppaea, he succeeded in securing the end he had in view, whereupon he returned to Judea laden with rich presents (Life, c. 3). Soon after his return, in A.D. 66, the war against the Romans broke out. At first Josephus kept himself clear of all connection with the war (Life, c. 4); and this indeed was quite possible, since the Jewish aristocracy in general entered this outbreak only under compulsion. But the fact is that Josephus, after the first decisive battles had taken place, attached himself to the revolution party, and indeed became one of its leaders. He was entrusted by the directors of the movement with the most important post of a commander-in-chief of Galilee (Wars of the Jews, ii. 20. 4; Life, c. 7). From that time onward his doings and fortunes are closely joined with those of the Jewish people, and therefore form a component part of the history of the Jewish war. Compare Life, c. 7-74; Wars of the Jews, ii. 20. 4-21. 10; iii. 4. 1, 6. 3-8. 9; ix. 1. 5, 6. His performances as commander-in-chief of Galilee came to an end by his being taken prisoner by the Romans after the fall of the fortress of Jotapata in A.D. 67 (Wars of the Jews, iii. 8. 7-8). When he was carried before Vespasian, he prophesied to him his future elevation to the imperial throne (Wars of the Jews, iii. 8. 9; Life, c. 75). But when, two years later, in A.D. 69, Vespasian was in very deed proclaimed emperor by the Palestinian legions, and the prophecy of Josephus was thus fulfilled, Vespasian remembered his prisoner, and as a thank-offering granted him his freedom (Wars of the Jews, iv. 10. 7). From this time onward Josephus, as custom required, assumed the family name of Vespasian "Flavius" along with his own. After being proclaimed emperor, Vespasian hasted first of all to Alexandria (Wars of the Jews, iv. 11.

5), to which place Josephus accompanied him (Life, c. 75). Thence Josephus returned to Palestine in the retinue of Titus, to whom Vespasian had committed the continuation of this war, and remained in the company of Titus down to the close of the war (Life, c. 75; Treatise against Apion, i. 9). During the siege of Jerusalem he was obliged, by order of Titus, often at the great risk of his own life, to negotiate with the Jews for a surrender (Wars of the Jews, v. 3. 3, 6. 2, 7. 4, 9. 2–4, 13. 3; vi. 2. 1–3, 2. 5, 7. 2; Life, c. 75). Once while engaged on such an errand he was struck by a stone, so as to be rendered unconscious (Wars of the Jews, v. 13. 3). When, after the capture of the city, Titus allowed him to take whatever he would, he took only some sacred books, and obtained the release of many of the prisoners who were his friends, among whom was his own brother. Three who had been already crucified were again taken down at his request, one of whom recovered (Life, c. 75). When his property in Jerusalem was required by the Roman garrison, Titus gave him in place of it another in the plain (Life, c. 76). At the conclusion of the war he went with Titus to Rome, where he continued to reside, pursuing his studies and engaged in literary work amid the unbroken favour of the emperor. The Jewish priest was now transformed into a Greek literary man. Vespasian assigned him a residence in what had formerly been his own palace, bestowed on him the rights of Roman citizenship, and granted him a yearly pension (Life, c. 76; compare Suetonius, Vespasian, 18: primus e fisco Latinis Graccisque rhetoribus annua centena constituit). He also presented him with a splendid estate in Judea. On the suppression of the Jewish outbreak in Cyrene, the captive leader of the insurrection, Jonathan, gave the names of many prominent Jews as being accomplices with him, and among these was the name of Josephus. He said that Josephus had sent him weapons and money. But Vespasian gave no credence to this false charge, and continued to show favour to Josephus (Life, c. 76; Wars of the Jews, vii. 11. 1–3). Like favour was enjoyed by Josephus under Titus, A.D. 79–81, and under Domitian, A.D. 81–96. The latter granted him exemption from tribute in respect of his estate in Judea (Life, c. 76). Nothing is known as to his relation to the later emperors. We also know equally little as to the precise time of his death. This much only is certain, that he was still alive in the first decade of the second century. For the autobiography was written after the death of Agrippa II. (Life, c. 65). But Agrippa died in the third year of Trajan, A.D. 100 (Photius, Biblioth. cod. 33). — According to a statement by Eusebius (Ecclesiast. History, iii. 9), Josephus was honoured in Rome by the erection of a statue.

In regard to his family connections, Josephus gives us the following details. During the days of John Hyrcanus his fore-father Simon the Stammerer lived. He belonged to the first of the twenty-four orders of priests, therefore to the order of Jehoiarib. Simon's son was Matthias, called Ephlias, who married a daughter of the high priest Jonathan (= Alexander Jannaeus?). Of this marriage was born Matthias Curtus, in the first year of Hyrcanus II. The son of Matthias Curtus was Joseph, born in the ninth year of the reign of Alexandra (?). His son was Matthias, the father of our Josephus, born in the tenth year of Archelaus (Life, c. 1). — The parents of our Josephus were still alive in the time of the great war. While he was commander-in-chief in Galilee, he obtained through his father news from Jerusalem (Life, c. 41). During the siege of Jerusalem his parents were within the beleaguered city, and were, because regarded as untrustworthy, kept in prison by the revolutionists (the father, Wars of the Jews, v. 13. 1; the mother, Wars, v. 13. 3; comp. also v. 9. 4 at the end). On the capture of the city he obtained the release of his brother from a Roman prison (Life, c. 75). This is supposed to have been his full brother Matthias, who had been educated along with him (Life, c. 2). According to the Wars of the Jews, v. 9. 4 at the end, his wife also was in the city during the siege. In all probability this was his first wife, of whom there is no mention elsewhere. As Vespasian's prisoner of war, he had at his command married a captive Jewess from Caesarea. But she left him during his stay with Vespasian in Alexandria. He then, again, in Alexandria married another (Life, c. 75). By this

last he had three sons, of whom at the time of his writing his autobiography only one survived, Hyrcanus, who was born in the fourth year of the reign of Vespasian (Life, c. 1 and 76). Still during Vespasian's reign, he got divorced from this wife and married a Jewess of noble family in Crete, who bore him two sons: Justus, born in the seventh year of Vespasian, and Simonides, with the surname of Agrippa, born in the ninth year of Vespasian. Both of these were alive when Josephus wrote his life (Life, c. 1 and 76).

To the literary leisure of Josephus at Rome we are indebted for those works, without which our history could scarcely have been written. They comprise the four following: —

1. THE WARS OF THE JEWS, Περὶ τοῦ Ἰουδαϊκοῦ πολέμου, as Josephus himself entitles the work in his Life, c. 74. It is divided into seven books, a distribution which, as appears from Antiq. xiii. 10. 6, xviii. 1. 2, it owes to Josephus himself. The proper history of the war is preceded by a very comprehensive introduction, which occupies the whole of the first book and the half of the second. The first book begins with the time of Antiochus Epiphanes, B.C. 175–164, and reaches down to the death of Herod, B.C. 4. The second continues the history down to the outbreak of the war in A.D. 66, and gives an account of the first year of the war, A.D. 66–67. The third treats of the war in Galilee in A.D. 67; the fourth of the continued course of the war down to the complete isolation of Jerusalem; the fifth and sixth describe the siege and overthrow of Jerusalem; the seventh relates the events that followed the war, down to the destruction of the last smouldering embers of the revolution. — From the preface to this work (c. 1) we learn that it was originally written in the author's mother tongue, therefore in Aramaic, and only at a later period re-written by him in Greek. In order to re-write it, he took lessons in Greek composition (Treatise against Apion, i. 9). As main authority for the story of the war proper, he relies upon his own experience, since he had been either actively engaged in, or was at least an eye-witness of, the events recorded. Even during the siege of Jerusalem he had taken down notes in writing, for which he drew upon the statements of survivors as to the state of matters within the city (Treatise against Apion, i. 9). When the work was completed, he handed it to Vespasian and Titus, and had the satisfaction of being assured by them, as also by King Agrippa II. and many Romans who had taken part in the war, that he had reported the facts correctly, and with absolute fidelity to the truth (Treatise against Apion, i. 9; Life, c. 65). Titus with his own hand wrote an order for the publication of the book (Life, c. 65). Agrippa wrote sixty-two letters, in which he gave testimony to the truthfulness of the narrative. During the composition of the work, Josephus had submitted to him book by book, and had obtained favourable opinions from him (Life, c. 65). — Since the completed work was submitted to Vespasian (Treatise against Apion, i. 9), it must have been written during his reign, A.D. 69–79; but not until near the close of that reign, for other works had been written on the Jewish war before this one by Josephus (Wars of the Jews, Preface, c. 1; Antiquities, Preface, c. 1).

2. THE ANTIQUITIES OF THE JEWS, Ἰουδαϊκὴ Ἀρχαιολογία, in twenty books, treat of the history of the Jewish people from the earliest times down to the outbreak of the war with the Romans in A.D. 66. The division into twenty books was also the work of Josephus himself (Antiq. conclusion). The first ten books run parallel with the biblical history, and reach down to the end of the Babylonian captivity. The eleventh carries the history down from Cyrus to Alexander the Great; the twelfth from Alexander the Great, who died B.C. 323, down to the death of Judas Maccabee in B.C. 161; the thirteenth down to the death of Alexandra in B.C. 69; the fourteenth down to the beginning of the reign of Herod the Great in B.C. 37; the fifteenth, sixteenth, and seventeenth treat of the reign of Herod, B.C. 37–4; the last three books carry us on to the year 66 after Christ. — The work, according to many parenthetic statements, was

completed in the thirteenth year of Domitian, when Josephus was in his fifty-sixth year, that is, in A.D. 93 or 94 (Antiq. xx. 11 at the close). He had been encouraged to carry it on to the end, especially by a certain Epaphroditus, a man whose lively interest in science and literature is enthusiastically praised by Josephus. — That the entire work was intended, in the first instance, not for Jewish but for Greek and Roman readers, and that its aim mainly was to afford the cultured world some idea of the much calumniated Jewish race, must appear evident from its general form and character, and is expressly declared even to superfluity by Josephus himself (Antiq. xvi. 6. 8).

As authorities, Josephus employed for the earlier periods down to Nehemiah, about B.C. 440, almost exclusively the canonical books of the Old Testament. As a native of Palestine, he displays in his use of them, in many ways, his knowledge of the Hebrew language. Yet he makes use commonly of the Greek Septuagint translation. To such an extent is this the case, that Josephus uses those parts of the books of Ezra and Esther which appear only in the LXX. (see Div. ii. vol. iii. 179, 182; Bloch, Die Quellen des Fl. Josephus, pp. 69–79). His reproduction of the Jewish history is written from the following points of view: — (1) Not infrequently modifications are made in an apologetical interest, something offensive is omitted or smoothed down, and the history is set forth in the form best fitted to glorify the nation. (2) For the latter purpose Josephus had the help of the older legends, the so-called Haggada. The influence of that literature is seen chiefly in the history of the patriarchs and of Moses. (3) Josephus, it would seem, had not derived this Haggadic adornment wholly from oral tradition, but in part from the older Hellenistic reproductions of the biblical history by Demetrius, Artapanus, and others. (4) In his exposition of the law he follows the Palestinian Halacha. For examples, see Div. ii. vol. i. 330–339. (5) In several particulars the influence of Philo is very observable. (6) He does not scruple to draw upon extra-biblical authors in order to illustrate, fill up, and confirm the Scripture history. This is specially the case with his treatment of the history of primitive times, and also of that of the latest periods, where it became largely mixed up with the history of neighbouring nations.

On the post-biblical period he has made his inquiries and set forth his information in an extremely unequal and disproportionate manner. In filling up the great gap between Nehemiah and Antiochus Epiphanes, from B.C. 440 to B.C. 175, Josephus depends almost entirely upon two legendary productions, namely, the Alexander legends and the pseudo-Aristeas, from whom he gives a lay extract (xii. 2). For the period B.C. 175–135 the First Book of Maccabees is the principal source, which indeed towards the close is used in so slight a way that it becomes doubtful whether Josephus could have had before him a complete copy of that work (see Div. ii. vol. iii. p. 9). It is supplemented by Polybius (xii. 9. 1), and, for the period beyond that at which Polybius stops, B.C. 146, by those authorities from which the history of the Asmoneans generally, down to B.C. 135, is derived. For this period Josephus evidently was without any written documents of Jewish origin. He therefore obtained his materials by culling from the general historical works of the Greeks any statements that he discovered bearing upon the history of Palestine. His chief authorities for the period B.C. 135–37 were two historians often, and indeed almost exclusively, quoted by him: Strabo (xiii. 10. 4, 11. 3, 12. 6; xiv. 3. 1, 4. 3, 6. 4, 7. 2, 8. 3; xv. 1. 2) and Nicolas of Damascus (xiii. 8. 4, 12. 6; xiv. 1. 3, 4. 3, 6. 4). In recent times the idea has been indeed expressed by many, that the very fact of these authors being so frequently quoted by Josephus shows that they were not his chief sources, and that the citations are to be regarded as interpolations, inserted only for the purpose of supplementing the text afforded by unnamed leading authorities made use of by him. But such a view would only lead one into inexplicable confusion. Josephus borrows his whole material from these authors, and

then refers to particular passages of special importance, which he quotes in order to show that they state the author in the same way that he does. Or where the citations are really an interpolation in the given text, Josephus follows the one and supplements it from the other. Of any deeper laid foundation, an unnamed principal source, not the least vestige can be found. The careful method of weighing his evidence which characterizes Strabo, and is so conspicuous in his geography, is quite discernible in particular passages where he is not named, as in several statements about numbers, xiii. 12. 5. Then, again, that these two base their conclusions upon earlier authorities is self-evident. For the first half of the period under consideration, B.C. 135–85, most probably Posidonius would prove the most reliable source (see above, pp. 49, 50). Also in passages borrowed from Strabo we find references to Timagenes (xiii. 11. 3, 12. 5), Asinius Pollio, and Hypsikrates (xiv. 8. 3). Josephus has scarcely made use of Livy, who is only once named (xiv. 4. 3). But the material obtained in this way from Strabo and Nicolas was supplemented by Josephus in respect of the internal Jewish history from narratives which, by reason of their contents, deserve to be characterized as legends, and from the general framework of the narrative we may see that they are plainly taken as such (xiii. 10. 3, 10. 5–6; xiv. 2. 1). These are evidently derived from oral tradition. — For the history of Herod, it is admitted on all hands that Nicolas of Damascus is the principal authority (comp. xii. 3. 2; xiv. 1–3; xvi. 7. 1; and above, pp. 58–63). It would seem that the short sketch given in the Wars of the Jews is drawn exclusively from him. Also the detailed account given in the Antiquities, books xvi. and xvii., produces the impression of having been derived from one source. On the other hand, in book xv. seams and joinings are apparent, which point to the employment of two sources; and indeed, in addition to Nicolas, it is evident that Josephus made use of another authority unfavourable to Herod. Whether Josephus had himself seen the Commentaries of King Herod, mentioned in the Antiquities, xv. 6. 3, is at least extremely questionable (compare above, p. 56). — Full and detailed as the treatment of the history of Herod is, it is very noticeable that the history of his immediate successor is extremely defective. It seems almost as if Josephus had at this point been deprived of all written sources of information. It is only when we come to the reign of Agrippa I., A.D. 41–44, that the narrative enters again more into detail. Here he would be once more in possession of abundance of oral tradition, for he would then be informed about the reign of Agrippa I. by his son Agrippa II. For the history of the last decade preceding the war, he would be able to rely upon his own personal recollections. The quite unparalleled completeness with which the events, even those which do not relate to the Jewish history, occurring in Rome at the time of Caligula's death, and at the beginning of the reign of Claudius in A.D. 41, are narrated, is very remarkable (xix. 1–4). There can be no doubt that this portion of the history is borrowed from a special source by the hand of a contemporary. But we are unable to arrive at any more definite conclusions from the absence of any sure standing ground. Josephus paid very particular attention to the history of the high priests. From what he here states, we are able to determine the uninterrupted succession of high priests from the time of Alexander the Great down to the destruction of the temple by Titus. It might be conjectured that for this purpose he would have had at his command, at least from the time of Herod the Great, the original priestly documents. For great importance was attached to the preservation of the register of the generations of the priests, and great care taken of it (Treatise against Apion, i. 7). — Finally, of great value are the State papers which Josephus frequently embodies in his narrative (xiii. 9. 2, xiv. 8. 5, xiv. 10, xiv. 12, xvi. 6, xix. 5, xx. 1. 2). The most numerous of these are those of the time of Caesar and Augustus, which granted to the Jews the privilege of the free observance of their religion.

3. THE LIFE OR AUTOBIOGRAPHY. It does not by any means present us with an actual account of the life of Josephus, but treats almost exclusively of the part which he played as

commander-in-chief of Galilee in A.D. 66-67, and indeed only of the measures which in that situation he took preparatory to the grand hostile encounter with the Romans (c. 7-74). The short biographical notices of the beginning and end of the work (c. 1-6, 75-76) form only introduction and conclusion to this principal part of the contents. According to the remarks at the close of the Antiquities, Josephus had then the intention of carrying on the account of the war and "our fortunes," the story of the Jewish people "down to the present day." "And if God permit me, I will briefly run over this war again, with what befell us therein to this very day," Antiq. xx. conclusion. In fact, the Life is represented as an Appendix to the Antiquities. It begins with the enclitic δέ, which attaches it to the preceding work, and concludes with the words: "To thee, O Epaphroditus, the most excellent of men, do I dedicate all this treatise of our Antiquities, and so for the present I here conclude the whole." Also the position of the Life in the manuscripts is immediately after the Antiquities. Eusebius (Ecclesiastical History, iii. 10. 8 f.) quotes a passage from the Life with the remark that the words occur "at the close of his Antiquities;" and in all extant manuscripts, with only one exception, the Life is joined with the Antiquities. It would, however, be a great mistake to regard the statement at the end of the Antiquities as having reference to the Life. Josephus there has in view the continuing of the history of the Jews down to the present time. The Life, however, is anything but a fulfilment of such a proposal. It was apparently called forth by the publication of another history of the Jewish war by Justus of Tiberias (see on him, above, pp. 64-69). That author had represented Josephus as the real organizer of the outbreak in Galilee. This was extremely inconvenient to Josephus now that he occupied a position of eminence in Rome. And so he now writes a counterblast, in which he casts all the blame on Justus, and makes himself pose as the friend of the Romans. The attempt is pitifully weak, for Josephus cannot avoid mentioning deeds which prove the very opposite of what he desires to make out. With this self-vindication which he had been driven to make he joined a few biographical notices by way of introduction and conclusion, and then published the whole as an Appendix to his Antiquities. The earlier scheme was therefore abandoned and quite a different one substituted for it. In spite, then, of the δέ that would attach it immediately to the other work, the Life must have been written a long time subsequent to the Antiquities. Now the Life assumes that Agrippa II. was already dead (c. 65). But Agrippa died, according to Photius, Biblioth. cod. 33, in the third year of Trajan, A.D. 100. If, then, the composition of the Life must be set down as at least after A.D. 100, that will be in perfect harmony with the other facts of the case, and there will be no reason to doubt the correctness of the statement of Photius or to set it aside as unsupported, because the Life must have been written immediately after the Antiquities.

4. THE TREATISE AGAINST APION, or, On the Extreme Antiquity of the Jewish People, in two books. This work is not solely, not even in any part of it mainly, directed against the grammarian Apion and his calumniating of the Jewish people, but rather generally against the venomous attacks and the prejudices, in many instances absurd enough, from which the Jews of those days suffered. It is a careful and well-conceived Apology for Judaism, skilfully and ably wrought out. The numerous quotations given from authors whose works are now lost lend it an altogether special interest. On the writers whose statements are contested by Josephus, see Div. ii. vol. iii. pp. 249-262. The title "Against Apion" is certainly not the original one. Porphyry in his De abstinentia, iv. 11, cites the work under the title πρὸς τοὺς Ἕλληνας; the earliest Church Fathers (Origen, contra Celsum, i. 16, iv. 11; Eusebius, Ecclesiastical History, iii. 9; Praeparatio evangel. viii. 7. 21, x. 6. 15) refer to it under the title περὶ τῆς τῶν Ἰουδαίων ἀρχαιότητος. Both titles are probably equally old and equally well authenticated, for the demonstration of the antiquity of the Jewish people is, in fact, the main point insisted upon in the Apology. In the Codex Peirescianus of the excerpts of Constantinus Porphyrogennetus, de virtutibus, we meet

with the superscription περὶ παντὸς ἢ κατὰ Ἑλλήνων, — a singular blending of right and wrong. The title contra Apionem first appears in Jerome in Epist. 70 ad Magnum oratorem, c. 3; de viris illustr. c. 13; adv. Jovinian. ii. 14. In the last-named passage he transcribes the above quoted sentence of Porphyry, but substituted for Porphyry's title the one that has now become current. For the full statement of Jerome, see Div. ii. vol. ii. p. 201. — As Josephus in this work quotes from his Antiquities (i. 1 and 10), the Treatise against Apion must have been written later than A.D. 93. It is, like the Antiquities and the Life, dedicated to Epaphroditus (i. 1, ii. 41).

Besides these four works, many of the Church Fathers ascribe to Josephus the so-called Fourth Book of Maccabees, or the treatise περὶ αὐτοκράτορος λογισμοῦ. The spirit of it is certainly very similar to that of Josephus. It is written from the standpoint of Pharisaic Judaism with a varnish of Greek philosophy. But it may be accepted as certain that Josephus was not its author. See Div. ii. vol. iii. pp. 244–247.

The writing described by Photius, Bibliotheca cod. 48, as bearing in the manuscripts the three different titles, Ἰωσήπου Περὶ τοῦ παντός, Περὶ τῆς τοῦ παντὸς αἰτίας, Περὶ τῆς τοῦ παντὸς οὐσίας, is of Christian origin, and belongs to the author of the Philosophumena, who, in c. x. 32, quotes it as his own under the title περὶ τῆς τοῦ παντὸς οὐσίας. The author of both was probably Hippolytus, among whose works in the list on the Hippolytus statue a treatise περὶ τοῦ παντός is also named. See Volkmar, Hippolytus und dis römischen Zeitgenossen, 1855, pp. 2 ff., 60 ff. Besides Photius, many other writers refer to this treatise as a work of Josephus. So, for example, John Philoponus in De mundi creatione, iii. 16; John of Damascus, Sacra parall. Opp. ii. 789 ff., and John Zonaras, Annal. vi. 4.

A considerable fragment of this treatise was published first by David Höschel in his edition of the Bibliotheca of Photius in 1601, then by Le Moyne in his Varia sacra, i. 53 ff., where he maintains the position that it was written by Hippolytus; by Ittig and Havercamp in their editions of Josephus; in Fabricius, Hippolyti Opp. i. 220–222; in Gallandi, Biblioth. patr. ii. 451–454, and in Migne, Patrol. gr. x. 795–802. It has been issued in a more complete form, according to codex Baroccianus, in Bunsen, Analecta Ante-Nicaena, vol. i., and Lagarde, Hippolyti quae feruntur, 1858, pp. 68–73. A specimen of the text according to three Vatican manuscripts is given by Pitra, Analecta sacra, ii. 1884, p. 269 f. Compare generally, Salmon in article on Hippolytus in Smith and Wace, Dictionary of Christian Biography, vol. iii. p. 100. Routh, Reliquiae sacrac, 2nd ed. ii. 157 ff. Caspari, Quellen zur Geschichte des Taufsymbols, iii. 395 ff.

At the close of the Antiquities Josephus says that he had the intention of writing "these books concerning our Jewish opinions about God and His essence; and about our laws, — why, according to them, some things are permitted us to do and others are prohibited." (κατὰ τὰς ἡμετέρας δόξας τῶν Ἰουδαίων ἐν τέσσαρσι βίβλοις περὶ θεοῦ καὶ τῆς οὐσίας αὐτοῦ καὶ περὶ τῶν νόμων, διὰ τί κατ' αὐτοὺς τὰ μὲν ἔξεστιν ἡμῖνποιεῖν τὰ δὲ κεκώλυται.) By this he certainly does not mean so many different works, as these words have been understood by many, but only one work, which should treat of the essence of God and the rational interpretation of the Mosaic law, in a way similar to Philo's systematic exposition of the legislation of Moses. Compare Div. ii. vol. iii. pp. 338–348. In the earlier books of the Antiquities, too, he frequently refers to this work as one contemplated by him (Preface 4, i. 1. 1, 10. 5; iii. 5. 6, 6. 6, 8. 10; iv. 8. 4, 44). But it seems never to have been actually written.

Many of the formulae of reference used in the Antiquities are obscure, seeming, as they do, to imply that Josephus had also written a work on the history of the Seleucidae. He often remarks, for example, that what is briefly related by him is narrated in more detail in another place.

Where this is done by the passive formula, “as has been related elsewhere” (καθὼς καὶ ἐν ἄλλοις δεδήλωται), the reference might quite naturally be supposed to be to the historical works of the writers (Antiq. xi. 8. 1; xii. 10. 1; xiii. 4. 8, 8. 4, 13. 4; xiv. 6. 2, 7. 3, 11. 1). But not infrequently Josephus distinctly uses the first person, “as we have informed the reader elsewhere” (καθὼς καὶ ἐν ἄλλοις δεδηλώκαμεν, Antiq. vii. 15. 3; xii. 5. 2; xiii. 2. 1, 2, 4, 4. 6, 5. 11, 10. 1, 10. 4, 12. 6, 13. 5). Of these citations four may be explained as references to other portions of the works of Josephus known to us. Antiq. vii. 15. 3 may refer to Wars of the Jews, i. 2. 5; Antiq. xiii. 10. 1 may refer to c. 7. 1 of the same book; Antiq. xiii. 10. 4 may refer to Wars, vii. 10; and Antiq. xiii. 3 and xiii. 13. 5 may refer to Antiq. iii. 10. 4. But so far as the rest are concerned, no such parallels can be thought of. All of them refer to the history of the Seleucid dynasty from Antiochus Epiphancs down to the end of the second century before Christ (Antiq. xii. 5. 2; xiii. 2. 1, 2. 4, 4. 6, 5. 11, 12. 6). Seeing, then, that nothing is known of a history of the Seleucids written by Josephus, Destinon in his Quellen des Josephus, pp. 21-29, ventures to guess that all these formulae of reference may have been already in the sources used by Josephus, and that he simply transcribed them without change to his own pages. Such procedure would indeed be somewhat extraordinary, but the conjecture is not to be thrown aside without further examination. This at least can be adduced in its favour, that occasionally similar formulae of reference are met with in the Antiquities and to the parallel passages in the Wars of the Jews, although both works were produced independently of one another from common sources. Compare Antiq. xiv. 7. 3 at the beginning, with Wars of the Jews, i. 8. 8; and Antiq. xiv. 7. 3 at the end, with Wars of the Jews, i. 8. 9. On the other hand, in some of the passages in question, the writer, immediately after or before speaking in the first person, is certainly Josephus himself (so in xii 5. 2 and xiii. 12. 6). These doubtful formulae, too, are precisely the same in form as those which unquestionably proceed from Josephus (xiii. 10. 4, 13. 5). It is therefore scarcely possible to do more than pass a verdict of non liquet.

On the character of Josephus and his credibility as a historian, the most widely divergent opinions have been entertained. In early times and during the Middle Ages he was, as a rule, very highly prized; Jerome, for example, styling him the “Greek Livy.” Modern criticism has run to the precisely opposite extreme of depreciation. It will probably be found that the truth lies midway between these extremes. No one will now be inclined to undertake the vindication of this character. Vanity and self-sufficiency are the main elements in his composition. And even had he not been the base and dishonourable betrayer of his native country that he at a later period in his Life declared himself to be, he at least carried out the transference of his allegiance to the Romans and his attachment to the imperial family of Flavius with more dexterity and equanimity than was becoming in an Israelite who pretended to mourn over the destruction of his people. As a writer, too, he has his great weaknesses. But to be quite fair, one must admit that his principal weakness as a writer is not to his discredit as a man. He writes with the purpose of glorifying his own nation. With such a design he invests the earlier history of the Jews with a halo of romance. His description of their later history, too, is dominated by the same intention. The Pharisees and Sadducees are philosophical schools which concern themselves with the problems of freedom and immortality. The Messianic hope, which, on account of the political claims which became attached to it, had proved the most powerful incentive to rebellion against Rome, is passed over in absolute silence, for it is his wish not to represent the people as enemies of the Romans. The war against Rome was not engaged upon by the will of the people, but they were only driven into it by some fanatics. In all these directions the historical statement of Josephus presents us with a distorted picture. In other respects, his several works are of very varied and unequal importance. The Wars of the Jews is unquestionably much more carefully compiled than the Antiquities. It gives an account, going into the minutest details of

events, the credibility of which we have no reason to doubt. The long speeches which Josephus puts into the mouth of his heroes are, of course, free rhetorical productions, and we must not take his numbers too exactly. But these faults are shared by Josephus with many ancient historians, and they do not affect the credibility of the works in other respects. Only what he says about the circumstances of his being taken prisoner at Jotapata, in Wars of the Jews, iii. 8, must be excepted from this favourable judgment. — The case is considerably different as regards the Antiquities. That work was evidently much more carelessly prepared than the history of the Wars of the Jews. This is specially true about the last books, of which it has been remarked that when writing them the author must have been utterly wearied. And not only is the work carelessly done, but also the sources are often used with great freedom and the utmost arbitrariness, at least where we are in a position to criticize them. This is not calculated to produce much confidence in regard to the use of those sources that we can no longer verify. Yet here, too, we meet with occasional evidence of his having subjected his sources to critical examination (Antiq. xiv. 1. 3, xvi. 7. 1, xix. 1. 10, 1. 14). As might be expected, the value of the work in its various sections varies according to the sources that had been used. By far the most faulty production is undoubtedly the Life, — an attempt made with singular blindness to turn facts upside down, by proving that while he had organized the rebellion in Galilee, he had always maintained his allegiance to the Romans.

In the Christian Church from the earliest times Josephus was diligently read, since his works afforded a suitable and convenient summary of the history of the Jewish people. The testimonia veterum regarding Josephus are gathered together in Havercamp's edition in the Prolegomena to the first volume.

In the West, Josephus became known mainly through a Latin translation of his complete works, with the exception of the Life, and by a free paraphrase of the Wars of the Jews. On the history of the origin of these texts we have statements from the following witnesses: — 1. Jerome, Epist. 71 ad Lucinium, c. 5, says: "The rumour that has reached you that the books of Josephus and of St. Papias and St. Polycarp have been translated by me is false, for I have had neither the leisure nor the strength to render these writings with the same elegance into another tongue." — From this it follows not only that Jerome had made no translation of Josephus, but also that in his time the works of Josephus, or at least some parts of them, were still untranslated, otherwise the need of such a performance would not have been felt. — 2. Cassiodorius, De institutione div. lit. c. 17, says: "As Josephus, almost a second Livy, is widely known by his books on the Antiquities of the Jews, whom Jerome, writing to Lucinus Baetieus, declares that he had not been able to translate on account of the size of his voluminous work. Yet one of our own friends has translated the work into Latin in twenty-two books," i.e. twenty books of Antiquities and the two books against Apion, "who also wrote other seven books on the captivity of the Jews with wonderful brilliancy, the translation of which some ascribe to Jerome, others to Ambrose, others to Rufinus; and its being ascribed to such men sufficiently proves the excellency of its style." — From this it may be assumed as certain that the extant Latin translation of the Antiquities and the Treatise against Apion were made at the suggestion of Cassiodorius, that is to say, in the sixth century after Christ. But there seems no ground whatever for attributing this translation, as has commonly been done after the example of St. Bernard, to a certain Epiphanitis, whose name was probably suggested by the fact that Cassiodorius, two sentences farther on, ascribed to him the reproduction of the historia tripartita. — It is uncertain whether the remarks of Cassiodorius in reference to the Bellum Judaicum refer to the Latin translation which is generally ascribed to Rufinus, or to the free Latin paraphrastic rendering which in the various editions bears the name of Hegesippus. The

designation of the work as a translation might apply to either production. For even the free rendering has been spoken of as a translation (compare the superscription in cod. Ambrosianus: Ambrosius epi de grego transtulit in latinum). But what Cassiodorius says about its style favours the reference to the work of Hegesippus. For although Rufinus also wrote in good Latin, the expression dictionis eximiae merita could only be correctly applied to the work of Hegesippus written in the Sallustian style. If the latter be intended, then these two results would follow from the words of Cassiodorius: 1. That this work was anonymous, for Cassiodorius knew only of conjectures as to its author. 2. That the literal translation was not yet in existence in the time of Cassiodorius; for had it been so he would not have been silent regarding it, and have mentioned only the free rendering, since he distinctly states that care had already been taken to translate the Wars of the Jews into Latin. Before this question can be decided with certainty, it would be necessary to inquire whether the older Latin writers down to the ninth century, from which the oldest manuscripts of Rufinus are dated, make use of the Wars of the Jews in the form of the so-called Rufinus or in that of the so-called Hegesippus translation. That the literal translation was the work of Rufinus is in any case highly improbable, since in the catalogue of Rufinus' translations by Gennadius, De viris illustr., no translation of Josephus is mentioned.

The free Latin rendering of the Wars of the Jews in the various editions bears the name of Egesippus or Hegesippus. This is certainly only a corruption of Josephus: in Greek, Ἰώσηπος, Ἰώσηππος, Ἰώσιππος; in Latin, Josepus, Joseppus, Josippus. The name "Egesippus" is not found in the manuscripts of Josephus earlier than the ninth century. In the earliest references the work is quoted simply under the name of Josephus; as, for example, in Eucherius in the fifth century, and now in Widukind, the historian of the Saxons, in the tenth century. Also in the oldest manuscripts, an Ambrosianus of the seventh and eighth centuries and a Cassellan of the eighth and ninth centuries, only Joseppus Josephus is named in the inscriptions on the columns as the author. In addition, at an early date the names of Ambrosius and Hegesippus were given. In the somewhat more recent part of the cod. Ambrosianus, eighth and ninth centuries, the inscription of the first book runs: "Josippi," corrected by a later hand into "Egesippi" "liber primus explicit." Incipit secundus. Ambrosius epi de grego transtulit in latinum. A codex Bernens of the ninth century names Hegesippus, a Palat.-Vatican of the ninth and tenth centuries names Ambrose; yet more modern manuscripts sometimes the one and sometimes the other. An interesting passage is brought forward by Traube in the Rhein. Museum, xxxix. 1884, p. 477, in a letter of the Spaniard Alvarus of the ninth century, in which he says to an opponent: scito quia nihil tibi ex Egesippi posui verbis, sed ex Josippi vestri doctoris, where he refers to a passage in the work ascribed to our Hegesippus! He knew the work therefore only under the name of Josephus, but his opponent had known it under the name of Hegesippus. — In this state of matters the idea of an Ambrosian authorship need not be seriously entertained. It is a mere conjecture, which has been suggested simply from the circumstance that Ambrose, as well as Jerome and Rufinus, acted a leading part in transmitting Greek theological literature to the West. The work certainly had its origin in the days of the great bishop of Milan, the second half of the fourth century, but was produced most probably not by him, as the thorough investigations of Vogel in his De Hegesippo, 1881, tend to show. — The text of Josephus is there treated with great freedom, — in many places abbreviated, in many places expanded. The seven books of Josephus are compressed into five. — The first edition appeared in Paris 1510. The work has been often since reprinted. The best edition is: Hegesippus qui dicitur sive Egesippus de bello Judaico ope codicis Cassellani recognitus, ed. Weber, opus morte Weberi interruptum absolvit Caesar, Marburg 1864. — Compare generally: Gronovii Observatorum in scriptoribus ecclesiasticis Monobiblos, 1651, capp. 1, 6, 11, 16, 21, 24. — Oudin, De script. eccl. ii. 1722, col. 1026–1031. — Fabricius, Biblioth. lat. mediae et infimae aetatis iii. 1735, pp. 582–584. — Teuffel,

History of Roman Literature, § 433. 5-6. — Mayor, Bibliographical Clue to Latin Literature, 1875, p. 179. — Vogel, De Hegesippo qui dicitur Josephi interprete, Erlangen 1881. Also: Ὁμοιότητες Sallustianae (in Acta, seminarii philolog. Erlangensis, i. 1878). — Also in Zeitschrift für die oesterreich Gymnas. 1883, pp. 241-249. — Lipsius, Die apokryphen Apostelgeschichten und Apostellegenden, ii. 1, 1887, pp. 194-200. — Rönsch. Die lexikalischen Eigenthümlichkeiten der Latinität des sogen. Hegesippus (Romanische Forschungen, Bd. i. 1883, pp. 256-321). — Also: Ein frühes Citat aus dem lat. Hegesippus (Zeitschrift für Wissensch. Theol. 1883, pp. 239-241). — Traube, Zum latein. Josephus (Rhein. Museum, Bd. xxxix. 1884, p. 477 f.).

The Latin translation of the works of Josephus was first printed by John Schüssler in Augsburg in 1470. From that time down to the appearance of the first Greek edition, the number of printed editions of the Latin rendering was very great; the last with which I am acquainted was issued in 1617. The Latin translations which after that date for the most part accompanied the Greek original, are modern productions; only the edition of Bernard, which which never carried to completion, gives the old Latin version. The best edition of the old Latin version is that of Basel 1524. The later ones are in various places corrected after the Greek text. More particulars about the character of this translation and its editions are given in the prolegomena of Ittig, Havercamp, and Niese, and in Fürst, Biblioth. Jud. ii. 118 ff. — A manuscript of the Latin translation of the Antiquities vi.-x. (with blanks), of importance owing to its age, the sixth and seventh centuries, and its material, papyrus, has been found in the Ambrosiana in Milan. On it see Muratori, Antiquitates Italicae, iii. 919 ff.; Reifferscheid, Sitzungsberichte der Wiener Akademie, philos.-hist. Kl., Bd. lxvii. 1871, pp. 510-512. Niese, Josephi opp. i. p. xxviii.

A Syriac translation of the sixth book of the Wars of the Jews is contained in the great Peschito manuscript of the Ambrosiana in Milan, and is there given as the Fifth Book of Maccabees. It has been published in a complete form, with notes by Ceriani, in the Translatio Syra Pescitto Veteris Testamenti, 2 vols., Milan 1876-1883. — Compare Kottek, Das sechste Buch des Bellum Jadaicum, nach der von Ceriani photolithographisch edirten Peschitta-Handschrift übersetzt und kritisch bearbeitet, Berlin 1886. The view there maintained is that this Syriae translation was made, not from the Greek, but from the Aramaic original of Josephus. See the opposite view upheld in the Lit. Centralbl. 1886, pp. 881-884.

On the free Hebrew rendering of Josephus known under the name of Josippon or Joseph son of Gorion, see below in the account of the rabbinical literature.

On the manuscripts of the Greek text the Prolegomena of the earlier editions gave very insufficient information. The manuscript material was first examined in a thorough manner by Niese. But the Prolegomena that have up to this time been published with the first volume of his edition, 1887, only undertake to deal with the manuscripts of the first ten books of the Antiquities. The following sketch of the most important manuscripts of the complete works has been most kindly handed over to me by Niese for publication at this place (compare also on his researches: Edersheim in Smith and Wace, Dictionary of Christian Biography, vol. iii. 1882, p. 450 ff.): —

"The several works of Josephus were issued separately. The Antiquities also fell again into two divisions, each of which, in respect of its transmission, has a history of its own.

"The numerous manuscripts of the Wars of the Jews fall into two principal classes. The most important representatives of the first are the Parisinus gr. 1425, the Ambrosianus D. super. 50, both from the eleventh century, and Marcianus 383, from the twelfth century. The second class

has three different types. As representative of the first type may be mentioned the Vatican 148, the Palatino-Vatican 284, and the Lipsiensis. To the second type belongs the Laurent, plut. 69, cod. 19; and to the third, the Urbinas n. 84. All these manuscripts, the most perfect specimens of the several kinds, belong to the eleventh century, only the Palatino-Vatican to the twelfth. Of the two classes the first named is the better. Besides the Greek text there is also the old Latin version commonly ascribed to Rufinus, which is at least a pre-Cassiodorian translation, belonging exclusively to neither of these two classes, but attaching itself in many passages to the superior class. Also the still older free Latin rendering of Ambrose, the so-called Hegesippus version, comes under consideration for the purposes of criticism and history of the text.

"The manuscripts of books i.-x. of the Antiquities also fall into two classes: the first and better, extant in two specimens, the Parisin. 1421 and the Bodleianus miscell. gr. 186; and the second, which embraces all the other manuscripts, of which we may mention the Marcianus gr. 381, Vindobon. hist. gr. 2, Parisin. 1419, and Laurent. plut. 69, cod. 20.

"Less directly marked are the distinctions of classes in the second division of the Antiquities, books xi.-xx., together with the Life. The oldest and best of the manuscripts is the Palatino-Vatican n. 14, of the tenth century, in which indeed the last three books, xviii.-xx., are wanting, while the Life is still preserved. Next to it come the Ambrosianus F. 128 sup., of the eleventh century, the Laurent. plut. 69, cod. 10, of the fifteenth century, the Laurent. plut. 69, cod. 20, and the Leidensis F. 13. The last two named have only books xi.-xv. In these manuscripts the documentary sources in book xiv. 10 are perfectly preserved. The rest, among which the Vatican 147 may be specially mentioned, want these either wholly or in part.

"For the history of the transmission of the Antiquities, an Epitome, extant in several manuscripts, and made use of by Zonaras, is of importance. It may have been drawn up somewhere in the ninth or tenth century. For the first edition it follows the inferior class of texts, and for the second it assumes a middle position. — The Antiquities, too, were translated into Latin on the suggestion of Cassiodorius. The text lying at the basis of this translation was for the first division a representative of the inferior class; but in the second division it rests sometimes upon this manuscript, sometimes upon that. The Life is to be found neither in the Epitome nor in the translation.

"Finally, of the Books against Apion, there is only one Greek manuscript that comes into consideration, the Laurentianus plut. 69, cod. 22, of the eleventh century. Besides this, the Cassiodorian Latin translation, which appears in a fragmentary form in all printed copies, is of very great critical value. Of special value, too, are the quotations of Eusebius, which restore to us several isolated passages of this important work."

EDITIONS AND LITERATURE

The first edition of the Greek text of the works of Josephus were published by Frobenius and Episcopius at Basel in 1544, under the direction of Arnold Peraxylus Arlen. — It was followed by the Genevan editions of 1611 and 1634. — At Leipzig, in 1691, the title falsely bearing the name Coloniae, appeared the edition of Ittig with learned Prolegomena. — An edition by Bernard, Antiquitatum Jud. libri quatuor priores et pars magna quinti, De bello Jud. liber primus et pars secundi, Oxoniae 1700, which made use of a new collection of manuscripts, and was accompanied by a rich exegetical apparatus, was never completed. — Hudson was the first to issue an improved text of the whole works according to the manuscripts, 2 vols, fol., Oxonii 1720. — Havercamp issued a repertory of everything that had previously been discovered, and

also new collections, but not an improved text, in 2 vols, fol., Amsterdam, Leyden, Utrecht, 1726. The editions of Oberthür, in 3 vols., Lips. 1782–1785, and Richter, 6 vols., Lips. 1826–1827, follow closely that of Havercamp. — Dindorf in his edition, 2 vols., Paris 1845–1847, here and there amended the text from materials supplied by Havercamp. — Bekker in his edition, in 6 vols., Lips. 1855–1856, followed Dindorf. — In none of these editions, not even in those of Hudson and Havercamp, is the manuscript apparatus presented with anything like completeness. None of the editors above named since Havercamp gave themselves any concern with the manuscripts. Only for the Bellum Judaicum Cardwell issued a separate edition of a creditable kind, for which he had examined at least a portion of the better manuscripts: Flavii Josephi De bello Judaico libri septem, ed. Cardwell, 2 vols., Oxonii 1837. — A comprehensive collection of all the better manuscripts was first undertaken quite recently by Niese. Of his critical edition, which gives a thorough reconstruction of the text of Josephus on the basis of the manuscripts, two volumes have up to this time appeared, containing the first ten books of the Antiquities: Flavii Josephi opera edidit et apparatu critico instruxit Bened. Niese, vols. i. ii., Berol. 1887, 1885. He has also issued a smaller edition of the text only, without the critical apparatus: Flavii Josephi opera recognovit B. Niese, vols. i. ii., Berol. 1888. The Life appeared in a separate edition by Henke, Brunswick 1786. — Compare generally on the editions: Fabricius, Biblioth. Graec., ed. Harles, v. 31 ff. Fürst, Biblioth. Judaica, ii. 117 f. Grraesse, Trésor de livres rares et précieux, iii. 1862, pp. 480–484.

On Textual Criticism: Ernesti, Observations philologicocriticae in Aristophanis nubes et Flav. Josephi antiqu. Jud., Lips. 1795. — Holwerda, Emendationum Flavianarum specimen, Gorinchemi 1847. Also: Observationes criticae in Flavii Josephi Antiquitatum Judaicarum librum XVIII. (Mnemosyne, 1853, pp. 111–141). — Bekker, Varianten zum Josephus, in Monatsberichte der Berlin. Akad. 1860, pp. 224–230. — Westermann, Excerptorum ex bibliothecae Paulinae Lipsiensis libris manu scriptis pars altera, Lips. 1866. — Wollenberg, Recensentur LXXVII. loci ex Flavii Josephi scriptis excerpti qui ex conlectaneis Constantini Augusti Porphyrogenetae περὶ ἀρετῆς καὶ κακίας in codice Peiresciano extant, Berlin 1871. — Dindorf, Ueber Josephos und dessen Sprache (Neue Jahrbb. für Philol. und Pädag. Bd. 99, 1869, pp. 821–847). — Naber, Observationes critieae in Flavium Josephum, in Mnemosyne, xiii. 1885, pp. 263–284, 352–399.

Translations. On the older translations, see what has been said above. More recent Latin translations are given in the editions of Hudson, Havercamp, Oberthür, and Dindorf. — An English translation of the whole works of Josephus was made by Whiston, Professor of Mathematics in the University of Cambridge, and published by him in 1737. Though by no means invariably correct in its rendering, nor in any sense a critical work, its serviceableness and general popularity are shown by the numerous editions through which it has passed. An admirable translation of the Wars of the Jews has been made by Traill, The Jewish War of Flavius Josephus, a new translation by R. Traill, edited by Isaac Taylor, London 1862. Before the publication of the Greek editions a German translation from the Latin was made by Caspar Hedio, Strassburg 1531; then revised by the same after the Greek text, Strassburg 1561. On other German translations of the sixteenth to eighteenth centuries, see Fabricius, Biblioth. Graec., ed. Harles, v. 31, 38, 48; Fürst, Biblioth. Judaica, ii. 121–123. There need here only be mentioned the translations of the whole works by Ott, Zürich 1736; Cotta, Tübingen 1736; Demme, Josephus' Werke, übers, von Cotta und Gfroerer; das Ganze von neuem nach dem Griechischen bearbeitet, etc., durch C. R. Demme, 7th ed., Philadelphia 1868–1869. The translation of the Antiquities by Martin, 2 vols., Cologne 1852–1853, 2nd ed. by Kaulen, 1883; of the 11th and 12th books of the Antiquities by Horschetzky, Prague 1826; of the 13th book of the Antiquities by the same translator in 1843; of the Jewish War by Friese, 2 vols., Altona 1804–

1805; by Gfroerer, 2 vols., Stuttgart 1836; and by Paret, 6 vols., Stuttgart 1855. Translations of the Life by Eckhardt, Leipzig 1782; by Friese, Altona 1806; by M. J. in the Library of Greek and Roman writers on Judaism and the Jews, vol. ii., Leipzig 1867. Of the Treatise against Apion by Frankel in the Monatsschrift für Gesch. und Wissensch. des Judenthums, 1851-1852, with some abbreviation; by Paret, Stuttgart 1856; and by M. J. in Library of Greek and Roman writers on Judaism and the Jews, vol. ii. 1867. On other translations into English, French, Italian, etc., see Fabricius, Bibliotheca Graec., ed. Harles, v. 30 ff.; Fürst, Bibliotheca Judaica, ii. 123-127.

General Literature on Josephus (the earlier literature given in Fabricius: Bibliotheca Graec., ed. Harles, v. 49-56; Fürst, Bibliotheca Judaica, ii. 127-132). – Vossius, De historicis Graecis (ed. 1, 1624), ii. 8, ed. Westermann, 1838, pp. 238-243. – Havercamp's edition, ii. 2, p. 57 ff. – Ceillier, Histoire générale des auteurs sacrés et ecclésiastiques, i., Paris 1729, pp. 552-580. – Cave, Scriptorum ecclesiasticorum historia literaria, i., Oxonii 1740, pp. 32-36. – Meusel, Bibliotheca historica, i. 2, 1784, pp. 209-236. – Oberthür in Fabricius, Bibliotheca graeca, ed. Harles, t. v. 1796, pp. 1-64 – Jost, Geschichte der Israeliten, ii. 1821, Anhang, pp. 55-73. – Schöll, Geschichte der griech. Literatur, ii. 1830, pp. 383-389. – Lewitz, Quaestionum Flavianarum specimen, Regiom. Pr. 1835. By the same, De Flavii Josephi fide atque auctoritate, Königsberg 1857. – Hoëvell, Flavii Josephi vita; quatenus per vitae opportunities ad conscribendam historiam atque antiquitatem Hebraicam idoneus fuit? etc., Traj. ad Rh. 1835. – Chasles, De l'autorité historique de Flavius Josèphe, Paris 1841. – Egger, Examen critique des historiens anciens de la vie et du règne d'Auguste, Paris 1844, pp. 189-209. – Bähr, art. "Josephus" in Pauly's Real-Encyclop. der class. Alterthumswissensch. ii. 1846, pp. 242-244. – Creuzer, Josephus und seine griechischen und hellenistischen Führer (Theol. Stud. und Krit. 1853, pp. 45-86). – Reuss, Geschichte der heil. Schriften A. T.'s, 1881, § 15. – Paret, art. "Josephus" in Herzog, Real-Encyclop. 1 Aufl. Bd. vii. 1857, pp. 24-29. – Farrar, article "Josephus" in Kitto, Cyclopaedia of Biblical Literature. – On relation of St. Peter to Josephus: Farrar in Expositor, second series, vol. iii. p. 403 ff.; E. A. Abbott in Expositor for January 1882; Salmon, Introduction to the New Testament, London 1885, pp. 638-649. – Edersheim, article on "Josephus" in Smith and Wace, Dictionary of Christian Biography, iii. 441-460. – Terwogt, Het leven van den joodschen geschiedschrijver Flavius Josephus, Utrecht 1863. – Hausrath, Neutestamentliche Zeitgeschichte, 2 ed., iv. 56-74. Also: Ueber den jüdischen Geschichtschreiber und Staatsmann Flav. Josephus (Sybel's Histor. Zeitschr. Bd. xii. 1864, pp. 285-314). – Ewald, History of Israel, vol. vii. 492 ff., viii. 68-75. – Baerwald, Josephus in Galiläa, sein Verhältniss zu den Parteien insbesondere zu Justus von Tiberias und Agrippa II., Breslau 1877.

On the theological and philosophical standpoint of Josephus: Bretschneider, Capita theologiae Judaeorum dogmaticae e Flavii Josephi scriptis collecta, Viteb. 1812. – Gfroerer, Philo, ii. pp. 356-367. – Dähne, Jüd.-alex. Religionsphilosophie, ii. 240-245. – Lutterbeck, Die neutestamentlichen Lehrbegriffe, i. 1852, pp. 410-412. – Gerlach. Die Weissagungen des A. T.'s in den Schriften des Fl. Josephus, 1863, pp. 6-19. – Poznanski, Ueber die religionsphilosophischen Anschauungen des Flavius Josephus, Breslau 1887. – Lewinsky, Beiträge zur Kenntniss der religionsphilosophischen Anschauungen des Flavius Josephus, Breslau 1887. – Drummond, Philo-Judaeus: or the Jewish-Alexandrian Philosophy in its Development and Completion, 2 vols., London 1888.

On the Old Testament Canon that lay before Josephus (especially in regard to the Treatise against Apion, i. 8), compare the Introductions to the Old Testament of Hävernick, Keil, vol. ii. pp. 138-140; De Wette, Bleek, ii. 307-309. – Robertson Smith, The Old Testament in the Jewish

Church, Edin. 1881, pp. 149 f., 408. — Ewald, History of Israel, viii. 337 ff., 346, 361. — Dillmann (Jahrbb. für deutsche Theologie, 1858). — Strack, art. "Kanon des Alten Testam.," in Herzog, 2 Aufl. Bd. vii. 1880. — Treuenfels in Fürst's Literaturblatt des Orients, x. 1849, xi. 1850. — Derenbourg, Histoire de la Palestine, pp. 478-480.

On the use of the original Hebrew text and the Septuagint: Carpzov, Critica sacra, Lips. 1748, pp. 945-954. — Gesenius, Geschichte der hebr. Sprache und Schrift, 1815, pp. 80-82. — Spittler, De usu versionis Alexandrinae apud Josephum, Gottiag. 1779. — Scharfenberg, De Josephi et versionis Alexandrinae consensu, Lips. 1780. — Bloch, Die Quellen des Flavius Josephus, 1879, pp. 8-22. — Siegfried, Die hebräischen Worterklärungen des Josephus (in Stade's Zeitschrift für die alttestam. Wissensch. 1883, pp. 32-35). — A list of the Hebrew etymologies of Josephus is also given in Vallarsi's edition of Jerome, iii. 745-752.

On the treatment of the biblical history of Josephus: Edersheim in article "Josephus" in Smith and Wace, Dictionary of Christian Biography, iii. pp. 454-457. — Zunz, Die gottesdienstlichen Vorträge der Juden, p. 120. — Hartmann, Die enge Verbindung des A. T.'s mit dem Neuen, 1831, pp. 464-514. — Burger, Essai sur l'usage que Fl. Josèphe a fait des livres canoniques de l' A. T., Strasburg 1836. — Gerlach. Die. Weissagungen des A. T. in den Schriften des Fl. Josephus, 1863. — Duschak, Josephus Flavius und die Tradition, Wien 1864. — Plaut, Flavius Josephus und die Bibel, Berlin 1867. — Tachauer, Das Verhältniss des Fl. Josephus zur Bibel und zur Tradition, Erlangen 1871. — Bloch, Die Quellen des Fl. Josephus, 1879, pp. 23-53. — Ranke, Weltgeschichte, iii. 2, pp. 12-41,1883. — Olitzki, Flavius Josephus und die Halacha, 1 Thl. 1885. — Grünbaum, Die Priestergesetze bei Flavius Josephus, 1887.

On the chronology of Josephus, especially for the earlier periods: Brinch. Chronologiae et historiae Fl. Josephi examen Hafniae 1701 (also in Havercamp's Josephus, ii. 2, 287-304). — Spanheim in Havercamp's Josephus, ii. 2, 407 f. — Carpzov, Critica sacrae, pp. 954-957. — Junker, Ueber die Chronologie des Flavius Josephus, Conitz 1848. — The Journal of Sacred Literature, vol. v. 1850, pp. 60-81. — Journal of Sacred Literature and Biblical Record, vol. vii. 1858, pp. 178-181. Ewald, History of Israel, ii. p. 371. — Niebuhr, Gesch. Assurs und Babel's, 1857, pp. 105-109, 347-360. — Kuenen, De statmboom van den masoretischen tekst des O. Testaments (Verdagm en Mededeelingen der koninkl. Akademie van Wetensehappen, Afdeeling Letterkunde, Tweede reeks, deel iii. 1873, pp. 289-339; on Josephus, p. 321 ff.). — Destinon, Die Chronologie des Josephus, Kiel 1880.

On the sources of the second half of the Antiquities: Nussbaum, Observationes in Flavii Josephi Antiquitates, lib. xii. 3-xiii. 14. Dissertat. inaugur. 1875. — Bloch, Die Quellen des Flavius Josephus in seiner Archaeologie, Leipzig 1879. — Destinon, Die Quellen des Flavius Josephus in der Jüd. Archaeologie, Buch xii.-xvii.=Jüd. Krieg, Buch i., Kiel 1882. — Schemann, Die Quellen des Flavius Josephus in der jüdischen Archaeologie, Buch xviii.-xx.=Polemos ii., cap. vii.-xiv., 3 Dissert. 1887.

On the communicated State Papers, especially of times of Caesar and Augustus: Gronovius, Decreta Romana et Asiatica pro Judaeis, etc., Lugd. Bat. 1712. — Krebs, Decreta Romanorum pro Judaeis facta e Josepho collecta et commentario illustrata, Lips. 1768. — Egger, Examen critique des historiens anciens de la vie et du règne d'Auguste, 1844, pp. 193-200. By the same: Études historiques sur les traités publics, 1866, p. 163 ff. — Bonnetty, Annales de philosophie chrétienne, ix., 5 série. — Mendelssohn, Senati consulta Romanorum quae sunt in Josephi Antiquitatibus (Acta Societatis philol., Lips. ed. Ritschelius, v. 1875, pp. 87-288). — Niese, Bemerkungen über die Urkunden bei Josephus Archaeologie, B. xiii. xiv. xvi., in Hermes, xi.

1876, pp. 466-488. — See reply to Niese by Mendelssohn, Rhein. Museum, Neue Folge, Bd. xxxii. 1877, pp. 249-258. — Wicseler, Einige Bemerkungen zu den römischen Urkunden bei Josephus Ant. 12. 10, 14. 8, 14. 10, in Theol. Stud. und Kritiken, 1877, pp. 281-298. — Rosenthal, Die Erlässe Cäsars und die Senatsconsulte im Josephus Alterth. xiv. 10, in Monatsschrift für Gesch. und Wissensch. des Judenthums, 1879, pp. 176-183, 216-228, 300-322.

For the literature on the so-called witness to Christ in Antiquities, xviii. 3. 3, which, as a rule, also deals with Josephus more generally, see below at § 17.

On the geographical views of Josephus: Robinson, Biblical Researches in Palestine, vol. i. pp. 408-415, and elsewhere throughout the work. — Raumer, Palästina, 4th ed. 1860, pp. 466-471. — Berggren, Flavius Josephus der Führer und Irreführer der Pilger im alten und neuen Jerusalem, Leipzig 1854. Arnold, Die Bibel, Josephus und Jerusalem; Sammlung und Beleuchtung aller Stellen der Bibel und des Josephus, welche auf die Topographie Jerusalem's Bezug nehmen, 2 Abth., Halle 1865-1866. — For the explanation and criticism of the geographical statements: Boettger, Topographisch-historisches Lexicon zu den Schriften des Flavius Josephus, Leipzig 1879.

For the illustration of the Treatise against Apion: Cruice, De Flavii Josephi in auctoribus contra Apionem afferendis fide et auctoritate, Paris 1844. — Creuzer, Theol. Stud. und Krit. 1853, p. 64 ff. — Kellner, De fragmentis Manethonianis guae apud Josephum contra Apionem, i. 14 et i. 26 sunt, Marburgi 1859. — Zipser, Des Flavius Josephus Werk, "Ueber das hohe Alter des jüdischen Volkes gegen Apion," nach hebräischen Originalquellen erläutert, Vienna 1871. — J. G. Müller, Des Flavius Josephus Schrift gegen den Apion, Text und Erklärung, Basel 1877.

D. — GREEK AND ROMAN WRITERS

We are not required here to take into consideration all the Greek and Roman writers who may have made any sort of contribution to our history, but only those who have contributed something of considerable and permanent value. The Greek and Roman historians whose works are still preserved, afford us only a few notices in regard to the special history of the Jewish people. Of much greater importance are the hints respecting the general characteristics of Judaism which we gather from contemporary authors, especially from satirists like Horace and Juvenal. But of yet higher value are the statements made by those historians who give special consideration to the history of Syria during the reign of the Seleucidae and the Roman period. For the history of Palestine during our period is most intimately linked with the general history of Syria. The historians who treat of the history of that country are therefore to be ranked among the authorities for our history. The most important of these are the following: —

1. Greek Writers

1. POLYBIUS of Megalopolis in Arcadia. He was one of the thousand distinguished Achaeans who in B.C. 167, under suspicion of being ill-affected toward Rome, were transported to Rome, and were detained there, or at least in Italy, for seventeen years. During his long residence in Rome, the conviction gained possession of him that there was a divine reason and need-be for the sovereignty of the Romans. He gave expression to this idea in his great historical work, which in forty books described the gradual upbuilding of the Roman Empire and universal supremacy from B.C. 220 to B.C. 146. Of these only the first five books are preserved in a complete form; of the rest we have only fragments, more or less extensive, contained for the

most part in the collection of excerpts by Constantinus Porphyrogennetus. For the purposes of our history, only the best fifteen books, xxvi.-xl., come into consideration. In book xxvi. c. 10, Polybius enters first upon the history of Antiochus Epiphanes.

2. DIODORUS. This historian was born at Agyrium in Sicily, hence called Siculus, and lived during the reigns of Caesar and Augustus. He wrote a large universal history of all times and peoples, which he entitled βιβλιοθήκη. It consisted of forty books, covered a period of eleven hundred years, and reached down to the conquest of Gaul and Britain by Caesar. Of this work there still remain books i.-v., giving the early history of Egypt and Ethiopia, of the Assyrians and the other peoples of the East, as well as the Greeks; books xi.-xx., from the beginning of the second Persian war, B.C. 480, down to the history of the successors of Alexander the Great, B.C. 302; of the other books we have only fragments, for the most part preserved in the collection of excerpts by Constantinus Porphyrogennetus. Some of these fragments have been brought to light only in recent publications by Mai, Müller, and Feder. — For our purpose only the fragment from book xxix. 32, given in Müller, Fragmenta histor. graecor. ii., comes into consideration, where for the first time mention is made of Antiochus Epiphanes.

3. STRABO of Amasia in Pontus lived from about B.C. 60 to A.D. 20; but we cannot precisely determine the date either of his birth or of his death. Of his works we possess only the Γεωγραφικά, in seventeen books, written toward the end of his life, well known as a principal source of information in regard to ancient geography. Among the numerous historical notices interspersed in this great work, we meet with many which are of importance for the history of Syria. In his description of Palestine, xvi. 2. 25-46, Strabo has used, besides other authorities, one which treated of the state of affairs during the ante-Pompeian age, for he speaks of Gaza, which was destroyed by Alexander Jannaeus, as μένουσα ἔρημος (xvi. 2. 30), without mentioning that it had been rebuilt by Gabinius; see Div. ii. vol. i. p. 70. Also, according to the authority used by him, the forcible Judaizing of Joppa and Gazara (Gadara) are fresh in the memory (xvi. 2. 28-29). These statements were perhaps derived from Posidonius, from whom Strabo here frequently quotes.

4. PLUTARCH was born about A.D. 50 at Chaeronea in Boeotia. Trajan bestowed on him consular rank, and Hadrian appointed him Procurator of Greece. We also know that in his native city he filled the office of Archon, and repeatedly presided at the festival of the Pythian Apollo. He died about A.D. 120. — Of his works we have to do with the Biographies, βίοι παράλληλοι, of distinguished men of Greece and Rome, of whom generally two, the one a Greek, the other a Roman, are placed alongside of one another. Somewhere about fifty of these are preserved, among which those of Crassus, Pompey, Caesar, Brutus, and Antony are of special interest in connection with our history.

5. APPIAN. Of Appian's life very little is known. He says of himself at the conclusion of his historical work: "I am Appian of Alexandria, who attained to the highest position of honour in my own land, and as a jurist conducted processes at Rome before the justiciary courts of the emperor, until the members of court deemed me fit to be made their procurator." From various passages in his works, it appears that he lived under Trajan, Hadrian, and Antoninus Pius. The composition of his historical work falls in the time of Antoninus Pius, about A.D. 150. It treats of the history of Rome, in twenty-four books. Instead of the synchronistic method, Appian chose to follow rather the ethnographic, "because he wished to give the history of events in each separate country in an unbroken narrative down to the time of its union with Rome. Thus he gives also the history of Rome in a series of special histories of the various lands and people that had been combined with the Roman Empire, describing in detail the history of each from

the period of its first contact with Rome down to the time of its absorption into the empire, and then sketching in a brief style the incidents of more recent times" (Bähr in Pauly's Real-Encyclop.). Of the twenty-four books, the following are extant: — Of books i.-v. and ix., only fragments, but in a complete form; book vi. Ἰβηρική (scil. ἱστορία), vii. Ἀννιβαϊκή, viii. Λιβυκὴ καὶ Καρχηδονική, xi. Συριακὴ καὶ Παρθική (of which the part on the Parthian history is lost), xii. Μιθριδάτειος, xiii.-xvii. Ἐμφύλια (that is, the Civil War), xxiii. Δακική or Ἰλλυρική. The extant five books on the Civil War, xiii.-xvii., are usually cited as Appian. Civ. i. ii. iii. iv. v.; the other books being named according to their contents as Libyca (or Punica), Syriaca, etc.

6. DIO CASSIUS, or, more correctly, Cassius Dio, was born at Nicaea in Bithynia about A.D. 155. He spent the period of his public life in Rome, and occupied successively the positions of aedile, quaestor, praetor, and, about A.D. 221, Consul. He administered the province of Africa as Proconsul. In A.D. 229 he retired from official life. We have no information at all regarding his later days or about the date of his death. — His great work on Roman history was most probably composed about A.D. 211-222, but it was continued by him down to A.D. 229. It consisted of eighty books, and comprised the whole Roman history from the arrival of Aeneas at Latium down to the year 229 after Christ. The following portions are still preserved: — Of the first thirty-four books only short fragments; more considerable pieces of books xxxv. and xxxvi.; books xxxvii.-liv. inclusive are complete, treating of the wars of Lucullus and Pompey with Mithridates, down to the death of Agrippa in B.C. 12; of books lv.-lx. inclusive, we have considerable portions; but of the rest, books lxi.-lxxx., we have only an epitome made by Xiphilinus in the eleventh century; while for the first thirty-four books we have not even this.

2. Latin Writers

1. CICERO was born on 3rd January B.C. 106, at Arpinum, and died on 7th December B.C. 43, a victim of the proscriptions of Antony and Octavian. Cicero's Orations and Epistles are generally recognised as a main source of information on the history of his times, and especially on the history of Syria during the years B.C. 57-43.

2. LIVY was born at Patavium (Padua) in B.C. 59, and died in the same place A.D. 17. His great historical work treated of the history of Rome from the founding of the city down to the death of Drusus, in 142 books. Of these, only thirty-five have been preserved, namely, the first, third, fourth decade, and the first half of the fifth. For the purpose of our history only the first half of the fifth decade comes into consideration. It comprises books xli.-xlv., dealing with the period B.C. 178-167. The summary of contents of the books that are lost, relating to more recent times, is still of some value to us.

3. MONUMENTUM ANCYRANUM. Augustus at his death left behind him, besides other writings, a review of the most important incidents in his reign, recorded on tablets of brass, and intended to be set up before his Mausoleum (Suetonius, Aug. 101: indicem rerum a se gestarum, quem vellet incidi in aeneis tabulus, quae ante Mausoleum statuerentur). This review has come down to us almost complete in consequence of its having been engraved, according to the Latin text, and in a Greek translation, on the marble walls of the temple of Augustus at Ancyra in Galatia. What is there wanting in the Latin text is so far supplied by the fragments of the Greek translation that only unimportant blanks remain. Another copy of the Greek text is found in a temple at Apollonia in Pisidia, whereof also extracts are still preserved. — This comprehensive documentary memorial is, together with the histories of Dio Cassius and Suetonius, our chief authority for the reign of Augustus. — The most recent and most correct editions are: 1. Perrot, Exploration archéologique de la Galatie et de la Bithynie, etc., 1862-

1872, pl. 25-29; 2. Corpus Inscript. Lat. iii. 1873, pp. 769-799, 1054, 1064; 3. Bergk, Augusti rerum a se gestarum indicem, ed. 1873; 4. Mommsen, Res gestae divi Augusti, ex monumentis Ancyrano et Apolloniensi iterum edidit; accedunt tabulae undecim, Berol. 1883, with a thoroughly comprehensive and informing commentary.

4. TACITUS was born about A.D. 55, and was praetor in A.D. 88, and Consul in A.D. 98. The date of his death is unknown. He seems to have been still alive at the beginning of the reign of Hadrian, and may therefore have died somewhere about A.D. 120. — Of his historical works, the Annals, which in sixteen or eighteen books — their exact number is not certainly known — treated of the times of Tiberius, Caligula, Claudius, and Nero, that is, of the period from A.D. 14 to A.D. 68, are admittedly the most important original authority for the history of these times, and so, too, for the history of Syria. They are arranged annalistically, so that they afford a sure determination of the chronology. A great piece is wanting in the middle. There are extant: books i-iv. complete, v. and vi. partly, and xi.-xvi. defective at the beginning and the end. The portions preserved embrace the period of Tiberius, the second half of the reign of Claudius and that of Nero, with the exception of its close. — Of his other great work, the History, which consisted of twelve or fourteen books, dealing with the reigns of Galba, Otho, Vitellius, Vespasian, Titus, and Domitian, that is, from A.D. 68 to A.D. 96, only a fragment remains, books i.-iv. and a part of book v., treating of A.D. 68-70. Of special interest for us is Book v. 1-13, where Tacitus, by means of a few graphic strokes, gives a sketch of the history of the Jewish people down to the war with Titus.

5. SUETONIUS. In regard to his life-course, we know that his youth synchronizes with the reign of Domitian, A.D. 81-96; that he had the rank of tribune conferred upon him during the reign of Trajan, A.D. 98-117; and that under Hadrian, A.D. 117-138, he was made magister epistolarum, but afterwards received his dismissal from that emperor. Among his writings only the Vitae XII. Imperatorum come into consideration in connection with our history. The twelve Imperatores are: Caesar, Augustus, Tiberius, Caligula, Claudius, Nero, Galba, Otho, Vitellius, Vespasian, Titus, and Domitian.

6. TROGUS POMPEIUS (JUSTINUS) wrote under Augustus a universal history from Ninus down to his own times, in forty-four books, with special reference to the history of Macedonia and the Diadochen dynasty, full of material, carefully compiled and resting on good Greek authorities. — The work itself is lost. Only the lists of contents or prologi of the forty-four books are preserved, and an epitome which a certain Justinus, probably in the age of the Antonines, drew up. Even this short epitome is itself so full of material, that it forms for us an important source of information regarding the Seleucid period.

E. — THE RABBINICAL LITERATURE

Compare specially: Zunz, Die gottesdienstliclien Vorträge der Juden, 1832. — For the bibliography: Wolf, Bibliotheca Hebraea, 4 vols. 1715-1733. — Fürst, Bibliotheca Judaica, 3 vols. 1849-1863. — Steinschneider, Catalogue librorum hebraeorum in Bibliotheca Bodleiana, Berol. 1852-1860. — Zedner, Catalogue of the Hebrew Books in the Library of the British Museum, London 1867. — Strack, Bibliographischer Abriss der neuhebr. Litteratur, in Lehrb. der neuhebr. Sprache und Litt., by Siegfried and Strack, 1884, p. 93 ff.

By “Rabbinical Literature” we understand that literature which has grown up out of the professional labours of the Rabbis or scribes. These labours consisted, not indeed exclusively, but mainly, in learned discussions and criticism of the Scriptures. Of such productions we have

two different classes. On the one hand, some have discussed the law hypercritically in the jurist style; on the other hand, some have expanded and developed the sacred history and religious and ethical views by means of learned combinations. The productions of the first sort constitute the Halacha, or the traditional law; the productions of the second kind form the Haggada, or the legends, embracing religious and moral contents. For further information about both, see § 25, III.

The Halacha and Haggada were transmitted for the first hundred years by oral tradition only. In the Halacha strict adherence to literal accuracy in the transmission was insisted upon; whereas in the Haggada, greater freedom was given to subjective opinion and imagination. The final fixing of both in numerous and comprehensive literary works makes up what we style the Rabbinical Literature. The origin of this literature dates almost without exception from the earliest years of the period immediately after that treated in our history. Only the Haggadic treatment of Genesis, which is known under the name of the Book of Jubilees, belongs to our period; as do also the earliest, but no longer extant, contributions to the Halacha. But almost the whole of the rabbinical literature that has been preserved reaches no farther back than the last decade of the second century after Christ. It is nevertheless an invaluable source for the times of Christ, for the fountain of the there fixed traditions is to be sought away back, not merely in the times of Christ, but in yet earlier periods.

The Halacha has been written down partly in close connection with the Scripture text, therefore in the form of commentaries upon Scripture, partly in systematic order, grouping the materials under various headings according to the subjects dealt with. The works belonging to the latter class very soon obtained the pre-eminence. They embrace – 1. The Mishna; 2. The Tosephta; 3. The Jerusalem Talmud; 4. The Babylonian Talmud. They may be comprehended under the general designation of Talmudical Literature. In all of them Haggada is mixed up with Halacha; this blending being most conspicuous in the Babylonian Talmud, and least discernible in the Mishna.

The Haggada makes its appearance mainly in the form of commentaries on the Scripture text. The Halachic, as well as the Haggadic commentaries, may be comprehended under the general name of Midrashim.

The traditional conception of the Scripture text is given expression to in the Aramaic translations or the Targums. They too, therefore, are to be mentioned here, although in the form in which they have come down to us they are probably to be dated about one hundred years after the time of Christ.

Finally, as the residuum of historical tradition, we must refer to still other historical works which make reference to the period of which we treat.

I. The Talmudical Literature

1. The Mishna

The word מִשְׁנָה(stat. construct. מִשְׁנַת, varied from מִשְׁנָה, stat. construct. מִשְׁנֵה) has generally been rendered by the Church Fathers by δευτέρωσις. This is correct, inasmuch as the verb שָׁנָה, according to its root significance, means δευτεροῦν, to repeat. But in later usage “to repeat” came to be equivalent to “the teaching or learning of the oral law,” traditiones docere or discere. For the mode of imparting such instruction was by the teacher dictating the matter again and

again to the pupils, or even by the pupils themselves being made to repeat it over and over again. Hence מִשְׁנָה, which properly means “repetition,” came to be regarded as signifying the doctrine of the law, and even the doctrine of the oral law as distinguished from the written Thora.

The work specially designated by the name Mishna is the oldest codification of the traditional Jewish law that has come down to us. The material is here arranged according to its contents, distributed into six groups (סְדָרִים), containing altogether sixty tracts (מַסֶּכְתּוֹת, sing. מַסֶּכֶת). In our printed editions, by subdivision their number is increased to sixty-three. Each tract, again, is divided into chapters (פְּרָקִים); each chapter into paragraphs (מִשְׁנִיּוֹת). The chapter division is very old; but the position and numbering of paragraphs is modern, and in the printed editions vary very considerably from those of the manuscripts. — The language of the Mishna is Hebrew; its contents, as we might expect, almost purely Halachic. Only two tracts, Aboth and Middoth, are Haggadic; and besides, Haggadic elements, to a small extent, are found in the conclusion of the tracts, or in the explanation of particular Halachas.

The names and contents of the sixty-three tracts are as follows: —

First Seder, ס׳ זְרָעִים

1. Berachoth, בְּרָכוֹת, on formulae of blessings and prayers.

2. Pea, פֵּאָה, on the corners of fields which in harvest must be left unreaped for the poor; and generally on the right of the poor in the produce of the soil, according to Lev. 19:9, 10, 23:22; Deut. 24:19-22.

3. Demai, דְּמַאִי, on the treatment of the fruit, especially about anything where it is doubtful whether it ought to be tithed or not.

4. Kilajim, כִּלְאַיִם, on the illegal mixing of what is heterogeneous in the animal and vegetable kingdoms, and in clothing, according to Lev. 19:19; Deut. 22:9-11.

5. Shebiith, שְׁבִיעִית, on the Sabbatical year.

6. Terumoth, תְּרוּמוֹת, on the dues of the priests.

7. Maaseroth, מַעֲשֵׂרוֹת, on the tithes of the Levites.

8. Maaser sheni, מַעֲשֵׂר שֵׁנִי, on secondary tithes, which are taken after the payment of the first tithes, and must, according to Deut. 14:22 ff., be paid at Jerusalem.

9. Challa, חַלָּה, on the dough offerings, a 1-24th of the baking for home use, and 1-48th of the baking for sale, which, according to Num. 15:17 ff., is to be given to the priests.

10. Orla, עָרְלָה, on the prohibition against using the fruits of newly-planted trees during the first three years, according to Lev. 19:23-25.

11. Bikkurim, בִּכּוּרִים, on the presenting of the firstlings of the produce of the ground.

Second Seder, ס׳ מוֹעֵד

1. Shabbath, שַׁבָּת, on the Sabbath festival.

2. Erubin, עֵרוּבִין, on the binding together of separate localities for the purpose of freer movement on the Sabbath.

3. Pesachim, פְּסָחִים, on the Passover festival.

4. Shekalim, שְׁקָלִים, on the half-shekel tax, Ex. 30:11 ff.; Matt. 17:24.

5. Yoma, יוֹמָא, on the "day," that is, the great day of atonement.

6. Sukka, סֻכָּה, on the Feast of Tabernacles.

7. Beza, בֵּיצָה, or Yom tob, יוֹם טוֹב, whether one may eat an egg laid on a feast day, and generally on the observance of feast and Sabbath days.

8. Rosh Hashana, רֹאשׁ הַשָּׁנָה, on the New Year festival.

9. Taanith, תַּעֲנִית, on the days of fasting and mourning.

10. Megilla, מְגִלָּה, on the reading of the "roll," that is, of the book of Esther, and generally on the Feast of Purim.

11. Moed katan, מוֹעֵד קָטָן, on the feast days intervening between the first and last feast days of the great festivals.

12. Chagiga, חֲגִיגָה, on the duty of appearing at Jerusalem to offer at the three great festivals.

Third Seder, ס׳ נָשִׁים

1. Jebamoth, יְבָמוֹת, on levirate marriage with the brother-in-law, according to Deut. 25:5–10.

2. Kethuboth, כְּתוּבוֹת, on marriage contracts.

3. Nedarim, נְדָרִים, on vows, especially with reference to their validity in the case of women, according to Lev. 27. and Num. 30.

4. Nasir, נָזִיר, on the Nazarite vow, according to Num. 6. and 30.

5. Sota, סוֹטָה, on proceeding against one suspected of adultery, according to Num. 5:11–31.

6. Gittin, גִּטִּין, on writings of divorcement (גֵּט), and what gives legal claim to the obtaining of a divorce.

7. Kiddushin, קִדּוּשִׁין, on betrothal.

Fourth Seder, ס׳ נְזִיקִין

1. Baba Kamma, בָּבָא קַמָּא, "the first gate," the first division of the threefold treatise on injuries, treating of the legal damages due for various kinds of injuries done by one to another.

2. Baba mezia, בָּבָא מְצִיעָא, "the middle gate," treats of complaints and claims, especially

between masters and slaves, employers and employed, borrowers and lenders.

3. Baba bathra, בָּבָא בתְרָא "the last gate," on the municipal regulations most influential upon the development of social life.

4. Sanhedrin, סַנְהֶדְרִין, on the Sanhedrim and the criminal law.

5. Makkoth, מַכּוֹת, on punishment by flogging.

6. Shebuoth, שְׁבוּעוֹת, on oaths and offences against sanctity.

7. Edujoth, עֵדֻיּוֹת, "witnesses," contains controverted propositions from all departments; the traditional validity is "witnessed to" by celebrated authorities.

8. Aboda sara, עֲבוֹדָה זָרָה, on idolatry and generally on heathenism.

9. Aboth, אָבוֹת, or Pirke Aboth, פִּרְקֵי אָבוֹת, a collection of sentences from the most famous scribes, dating from somewhere about B.C. 200 to A.D. 200.

10. Horayoth, הוֹרָיוֹת, decisions on unintentional offences caused by erroneous decisions of the Sanhedrim, and on unintentional offences of the high priests and princes.

Fifth Seder, ס׳ קָדָשִׁים

1. Sebachim, זְבָחִים, on sacrifices.

2. Menachoth, מְנָחוֹת, on meat-offerings.

3. Chullin, חוּלִּין, on the right method of slaying animals not to be offered, and on the eating thereof.

4. Bechoroth, בְּכוֹרוֹת, on the sanctifying of the first-born among men and cattle.

5. Arachin, עֲרָכִין, "treasures," treating, according to Lev. 27., of the redemption of persons and things which had been devoted to the service of the sanctuary, or had so devoted themselves.

6. Temura, תְּמוּרָה, on the exchanging of things devoted to God, Lev. 27:10.

7. Kerithoth, כְּרִיתוֹת, on the penalty of extermination, or rather what those have to do who have unintentionally broken a command which involves the penalty of utter destruction.

8. Meila, מְעִילָה, on the embezzlement of things devoted to God, Num. 5:6–8.

9. Tamid, תָּמִיד, of daily morning and evening sacrifices, and generally of the daily temple service.

10. Middoth, מִדּוֹת, of the size and arrangements of the temple.

11. Kinnim, קִנִּים, of the offerings of doves by the poor, according to Lev. 5:1–10 and 12:8.

Sixth Seder, ס׳ טָהֳרוֹת

1. Kelim, כֵּלִים, on household furniture and its purifying.

2. Ohaloth, אֹהֳלוֹת, on the defilement of tents and houses, specially by the dead, according to Num. 19.

3. Negaim, נְגָעִים, on leprosy.

4. Para, פָּרָה, on the red heifer, that is, on atonement for pollution contracted from the dead, according to Num. 19.

5. Tohoroth, טָהֳרוֹת, of the lesser kinds of defilements.

6. Mikwaoth, מִקְוָאוֹת, of the water fitted for bathing and washing.

7. Nidda, נִדָּה, of the defilement peculiar to the female sex.

8. Machshirin, מַכְשִׁירִין, properly “making fit,” treating of the liquids which, falling upon fruits, render or do not render them impure, according to Lev. 11:34, 38.

9. Sabim, זָבִים, on the running of ulcers and bloody issues.

10. Tebul yom, טְבוּל יוֹם, treats of the defilement which is removed by bathing, but requires isolation until the going down of the sun.

11. Yadayim, יָדַיִם, on the pollution and the cleansing, washing of the hands.

12. Ukzin, עוּקְצִין, on the defilement of fruits through their stalks and rinds or husks.

Tolerably sure results in regard to the age and origin of this work may also be gained from certain indications given iu the text itself. In innumerable instances, where the opinions of scholars on particular points of law are divergent, not only is the view of the majority given, but the views of the dissenting scholar or scholars, with the distinct mention of the names. In this way somewhere about 150 authorities are quoted in the Mishna; the most, indeed, only very seldom, but some almost through all the tracts. The most frequently cited authorities are the following: –

First Generation, from about A.D. 70 to A.D. 100

Rabban Jochanan ben Sakkai, 23 times. – R. Zadoc or Zadduc. – R. Chananya, president of the priests, 12 ,סגן הכהנים times. – R. Elieser ben Jacob.

Second Generation, from about A.D. 100 to A.D. 130

A. Older Group: Rabban Gamaliel II., 84 times. – R. Josbua [ben Chananya], 146 times. – R. Elieser [ben Hyrcanos], 324 times. – R. Eleasar ben Asarya, 38 times. – R. Dosa ben Archinos, 19 times. – R. Eleasar, son of R. Zadduc.

B. Younger Group: R. Ishmael, 71 times. – R. Akiba [ben Joseph], 278 times. – R. Tarphon, 51 times. – K. Jochanan ben Nuri, 38 times. – R. Simon ben Asai, or simply Ben Asai, in the one form 4, in the other 21 times. – R. Jochanan ben Beroka, 11 times. – R. Jose the Galilean, 26 times. – R. Simon ben Nannos, or simply Ben Nannos, in each of these forms 5 times. – Abba Saul, 20 times. – R. Judah ben Bethera, 16 times.

Third Generation, from about A.D. 130 to A.D. 160

R. Judah [ben Ilai, or more correctly Elai], 609 times. – R. Jose [ben Chalephta], 335 times. – R. Meir, 331 times. – R. Simon [ben Jochai], 325 times. – Rabban Simon ben Gamaliel II., 103 times. – R. Nehemiah, 19 times. – R. Chananya ben Antigonos, 13 times.

Fourth Generation, from about AD. 160 to A.D. 200

Rabbi [i.e. R. Juda ha-Nasi or ha-kadosh], 37 times. – R. Jose, son of R. Judah [ben Elai], 14 times.

The chronology which has been here adopted, while in its leading outlines perfectly certain, cannot be vouched for in every individual case. The fact that the men enumerated in the same generation were really contemporary with one another, is evidenced by the circumstance of their being more or less frequently referred to in the Mishna as disputing with one another. Thus, for example, we find Rabban Gamaliel II., R. Joshua, R. Elieser, and R. Akiba frequently engaged together in conversation and discussion, and that, indeed, with such indications as show that R. Akiba was a younger contemporary of the three previously named. So, too, we often find disputing with one another, R. Judah, R. Jose, R. Meir, and R. Simon. And in a similar way in respect to other scholars mentioned here, it can be determined with more or less certainty to which of the four generations each belonged. – But further, also, the succession of the generations can be ascertained by similar statements in the Mishna. R. Joshua and R.

Elieser were pupils of Rabban Jochanan ben Sakkai; also, R. Akiba is so described. The men of the third generation, too, are linked on with the men of the second by personal relationships, etc. — Finally, we are furnished with various outstanding points for the sure determination of an absolutely correct chronology. Rabban Jochanan ben Sakkai is said to have made various arrangements "after the temple had been destroyed;" he was therefore alive immediately after that event. With this also agrees the statement that Akiba, who was about a generation younger, was a contemporary of Barcochba and a martyr during the war of Hadrian. In a like manner we may deal with the rest.

Our statistics, then, have thus proved that the Mishna must have been collected and edited toward the end of the second century after Christ, for in a later composition it might be expected that more recent authorities would have been employed. In fact, the composition of the work has been ascribed to E. Judah ha-Nasi, or ha-kadosh, called also simply Rabbi, who lived at the end of the second century after Christ. But our statistics teach us something more even than this. It is clear that a couple of thousand of statements about the views of particular scholars could not have been transmitted by oral traditions. If in a work issued toward the end of the second century, by various scholars of earlier generations, even a couple of hundred particular decisions were communicated (by R. Judah ben Elai over six hundred!), there must have been written sources at their command. But the result of our statistics makes it probable that the final redaction had been preceded by two earlier summaries of written documents, one from the age of the second generation, and one from the time of the third generation. Certain phenomena in the text of the Mishna itself favour this theory, as well as some rather obscure and doubtful traditions. The opinion, still firmly maintained by many Jewish scholars, that written documents are not to be found before the time of Judah ha-Nasi, indeed not even in his days, is based upon the assumed prohibition of a written record of the Halacha, of which, however, the age and range of application are extremely uncertain. — At any rate this much is beyond dispute, that in the Mishna the Jewish law is codified in that form which it retained in the schools of Palestine from the end of the first to the end of the second century after Christ.

2. Tosephta

The Mishna of R. Judah ha-Nasi has generally received canonical rank, and has served as the basis for the further development of the law Another collection that has come down to us, the so-called Tosephta, תּוֹסֶפְתָּא, additamentum, has not attained such a rank. The material here gathered together belongs essentially to the age of the Tannaites (הַנָּאִים in Aramaic, meaning δευτερωταί, the scholars of the age of the Mishna). The arrangement is quite the same as that of the Mishna. Of the sixty-three tracts of the Mishna, only Aboth, Tamid, Middoth, and Kinnim are wanting in the Tosephta. The other fifty-nine tracts, not merely fifty-two, as Zunz in his Gottesdienstlichen Vorträge affirms, have their exact parallels in the Tosephta. The two are therefore closely related. The precise nature of their relationship has not yet indeed been made sufficiently clear. But there are at least two points which may be stated with absolute certainty: — 1. That the Tosephta is laid out in accordance with the plan of the Mishna, and professes to be an expansion of it, as the name itself implies; and 2. That the redactors had at their command in carrying out their scheme sources which are older than our Mishna. Hence, on the one hand, in the Tosephta we have authorities cited which belong to the post-Mishna times; while, on the other hand, the Tosephta has not unfrequently retained the original and complete literal quotation where the Mishna has given only an abbreviated text. The Haggada bulk much more largely in the Tosephta than in the Mishna.

A complete separate edition of the Tosephta was issued for the first time quite recently by

Zuckermandel, Tosephta nach den Erfurter und Wiener Handschriften mit Parallelstellen und Varianten, Pasewalk 1880. Supplement containing summary, register, and glossary, Treves 1882–1883. — On the Erfurt manuscript: Zuckermandel, Die Erfurter Handschrift der Tossefta, Berlin 1876; and Lagarde, Symmicta, i. 1877, pp. 153–155. — Previous to this, leaving out of account separate editions of special portions, the Tosephta had appeared only in the editions of the Alfasi. On these and on the separate editions of portions, see Fürst, Bibliotheca Judaica, i. 34–36, 173; Steinschneider, Catalogus librorum hebr. in biblioth. Bodleiana, col. 647 sq., 1087 sqq.; Alter Zedner, Catalogue of the Hebrew Books in the Library of the British Museum, pp. 365 f., 757.

A great part of the Tosephta, consisting of some thirty-one tracts, is translated into Latin in Ugolini Thesaurus antiquitatum sacrarum: in vol. xvii. Schabbath, Erubin, and Pesachim; in vol. xviii. the other nine tracts of the second Seder; in vol. xix. the following eight tracts of the fifth Seder: Sebachim, Menachoth, Chullin, Bechoroth, Temura, Meila, Kerithoth, Arachin; in vol. xx. the whole of the eleven tracts of the first Seder.

On the Tosephta generally, compare: Zunz, Die gottesdienstlichen Vorträge der Juden, 1832, pp. 50 f., 87 f. — Dünner, Die Theorien über Wesen und Ursprung der Tosephta kritisch dargestellt, Amsterdam 1874. — Zuckermandel, Verhältniss der Tosifta zur Mischna und der jerusalemischen Gemara zur babylonischen (Monatsschrift für Geschichte und Wissensch. des Judenthums, 1874–1875). By the same, Tosifta-Variantem (Monatsschrift, 1880–1881). — Schwarz, Die Tosifta des Tractates Sabbath in ihrem Verhältnisse zur Mischna kritisch untersucht, Carlsruhe 1879. By the same, Die Tosifta des Tractates Erubin in ihrem Verhältnisse zur Mischna kritisch untersucht, Carlsruhe 1882. — Hoffmann, Mischna und Tosefta (Magazin für die Wissenschaft des Judenthums, ix. 1882, pp. 153–163). — Hamburger, Real-Encyclopaedie für Bibel und Talmud, ii. 1225–1227, art. “Tosephta.” — Brüll, Begriff und Ursprung der Tosefta (Jubelschrift zum neunzigsten Geburtstag des Dr. L. Zunz, Berlin 1884, pp. 92–110). — Pick, Die Tosefta-Citate und der hebräische Text (Zeitschrift für die alttestamentl. Wissensch. 1886, pp. 23–29). — Strack in Herzog, Real-Encyclopaedie, xviii. p. 298 f.

3. The Jerusalem Talmud

On the basis of the Mishna the juristic discussion was carried on with unwearied energy and zeal in the schools of Palestine, especially in that of Tiberias, during the third and fourth centuries. By means of the codification of the new material that was in this way gathered together, there sprang up in the fourth century after Christ the so-called Jerusalem, or more correctly, Palestinian, Talmud. In it the text of the Mishna is taken statement after statement in regular succession, and is explained by a casuistical system of distinctions that becomes ever more and more subtle and over-refined. For the purpose of explanation not only are the opinions of the “Amoreans,” the scholars of the post-Mishna age, drawn upon, but very frequently dogmatic utterances of the Mishna age. Such propositions as are borrowed from earlier times which have not been incorporated in the Mishna, are called Baraytha, בָּרַיְתָא “extranea,” scil. traditio. They are quoted in the Talmud in Hebrew, whereas for the rest the language of the Talmud is Aramaic. — The date of the composition of the Palestinian Talmud may be determined from the fact that, although indeed the Emperors Diocletian and Julian are mentioned, no Jewish authorities are referred to who can be assigned to a later period than the middle of the fourth century. — Besides the Halacha, which forms its principal contents, we also meet in it with rich Haggadic material. — Whether the Palestinian Talmud ever went over the whole range of the Mishna is still a disputed point. Only its first four Seders, together with the tract Nidda, have been preserved to us, and the tracts Eduyoth and Aboth are wanting.

4. The Babylonian Talmud

The Mishna is said to have been brought to Babylon by Abba Areka, usually called Rab, a scholar of R. Judah. In the schools of that place, too, it came to be used as the basis for continuous juristic discussion. The boundless accumulation of material here also led gradually to its codification. This was in all probability undertaken in the fifth century after Christ, but was not brought to a conclusion before the sixth century. — In the Babylonian Talmud as well as in the Palestinian, the statements of older scholars were frequently given in the Hebrew language. The Talmud itself was written in the Aramaic dialect of Babylon. — The Haggada is here represented still more literally than in the Palestinian Talmud. — The Babylonian Talmud, too, is incomplete. There are wanting: The whole of the first Seder with the exception of Berachoth; Shekalim out of the second; Eduyoth and Aboth from the fourth; Middoth and Kinnim and the half of Tamid from the fifth; and the whole of the sixth with the exception of Nidda. See Zunz, p. 54. It therefore embraces only 36½ tracts, while in the Palestinian Talmud 39 tracts are dealt with. Nevertheless, the Babylonian Talmud is at least four times the size of the Palestinian, has been much more diligently studied in Europe since the Middle Ages, and stands in much higher repute than the other.

The literature of the Mishna and both Talmuds, their editions, translations, and commentaries, are carefully enumerated by Wolf, Bibliotheca Hebraica, ii. pp. 700–724, 882–913; iv. 321–327, 437–445. — Winer, Handbuch der theolog. Literatur, i. pp. 523–525. — Fürst, Bibliotheca Judaica, ii. 40–49, 94–97, confines himself to the Mishna and Palestinian Talmud. — Neubauer, Catalogue of the Hebrew Manuscripts in the Bodleian Library, Oxford 1886, nos. 393–407. — Schiller-Szinessy, Catalogue of the Hebrew Manuscripts preserved in the University Library, Cambridge, vol. ii. pp. 1–12. — Zedner, Catalogue of Hebrew Books in the Library of the British Museum, 1867, pp. 545–555, 739–751. — Raph. Rabbinovicz has written in Hebrew a critical review of all the complete and separate editions of the Babylonian Talmud since A.D. 1484, Munich 1877. — Strack in Herzog, Real-Encyclopaedie) xviii. 342 ff., 357–368. — We specify only the following: —

EDITIONS AND TRANSLATIONS OF THE MISHNA

Mishna sive totius Hebraeorum juris, rituum, antiquitatum ac legum oralium systema cum clarissimorum Rabbinorum Maimonidis et Bartenoras commentariis integris, etc. Latinitate donavit ac notis illustravit Guil. Surenhusius. 6 vols. fol. Amsterdam 1698–1703.

The Mishnah on which the Palestinian Talmud rests, edited from the unique manuscript preserved in the University Library of Cambridge, Add. 470, 1, by W. H. Lowe. Cambridge 1883. An exact reproduction of a valuable Cambridge manuscript, which, however, is not “unique,” since there is certainly another of the same kind, the cod. de Rossi 138, at Parma, representing the same text in perhaps even a better form.

Eighteen Treatises from the Mishna. Translated by D. A. de Sola and M. J. Raphall. London 1843.

6 .ששה סדרי משנה וכו׳ vols. Berlin 1832–1834. Issued by authority of the Society of Friends of the Thora and Science at Berlin, under the direction of J. M. Jost. The printed text with a German translation in Hebrew writing and a short Hebrew commentary.

Mischnajoth, Die sechs Ordnungen der Mischna. Hebrew printed text, German translation and exposition, by A. Sammter. Part I. giving the First Seder. Berlin 1887. If this edition be carried out to completion in accordance with the promise of its first part, it will be most worthy of recommendation for the use of the Christian theologian. The German translation follows closely that of Jost, but it is printed in German letters.

Editions of the Hebrew texts, with short Hebrew commentaries, have in all times been issued in large numbers. Of the more recent editions, we may name those of Sittenfeld in Berlin 1863, of Cohn in Berlin 1876.

EDITIONS AND TRANSLATIONS OF THE PALESTINIAN TALMUD

The editio princeps was issued by Bomberg in Venice in folio, without mention of the year; but this was, according to Wolf, Bibliotheca Hebraica, iv. 439, either A.D. 1523 or A.D. 1524.

Besides this other three complete editions have appeared: at Cracow A.D. 1609, at Krotoschin A.D. 1866, and at Shitomir in 4 vols. fol. A.D. 1860–1867. — Several other editions have been projected, but were stopped after the appearance of one or more parts. See Strack in Herzog, Real-Encyclop. xviii. 343.

A Latin translation of a great part of the Palestinian Talmud, extending to nineteen tracts, appeared in Ugolini Thesaurus antiquitatum sacrar., namely, in vol. xvii. Pesachim; in vol. xviii. Shekalim, Joma, Sukka, Rosh hashana, Taanith, Megilla, Chagiga, Beza, Moed Katan; in vol. xx. Maaseroth, Challa, Orla, Bikkurim; in vol. xxv. Sanhedrin, Makkoth; in vol. xxx. Kiddushin, Sota, Kethuboth.

An English rendering of the French translation of Moses Schwab has been undertaken. The first volume, containing the tract Berachoth according to the Jerusalem Talmud, was issued in the end of 1885. The French translation began to appear at Paris in 1871; and up to this time ten volumes have been issued, containing thirty-three tracts.

WÜNSCHE, Der jerusalemische Talmud in seinen haggadischen Bestandtheilen in's Deutsche übertragen, Zürich 1880, gives only the Haggadic passages.

SCHILLER-SZINESSY, Occasional Notices of Hebrew Manuscripts; No. 1. Description of the Leyden Manuscript of the Palestinian Talmud. Cambridge 1878.

EDITIONS AND TRANSLATIONS OF THE BABYLONIAN TALMUD

The editio princeps was published by Bomberg at Venice in 12 vols. folio, A.D. 1520 ff. With this edition all subsequent issues agree exactly in the numbering of pages.

Among later editions there is none that can be regarded as satisfactory on critical grounds. The prejudices of Christian editors led unhappily to the perverse corruption of the text. On this point, see Neubauer, Catalogue of the Hebrew Manuscripts in the Bodleian Library, p. 1099. On the other hand, the persecutions to which the Jews were subjected occasioned such bitterness of feeling on their part that they forbade, under severest penalties, the printing in the Mishna or Gemara anything that had reference to Jesus of Nazareth. See circular to this effect printed by Leslie in his Short and Easy Method with the Jews. London 1812.

The Fragment of the Talmud Babli Pesachim of the Ninth or Tenth Century, in the University Library, Cambridge, edited with notes and an autograph facsimile, by W. H. Lowe. Cambridge 1879.

IN UGOLINI'S Thesaurus antiquitatum sacrar., three tracts of the Babylonian Talmud are translated into Latin; in vol. xix. Sebachim and Menachoth; and in vol. xxv. Sanhedrin.

Several single tracts have been translated into German: Berachoth, by Pinner, Berlin 1842; Aboda Sara or Idolatry, by F. Chr. Ewald, Nürnberg 1856; Baba Mezia, by Sammter, Berlin 1876; Taanith, by Straschun, Halle 1883; Megilla with Tosafat transl. into German, by Rawicz, Frankf. 1883; Rosch ha-Schanah, by Rawicz, Frankf. 1886; Rabbinowicz, Legislation civile du Talmud, 5 vols. Paris 1877–1880, discusses passages on civil law from the various tracts of the Talmud.

WÜNSCHE, Der babylonische Talmud in seinen haggadischen Bestandtheilen wortgetreu übersetzt, etc., 2 vols. 1886–1888, gives only the Haggadic passages.

FOR CRITICISM OF THE TEXT

RABBINOVICZ, Variae lectiones in Mischnam et in Talmud Babylonicum quum ex aliis libris antiquissimis et scriptis et impressis tum e codice Monacensi praestantissimo collectae annotationibus instructae, written in Hebrew, not yet completed. Vols. i.–xv. Munich 1867–1886.

LEBRECHT, Handschriften und erste Gesammtausgaben des Babylonischen Talmud, No. 1, Berlin 1862, deals only with the manuscripts.

HELPS IN REGARD TO THE LANGUAGE

BUXTORF, Lexicon Chaldaicum, Talmudicum et Rabbinicum. Basel 1640. — A reprint of this work has been issued by B. Fischer. Leipzig 1874.

LEVY, Neuhebräisches und Chaldäisches Wörterbuch über die Talmudim und Midraschim, vol. i. 1876, א-ד; vol. ii. 1879, ח-ל; vol. iii. 1883, מ-ע; vol. iv. still incomplete. — Also: Chaldäisches Wörterbuch über die Targumim und einen grossen Theil des rabbinischen Schriftthums. 2 vols. 1867–1868.

JASTROW, A Dictionary of the Targumim, the Talmud Babli and Yérushalmi, and the Midrashic Literature. Vol. i. London 1886. Containing 96 pp. quarto, and reaching down to אספריסא.

HARTMANN, Thesauri linguae Hebraicae e Mischna augendi particula, i. ii. iii. Rostock 1825–1826. A diligent collection of the non-biblical linguistic materials of the Mishna.

GEIGER, Lehrbuch zur Sprache der Mischna. Breslau 1845.

DUKES, Die Sprache der Mischna, lexikographisch und grammatisch betrachtet. Esslingen 1846.

WEISS, משפט לשין המשנה, Studien über die Sprache der Mischna, in Hebrew. Vienna 1867.

LUZZATTO, Grammatik der biblisch-chaldäischen Sprache und des Idioms des Talmud Bibli. From the Italian by Krüger. Breslau 1873.

STRACK and SIEGFRIED, Lehrbuch der neuhebräischen Sprache und Literatur Carlsruhe 1884.

GENERAL LITERATURE ON THE MISHNA

The most complete and comprehensive treatises on the origin and character of the Mishna, are the three following works written in the Hebrew language: –

FRANKEL, דרכי המשנה, Hodegetica in Mischnam librosque cum ea conjunctos Tosefta, Mechilta, Sifra, Sifri. P. I. Introductio in Mischnam. Lips. 1859. – Also: חוספות ומפתח לספר דרכי המשנה, Additamenta et index ad librum Hodegetica in Mischnam. Lips. 1867.

BRÜLL, מבוא המשנה, Einleitung in die Mischnah, enthaltend das Leben und die Lehrmethode der Gesetzeslehrer von Ezra bis zum Abschlusse der Mischnah. Frankfort 1876. – A second volume has been published under the title, Einleitung in die Mischnah, ii.; Plan und System der Mischnah. Frankfort 1884.

WEISS, דור דור ודורשיו, Zur Geschichte der jüdischen Tradition. Vol. i. From the earliest Times down to the Destruction of the Second Temple, Vienna 1871; vol. ii. From the Destruction of the Second Temple down to the close of the Mishna, 1876; vol. iii. From the close of the Mishna down to the completion of the Babylonian Talmud, 1883; vol. iv. From the close of the Talmud down to the end of the first five thousand years according to Jewish reckoning, 1887.

SCHILLER-SZINESSY, article “Mishnah” in the Encyclopaedia Britannica, vol. xvi. 1883, pp. 502-508.

TAYLOR, Sayings of the Jewish Fathers, comprising Pirke Aboth and Pereq R. Meir in Hebrew and English, with critical and illustrative notes. Cambridge 1877.

ROBINSON, The Evangelists in the Mishna; or, Illustrations of the Four Gospels drawn from Jewish Traditions. London 1859.

BENNETT, The Mishna as illustrating the Gospel. Cambridge 1884.

JOST, Geschichte der Israeliten seit der Zeit der Makkabäer, iv. 103 ff. – Also: Geschichte des Judenthums und seiner Secten, ii. 114-126.

ZUNZ, Die gottesdienstlichen Vorträge der Juden, 1832, pp. 45 f., 86 f., 106 f.

GRÄTZ, Geschichte der Juden (2 Aufl.), iv. 210-240, 419-422, 430 f., 479-485, 494 f. – Also: Beiträge zur Wort- und Sacherklärung der Mischna (Monatsschrift für Gesch. und Wissensch. des Judenthums, 1871). – Also: Die Mischna in mündlicher Ueberlieferung erhalten (Monatsschr. 1873, pp. 35-41).

DÜNNER, Veranlassung, Zweck und Entwickelung der halachischen und halachischen exegetischen Sammlungen während der Tannaim-Periode, in Umrisse dargestellt (Monatsschrift für Gesch. und Wissensch. des Judenthums, 1871). – Also: R. Juda ha-Nasi’s Antheil an unserer Mischnah (Monatsschr. 1872, pp. 161-178, 218-235). – Also: Der Einfluss anderer Tannaiten auf B. Jehuda Hanassi’s Halachah-Feststellung (Monatsschr. 1873, pp. 321 ff., 361 ff.).

HAMBURGER, Real-Encyclopaedie für Bibel und Talmud, Abth. ii. 1883, pp. 789–798 (art. “Mischna”).

On the scholars quoted and referred to in the Mishna, the “doctores Misnici,” see Div. ii. vol. i. pp. 351–379 (§ 25, IV.).

GEIGER, Einiges über Plan und Anordnung der Mischna (Geiger’s Wissenschaftl. Zeitschrift für jüdische Theologie, Bd. ii. 1836, pp. 474–492).

COHN, Aufeinanderfolge der Mischnaordnungen (Geiger’s Jüdische Zeitschr. für Wissensch. und Leben, Bd. iv. 1866, pp. 126–140).

LANDSBERG, Plan und System in der Aufeinanderfolge der einzelnen Mischna’s (Monatsschr. 1873, pp. 208–215).

DERENBOURG, Les sections et les traités de la Mischnah (Revue des études juives, t. iii. 1881, pp. 205–210).

On the various series of tracts in some of the principal manuscripts and editions, see the tabulated list by Strack in Herzog’s Real-Encyclop. 2 Aufl. xviii. 302–304.

DÜNNER, Einiges über Ursprung und Bedeutung des Tractates Edajoth (Monatssch. 1871, pp. 33–42, 59–77).

JELLINEK, Die Composition der Pirke Aboth (Füret’s Literaturblatt des Orients, 1849, nos. 31, 34, 35).

FRANKEL, Zum Tractact Aboth (Monatsschr. 1858, pp. 419–430).

BRÜLL, Entstehung und ursprünglicher Inhalt des Tractates Abot (Jahrbb. für jüd. Gesch. und Literatur, vii. 1885, pp. 1–17).

A complete list of the Old Testament passages, quoted in the Mishna, is given by Pinner, Tract. Berachoth, Einl. fol. 21b.

ON THE PALESTINIAN TALMUD

Arguments against the generally accepted opinion that the Jerusalem Talmud had been revised from the Babylonian Talmud, are given in Fürst, Literaturblatt des Orients, 1843, nos. 48–51.

FRANKEL, מבוא הירושלמי, in Hebrew, with the Latin title: Introductio in Talmud Hierosolymitanum. Breslau 1870. — Also: Einiges über die gegenseitigen des Beziehungen des jerusalemischen und babylonischen Talmuds (Monatsschr. für Gesch. und Wissensch. des Judenthums, 1851–1852, pp. 36–40, 70–80).

GEIGER, Die jerusalemische Gemara im Gesammtorganismus der talmud. Lit. (Jüd. Zeitschr. 1870, pp. 278–306). — Also: Der Jerusalem. Talmud im Lichte Geiger’scher Hypothesen (Monatsschr. 1871, pp. 120–137).

WIESNER, Gibe’th Jeruschalaïm. A study on the nature, sources, origin, conclusion, and on the author of the Jerusalem Talmud, edited with critical notes by Smolensky. Vienna 1872.

ON THE TWO TALMUDS GENERALLY

WOLF, Bibliotheca Hebraea, ii. 657-993, iv. 320-456.

WAEHNER, Antiquitates Ebraeorum, de Israeliticae gentis origine fatis, etc., vol. i. pp. 231-584. Göttingen 1742.

BARCLAY, The Talmud, London 1878; containing selected treatises from the Mishna and Gemara, with commentary.

LIGHTFOOT, Horae Hebraicae et Talmudicae, on Gospels, Acts, Romans, and 1 Corinthians, in Opera Omnia. Francker 1699, vol. ii. pp. 243-742, 783-928.

OORT, The Talmud and the New Testament, reprinted from the Modern Review. London 1883.

DEUTSCH, The Talmud, in Literary Remains. London 1874.

DAVIDSON, article "Talmud" in Kitto's Cyclopaedia of Biblical Literature, vol. iii. Edinburgh 1862.

PICK, article "Talmud" in M'Clintock and Strong's Cyclop. of Bibl. Theol. and Eccl. Literature, New York 1881, pp. 166-187.

STRACK, article "Thalmud" in Herzog's Real-Encyclopaedie, xviii. 297-369; a particularly careful and complete statement of rich and voluminous literature.

JOST, Geschichte der Israeliten seit der Zeit der Makkabäer, Bd. iv. 1824, pp. 222 f., 323-328, nebst dem Excurs "Ueber den Talmud als historische Quelle," im Anhang, pp. 264-294.

ZUNZ, Die gottesdienstl. Vorträge, pp. 51-55, 94.

PINNER, Compendium des hierosolym. und babyl. Talmud. Berl. 1832. — Also: Einl. in den Talmud, vor seiner Ausgabe und Uebersetz. des Tractates Berachoth. — Also the first twelve sheets of the same, containing Maimonides' Preface to Seder Seraim (German and Hebrew).

FÜRST, Die literarischen Vorlagen des Talmuds (Literaturbl. des Orients, 1850, n. 1 ff.). — Also: Kultur- und Literaturgesch. der Juden in Asien. 1 Thl. 1849.

FRANKEL, Ueber die Lapidarstyl der talm. Historik (Monatsschr. 1851-1852, pp. 203-220, 403-421). — Also: Beiträge zur Einl. in den Talmud (Monatsschr. 1861, pp. 186-194, 205-212, 258-272).

GRÄTZ, Die talmudische Chronologie (Monatsschr. 1851-1852, pp. 509-521). — Also: Zur Chron. der talm. Zeit (Monatsschr. 1885, pp. 433-453, 481-496). — Also: Gesch. der Juden, iv. 384, 408-412.

PRESSEL, art. "Thalmud" in Herzog's Real-Encyclopaedie, 1 Aufl., Bd. xv. 1862, pp. 615-664.

JOST, Geschichte des Judenthums, ii. 202-212.

BEDARRIDE, Étude sur le Talmud (142, p. 8). Montpellier 1869.

AUERBACH, Das jüdische Obligationsrecht, Bd. i. 1870. — Gives in the very full introduction, especially pp. 62-114, a history of the development of the Talmud.

BRÜLL, Die Entstehungsgeschichte des babylonischen Talmuds als Schriftwerkes (Jahrbb. für jüd. Gesch. und Literatur, ii. 1876, pp. 1-123).

DERENBOURG, art. "Talmud" in Lichtenberger's Encyclopédie des sciences religieuses, t. xii. pp. 1009-1038.

HAMBURGER, Real-Encyclop. für Bibel und Talmud, Abth. ii. (1883) art "Talmud, Talmudlehrer, Talmudschulen" (pp. 1155-1164), and various articles on individual teachers.

WEISS, Zur Geschichte der jüd. Tradition, iii. 1883

BLOCH, Einblicke in die Geschickte der Entstehung der talmudischen Literatur, Vienna 1884 (see also: Brüll's Jahrbb. für jüd. Gesch. und Literatur, vii. 1885, pp. 101-106).

In the editions of the Babylonian Talmud, in vol. ix., at the close of the fourth Seder, we meet with several pieces which do not belong to the codex, but in part at least reach back to the Talmudic age: —

(a) The Aboth derabbi Nathan, an expansion of the Pirke Aboth, with many stories about the life of the Sage and other Haggadic legends. Its present form was given it first in post-Talmudic times.

A recension of this tract, diverging from the usually printed text, has been edited by Taussig, ניה שלום, Nweh Shalom; 1st part, containing Aboth di R. Nathan, is a recension differing from the printed text, Seder Tannaim w'Amoraim and Varianten or Pirke Aboth, from manuscripts in the Royal Library at Munich, edited and annotated, Munich 1872. — Both recensions are given by Schechter, Aboth de Rabbi Nathan, hujus libri recensiones duas collatis variis apud bibliothecas et publicas et privatas codicibus edidit, Vienna 1887. — A Latin translation of the common text is given in Tractatus de patribus: Rabbi Nathane auctore, in linguam Latinum translatus opera Francisci Taileri, London 1654. — Compare generally: Wolf, Bibliotheca Hebraea, ii. 855-857. — Zunz, Die gottesdienstlichen Vorträge, p. 108 f. — Fürst, Bibliotheca Judaica, iii. p. 19 f. — Zedner, Catalogue of British Museum, p. 748.

(b) The so-called small tracts: on these compare Jost, Geschichte des Judenthums, ii. 237 ff.; Zedner, Catalogue, p. 748 f.; Strack in Herzog, Real-Encyclop. xviii. 328.

1. Sopherim, on the writing of the roll of the law, and the various exercises of the Synagogue. Belonging to post-Talmudic times.

Separate edition: Masechet Soferim. Der talmudische Tractat der Schreiber, nach Handschriften herausgegeben und commentirt von Joel Müller, Leipzig 1878. Compare generally: Zedner, Catalogue, p. 749; Zunz, Die gottesdienstl. Vorträge, p. 96 f.; Hamburger, Real-Enc. Supplem. p. 104.

2. Ebel rabbathi, or euphemistically Semachoth, not Simchoth, on the treatment of corpses, and on the customs observed in reference to the dead. It is quoted in the Talmud. Zunz, p. 90. Brüll, however, contests the idea that the tract cited in the Talmud is identical with the one that has

come down to us. See Hamburger, Supplement, pp. 51-53.

3. Kalla, on marital intercourse and on chastity in general. According to Zunz, p. 89 f., it is probably older than the Jerusalem Talmud.

4. Derek erez rabba, on social duties, Zunz, p. 110 f.; Hamburger, Supplement, p. 50 f.

5. Derek erez suta, Precepts for Scholars, Zunz, pp. 110-112; Hamburger, Supplement, p. 50 f. Separate edition: Der talmudische Tractat Derech Erez Sutta nach Hand-schriften und seltenen Ausgaben mit Parallelstellen und Varianten, kritisch bearbeitet, übersetzt und erläutert von Abr. Tawrogi, Königsberg 1885.

6. Perek schalom, on peace-making, Zunz, pp. 110-112.

Seven similar small tracts have been recently published by Raphael Kirchheim, under the title שבע מסכתות קטנות ירושלמיות, Septem libri Talmudici parvi Hierosolymitani, Frankfort 1851. These are the following: — 1. Massecheth Sepher Thora; 2. M. Mesusa; 3. M. Tephillin; 4. M. Zizith; 5. M. Abadim; 6. M. Kuthim; 7. M. Gerim. — The sixth tract was published separately, with a commentary, under the title: כרמי שמרון, Introductio in librum Talm. de Samaritanis, Frankfort 1851. — On the tract Gerim, which was earlier recognised, see Zunz, p. 90. It is of later date than the Talmud. — On all the seven, see Hamburger, Real-Encyclopaedie, Supplementalband, p. 95, article “Kleine Tractate;” Strack in Herzog, Real-Encyclopaedie, xviii. p. 328 f.

II. The Midrashim

In the Mishna and the two Talmuds the Jewish law, the Halacha, is codified in systematic order. Another class of rabbinical literary works attaches itself closely to the Scripture text, commenting upon it step by step. These commentaries or Midrashim, מִדְרָשִׁים, are partly of Halachic, partly of Haggadic contents. In the older ones, Mechilta, Siphra, Siphre, the Halacha predominates; the more recent ones, Rabboth and those following it, are almost exclusively Haggadic. The former, in respect of age and contents, stand in very close relation to the Mishna; the latter belong to a later period, and are not the product of juristic discussion, but the residuum of practical lectures delivered in the synagogue. The following three works therefore form a group by themselves: —

1. Mechilta, מכילתא, on a portion of Exodus.

2. Siphra, ספרא, on Leviticus.

3. Siphre or Siphri, ספרי, on Numbers and Deuteronomy.

All the three were frequently made use of in the Talmud; Siphra and Siphre being also expressly quoted (Zunz, Die gottesdienstl. Vorträge, 46, 48; on Mechilta, see Geiger’s Zeitschr. 1866, p. 125). In their original form they date back to the second century after Christ, but were revised and altered in later times. The Mechilta is ascribed to R. Ishmael (see on him, Div. ii. vol. i. pp. 373, 374). This opinion, however, is based simply on the fact that in Mechilta, as well as in Siphre, sayings of R. Ishmael and those of his school are very frequently quoted. The theory of Geiger is extremely problematical, that the original form of the Mechilta and Siphre represented an older Halachic tendency, which had already disappeared from the Mishna, Siphra, and Tosephta. — The Haggada is only feebly represented in Siphra, more strongly in Mechilta, and

in Siphre “there are considerable passages almost exclusively Haggadic, which comprise at least three-seventh parts of the whole work” (Zunz, Die gott. Vorträge, p. 84 f.). — The language of these, as well as of the other Midrashim, is Hebrew.

On the older editions of these three Midrashim, see Wolf, Bibliotheca Hebraea, ii. 1349–1352, 1387–1389; iv. 1025, 1030 f. — Fürst, Bibliotheca Judaica, ii. 76 f., iii. 125, 126. — Steinschneider, Catalogue librorum Hebr. in Bibliotheca Bodleiana, Berol. 1852–1860, col. 597 sq., 627 sq. — Zedner, Catalogue of the Hebrew Books in the Library of the British Museum, 1867, pp. 515 f., 699 f. — More recent editions are the following: —

מכילתא. Mechilta. Der älteste halachische und hagadische Commentar zum zweiten Buch Moses. Krit. bearbeitet von J. H. Weiss, Vienna 1865.

ספר מכילתא דרבי ישמעאל על ספר שמות וכו׳, Mechilta de Rabbi Ishmael, the oldest Halachic and Haggadic Midrash on Exodus. Edited after the oldest printed editions, with critical note, explanations, indices, and introduction by M. Friedmann, Vienna 1870 (reviewed in Monatsschr. 1870, pp. 278–284).

ספרא דבי רב הוא ספר תורת כהנים וכו׳, with commentary (“Hatora vehamitva”), Bucharest 1860.

ספרא דבי רב הוא ספר תורת כהנים וכו׳, also under the title: Sifra, Barajtha zum Leviticus, mit dem Commentar des Abraham ben David, etc., ed. by Weiss, Vienna 1862.

ספרי. Sifré debé Rab, der älteste halachische und hagadische Midrasch zu Numeri und Deuteronomium, ed. by Friedmann, Vienna 1864.

A Latin translation of the Mechilta is given in Ugolini Thesaurus antiquitatum sacrum, vol. xiv. Also a Latin translation of Siphra in the same volume, and of Siphre in vol. xv.

On the three above-named Midrashim generally, compare: Wolf, Bibliotheca Hebraea, ii. 1349 sqq., 1387 sqq.; iii. 1202, 1209; iv. 1025, 1030 sq. — Zunz, Die gottesdienstlichen Vorträge, pp. 46–48, 84 f. — Frankel, Hodegetica in Mischnam, p. 307 sqq. — Derenbourg, Histoire de la Palestine, pp. 393–395. — Joel, Notizen zum Buche Daniel. Etwas über die Bücher Sifra und Sifre, Breslau 1873. — Weber, System der altsynag. palästinischen Theologie, 1880, p. xix. f. — Strack, art. “Midrash” in Herzog, Real-Encyclopaedie, ix. 1881, p. 752 f. — Hamburger, Real-Encyclopaedie für Bibel und Talmud, ii. pp. 721–724, 1166 ff., articles Mechilta and Talmud. Schriften. — Schiller-Szinessy, article “Mishnah” in the Encyclopaedia Britannica, vol. xvi. 1883, p. 507 f. — Hoffmann, Bemerkungen zur Kritik der Mischna (Magazin für die Wissenschaft des Judenthums, xi. 1884, pp. 17–30).

On Mechilta and Siphre: Geiger, Urschrift und Uebersetzungen der Bibel, pp. 434–450. — Also: Jüd. Zeitschr. für Wissensch. und Leben, 1866, pp. 96–126, and for 1871, pp. 8–30. — Pick, Text-Varianten aus Mechilta und Sifre (Zeitschr. für die alttest. Wissensch. 1886, pp. 101–121).

On Mechilta: Frankel, Monatsschrift für Gesch. und Wissensch. des Jud. 1853, pp. 388–398; 1854, pp. 149–158, 191–196.

On Siphra: Frankel, Monatsschrift, 1854, pp. 387–392, 453–461. Geiger, Jüd. Zeitschr. xi. 1875, pp. 50–60.

Besides Siphre, there is yet another Midrash, on Numbers, the so-called second or small Siphre, Siphre suta, סיפרי זוטא, which is known only from repeated quotations given from it in Yalkut and other Midrashic works. It seems also to have belonged to the Tannaite period. See in regard to it: Zunz, Die gottesdienstlichen Vorträge, p. 48; Brüll, Der kleine Sifre, in the Jubelschrift zum siebzigsten Geburtstage des Prof. Dr. H. Grätz, Breslau 1887, pp. 179-193.

The following Midrashim contain almost nothing but Haggada: —

4. Rabboth, רבות, or Midrash Rabboth, מדרש רבות.

This is made up of a collection of Midrashim on the Pentateuch and the five Megilloth (the Song, Ruth, Lamentations, Ecclesiastes, Esther), which took their rise in very different times, but were subsequently gathered together as one whole under the above name.

(a) Bereshith Rabba, on Genesis. According to Zunz, it was compiled in Palestine during the sixth century. The last five chapters on Gen. 47:28, and what follows, hence from the opening words of the passage וַיְחִי, called also Vaiechi rabba, are certainly of later date; according to Zunz, p. 255 f., of the eleventh or twelfth century. Compare generally: Zunz, pp. 174-179, 254-256. Lerner, Anlage des Bereschith rabba und seine Quellen, in Mag. für die Wiss. des Jud. book vii. 1880, and book viii. 1881. Wünsche, Der Midrash Bereschit Rabba, in's Deutsche übertragen, Leipzig 1881.

(b) Shemoth Rabba, on Exodus, owes its origin to the same pen as Vaiechi rabba, and so belongs to the eleventh or twelfth century. Zunz, pp. 256-258. Wünsche, Der Midrash Shemoth Rabba, in's Deutsche, übertragen, Leipzig 1882.

(c) Vayyikra Rabba, on Leviticus, was compiled, according to Zunz, in Palestine, somewhere about the middle of the seventh century. Zunz, pp. 181-184. Wünsche, Der Midrash Wajikra Rabba, in's Deutsche übertragen, Leipzig 1884.

(d) Bamidbar Rabba, on Numbers, written, according to Zunz, by two different authors, both of whom made use of Pesikta, Tanchuma, Pesikta Rabbathi, and the works of still later Rabbis. Zunz places the second author in the twelfth century. Compare generally: Zunz, pp. 258-262. Wünsche, Der Midrash Bemidbar Rabba, in's Deutsche übertragen, Leipzig 1885.

(e) Debarim Rabba, on Deuteronomy, compiled, according to Zunz, about A.D. 900. Zunz, pp. 251-253. Wünsche, Der Midrash Debarim Rabba, in's Deutsche übertragen, Leipzig 1882.

(f) Shir Hashirim Rabba, on the Song, also called Agadath Chasith, from the words with which it opens. It belongs to the later Midrashim, but is "presumably older than the Pesikta Rabbathi." Zunz, p. 263 ff. Chodowski, Observationes criticae in Midrash Shir Hashirim secundum cod. Monac. 50 Orient, Halle 1877. Wünsche, Der Midrash Shir ha-Schirim, in's Deutsche übertragen, Leipzig 1880.

(g) Midrash Ruth, somewhere about the same date as the preceding. Zunz, p. 265. Wünsche, Der Midrash Ruth Rabba, in's Deutsche übertragen, Leipzig 1883.

(h) Midrash Echa, on Lamentations, also called Echa Rabbathi. It was compiled, according to Zunz, in Palestine, in the second half of the seventh century. Zunz, pp. 179-181. J. Abrahams, The Sources of the Midrash Echah Rabbah, Leipzig Dissertation, 1881. Wünsche, Der Midrash

Echa, Rabbati, in's Deutsche übertragen, Leipzig 1881.

(i) Midrash Koheleth, or Koheleth Rabba, belonging to somewhere about the same time as the Midrashim on the Song and on Ruth. Zunz, p. 265 f. Wünsche, Der Midrash Koheleth, in's Deutsche übertragen, Leipzig 1880.

(k) Midrash Esther, or Hagadath Megilla, makes use of, according to Zunz, p. 151, Josippon, written about A.D. 940, and first quoted in the thirteenth century. Zunz, p. 264 f. Wünsche, Der Midrash zum Buche Esther, in's Deutsche übertragen, Leipzig 1881. — Originally, according to Jellinek and Buber, closely connected with this Midrash, is the "Midrash Abba Gorion," edited by Jellinek, Bet ha-Midrash, i. 1853, pp. 1-18; and by Buber, Sammlung agadischer Commentare zum Buche Esther, Wilna 1886. Compare also Brüll, Jahrbb. für jüd. Gesch. und Literatur, viii. 1887, pp. 148-154, who expresses himself opposed to Jellinek and Buber's view.

On the entire Rabboth and its editions, compare generally: Wolf, Bibliotheca Hebraea, ii. 1423-1427, iii. 1215, iv. 1032, 1058. — Steinschneider, Catalogus libr. Hebr. in Bibliothecum Bodleian., col. 589-594. — Zedner, Catalogue of Hebrew Books in the Library of the British Museum, pp. 539-542. — Strack, art. "Midrash" in Herzog, Real-Encyclopaedie, ix. 1881, pp. 753-755. — Schiller-Szinessy, art. "Midrash" in the Encyclopaedia Britannica, vol. xvi. 1883, p. 285 f. — Theodor, Die Midraschim zum Pentateuch und der dreijährige palästinensische Cyclus (Monat. 1885, 1886, 1887), seeks to show that the chapter division rests on the three years' Palestinian cycle. — Hamburger, Real-Encyclopaedie für Bibel und Talmud, Supplementalband, pp. 107-111, art. "Midrash Rabba." — Editions with Hebrew commentaries are numerous in recent times. For example, that of Warsaw 1874, of Wilna 1878.

5. Pesikta, פסיקתא.

The Pesikta does not treat of a whole biblical book, but of the biblical lessons for the feast days and the more important Sabbaths of the entire year, taking up sometimes the readings of the day from the Pentateuch and sometimes those from the prophets (Zunz, p. 190). Since the work is frequently quoted from in the later literature, Zunz made the attempt to reconstruct the text without having a copy of the work within reach, and succeeded in producing what in all essential points agrees with the original. The complete text was first edited by Buber in A.D. 1868. — Owing to its manifold resemblances to Bereshith Rabba, Vayyikra Rabba, and Echa Rabbathi, Zunz, p. 195, considered that the text of the Pesikta must be regarded as dependent on these, and hence set down the time of its composition at A.D. 700. So also Geiger, Weiss, and Hamburger. On the contrary, Buber, Berliner, and Theodor regard the Pesikta as older than those Midrashim. — It must have originally begun with the reading for the New Year (Zunz, p. 191; Geiger, Zeitschrift for 1869, p. 191); whereas in the manuscripts which Buber follows it begins with the Feast of Dedication.

Edition: פסיקתא, Pesikta. Die älteste Hagada, redigirt in Palästina von Rab Kahana. Herausgegeben nach einer in Zefath vorgefundenen und in Aegypten copirten Handschrift durch den Verein Mekize Nirdamim. Mit kritischen Bemerkungen, Verbesserungen und Vergleichungen der Lesearten anderer drei Handschriften in Oxford, Parma und Fez, nebst einer ausführlichen Einleitung von Salomon Buber, Lyk 1868. German translation: Wünsche, Pesikta des Rab Kahana, nach der Buber'schen Textausgabe in's Deutsche übertragen, Leipzig 1885.

Compare generally: Zunz, pp. 185-226. — Carmoly, Pesikta (Monatsschrift, 1854, pp. 59-65). —

Grätz, Geschichte der Juden, iv. 495 ff. — Weber, System der altsynagog. paläst. Theol. p. xxii. — Strack, article "Midrash" in Herzog, Real-Encyclopaedie, ix. 1881, p. 755 f. — Hamburger, Real-Encyclopaedie für Bibel und Talmud, Supplementalband, p. 117 ff., art. "Pesikta."

Besides this Pesikta de Rab Kahana, or Pesikta simply, there are other two works which bear that name: —

(a) Pesikta Rabbathi, which, like the older Pesikta, treats of the biblical readings for certain feast days and Sabbaths of the Jewish year. The date of its origin is the second half of the ninth century. Zunz, p. 244.

(b) Pesikta Sutarta, a Midrash on the Pentateuch and the five Megilloth, by R. Tobia ben Elieser of Mainz, in the beginning of the twelfth century. It was quite a mistake to give to this book the name of Pesikta, for it has nothing at all in common with the other two books that bear this name. Compare Zunz, pp. 293-295. A Latin translation is given in Ugolini's Thesaurus antiquitatum sacrarum, vols. xv. and xvi.

On these two works and their editions see: Wolf, Bibliotheca Hebraea, i. 391, 720 f., iv. 1031. — Fürst, Bibliotheca Judaica, ii. 160, iii. 427. — Steinschneider, Catalog. libr. Hebr. in Biblioth. Bodl., col. 631 sq., 2674 sq. — Zedner, Catalogue of Hebrew Books in Library of British Museum, pp. 633, 758. — Strack in Herzog, Real-Encyclopaedie, ix. 756. Hamburger, Real-Encyclop., Supplement, pp. 119-122, art. "Pesikta."

A "New Pesikta," which is closely related to the Pesikta Rabbathi, but shorter and more popular in style than it, has been edited by Jellinek in his Bet ha-Midrash, vol. vi. 1877, pp. 36-70.

6. Pirke derabbi Elieser, פרקי דר׳ אליעזר, or Baraytha derabbi Elieser, ברייתא דר׳ אליעזר.

A Haggadic work, in fifty-four chapters, which follows in all essential respects the course of the pentateuchal history. It goes into specially minute details about the creation and the first man, and then again it lingers over the story of the patriarchs and the Mosaic age. — It was written at the earliest not before the eighth century (Zunz, p. 277).

Compare: Wolf, Bibliotheca Hebraea, i. 173 sq., iii. 110, iv. 1032. — Zunz, pp. 271-277. — Sachs, Bemerkungen über das gegenseitige Verhältniss der Beraita des Samuel und der Pirke de R. Eliesar (Monatsschr. 1851-1852, pp. 277-282). — Strack and Hamburger are referred to in the last note. Pinner gives an outline of its contents in the introduction to his translation of the tract Berachoth (1842). — A list of editions, etc., is given by Fürst, Bibliotheca Judaica, i. 232. — Steinschneider, Catalogus, col. 633 sq. — Zedner, Catalogue, p. 221. — A Latin translation is given by Vorstius, Capitula R. Elieser ex Hebraeo in Latinum translata, Lugd. Bat. 1644. — Proof that the Barajtha derabbi Elieser is different from the Barajtha R. Samuel is given by Zunz in Steinschneider's Hebr. Bibliographie, vol. v. 1862, p. 15 f.

7. Tanchuma, תנחומא, or Yelamdenu, ילמדנו.

A Midrash on the Pentateuch. Zunz fixes the date of its composition in the first half of the ninth century, and assumes that it had its origin in Europe, perhaps in Greece or in the south of Italy. It obtained the name Yelamdenu from its frequent use of the formula: "It is taught us by our Master" — Yelamdenu rabbenu. — Zunz has proved, pp. 226-229, that both of these designations, Yelamdenu and Tanchuma, were originally applied to one and the same Midrash.

But the author of Yalkut had before him two different recensions, which he distinguished as Yelamdenu and Tanchuma (Zunz, p. 229 f.). And the common printed text is also distinguished from both of these as a comparatively recent abbreviation of Tanchuma; so that we have in all no less than three recensions of the text of this Midrash. Buber edited the original text of Tanchuma in 1885. Up to this time, however, we have no complete text of Yelamdenu. In opposition to Buber's opinion, that the original Tanchuma is older than Bereshith Rabba, Pesikta, or the Babylonian Talmud, Neubauer has written in the Revue des études juives, xiii. 225 sq., and Brüll in the Jahrbb. für jüd. Geschichte und Literatur, viii. 121 ff. Tanchuma, however, is undoubtedly the oldest Haggadic Midrash on the whole Pentateuch (Zunz, p. 233).

On the common printed text and its editions: Wolf, Bibliotheca Hebraea, i. 1159 sq., iii. 1166 sq., iv. 1035. — Fürst, Bibliotheca Judaica, iii. 409. — Steinschneider, Catalogus, col. 596 sq. — Zedner, Catalogue, p. 543. — Recent editions have been issued at Stettin 1864, at Warsaw 1875.

Midrasch Tanchuma. Ein agadischer Commentar zum Pentateuch von Rabbi Tanchuma ben Rabbi Abba. Zum ersten Male nach Handschriften aus den Bibliotheken zu Oxford, Rom, Parma und München herausgegeben etc. von Salomon Buber, 3 vols., Wilna 1885.

Fragments from Yelamdenu and Tanchuma are given in Jellinek, Bet ha-Midrash, vol. vi. 1877, pp. 79–105. Fragments of Yelamdenu in Neubauer, Le midrasch Tanchuma et extraits du Yélamdénu et de petits midraschim (Revue des études juives, xiii. 1886, pp. 224–238; xiv. 1887, pp. 92–113).

For a general information reference may be made to the following: Zunz, pp. 226–238. — Weber, System der Altsynagogalen Palästinischen Theologie, xxiv. f. — Strack in Herzog, Real-Encyclopaedie, ix. 757 f. — Theodor, Buber's Tanchuma (Monatsschr. 1885, pp. 35–42, 422–431). — Die Midraschim, zum Pentateuch und der dreijährige palästinensische Cyclus (Monatsschr. 1885, 1886, 1887). — Bacher, Zu Buber's Tanchuma-Ausgabe (Monatsschr. 1885, pp. 551–554). — Hamburger, Real-Encyclopaedie für Bibel und Talmud, Supplementalband, p. 154 f., art. "Tanchuma." — Brüll, Jahrbb. für jüd. Gesch. 1887, pp. 121–144.

8. Yalkut Shimoni, ילקוט שמעוני (from לקט, to collect).

This is an immense Midrashic compilation on the whole Hebrew Bible, in which, after the style of the patristic Catenae, explanations of each separate passage are put down in order, collected from the older works. According to Zunz, p. 299 f., the work was composed in the first half of the thirteenth century. — A certain Rabbi Simeon Haddarshan is named as the compiler, whose native place or residence is said to have been Frankfurt-on-the-Main. Zunz supposes that he was Simeon Kara, who, in the beginning of the thirteenth century, lived in South Germany.

Compare: Wolf, Bibliotheca Hebraea, i. 1129 sq., iii. 1138. — Zunz, pp. 295–303. — Rapoport in Kerem Chemed (written in Hebrew), vii. 4 ff. — Fürst, Bibliotheca Judaica, iii. 327 sq. — Steinschneider, Catalogus, col. 2600–2604. — Zedner, Catalogue, p. 702. — Strack in Herzog, Real-Encyclopaedie, ix. 738. — Recent edition, Warsaw 1876–1877.

III. Targums

The Targums or Aramaic translations of the Old Testament also belong to the Rabbinical Literature, inasmuch as expression is given in them likewise to the traditional understanding of

the Scripture text. This is especially true of those which are not strictly literal, but rather free paraphrastic renderings of the original. — We mention here only the Targums on the Pentateuch and on the Prophets, for the Targums on the Sacred Writings or Kethubim can scarcely come under consideration by us owing to their late origin.

1. ONKELOS ON THE PENTATEUCH. The few notices about the person of Onkelos that are to be found in the Talmud describe him sometimes as a scholar and friend of the elder Gamaliel, according to which he must have lived about the middle of the first century after Christ, sometimes as a contemporary of R. Elieser and R. Joshua, according to which he must have lived in the first half of the second century. They agree only in this one particular, that he was a proselyte. The Chaldaic translation of the Pentateuch which has been ascribed to him is distinguished from all other Targums by its almost painful literalness. Only in a few, and those mostly poetic, passages (Gen. 49; Num. 24; Deut. 32-33), does it incline towards the Haggada by fanciful exposition. In other places departures from the text have been occasioned simply by a desire to avoid anthropomorphisms and expressions or modes of representation that seemed to be unworthy of God. The dialect of Onkelos is, according to Geiger and Frankel, the East Aramaic or Babylonian. Nöldeke in his earlier writings described it as "a somewhat later development of the Palestinian Aramaic already represented in some of the books of the Old Testament;" but latterly he has adopted the more definite view, that Onkelos is a Palestinian production re-edited in Babylon, "in general conformed in respect of language to the Old Palestinian dialect, but in respect of particular phrases very decidedly coloured by the dialect of Babylon." At a very early period Onkelos secured a great reputation. The Babylonian Talmud and the Midrashim frequently quote passages from it. And in later times, indeed, it had an entire Masora devoted to itself. It has been often printed, e.g. in the rabbinical Bibles of Bomberg and Buxtorf, and in the London Polyglott. Berliner has issued a critical edition.

2. JONATHAN ON THE PROPHETS. Jonathan ben Uzziel is said to have been a scholar of Hillel, and must therefore have lived during the first decades of the Christian era. The Targum ascribed to him embraces all the Prophets, Nebiim, that is, the historical books and the prophets properly so called. It is distinguished from the Targum of Onkelos by its decidedly more paraphrastic character. "Even in the case of the historical books Jonathan often acts the part of an expositor; in the case of the prophetical books again, such a style of exposition is uninterruptedly pursued as makes it really a Haggadic work." In respect of dialect, what was said above of Onkelos is equally applicable here. Jonathan also soon attained a high reputation, and is very frequently quoted in the Talmud and Midrashim. Like Onkelos, it has been often printed; e.g. in the rabbinical Bibles of Bomberg and Buxtorf, and in the London Polyglott. Lagarde issued a small critical edition on the basis of a codex Reuchlinianus.

According to the traditional views which we have thus reported, the Targums of Onkelos and Jonathan were written somewhere about the middle of the first century after Christ. Zunz and many recent scholars still are inclined to set them down to that period. But this opinion has been ably contested, especially by Geiger. A series of circumstances strongly supports the idea that both works must have been wrought up in Babylon, where a rabbinical school had been first established during the third century after Christ. Geiger therefore assumes that both Targums were composed, or rather revised and edited, in Babylon not before the fourth century. Frankel agrees with him in all essential points, only putting Onkelos a little earlier, as belonging to the third century. This latter opinion might be supported by the fact that Onkelos seems to have been made use of by Jonathan. The idea that the Targum on the Prophets was edited in the fourth century is also confirmed by tradition, for the Babylonian Talmud quotes it as the "Targum

of R. Joseph," a Babylonian teacher of the fourth century. But as to Onkelos, nothing whatever is known of his existence save that he composed the Targum that is named after him. For the notice which the Babylonian Talmud (Megilla 3a) gives of Onkelos and his Chaldaean translation of the Pentateuch, is to be found in the parallel passage in the Jerusalem Talmud attached to the name of Aquila and his Greek translation (Jer. Megilla i. 9). And the latter is undoubtedly the original form of the statement. Elsewhere, too, the names אונקלוס and עקילס are interchanged. It seems therefore that in Babylon the old and correct statement about a translation of the Pentateuch by the proselyte Aquila was erroneously attached to the anonymous Chaldaean Targum, and that the name Onkelos therefore is merely a corruption of the name Aquila. But even if the two Targums were first issued during the third and fourth centuries, it cannot be doubted that they are based upon earlier works, and only form the conclusion of a process that had been going on for several centuries. Even the Mishna speaks of Chaldee translations of the Bible. The New Testament is sometimes found in its rendering of Old Testament passages in striking agreement with the Targums (e.g. in Eph. 4:8), – a clear proof that the latter in respect of their materials reached back to the Apostolic age. Also express mention is made of a Targum on Job in the period preceding the overthrow of the temple. Fragments even from the time of John Hyrcanus are preserved in our Targums. From all this it is evident that in our Targums materials are made use of which had been gradually amassed during many generations, and that the works which we now possess were preceded by earlier written treatises. The linguistic character of the Targums, as Nöldeke has quite correctly maintained, testifies to the history of their origin. For in spite of their being revised and issued in Babylon, the Palestinian character of their language is unquestionable.

3. PSEUDO-JONATHAN AND JERUSALMI ON THE PENTATEUCH. Besides Onkelos, there are other two Targums on the Pentateuch, one of which contains the whole of the Pentateuch, while the other comprises only separate verses, and gives often only renderings of isolated words. The former is ascribed to Jonathan ben Uzziel; the latter is designated by the editors "Targum Jerusalmi." That the former cannot have been written by the author of the Targum on the Prophets has long been generally admitted. But Zunz has also shown that Pseudo-Jonathan and Jerusalmi are only two different recensions of one and the same Targum; that both are quoted by older authorities (Aruch and Elia) under the name "Targum Jerusalmi;" and that even the recension now existing only as a fragment had been before the older authors in its complete form. The last statement may be questioned. Geiger thinks that the fragmentary Targum was from the beginning only "a collection of detached glosses," not probably on the Pseudo-Jonathan but on the primary recension. According to Seligsohn and Volck, the Jerusalmi was "not a fragment of what had originally been a complete paraphrase, but a Haggadic supplement and a collection of marginal glosses and various readings on Onkelos; but Pseudo-Jonathan, on this basis and, upon the whole, with the same tendency, composed a later redaction of the Jerusalmi." Bacher regards the fragmentary Targum as a collection of portions from the oldest Palestinian Targum. On the basis of the latter arose on the one side Onkelos, on the other side Pseudo-Jonathan, who already made use of Onkelos. At any rate, Pseudo-Jonathan and Jerusalmi are most intimately related to one another, and might best be designated as Jerusalmi I. and II. The attributing to Jonathan of the more complete issue is probably due to an erroneous interpretation of the abbreviation תי, which means תַּרְגּוּם יְרוּשַׁלְמִי. This Jerusalem Targum transmitted in its twofold recension is related to the Targum of Onkelos as "a midrash for the simple explanation of words. Onkelos is only sometimes an expositor; the Jerusalemite is only sometimes a translator" (Zunz, p. 72). "His language is a Palestinian dialect of the Aramaic; hence we must pitch upon Syria or Palestine as its author's native country; and this assumption is confirmed by the oldest examples we have of the way in which the work was

referred to — תַּרְגּוּם אֶרֶץ יִשְׂרָאֵל" (Zunz, p. 73). As to the date, Pseudo-Jonathan, seeing that in his work there occur the names of a wife and daughter of Mohammed, cannot have composed it before the seventh or eighth century. But besides those later portions it contains, like the other Targums, and perhaps even to a greater extent than these, fragments from a very early period, so that it may justly be styled "a thesaurus of views from various centuries." — Both recensions have often been printed, as, e.g., in the London Polyglott.

For the literature on the Targums and their editions, see: Wolf, Bibliotheca Hebraea, ii. 1189 sqq. — Le Long, Bibliotheca sacra, ed. Masch, Part ii. vol. i. 1781, pp. 23–49. — Fürst, Bibliotheca Judaica, ii. 105–107, iii. 48. — Steinschneider, Catalogus libr. hebr. in Bibliothec. Bodlei. col. 165–174. — Berliner, Targum Onkelos, 1884, ii. 175–200. — Volck in Herzog, Real-Encyclopaedie, xv. 1885, pp. 375–377.

ON THE TARGUMS GENERALLY

HÄVERNICK, A General Historico-Critical Introduction to the Old Testament, translated by Dr. Lindsay Alexander, Edin. 1852, pp. 328–330.

ETHERIDGE, The Targums of Onkelos and Jonathan ben Uzziel on the Pentateuch; with the fragments of the Jerusalem Targum: from the Chaldee. 2 vols. London 1862–1865.

DEUTSCH, article "Ancient Versions" in Smith's Dictionary of the Bible, American edition, vol. iv. pp. 3395–3424.

DAVIDSON, article "Targum" in Kitto's Cyclopaedia of Biblical Literature. Ginsburg: Articles in the same Cyclopaedia on "Onkelos" and "Jonathan."

DE WETTE, Introduction to the Old Testament, § 58, and corresponding parts of the Introductions of Keil and Bleek.

Targums on Ruth and Jonah, literally translated by O. T. Crane. New York 1888.

ZUNZ, Die Gottesdienstlichen Vorträge der Juden, 1832, pp. 61–83.

WEBER, System der altsynagogalen Palästinischen Theologie, 1880, pp. xi.–xix.

HELVICUS, De chaldaicis bibliorum paraphrasibus. Giessen 1612.

CARPZOV, Critica sacra V. T. 1728, pp. 430–481. According to Winer, Grammatik des bibl. und targum. Chaldaismus, what more recent works give about the Targums is largely taken from these treatises of Helvicus and Carpzov.

WOLF, Bibliotheca Hebraea, vol. ii. 1135–1191, iv. 730–734.

EICHHORN, Einleitung in das Alte Testament, Bd. ii. (4 Aufl. 1823) pp. 1–123.

GFROERER, Das Jahrhundert des Heils (1838), i. 36–59.

FÜRST, Literaturblatt des Orients, 1840, Nos. 44–47.

FRANKEL, Einiges zu den Targumim (Zeitschrift für die religiösen Interessen des Judenthums,

1846, pp. 110–120).

HERZFELD, Geschichte des Volkes Jisrael, Bd. iii. (1857) pp. 61 ff., 551 ff.

GEIGER, Urschrift und Uebersetzungen der Bibel (1857), pp. 162–167.

VOLCK, art. “Thargumim” in Herzog’s Real-Encyclop. 1 Aufl. xv. (1862) pp. 672–683; 2 Aufl. xv. (1885) pp. 365–377.

LANGEN, Das Judenthums in Palästina (1866), pp. 70–72, 209–218, 268 ff., 418 ff.

NÖLDEKE, Die alttestamentliche Literatur (1868), pp. 255–262.

BÖHL, Forschungen nach einer Volksbibel zur Zeit Jesu (1873), pp. 140–168.

SIEGFRIED, Philo von Alexandria (1875), p. 281 ff.

HAMBURGER, Real-Encyclopaedie für Bibel und Talmud.

MERX, Bemerkungen über die Vocalisation der Targume (Abhandlungen und Vorträge des fünften internationalen Orientalisten-Congresses zu Berlin 1881, ii. 1: Abhandlungen und Vorträge der semitischen und afrikanischen Section, Berlin 1882, pp. 142–225). — Also: Johannes Buxtorf’s des Vaters Targumcommentar Babylonia (Zeitschrift für wissenschaftl. Theologie, 1887, pp. 280–299, 462–471; 1888, pp. 41–48).

ON ONKELOS

WINER, De Onkeloso ejusque paraphrasi chaldaica, Lips. 1820.

MAYBAUM, Die Anthropomorphien und Anthropopathien bei Onkelos und den spätern Targumim mit besonderer Berücksichtigung der Ausdrücke Memra, Jekara und Schechintha. Breslau 1870.

SINGER, Onkelos und das Verhältniss seines Targums zur Halacha. Berlin 1881.

BERLINER, Targum Onkelos, herausgegeben und erläutert, vol. ii., Notes, Introduction, etc. Berlin 1884.

LUZZATTO, אוהב גר Philoxenus sive de Onkelosi chaldaica Pentateuchi versione (written in Hebrew). Vienna 1830.

RÖDIGER, art. “Onkelos” in Ersch und Gruber’s Allgem. Encyklop. Section iii. Bd. iii. (1832) p. 468 f.

LEVY, Ueber Onkelos und seine Uebersetzung des Pentateuch (in Geiger’s Wissen. Zeitschr. für jüd. Theol. v. 1844, pp. 175–198; continued in Fürst’s Literaturblatt des Orients, 1845, pp. 337 ff., 354 ff.).

ANGER, De Onkelo Chaldaico quem ferunt Pentateuchi paraphraste et quid ei rationis intercedat cum Akila Graeco Veteris Testamenti interprets. 2 Partt. Lips. 1846.

PRESSEL, art. “Onkelos” in Herzog’s Real-Encyclopaedie, 1 Aufl. x. (1858) p. 613 f.

SCHRÖNFELDER, Onkelos und Peschittho. Studien über das Alter des Onkelos’schen Targums. München 1869.

GEIGER, Das nach Onkelos benannte babylonische Thargum zum Pentateuch (Jüdische Zeitschr. für Wissensch. und Leben 1871, pp. 85–104).

NEUBÜRGER, Onkelos und die Stoa (Monatsschr. 1875, pp. 566–568; 1874, p. 48).

BACHER, Das gegenseitige Verhältniss der pentateuchischen Targumim (Zeitschr. der DMG. 1874, pp. 59–71).

ON JONATHAN ON THE PROPHETS

KLOSTERMANN, Anzeige von Lagarde’s Ausgabe, in den Stud. und Krit. 1873, pp. 731–767.

FRANKEL, Zu dem Targum der Propheten. Breslau 1872.

BACHER, Kritische Untersuchungen zum Prophetentargum, in Zeitschrift der deutschen morgenländ. Gesellsch. xxviii. 1874, pp. 1–72.

CORNILL, Das Targum zu den Propheten, in Zeitschrift für die alttestamentl. Wissenschaft, 1887, pp. 177–202.

KLEIN, Bemerkungen zu Bacher’s “Kritischen Untersuchungen” (Zeitschr. der DMG. xxix. 1875, pp. 157–161). — Bacher, Gegenbemerkungen (in same, p. 319 f.).

ON JONATHAN AND JERUSALMI ON THE PENTATEUCH

WINER, De Jonathanis in Pentateuchum paraphrasi chaldaica. Erlangen 1823.

PETERMANN, De duabus Pentateuchi paraphrasibus chaldaicis. P. I. De indole paraphraseos quae Jonathanis esse dicitur. Berol. 1829.

BÄR, Geist des Jeruschalmi (Pseudo-Jonathan), in Monatsschr. f. G. u. W. des Jud. 1851–1852, pp. 235–242.

SELIGSOHN, De duabus Hierosolymitanis Pentateuchi paraphrasibus. Breslau 1858.

SELIGSOHN UND TRAUB, Ueber den Geist der Uebersetzung des Jonathan ben Usiel zum Pentateuch und die Abfassung des in den Editionen dieser Uebersetzung beigedruckten Targum Jeruschalmi (Monatsschr. 1857, pp. 96–114, 138–149).

GEIGER, Das jerusalemische Thargum zum Pentateuch, in Urschrift, etc., pp. 451–480.

GRONEMANN, Die Jonathan’sche Pentateuch-Uebersetzung in ihrem Verhältnisse zur Halacha. Leipzig 1879.

LAGARDE, Eine vergessene Handschrift des sogenannten Fragmententargums (Nachricht. von der kön. Gesells. d. Wissensch. zu Gött. 1888, pp. 1–3).

IV. Historical Works

Besides the Talmud, Midrashim, and Targums, there are also the following treatises, which ought to be classed among the works belonging to the circle of rabbinical works, inasmuch as they stand related in one way or another to our history. Only the first named, however, can be regarded as of any particular historical value.

1. Megillath Taanith, properly the "Book of the Fasts," a list of those days on which, owing to some association or another, any joyous event (especially during the period of the Maccabees) could not be celebrated. The observance of such days is already presupposed in Judith 8:6. Our list is quoted even in the Mishna, Taanith ii. 8, and seems to have been compiled in the first century after Christ. The text is Aramaic; the much later commentary is in Hebrew. — The little tract, which in earlier times was not very highly esteemed, has been found of great historical importance, and much use has been made of it, especially by Derenbourg and Grätz.

Edition with Latin translation: Meyer, Tractatus de temporibus sacris et festis diebus Hebraeorum, etc. Accedit מגלת volumen de jejunio, Amstelaedami 1724. — Derenbourg in his Histoire de la Palestine (1867), pp. 439-446, gives the Aramaic text with a French translation. — Compare generally: Wolf, Bibliotheca Hebraea, i. 68 f., 384 f., ii. 1325 ff., iii. 1195 ff.,iv. 1024. — Fürst, Bibliotheca Judaica, i. 9, under Abraham ha-Lewi. — Steinschneider, Catalogus libr. Hebr. in Biblioth. Bodlei. col. 582. — Zedner, Catalogue of the British Museum, p. 517. — Zunz, Die gottesdienstlichen Vorträge der Juden, pp. 127, 128. — Ewald, History of Israel, vol. v. p. 381, vol. viii. p. 280 sq. — Grätz, Gesch. der Juden, iii. pp. 597-615 (n. 1), and 685 ff. (n. 1). — Wellhausen, Phar. u. Saduc. pp. 56-63. — Schmilg, Ueber Entstehung und historischen Werth des Siegeskalenders "Megillath Taanith," Leipz. 1874. — Joel Müller, Der Text der Fastenrolle (Monatsschr. 1875, pp. 43-48, 139-144). — Brann, Entstehung und Werth der Megillat Taanit (Monatsschr. 1876, pp. 375 ff., 410 ff., 445 ff.). — Cassel, Kritisches Sendschreiben über die Probebibel; II. Messianische Stellen des Alten Testaments. Angehängt sind Anmerkungen über Megillath Taanith, Berlin 1885. — Hamburger, Real-Encyclopaedie für Bibel und Talmud, Supplementalband, pp. 104-107, art. "Megillath Taanith."

2. Seder olam, also called Seder olam rabba, an exposition of the biblical history from Adam down to the time of Alexander the Great, with some notices also of later times. — It is quoted in the Talmud, and is ascribed to R. Jose ben Chalephta, who lived about the years 130-160 after Christ. This supposition, however, rests simply on the fact that R. Jose is quoted nine times as an authority.

Much more modern, composed at the earliest in the eighth century, is the Seder olam sutta, a genealogical work, which treats first of all of biblical times, and then seeks to give an unbroken list of the princes during the Babylonian exile.

An edition of both, with a Latin translation: Chronicon Hebraeorum majus et minus, latine vertit et commentar. perpet. illustravit J. Meyer. Accedit ejusdem dissertat. 3, Amstelaedami 1699. — Compare generally: Wolf, Bibliotheca Hebraea, i. 492-499, iv. 1029 sq. — Fürst, Bibliotheca Judaica, ii. 107 sq. — Steinschneider, Catalogus Bodlei. col. 1433-1437. — Zedner, Catalogue of the British Museum, p. 689 sq. — Zunz, Die gottesdienstlichen Vorträge der Juden, pp. 85, 135-139. — Ewald, History of Israel, vol. i. pp. 200, 209, vol. viii. p. 49. — Fürst, Literaturblatt des Orients, 1846, pp. 547-552. — Grätz, Geschichte der Juden, iv. 200. — Hamburger, Real-Encyclopaedie für Bibel und Talmud, Supplement. p. 132 f.

3. Megillath Antiochus, a short legendary history of the persecutions of Antiochus Epiphanes and the conquests of the Asmoneans. It belongs to the post-Talmudic age, and is historically worthless. The original Aramaic text was first printed in the present century. Numerous older editions give a Hebrew translation, which in its manuscript form is still extant.

On the manuscripts of the Aramaic and Hebrew texts, see especially: Curtiss, The Name Maccabee, Leipzig 1876, p. 36 sqq. In addition, consult: Merx, Chrestomathia targumica 1888, p. xvi., which calls attention to two manuscripts of the British Museum (Oriental Manuscripts, 2377, 2212) as giving the Aramaic text with the Babylonian pointing. — Bartolocci in his Bibliotheca rabbinica, i. 388 sqq., gives the Hebrew text with a Latin translation. The Latin translation alone is copied by Fabricius in his Codex pseudepigr. Vet. Test. i. 1165 sqq. — A modern edition of the Hebrew text: Jellinek, Bet ha-Midrasch, i. (1853) pp. 142-146. — The Aramaic text was first edited by Filipowski in 1851: The Choice of Pearls … to which is added the Book of Antiochus, published for the first time in Aramaic, Hebrew, and English, by H. Filipowski, London 1851. Also more recently by Jellinek in Bet ha-Midrash, vi. (1877) pp. 4-8.

Compare generally: Wolf, Bibliotheca Hebraea, i. 204 sq., iii. 130. — Fürst, Bibliotheca Judaica, ii. 317. — Steinschneider, Catalogus libr. hebr. Bodlei. col. 206 sq. — Zedner, Catalogue of British Museum, p. 51. — Zunz, p. 134. — Ewald, History of Israel, vol. v. p. 287 sq.

4. Josippon or Joseph ben Gorion. Under this name there exists, written in Hebrew, a history of the Jewish people from Adam down to the destruction of the temple by Titus. The author wishes to pass himself off for the ancient Josephus, but calls himself erroneously Joseph son of Gorion, and not infrequently departs so widely from the rôle which he had assumed as even expressly to quote from the true Josephus (Zunz, p. 150). The latter is, indeed, abundantly made use of, but in a very free and eclectic manner, while much purely legendary material is introduced from other sources. It would seem that this author had before him, not the Greek text, but a Latin translation of Josephus, and for the Bellum Judaicum, indeed, only the paraphrastic and loose rendering of the so-called Hegesippus. According to Zunz, pp 150-152, the work originated in Italy during the first half of the tenth century after Christ.

Among the numerous editions, the following deserve to be mentioned: Josephus Gorionides s. Josephus Hebraicus juxta venetam edit. latine versus et cum exemplari Constantinop. collatus atque notis illustratus a J. F. Breithaupto, Gothae 1707, in Hebrew and Latin. The same with a new title, Gothae et Lips. 1710. — A Hebrew-Latin edition had been already issued at a much earlier date by Sebastian Münster, Josephus Hebraicus diu desideratissimus opera Seb. Münsteri, Basil 1541; but it was disfigured by many arbitrary abbreviations. — A Latin translation of the whole text was given by Gagnier, Josippon sive Josephi ben Gorionis historiae Judaicae libri sex, ex hebraeo latine vertit, etc., Oxon. 1706.

Compare generally on the work and its editions: Oudin, De script. eccles. ii. col. 1032-1062. — Wolf, Bibliotheca Hebraea, i. 508-523, iii. 387-389. — Meusel, Bibliotheca histor. i. 2 (1784), pp. 236-239. — Fabricius, Bibliotheca graec., ed. Harles, v. 56-59. — Fürst, Bibliotheca Judaica, ii. 111-114. — Steinschneider, Catalogus libr. hebr. Biblioth. Bodlei. col. 1547-1552. — Zedner, Catalogue of the British Museum, p. 344 sq. — Zunz, Die gottesdienstlichen Vörtrage der Juden, pp. 146-154. — Delitzsch, Zur Geschichte der jüdischen Poesie, Leipsic 1836, pp. 37-40. — Külb, art. “Josephus Gorionides” in Ersch und Gruber’s Allgem. Encyclop. Sec. ii. Bd. 23 (1844), p. 184.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX I: HISTORY OF CHALCIS, ITUREA, AND ABILENE

LITERATURE

NORIS, Annus et epochae Syromacedonum, iii. 9. 3, ed. Lips. pp. 316–322 (History of the City of Chalcis).

BELLEY, "Observations sur les médailles du tetrarque Zenodore" (Mémoires de l'Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres, first series, vol. xxviii. 1761, pp. 545–556).

MÜNTER, De rebus Ituraeorum, Hafniae 1824 (a comprehensive monograph).

WINER, Biblisches Realwörterb. articles "Abilene" (i. 7 f.) and "Iturea" (i. 622).

SCHENKEL, Bibellexicon, articles "Abilene" and "Iturea."

RIEHM'S Handwörterbuch des biblischen Altertums, articles "Abilene," "Iturea," and "Lysanias."

HERZOG, Real-Encyclopaedie, 2 Aufl. i. 87–89 (article "Abilene" by Wieseler) and vii. 261 f. (article "Ituräa" by Rüetschi).

CLESS, art "Ituräa" in Pauly's Real-Encyclopaedie der class. Alterthums-wissenschaft, iv. 337–340.

RITTER, Erdkunde, xvii. 1, pp. 14–16 (on the Itureans).

KUHN, Die städtische und bürgerliche Verfassung des römischen Reichs, ii. (1865), pp. 169–174 (on the dynasties of Chalcis, Abilene, and Iturea).

MARQUARDT, Römische Staatsverwaltung, 2 Aufl. i. 1881, pp. 400–403 (on the dynasties of Chalcis and Abilene).

WIESELER, Beiträge zur richtigen Würdigung der Evangelien (1869), pp. 169–204 (Lysanias of Abilene).

DE SAULOY, "Recherches sur les monnaies des tétrarques héréditaires de la Chalcidène et de l'Abilène" (Wiener numismatische Monatshefte von Egger, 5 Bd. 1 Abth. (1869) pp. 1–34).

REIOHARDT, Numismat. Zeitschrift, edited by Huber and Karabacek, ii. 1870, pp. 247–250 (Review of the treatise of De Saulcy).

RENAN, "Mémoire sur la dynastie des Lysanias d'Abilène" (Mémoires de l'Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres, t. xxvi. 2, 1870, pp. 49–84).

Among the sons of Ishmael there is mentioned in the Old Testament one יְטוּר (Gen. 25:15; 1 Chron. 1:31, 5:19). It is without doubt the same tribe that is referred to in the later history under

the name Ἰτουραῖοι or Ἰτυραῖοι. The earliest mention of this people, so far as I know, is to be found in the writings of the Jewish Hellenist Eupolemus (in the middle of the second century before Christ), who mentions the Itureans among the tribes fought against by David. Then we know from Josephus and his authorities, Strabo and Timagenes, that the Jewish king Aristobulus I., B.C. 105–104, fought against the Itureans and took from them a portion of their territory (Antiq. xiii. 11. 3). And from this time onward they are frequently mentioned. They were designated sometimes as Syrians, sometimes as Arabians. The proper names of Iturean soldiers, which are mentioned on Latin inscriptions, are Syrian. — At the time of the Roman conquest they were still an uncivilised robber tribe, but greatly celebrated for their skill as bowmen. Even Caesar made use of Iturean bowmen in the African war. The triumvir Marc Antony had some of them as his bodyguard, and with them he terrorized the Senate to the great scandal of Cicero. Poets and historians speak of the Iturean bowmen down to the later days of the empire.

The districts inhabited by them may not always have been the same. But during the period of which we have fullest and most accurate information about them, they are never spoken of as resident elsewhere than in Mount Lebanon. Christian theologians indeed endeavour to place it as near as possible to Trachonitis on account of Luke 3:1. Even Eusebius has for this reason identified Trachonitis and Iturea. But all historical authorities point most distinctly to Lebanon. So pre-eminently Strabo, who repeatedly designates the Itureans mountaineers and inhabitants of that particular mountain which rises upon the plain of Massyas, and says that they had Chalcis as their capital. The plain of Massyas or Marsyas is the plain between the Lebanon and the Anti-Lebanon, beginning in the north at Laodicea of the Lebanon and stretching south as far as Chalcis. Since the Itureans are often named together with the Arabians, they are to be looked for in the mountain range that bounds the Massyas plain on the east, that is, in the Anti-Lebanon. They appear also in later accounts as inhabitants of the Lebanon. Dio Cassius (xlix. 32) plainly names the older Lysanias king of the Itureans. But he was son and successor of Ptolemy Mennäus, whose kingdom just embraccd the Lebanon and the plain of Massyas with the capital Chalcis (see below, p. 329 f.). On the well-known inscription of the time of Quirinius his subordinate general Q. Aemilius Secundus says of himself: “missu Quirini adversus Ituraeos in Libano monte castellum eorum cepi.” During the time of the Vespasian war, Josephus in his Life, xi., mentions a Οὐᾶρος βασιλικοῦ γένους, ἔκγονος Σοέμου τοῦ περὶ τὸν Λίβανον τετραρχοῦντος. But this Soemus was probably the same as is designated by Dio Cassius and Tacitus the ruler of the Itureans. We never find anywhere any indication that the Itureans had dwelt in any other region than in the Lebanon. The opinion of Wetzstein, that they are to be looked for on the eastern borders of the Hauran, is therefore just as erroneous as the older view that the valley of Dschedur, south of Damascus, had received its name from them. The latter theory is now found on philological grounds to be impossible.

In the last decades before the arrival of Pompey, the Itureans belonged to an important confederacy, which recognised as its head Ptolemy the son of Mennäus (Πτολεμαῖος ὁ Μενναίου); for his kingdom, according to the first passage quoted from Strabo (xvi. 2. 10, p. 753), embraced “the mountain lands of the Itureans” and the plain of “Massyas” with the capital Chalcis. The plain of Massyas runs north as far as Laodicea of Lebanon. But it would seem from the other passages that Ptolemy, like Alexander Jannäus, pushed his conquests beyond this limit. His territory (for to him applies what Strabo, xvi. 2. 18, p. 755, says of the inhabitants of the Lebanon) extended westward to the sea. Botrys and Theuprosopon (Θεοῦ πρόσωπον) belonged to him. Byblus and Berytus were threatened by him. In the east the Damascenes suffered at his hands. In the south the district of Panias, as may be inferred from the history of

Zenodorus (Josephus, Antiq. xv. 10. 1-3, compare with this passage also below, p. 333), belonged to him. Indeed in the time of the Jewish king Aristobulus I., the kingdom of the Itureans seems to have embraced even Galilee (see vol. i. of present work, pp. 293, 294). In any case the Itureans were in that direction immediate neighbours of the Jews. We have therefore before us a State constructed precisely in the same fashion as was the Jewish State of that time, only that Ptolemy, son of Mennäus, was in point of civilisation a good way in advance of Alexander Jannäus.

Ptolemy, son of Mennäus, reigned from about B.C. 85 to about B.C. 40. About B.C. 85, from fear of him, the Damascenes called in the aid of Aretas, king of the Arabians (Antiq. xiii. 15. 2; Wars of the Jews, i. 4. 8). About B.C. 78, Aristobulus, son of Queen Alexandra, made a journey to Damascus, avowedly with the object of protecting it against Ptolemy (Antiq. xiii. 16. 3; Wars of the Jews, i. 5. 3). When Pompey arrived, Ptolemy purchased immunity from him by the payment of a thousand talents (Antiq. xiv. 3. 2). Pompey, however, destroyed the fortified places in the Lebanon (Strabo, xvi. 2. 18. p. 755), and undoubtedly also curtailed the territory of Ptolemy in a way similar to that in which he dealt with the Jewish territory. In B.C. 49, Ptolemy took under his personal care the sons and daughters of the Jewish king Aristobulus II., who had been deposed and quite recently murdered by the party of Pompey (Antiq. xiv. 7. 4; Wars of the Jews, i. 9. 2). In B.C. 42, when Cassius had left Syria, Ptolemy supported Antigonus, the son of Aristobulus, in his endeavour to secure to himself the government of Judea (Antiq. xiv. 12. 1). Ptolemy died during the progress of the Parthian war, B.C. 40 (Antiq. xiv. 13. 3; Wars of the Jews, i. 13. 1). As he is never designated "king" (Josephus, Antiq. xiv. 7. 4: δυναστεύων), it is possible that the coins, which for the most part have the incomplete superscription Πτολεμαίου τετράρχου ἀρχ(ιερέως), belong to him.

Ptolemy was succeeded by his son Lysanias (Josephus, Antiq. xiv. 13. 3; Wars of the Jews, i. 13. 1), who therefore obtained the kingdom with the same extent of territory as had been left to his father by Pompey. Dio Cassius styles him "King of the Itureans" (Dio Cassius, xlix. 32). His reign falls in the time of Antony, who also laid the Itureans under a heavy tribute (Appian, Civ. v. 7). At the instigation of Cleopatra, Antony caused Lysanias to be executed in B.C. 36 (on the reckoning of the date, see vol. i. p. 402), on the pretence that he had been conspiring with the Parthians, and gifted a large portion of his territory to Cleopatra (Josephus, Antiq. xv. 4. 1; Wars of the Jews, i. 22, 3; Dio Cassius, xlix. 32). Since Dio Cassius and Porphyry call him "king," it is doubtful whether the coins bearing the superscription Λυσανίου τετράρχου καὶ ἀρχιερέως belong to him, for there were one or more younger princes of this name. At the same time writers were accustomed to apply the title of βασιλεύς in a loose way even to tetrarchs.

The further history of the country cannot be followed out in more detail. But it is certain that the once important kingdom of Ptolemy and Lysanias was gradually cut up more and more into smaller districts. We can quite definitely distinguish four different districts, all of which originally belonged to the one kingdom of Chalcis.

1. About the year 23 B.C. (with regard to the chronology, see vol. i. p. 409) Josephus tells of a certain Zenodorus who had taken on lease the possessions that previously belonged to Lysanias (Antiq. xv. 10. 1: ἐμεμίσθωτο τὸν οἶκον τοῦ Λυσανίου; Wars of the Jews, i. 20. 4: ὁ τὸν Λυσανίου μεμισθωμένος οἶκον). This Zenodorus took part in the robberies in Trachonitis, on account of which Trachonitis was separated from the dominions under the sway of Zenodorus, and was conferred upon Herod (Antiq. xv. 10. 1-2; Wars of the Jews, i. 20. 4). Three years later, in B.C. 20, Zenodorus died, and then Augustus conferred upon Herod also the territories over

which he had ruled, namely, Ulatha and Panias (Antiq. xv. 10. 3: τὴν τούτου μοῖραν οὐκ ὀλίγην οὖσαν … Οὐλάθαν καὶ Πανιάδα καὶ τὴν πέριξ χώραν; compare Wars of the Jews, i. 20. 4; Dio Cassius, liv. 9: Ζηνοδώρου τινὸς τετραρχίαν) A difficulty arises here inasmuch as Zenodorus is mentioned at first only as lessee or farmer of the οἶκος Λυσανίου, whereas mention is afterwards made of his own country, Dio Cassius speaking of his tetrarchy, which was obtained by Herod. The difficulty might be explained by regarding the two as different territories. But against this may be alleged the circumstance that Josephus most decidedly, at least in his first reference to him, would have designated him by his own territory, if that territory had been different from the one which he had farmed out. We are therefore constrained to regard the two as identical. That the district of Ulatha and Panias had formerly belonged to the dominion of Lysanias, i.e. to the Iturean kingdom, is highly probable, since the latter extended as far as the borders of the Jewish country (see above, p. 330). It seems therefore that Zenodorus, after the death of Lysanias, had received on rent a portion of his territory from Cleopatra, and that after Cleopatra's death this "rented" domain, subject to tribute, was continued to him with the title of tetrarch.

On a monument to the dynasty of Lysanias at Heliopolis, of the inscription on which we have indeed only fragments, mention is made of a "Zenodorus, son of the tetrarch Lysanias." The reference has almost universally been supposed to apply to our Zenodorus, and he has therefore been regarded as a son of the Lysanias executed by Antony. Although this also is uncertain, because Lysanias is designated as tetrarch (see above, p. 332), yet there is proved from the inscriptions a genealogical connection between the two families, in which the same name may have been often repeated. — It may be taken as certain that the coins with the superscription Ζηνοδώρου τετράρχου ἀρχιερέως belong to our Zenodorus. They have the year numbers ΠΣ, ΒΠΣ, ΖΠ[Σ]], i.e. 280, 282, 287 aera Seleuc. or B.C. 32, 30, and 25, which precisely fit our hypothesis.

After the death of Herod the Great, a portion of the former tetrarchy of Zenodorus went to Herod's son, Philip (Antiq. xvii, II. 4; Wars of the Jews, ii. 6. 3). This is the portion referred to by the evangelist Luke (Luke 3:1), when he says that Philip was governor of Iturea (τῆς Ἰτουραίας). — The tetrarchy of Philip was subsequently obtained by Agrippa I. and Agrippa II.

2. Another tetrarchy was sliced off from the earlier Iturean empire in the East between Chalcis and Damascus to form the district of Abila in the Lebanon. This Abila, according to the Itinerarium Antonii and the Peutinger tables, lay 18 mil. pass. from Damascus on the road from that city to Heliopolis, consequently on the site of the present village of Suk on the Barada, where are still to be seen the ruins of an old city. In the neighbourhood on the wall of rock is engraved an inscription, on which it is said that the Emperors Marcus Aurelius and L. Verus viam fluminis vi abruptam interciso monte restituerunt … impendiis Abilenorum. In the same neighbourhood, too, they point out the so-called grave of Abel (Nebi Abil), evidently a legendary creation, which had its origin in the name of the place Abel. The identity of Abila and Suk, therefore, is placed beyond all doubt. Much more uncertain is this identification with our Abila of a city Leucas, urged by many numismatists, of which several coins are still extant. In support of this, reference is made to a coin on which, besides the words [Λευκ]αδιων Κλαυ[διεων], is to be read also the name of the river Χρυσοροας. In ancient times, certainly, the Barada was called Chrysorrhoas, and it had upon its banks, besides Damascus, no other city than Abila. But the name Chrysorrhoas is also met with elsewhere, e.g. on the inscription of the Gerasenes, Div. II. vol. i. p. 118; and it should be particularly observed that on the coin in question the designation of the city is restored only by means of filling up the lacunae.

Our Abila was before the time of Caligula the capital of a tetrarchy which is often spoken of by Josephus. When Caligula ascended the throne in A.D. 37, Agrippa I, besides the tetrarchy of Philip, received also “the tetrarchy of Lysanias” (Antiq. xviii. 6. 10: τὴν Λυσανίου τετραρχίαν). By this is meant the tetrarchy of Abila. For when Claudius came to the throne in A.D. 41, he confirmed and increased the domain of Agrippa by handing over to him the whole empire of his grandfather Herod as his hereditary possession, and adding thereto: Ἀβίλαν τὴν Λυσανίου καὶ ὁπόσα ἐν τῷ Λιβάνῳ ὄρει (Antiq. xix. 5. 1; compare Wars of the Jews, ii. 11. 5: βασιλείαν τὴν Λυσανίου καλουμένην). After the death of Agrippa I., in A.D. 44, his territory was administered by Roman procurators. But in A.D. 53, in the thirteenth year of Claudius, Agrippa II. obtained what had been the tetrarchy of Philip, together with Abila, the tetrarchy of Lysanias (Antiq. xx. 7. 1: σὺν Ἀβίλᾳ, Λυσανία δὲ αὕτη ἐγεγόνει τετραρχία. Compare Wars of the Jews, ii. 12. 8: τήν τε Λυσανίου βασιλείαν).

From these passages we see that the tetrarchy of Abila had belonged previously to A.D. 37 to a certain Lysanias. And seeing that Josephus nowhere previously makes any mention of another Lysanias, except the contemporary of Antony and Cleopatra, B.C. 40–36, theological criticism has endeavoured in various ways to show that there had not afterwards been any other, and that the tetrarchy of Abilene had its name from that older Lysanias. But this is impossible. Lysanias I. had possessed the Iturean kingdom with the same boundaries as his father Ptolemy. The capital of his kingdom was Chalcis (compare also especially the passage quoted from Porphyry on p. 332). The domain of Abila did indeed belong to that territory; for the empire of Ptolemy bordered on the territory of Damascus. But it certainly formed only a small portion of that important kingdom which embraced almost all of the Lebanon. It is therefore impassible that the district of Abila could have been characterized as “the tetrarchy of Lysanias.” It must therefore be assumed as certain that at a later date the district of Abilene had been severed from the kingdom of Chalcis, and had been governed by a younger Lysanias as tetrarch.

The existence of a younger Lysanias is also witnessed to by the following inscription found at Abila: —

Ὑπὲρ τῆς τῶν κυρίων Σε[βαστῶν]

σωτηρίας καὶ τοῦ σύμ[παντος]

αὐτῶν οἴκου, Νυμφαῖος ….

Λυσανίου τετράρχου ἀπελε[ύθερος]

τὴν ὁδὸν κτίσας κ.τ.λ.

Since the correctness of the filling up of the word Σε[βαστῶν] cannot be doubted, the inscription cannot be placed earlier than the time of Tiberius. For the title Augusti in the plural was never before given. The first contemporary Σεβαστοί were Tiberius and his mother Livia, who from the death of Augustus, in consequence of the last expressed wish of her husband, took the title of Augusta. In the time of Tiberius, therefore, at least fifteen years after the death of Lysanias I, it is, indeed, hardly conceivable that a freedman of his would have built a street and erected a temple, as is said on the inscription. Undoubtedly Nyraphäus was the freedman of the younger tetrarch Lysanias. — Also the inscription from Heliopolis, quoted on p. 334, makes it probable that there had been several princes of the name of Lysanias. — The evangelist Luke is thoroughly correct when he assumes (Luke 3:1) that in the fifteenth year of Tiberius there was a

Lysanias tetrarch of Abilene.

The tetrarchy of Lysanias I. remained in possession of Agrippa II. down to his death in A.D. 100; but the name of Lysanias long clung to the place. Also in Ptolemaeus, v. 15. 22, Abila is called Ἄβιλα ἐπικληθεῖσα Λυσανίου, as may be supposed because Lysanias was not only a previous possessor, but the new founder of the city (compare Caesarea Philippi).

3. The domains of Zenodorus and Lysanias lay on the circumference of the earlier Iturean kingdom. In the time of Quirinius, his subordinate general, Q. Aemilius Secundus, undertook a warlike expedition against the Itureans proper, as is told us on an inscription ("missu Quirini adversus Ituraeos in Libano monte castellum eorum cepi"). Perhaps just at that time a breaking up of the Iturean kingdom took place. At any rate, in the time of Claudius we find a kingdom of Chalcis and a kingdom of Iturea alongside of one another. In A.D. 38, Caligula deprived a certain Soemus of the government of the Itureans (Dio Cassius, lix. 12: Σοαίμῳ τὴν τῶν Ἰτυραίων τῶν Ἀράβων … ἐχαρίσατο). This Soemus died in A.D. 49, and then his territories were incorporated with the province of Syria. Tacitus, Annales, xii. 23: "Ituraeique et Judaei defunctis regibus Sohaemo atque Agrippa provinciae Suriae additi." But at the same time a Herod reigned in Chalcis, so that now the one kingdom of Ptolemy and Lysanias was partitioned into, at least, four divisions. The kingdom of Soemus is supposed to have embraced the northern part, from about Heliopolis to Laodicea in the Lebanon.

When, upon the death of Soemus, his territory was confiscated, it would seem that his son Varus (or Noarus, as he is called in Wars of the Jews, ii. 18. 6) was portioned off with a small part of his ancestral domains, and even this he held only till A.D. 53. In that year Claudius bestowed upon Agrippa, in addition to the tetrarchies of Philip and Lysanias, τὴν Οὐάρου γενομένην ἐπαρχίαν (Wars of the Jews, ii. 12. 8; in regard to the date, Antiq. xx. 7. 1). This Varus was, according to Josephus, Life, xi., probably the son of that Soemus who died in A.D. 49 (Οὐᾶρος βασιλικοῦ γένους, ἔκγονος Σοέμου τοῦ περὶ τὸν Λίβανον τετραρχοῦντος).

After the Iturean territories had been amalgamated with the province of Syria, regular Roman troops were enlisted there. We meet with Iturean alae and cohortes from the last decades of the first century in this farthest distant province of the Roman empire.

4. The history of Chalcis, the centre of the former Iturean kingdom, is unknown to us from the death of Cleopatra down to the date of Claudius' accession. The Emperor Claudius, on his coming to the throne in A.D. 41, gifted it to a grandson of Herod the Great, who was also called Herod. He was a brother of Agrippa I, and so a son of Aristobulus, the son of Herod the Great.

Herod of Chalcis had the title βασιλεύς, and praetorian rank. He was twice married. His first wife was Mariamme, a granddaughter of Herod the Great. By her he had a son, Aristobulus, who married Salome, the daughter of Herodias, and widow of the tetrarch Philip, and obtained from Nero the government of Lesser Armenia. The second wife of Herod was Berenice, the daughter of his brother Agrippa, who gave her to him in marriage after the death of Marcus, son of Alexander, the alabarch of Alexandria, to whom she was first betrothed. By her he had two sons, Berenicianus and Hyrcanus.

At the assembly of princes which was once convened by Agrippa I. at Tiberias, but had been so rudely treated by the Roman governor Marsus, we find our Herod also present. After the death of Agrippa I. in A.D. 44, he besought from the emperor – and this is the point that makes him an object of interest in the Jewish history – the oversight of the temple and the temple treasury, as

well as the right of nominating the high priest. His prayer was granted, and he exercised his right by frequent appointments and depositions of high priests.

On his coins he is named Φιλοκλαύδιος — a natural compliment to the emperor, to whom he owed all his advancement. Whether an honorary inscription of the Athenians to a Ἡρώδης Εὐσεβὴς καὶ Φιλόκαισαρ, refers to him, seems doubtful.

He died after a reign of about seven years, in the 8th year of Claudius, A.D. 48. His nephew, Agrippa II., obtained his kingdom, but probably only at a somewhat later period.

Agrippa continued in possession of Chalcis only till A.D. 53, when he, in return for the surrender of this country, obtained a larger kingdom: The history of Chalcis thereafter recedes again into obscurity. In the time of Vespasian there is, indeed, a King Aristobulus of Chalcidice mentioned, who possibly may be identical with the son of Herod of Chalcis and king of Lesser Armenia. But even if this were so, it is very doubtful whether by Chalcidice we are to understand the territory of our Chalcis ad Libanum, or the territory of Chalcis ad Belum. On both see above, p. 329 f.

The city of Chalcis, according to the coins, has an era beginning with A.D. 92, which probably was the year of its incorporation with the province of Syria.

APPENDIX II: HISTORY OF THE NABATEAN KINGS

LITERATURE

RELAND, Palestina, pp. 90-95.

VINOENT, Commerce and Navigation of the Ancients in the Indian Ocean, London 1807, vol. ii. pp. 273-276 (was not obtainable by me).

QUATREMÈRE, “Mémoire sur les Nabatéens” (Nouveau Journal asiatique, t. xv. 1835, pp. 5-55, 97-137, 209-240).

ROBINSON, Biblical Researches in Palestine, ii. 558 ff.

WILLIAMS IN SMITH’S Dictionary of Greek and Roman Geography, art,“Nabataei,” vol. ii. 392-394.

BITTER, Erdkunde von Asien, Thl. xii. (1846), pp. 111-140.

CLESS, art. “Nabataei,” in Pauly’s Real-Encyclopaedie der class. Alterthumswissenschaft, Bd. v. (1848) pp. 377-384.

WINER, Biblisches Realwörterbuch, art. “Nabatäer.”

DUO DE LUYNES, “Monnaies des Nabatéens” (Revue Numismatique, 1858, pp. 292-316, 362-385, pl. xiv., xv., xvi.).

The Nabateans and Professor CHWOLSON (Journal of Sacred Literature and Biblical Record, new series, vol. i. 1862, pp. 103-115).

KUHN, Die städtische und bürgerliche Verfassung des römischen Reichs, Bd. ii. (1865) pp. 165-

169.

DE VOGÜÉ, “Monnaies des rois de Nabatène (Revue Numismatique, 1868, pp. 153–168, pl. v.); also reprinted in Mélanges d’archéologie orientale, Paris 1868.

DE VOGÜÉ, Syris centrales, Inscriptions sémitiques (Paris 1868), pp. 100–124; comp. Schröder, Zeitschrift des deutschen Palastina-Vereins, xxxviii. 1884, p. 532 f.

NÖLDEKE, art. “Nabatäer,” in Schenkel’s Bibellexicon, Bd. iv. (1872) p. 269 f.

DE SAULCY, “Numismatique des rois Nabatéens de Pétra” (Annuaire de la Société françaiss de Numismatique et d’Archéologie, t. iv. 1, 1873, pp. 1–35). Supplements to this: (1) Annuaire de la Sociétéfrançaise de Numismatique et d’Archéologie, t. v. (=seconde série, t i) fasc. 5, 1881, p. 462 sq. (unreadable coins, perhaps of Aretas and Sekailath). (2) Mélanges de Numismatique, t iii. 1882, pp. 193–197 (a coin of Aretas and two of Sylläus?).

GRÄTZ, “Die Anfänge der Nabatäerherrschaft” (Monatsschrift für Geschichte und Wissenschaft des Judenthums, 1875, pp. 49–67).

SCHRADER, Keilinschriften und Geschichtsforschung, 1878, pp. 99–116.

KAUTZSCH, art. “Nabatäer,” in Riehm’s Handworterbuch des biblischen Alterthums.

MARQUARDT, Römische Staatsverwaltung, Bd. i. 2 Aufl. 1881, pp. 404 f., 431 f.

SACHAU, “Eine nabatäische Inschrift aus Dmâr” (Zeitschrift der deutschen morgenländ. Gesellsch. 1884, pp. 635–542). — In addition, CLERMONTGANNEAU, Revue critique, 1885, Nr. 5, pp. 88–92, and Nr. 9, p. 176 sq. DE VÖGUE, Comptes rendus de l’Académie des inscriptions et belles-lettres de l’année, 1885 (IV série, t. xiii.), pp. 45–52.

DOUGHTY, Documents épigraphiques recueillis dans le nord de l’Arabie, Paris 1884.

BERGER, “Nouvelles inscriptions nabatéennes de Medaïn Salih” (Comptes rendus de l’Académie des inscriptions et belles-lettres de l’année (IV série, t. xii.), pp. 377–393.

HALÉVY, “Inscriptions nabatéennes” (Revue des études juives, i. ix. 1884, pp. 8–16), known only from quotation in Doughty.

CLERMONT-GANNEAU, “Les noms royaux nabatéens employés comme noms divins” (Revue archéologique, III série, t. v. 1885, pp. 170–178).

NEUBAUER, “On some newly-discovered Temanite and Nabataean Inscriptions” (Studia Biblica, Oxford 1885, pp. 209–232).

MOMMSEN, Römische Geschichte, v. 1885, p. 476 ff.

EUTING, Nabatäische Inschriften aus Arabien, Berlin 1886; in this work at pp. 81–89: GUTSCHMID, Verzeichniss der nabatäischen Könige — the most complete collection of materials. — Euting gives the same inscriptions for the most part as Doughty and Berger, but much more correctly.

SORLIN-DORIGNY and BABELON, “Monnaies Nebatéennes inédites” (Revue Numismatique, troisième sèrie, t. v. 1887, pp. 369-377).

Separate single Nabatean coins have been communicated by Levy, Numismat. Zeitschrift, Bd. iii. 1871, pp. 445-448, and Olshausen, Monatsberichte der Berliner Akademie aus dem Jahrs, 1874, p. 185. A Nabatean inscription from Puteoli is given by Gildemeister, Zeitschrift der DMG. 1869, pp. 150-154; comp, also, Levy, Zeitschrift der DMG. pp. 652-654; Nöldeke, Ibid. 1884, pp. 144, 654. Other examples are given by Renan, Journal asiatique, VII série, t. ii. 1873, pp. 366-382. One inscription from Sidon is given by Levy, in Zeitschrift der DMG. 1869, pp. 435-440.

Greek Aretas coins are given in Eckhel, Doctr. Num. iii. 330; Mionnet, Description de médailles, v. 284 sq.; Visconti, Iconographie grecque, t ii. (p. 444 sq.=atlas, pl. 48, n. 12; Lenormant, Trésor de Numismatique, p. 117, pl. lvi. n. 17-19. A Latin coin of Scaurus, with reference to the subjugation of Aretas, in Eckhel, Doctr. Num. v. 131; Babelon, Monnaies de la république romaine, i. 120 sq.

On the Aretas referred to in the New Testament (2 Cor. 11:32), see especially Job. Gottlob Heyne, De ethnarcha Aretae Arabum regis, 2 vols. Wittemb. 1755; Anger, De temporum in actis apostolorum ratione (1833), pp. 173-182; Wieseler, Chronologie des apostol. Zeitalters (1848), pp. 167-175, and the articles on Aretas in Winer’s Realwörterbuch and Herzog’s Real-Encyclopaedie (the latter by Wieseler).

Besides the Syrian empire in the north, and the Egyptian empire in the south, Palestine had during the Graeco-Roman period a third powerful neighbour: the Nabatean kingdom in the south and east. The history of this kingdom can now be set forth in a tolerably connected manner only when the scattered references to it in early writers, particularly in Josephus, are filled out by means of the rich materials afforded by coins and inscriptions. Information regarding the coins has been imparted by the Duc de Luynes (1858), De Vogüé (1868), and De Saulcy (1873); information regarding the inscriptions by De Vogüé (1868), Doughty (1884), Berger (who in 1884 published the materials gathered by the scientific traveller Huber, who perished as a victim in the prosecution of his calling), and Euting (1885). The inscriptions of De Vogüé belong to the district of the Hauran, and therefore to the north of the Nabatean kingdom; those published by Doughty, Berger, and Euting were found for the most part at el-Hegr. (=Medain Salih), one of the southernmost points of the kingdom of Nabatea. The latter are specially numerous and important, since almost all of them are dated according to the years of the reigns of the Nabatean kings Aretas and Malchus. The correct reading of them was for the first time made possible by the careful copies of Euting. This scholar has also correctly determined the meaning of some Nabatean number-signs, and has thereby made corrections upon several conjectured dates in the earlier readings of the coins and inscriptions. The whole material from writers, coins, and inscriptions has been collected together by Gutschmid in an excursus to Euting’s works. To his full and informing treatise, we are largely indebted for the facts in the following sketch.

About the nation of the Nabateans (Ναβαταῖοι, נבטו) we know so little that we can point to no certain indication of its nationality. The language of the coins and inscriptions, which without exception are in Aramaic, seems to confirm Quatremère’s supposition that they were Aramaeans. On the other hand, they are uniformly designated by early writers Arabians, and indeed not only by those writing at a distance, but also by such as Josephus, who must have been quite familiar with the distinction between Aramaeans and Arabians. Besides this, it should be noted also that the names on the inscriptions are distinctly Arabian. The idea

therefore has rightly been insisted upon principally by Nöldeke that they were Arabians, but that they had made use for literary purposes of the Aramaic as the language of culture at that time, because the Arabic had not yet been developed into a literary language.

Regarding the history of the Nabateans previous to the Hellenic period, we really know next to nothing. Their identity with the נְבָיוֹת who are mentioned in Gen. 35:13, 28:9, 36:3, 1 Chron. 1:29, Isa. 60:7, as an Arabian tribe, is indeed probable but by no means certain. Nor do we obtain much further information from the cruciform inscriptions. The first actually reliable information about the Nabateans comes to us at the beginning of the Hellenistic period. We find them then, where in earlier times the Edomites had been settled, between the Dead Sea and the Aelanitic Gulf in the district of Petra, the ancient סֶלַע of the Edomites. When Antigonus, in B.C. 312, had driven Ptolemy Lagus out of Coele-Syria, he sent his general Athenäus with 4000 foot soldiers and 600 cavalry against the Nabateans. Athenäus threw down their stronghold Petra, and took from it great spoil. But in consequence of his own carelessness his army was soon thereafter almost completely annihilated by a night attack of the Nabateans; only fifteen horsemen, and even these mostly wounded, are said to have escaped. Antigonus thereupon sent his son Demetrius against the Nabateans with a new army. But even Demetrius was not able to win any decisive victory. After a fruitless siege of Petra he began again his homeward march, for he had to content himself with arranging for hostages, and taking pledges from the Nabateans that they would maintain friendship. Diodorus, who reports all this to us, gives on this occasion also a description of the Nabateans. They were even then uncivilised nomads, practising no agricultural arts, pursuing no cattle rearing and trade, and evidently still without kings. But gradually culture must have made its way more and more amongst them, until they came to have a sort of civil and political order under regal government. Their dominion was now extended toward the north and toward the south Their capital continued to be that Petra which so early as the time of Antigonus had formed their strongest place of refuge.

The first prince (τύραννος) of the Nabateans of whom we know anything is that Aretas (Aretas I.) with whom the high priest Jason in B.C. 169 in vain sought shelter (2 Macc. 5:8). Since Aretas is designated as τύραννος it would seem that the Nabatean princes then had not yet assumed the title of king. — After the outbreak of the Maccabean revolution the Nabatean princes assumed a friendly attitude toward the leaders of the Jewish national party (Judas, B.C. 164; Jonathan, B.C. 160). See 1 Macc. 5:25, 9:35. The country under their rule now extended as far as to the district east of the Jordan.

The kingdom of the Nabateans, however, did not rise into greater importance until the end of the second century before Christ, when the fall of the empire of the Ptolemies and the Seleucid dynasty made possible the founding of a powerful independent commonwealth upon their borders. In Justin's abstract from Trogus Pompeius it is said of the period about B.C. 110–100 (Justin, xxxix. 5. 5–6) that this kingdom of Syria and Egypt had become so enfeebled, "ut adsiduis proeliis consumpti in contemptum finitimorum venerint praedaeque Arabum genti, inbelli antea, fuerint: quorum rex Erotimus fiducia septingentorum filiorum, quos ex paelicibus susceperat, divisis exercitibus nunc Aegyptum, nunc Syriam infestabat magnumque nomen Arabum viribus finitimorum exsanguibus fecerat." This Erotimus therefore ought to be regarded as the founder of the royal Nabatean dynasty.

An Aretas II. (Ἀρέτας ὁ Ἀράβων βασιλεύς) is spoken of at the time of the siege of Gaza by Alexander Jannäus in B.C. 96. He had promised help to the Gazites, but the city fell into the hands of Alexander before Aretas could afford assistance (Josephus, Antiq. xiii. 13. 3).

A couple of years later, about B.C. 90, Alexander Jannäus attacked King Obedas I. (Ὀβέδαν τὸν Ἀράβων Βασιλέα), but suffered at his hands a crushing defeat on the east of the Jordan (Josephus, Antiq. xiii. 13. 5; Wars of the Jews, i 4. 4). De Saulcy, Gutschmid, and Babelon think that to this Obedas I. should be ascribed certain coins with the superscription עבדת מלך נבטו.

Again, another couple of years later, Antiochus XII advanced from Coele-Syria against the king of the Arabians, whose name is not mentioned. This time also the Arabians were victorious. Antiochus himself fell in the battle at Cana (Josephus, Antiq. xiii. 15. 1; Wars of the Jews, i. 4. 7). By the unnamed king of the Arabians we are to understand Aretas III., of whom Josephus immediately afterwards tells that he, just in consequence of the death of Antiochus, succeeded in gaining possession of Coele-Syria and Damascus, and then gained a victory over Alexander Jannäus near Adida (Josephus, Antiq. xiii. 15. 2; Wars of the Jews, i. 4. 8). The power of the Nabatean kings was thus now, about B.C. 85, extended as far as Damascus. To our Aretas III. the Numismatists have rightly assigned the coins with the superscription, Βασιλέως Ἀρέτου Φιλέλληνος. These can belong to no other Aretas, for they were minted in Damascus; and not indeed to the younger Aretas IV., since he called himself "the Friend of his People." The coins witness therefore to the prevalence of Hellenism at that period in the Nabatean kingdom. — In the time of this Aretas there occurred also the first collision with the Romans. We know from the Jewish history that Aretas, in the conflict between Hyrcanus and Aristobulus, sided with the party of Hyrcanus, supported him with his troops, and laid siege to Aristobulus in Jerusalem; but then, at the command of the Roman general Scaurus, he withdrew, and on his return march was defeated by Aristobulus (Josephus, Antiq. xiv. 1. 4–2. 3; Wars of the Jews, i. 6. 2–3). Thereupon Pompey had made a resolve to go himself against Aretas. But during his march to Petra he was obliged by the hostile attitude of Aristobulus to make his way back to Judea (Antiq. xiv. 3. 3–4). After the conquest of Jerusalem, Pompey made over the province of Syria to Scaurus (Antiq. xiv. 4. 5); and this general was the first to lead an expedition against Petra, but obtained from Aretas no more than the payment of a sum of money (Antiq. xiv. 5. 1; Wars of the Jews, i. 8. 1). Only to this extent was the subjugation of Aretas carried, of which Pompey had boasted, and which was gloried over upon a coin struck in memory of the event The city of Damascus, on the very first appearance of the Romans in Syria, had been laid siege to by the legates of Pompey (Josephus, Antiq. xiv. 2. 3; Wars of the Jews, i. 6. 2), and from that time onward continued under Roman suzerainty. — The period of the reign of Aretas III. extends, according to the hitherto prevailing view, from somewhere about B.C. 85 to B.C. 60. On account of the similarity between his portrait and that of Aretas Philellen, some of the Nabatean coins with the superscription חרתת מלך נבטו have been ascribed to him. On one we meet with the number 17 or 18 (so Euting-Gutschmid, not as was formerly read, 32 or 33).

In B.C. 55 Gabinius undertook an expedition against the Nabateans. Whether at that time Aretas or his successor Malchus occupied the throne is not stated by Josephus (Antiq. xiv. 6. 4; Wars of the Jews, i. 8. 7).

Malchus I. (Μάλχος or Μάλιχος, see Nöldeke in Euting, Nabatäische Inschriften, p. 63) reigned from B.C. 50 to B.C. 28. In B.C. 47 he placed cavalry at the service of Caesar for the Alexandrian war (Bell. Alex. i.). When the Parthians conquered Palestine in B.C. 40, Herod wished to take refuge with Malchus, but was not received by him (Josephus, Antiq. xiv. 14. 1–2; Wars of the Jews, i. 14. 1–2). On account of the aid given by him to the Parthians, Ventidius exacted from him a tribute in B.C. 39 (Dio Cassius, xlviii. 41). Antony bestowed a portion of his territory upon Cleopatra (Dio Cassius, xlix. 32; Plutarch, Anton. 36; Josephus, Wars of the Jews, i. 18. 4). In B.C. 32 Malchus sent to Antony auxiliary troops for the Actean war (Plutarch,

Anton. 61). Since he no longer paid the tribute for the portion granted to Cleopatra, war was waged against him by Herod at the instigation of Antony. The war, which at the beginning was favourable to the Arabians, ended in their utter overthrow in B.C. 32–31 (Josephus, Antiq. xv. 5; Wars of the Jews, i. 19). The last that we hear of Malchus is that he promised the aged Hyrcanus to support him in the revolt planned against Herod in B.C. 30 (Antiq. xv. 6. 2–3). — To our Malchus De Vogüé thinks a Nabatean inscription at Bozra should be referred, in which "the eleventh year of King Muliku" is spoken of (למלכו מלכא 11 שנת). Renan finds this same Malchus (מלכו מלך נבטו) on an inscription which has been discovered at Puteoli.

Obodas II., about B.C. 28–9, was king during the campaign of Aelius Gallus against the southern Arabians, B.C. 25–24, in which campaign a thousand Nabatean auxiliary troops took part. He made over the concerns of government wholly to his ἐπίτροπος Syllaeus, who gave to Aeliua Gallus evil counsel as to the course of march that he should take (Strabo, xvi. pp. 780–782). Obodas is still spoken of as king in the last days of Herod, when Syllaeus went to Jerusalem to treat for the hand of Salome, the sister of Herod (Antiq. xvi. 7. 6; Wars of the Jews, i. 24. 6), and when Herod undertook an expedition against the Arabians (Antiq. xvi. 9. 1 and 4). Just about that time, B.C. 9 (?), Obodas died it is supposed by poison administered to him by Syllaeus (Antiq. xvi 9. 4). Some coins have been communicated by De Saulcy.

Aretas IV., whose original name was Aeneas, from B.C. 9 till A.D. 40, succeeded Obodas immediately in the possession of the throne (Antiq. xvi. 9. 4). Because of his assuming the government of his own accord, Augustus was at first indignant, but afterwards recognised him as king (Antiq. xvi. 10. 9). Aretas repeatedly preferred accusations against Syllaeus before Augustus (Antiq. xvii. 3. 2; Wars of the Jews, i. 29. 3), and in consequence of these complaints Syllaeus was put to death in Rome (Strabo, xvi. p. 782; Nicholas of Damascus in Müller, Fragm. hist, graec. iii. 351). When, after the death of Herod in B.C. 4, the governor Varus was obliged to fit out a warlike expedition against the Jews, Aretas contributed auxiliary troops to his army (Antiq. xvii. 10. 9: Wars of the Jews, ii. 5. 1). — From the long reign of Aretas only a few incidents belonging to its latest period have come down to us. The tetrarch Herod Antipas had a daughter of Aretas for his wife, and her he subsequently divorced in order to marry Herodias. The enmity occasioned thereby between the two princes was further inflamed by disputes regarding boundaries. An open conflict followed, in which the army of Herod was defeated by the troops of Aretas. Owing to his having proceeded at his own instance, Aretas was to have been chastised by the governor Vitellius at the instigation of the Emperor Tiberius. But when Vitellius, on his march against Petra, received in Jerusalem the tidings of the death of Tiberius he turned back, leaving his task unperformed (Antiq. xviii. 5.1 and 3). These events therefore belong to the latest years of the reign of Tiberius, A.D. 36–37. At a period not much later occurred Paul's flight from Damascus, at which time Damascus was under a governor (ἐθνάρχης) of King Aretas (2 Cor. 11:32). We learn from this statement that now again Damascus belonged to the domain of the Arabian king. This is also confirmed by the fact that from the time of Caligula and Claudius no coins of Damascus are known having the image of the Roman emperor. Compare Div. II. vol. i. pp. 97, 98. Probably Caligula, who was induced to the performance of such acts of grace, had restored the city to Aretas. — Of no other Nabatean king have we so rich materials in coins and inscriptions as of Aretas IV. Among the inscriptions of el-Hegr=Medain-Salih, which Doughty, Huber, and, most correctly of all, Euting have communicated, there are found no fewer than twenty which are dated from the reign of this Aretas, most of which are in a good state of preservation. The same Aretas is probably also referred to in an inscription at Sidon, and on the two inscriptions from Puteoli. His name also occurs not infrequently on coins. On the inscriptions at el-Hegr he is constantly called חרתת מלך

נבטו רחם עמה, “Charitheth, king of the Nabateans, who loves his people” (Rachem-ammeh). It is the same also, as a rule, upon the coins. The title Rachem-ammeh is an expression of a national patriotic sentiment, and embraces an indirect refusal or repudiation of such titles as Φιλορώμαιος or Φιλόκαισαρ (Gutschmid, p. 85). That this very Aretas, Rachem-ammeh, is identical with Aretas IV. may be regarded as certain. For the year of this reign as given on the inscriptions of el-Hegr reach down to the year 48, and indeed the twenty-eighth year is written on both inscriptions (Euting, No. 16 and 17) in words, שנת ארבעין ותמונא לחרתת מלך נבטו רחם עמה, so that a doubt in regard to the number is impossible. The coins (also according to Euting-Gutschmid, p. 85) come down to the year 48; but only Aretas IV. can have reigned for so long a time. And there is thus also a proof supplied that the Aretas mentioned in the last years of Herod the Great is identical with the opponent of Herod Antipas.

Abias, ὁ Ἀράβων βασιλεύς, in the time of Claudius undertook a warlike expedition against Izates of Adiabene, in which he was aided by the very subjects of Izates, who were disgusted at his conversion to Judaism. Abias was conquered by Izates, and in order to escape falling into his enemy’s hands took his own life (Antiq. xx. 4. 1). — In Gutschmid’s list this Abias is not inserted (or is overlooked?). But certainly the fact is remarkable that a Nabatean king takes the field against the Adiabene lying on the other side of the Euphrates. — In another place, however, Josephus says expressly that Ναβατηνή stretched from the Red Sea to the Euphrates.

Malchus II., about A.D. 48–71, in A.D. 67 contributed auxiliary troops to the army of Vespasian for the Jewish war (Josephus, Wars of the Jews, iii. 4. 2), and is mentioned in the Periplus maris Erythraei, composed about A.D. 70, as king of the Nabateans (Periplus maris Erythrasi, § 19, ed. Fabricius: Λευκὴ κώμη, διὰ ἧς ὁδός ἐστιν εἰς Πέτραν πρὸς Μαλίχαν, βασιλέα Ναβαταίων). An inscription at Salkhat in the Hauran is dated from “the seventeenth year of Maliku, king of the Nabateans, son of Charithath, king of the Nabateans, who loves his people” (Rachem-ammeh). At el-Hegr were found six inscriptions, which are dated according to the years of the reign of Maliku, of which the latest (Euting, No. 26) is of “the twenty-first year of King Maliku, king of the Nabateans,” כשנתעשרין וחדה למלכו מלכא מלד נבטו. There are coins of the year 9, and of the year 23 (so Euting-Gutschmid, p. 86, not as De Vogüé, who reads 25 and 33). Since the king Rabel, according to the inscription of D’mer, succeeded to the throne in A.D. 71, Malchus reigned from about A.D. 48 to 71. During his time also Damascus had been, probably by Nero, again separated from the Nabatean kingdom (see above, p. 357).

Rabel, A.D. 71–106, is known only from inscriptions and coins. His name is, according to Euting, to be pronounced not as formerly Dabei, but Rabel (רבאל). An older Ῥάβιλος βασιλεὺς τῶν Ἀραβίων is mentioned in Steph. Byz. s.v. Μωθώ (see above, p. 352). The year of his accession to the throne can be precisely determined according to the inscription at D’mer, which is dated from the month Ijjar “in the year 405 according to the reckoning of the Romans, that is, in the twenty-fourth year of the king Rabel.” By the year 405, “according to the reckoning of the Romans,” is to be understood the year of the Seleucid era. Accordingly the date corresponds to May A.D. 94. See Gutschmid, p. 86. The first year of Rabel is A.D. 71. On two inscriptions at el-Hegr the second and fourth year of Rabel are mentioned; on an inscription at Salkhat in the Hauran the twenty-fifth, שנת עשרין וחמש לרבאל; the coins give no certain date. Since on some coins Rabel is mentioned along with his mother, he must have been a minor at the time of his accession. Mention of him on the inscription at D’mer, east of Damascus, on the way to Palmyra, proves that the Nabatean dominion extended to that region.

Rabel was probably the last king of the Nabateans, for in A.D. 106 “Arabia belonging to Petra” was converted by Cornelius Palma, the governor of Syria, into a Roman province. The

boundary of the province seems to have approached that of what had been the Nabatean kingdom. In any case, Petra in the south and Bostra in the north (in the district of Hauran), both of which reckoned according to the provincial era of A.D. 106, had belonged to that kingdom as its most important cities. Subsequently in the fourth Christian century Arabia was divided into two provinces: Arabia with Bostra as its capital, and Palaestina tertia with Petra as its capital.

APPENDIX III: THE JEWISH AND MACEDONIAN MONTHS COMPARED WITH THE JULIAN CALENDAR

1. נִיסָן

Nisan

Ξανθικός

April.

2. אִיָּר

Ijjar

Ἀρτεμίσιος

May.

3. סִיוָן

Sivan

Δαίσιος

June.

4. תַּמּוּז

Tammuz

Πάνεμος

July.

5. אָב

Ab

Λῷος

August.

6. אֱלוּל

Elul

Γορπιαῖος

September.

7. תִּשְׁרִי

Tischri

Ὑπερβερεταῖος

October.

8. מַרְחֶשְׁוָן

Marcheshvan

Δῖος

November.

9. כִּסְלֵו

Chisleu

Ἀπελλαῖος

December.

10. טֵבֵת

Tebeth

Αὐδυναῖος

January.

11. שְׁבָט

Shebat

Περίτιος

February.

12. אֲדָר

Adar

Δύστρος

March.

The Jewish names of the months, as has been now thoroughly established by the cuneiform inscriptions, are of Babylonian-Assyrian origin. On the tablet of months discovered at Nineveh the names are given as follows (see Schrader, The Cuneiform Inscriptions and the Old Testament, London 1885–1888, vol. ii. p. 69): Nisaannu, Airu, Sivanu, Duuzu, Abu, Ululu, Tasritav, Araah samna, Kisilivu, Tibituv, Sabatu, Addaru. — Within the realm of Judaism the most ancient document which gives the names of the months in regular succession is the Megillath Taanith, which was edited sometime during the first Christian century, since it is quoted in the Mishna (see vol. i. of this work, p. 163). Of later witnesses we need here mention only the little-known Christian Josephus, who, in his Hypomnesticum, c. 27, gives the following list (Fabricius, Codex pseudepigraphus Vet. Test. t. ii. Appendix, also in Gallandi, Bibl. patr. t. xiv., and Migne, Patrolog. graec. t. cvi.): Νησάν, Εἴαρ, Σιουάν, Θαμούζ, Ἄβ, Ἐλούλ, Ὀσρί [read Θισρί], Μαρσαβᾶν, Χασελεῦ, Τηβήθ, Σαβάθ, Ἀδάρ. In regard to the several names the oldest proofs and examples, apart from the cuneiform inscriptions, occur in the following passages: —

1. נִיסָן,
Neh. 2:1; Esth. 3:7; Mishna, Pesachim iv. 9; Shekalim iii. 1; Rosh hashana i. 1, 3, 4; Taanith i. 2, 7, iv. 5; Nedarim viii. 5; Bechoroth ix. 5. Euting, Nabatäische Inschriften aus Arabien (1885), n. ii. 4, v. 3, x. 7, xi. 7, xii. 9, xvi. 3, xx. 8, xxi. 4; De Vogüé, Syrie centrale, Inscriptions sémitiques (1868), Palmyrenische Inschriften, n. i. 2, 4, 6, 18, 23, 25, 26, 27, 32, 34, and elsewhere. — The Greek Νισάν occurs in Esra apocr. v. 6; Additions to Esther i. 1; Josephus, Antiq. i. 3. 3, ii. 14. 6, iii. 8. 4, 10. 5, xi. 4. 8.

2. אִיָּר,
Rosh hashana i. 3; Euting, Nabatäische Inschriften, n. viii. 10, ix. 9, xiii. 8, xxvii. 13; De Vogüé, Inscript. sémit. Palmyren. n. 88. — Ἰάρ, Josephus, Antiq. viii. 3. 1.

3. סִיוָן,
Esth. 8:9; Shekalim iii. 1; Bechoroth ix. 5; De Vogüé, Palmyren. n. 33 and 33b. — Σιουάν, Baruch
1:8.

4. תַּמּוּז, Taanith iv. 5, 6.

5. אָב,
Pesachim iv. 5; Shekalim iii. 1; Rosh hashana i. 3; Taanith ii. 10, iv. 5, 6; Megilla i. 3; Bechoroth ix. 5; Euting, n. vii. 5; De Vogüé, n. 5, 28, 29, 73, 84, 103. — In Josephus, Antiq. iv. 4. 7, we have the reading Ἀββά (more correctly Ἀβά). It is, indeed, only a conjectural reading introduced by Bernard, but it is a well-conceived conjecture. For the Σαβά adopted, in accordance with the manuscripts by Niese, cannot possibly have been written by Josephus.

6. אֱלוּל,
Neh. 6:15; Shekalim iii. 1; Rosh hashana i. 1, 3; Taanith iv. 5; Bechoroth ix. 5, 6; Euting, n. i. 3; De Vogüé, n. 78, 79, 123 I. — Ἐλούλ, 1 Macc. 14:27.

7. תִּשְׁרִי,
Shekalim iii. 1; Rosh hashana i. 1, 3, 4; Bechoroth ix. 5, 6; De Vogüé, n. 17, 22, 85, 123 II. — In

Josephus, Antiq. viii. 4. 1, where editions since Hudson have Θισρί, Niese reads Ἀθύρει. But Hudson's reading, which is supported by the form used by older Latin writers, is without doubt the correct one.

8. מַרְחֶשְׁוָן, Taanith i. 3, 4. – Μαρσουάνης, Josephus, Antiq. i. 3. 3. – On the Palmyrene inscriptions this month is called Kanun, כנון, De Vogüé, n. 31, 63, 64.

9. כִּסְלֵו, Zech. 7:1; Neh. 1:1; Rosh hashana i. 3; Taanith i. 5. – Χασελεῦ, 1 Macc. 1:54, 4:52; 2 Macc. 1:9, 18, 10:5; Josephus, Antiq. xii. 5. 4, 7. 6. – On the Palmyrene inscriptions the name is given in the form כסלול, Kislul or Kaslul (De Vogüé, n. 24, 75).

10. טֵבֵת, Esth. 2:16; Taanith iv. 5; Euting, n. iii. 2, xiv. 9, xv. 8; De Vogüé, n. 66, 123 III. – Τεβέθος, Josephus, Antiq. xi. 5. 4.

11. שְׁבָט, Zech. 1:7; Rosh hashana i 1; Euting, n. iv. 9; De Vogüé, n. 67, 89. – Σαβάτ, 1 Macc. 16:14.

12. אֲדָר, frequently in the Book of Esther, and also in Additions to that book; Shekalim i. 1, iii. 1; Rosh hashana i. 3; Megilla i. 4, iii. 4; Nedarim viii. 5; Edujoth vii. 7; Bechoroth ix. 5; Euting, n. xxiv. 6; De Vogüé, n. 8, 10, 11, 12, 13, 19, 94, 117, 119. – Ἀδάρ, 1 Macc. 7:43, 49; 2 Macc. 15:36; Josephus, Antiq. iv. 8. 49, xi. 6. 2, xii. 10. 5.
– אֲדָר הָרִאשׁוֹן and אֲדָר הַשֵּׁנִי, Megilla i. 4; Nedarim viii. 5.

The Jewish months continued always to be, what the "months" of all civilised nations originally were, actual lunar months. Since the astronomical length of a month is equivalent to 29 days, 12 hours, 44 minutes, 3 seconds (Ideler, Handbuch der Chronologie, i. 43), then it must follow that in actual practice months of 29 and mouths of 30 days must pretty regularly alternate with one another. – But twelve such lunar months would give only 354 days, 8 hours, 48 minutes, and 38 seconds (Ideler, Handbuch der Chronologie, i. 66), whereas the solar year embraccs 365 days, 5 hours, 48 minutes, and 48 seconds (Ideler, i. 35, 66) The difference between a lunar year of twelve months and the solar year is 10 days and 21 hours. In order to do away with this difference a month must be intercalated, at least, in every third year, sometimes even in the second. It was observed in very early times that a sufficiently accurate equation would be reached, if three times in every eight years a month were intercalated (the difference in eight years amounting to 87 days). Acquaintance with this cycle of eight years, this "Octaeteris," was possessed by those who arranged the Greek games for every fourth year; for the cycle of four years is only got by halving that of eight years. But even as early as the fifth century before

Christ, the astronomer Meton of Athens proposed a still more exact system of equation, a cycle of nine years, in which a month had to be seven times intercalated. This was considerably in advance of the eight years' cycle in accuracy, since in this case in 19 years only a difference of somewhere about 2 hours remained (Ideler, i. 47), whereas in the eight years' cycle in 8 years there was a remaining difference of 1½ days.

How far, then, had the Jews in the time of Christ advanced in the knowledge of these matters? They, naturally, had a general sort of acquaintance with them. But, unless all indications are deceitful, they did not in the time of Jesus Christ possess as yet any fixed calendar, but on the basis of a purely empirical observation, on each occasion they began a new month with the appearing of the new moon, and likewise on the basis of each repeated observation intercalated a month in the spring of every third and second year, in accordance with the rule that the Passover under all circumstances must fall after the vernal equinox.

1. The author of the astronomical pieces in the Book of Enoch was aware that the year has six months of 30 days each and as many of 29 days each; and Galen, in the second century after Christ, says that "the people of Palestine" divide the period of every two months, embracing 59 days, into two unequal halves, so that they reckon to one month 30 days, and to the other 29 days. But it would be a mistake if we were from this to draw the conclusion that the duration of the months was à priori strictly determined. Even in the age of the Mishna, in the second Christian century, this cannot have been the case; for the whole legislation of the Mishna rests on the presupposition that the new month, without previous reckoning, was begun each time upon the new moon becoming visible. So soon as the appearance of the new moon was proved by credible witnesses before the competent court at Jerusalem and later at Jamnia, the new moon was solemnized, and, after all the rites had been observed, messengers were sent in order to notify the opening of the new month. So, at least, was it done during the six months in which it was of importance on account of the existence of any festival: in Nisan on account of the Passover, in Ab on account of the Fast, in Elul on account of the New Year, in Tizri on account of the arrangement of the feast days of that month, the Day of Atonement, and the Feast of Tabernacles; in Chisleu on account of the feast of the Dedication of the Temple, in Adar on account of the feast of Purim, and so long as the temple stood, in Adar also on account of the little Passover. Since, naturally, it was known pretty accurately when the appearing of the new moon was to be expected, every effort would be made so as to fix the date wherever possible upon the right day. But the duration of the particular months was not fixed. This is confirmed especially by the following two passages from the Mishna: (1) Arachin iii. 7: "If one should have any apprehension in regard to the New Year feast, lest the month Elul should be fixed at 30 days, he may," etc. (2) Arachin ii. 2: "In one year there are, at least, four months of thirty days, and of these there have not hitherto been more than eight." From the former passage it appears that it was by no means established à priori whether a month should have 29 or 30 days; and the latter passage shows how uncertain this empirical method left the calendar. Even in the time of the Mishna, the second Christian century, it was still a possible contingency that a year might come in which only four months had each 30 days, and again another in which there might be eight such months. Thus the length of the lunar year might vary from 352 days to 356 days, while in actual fact it can only oscillate between 354 and 355 daye.

2. The system of intercalation was not fixed even in the second century after Christ. Julius Africanus indeed says that the Jews as well as the Greeks intercalated three months in every eight years; and we have no reason for doubting this statement in regard to the time of Julius Africanus, in the first half of the third Christian century, although it is uncertain so far as the

Greeks are concerned, for the majority of them had long adopted the more exact cycle of nineteen years. Also for the time of Jesus Christ this statement may be regarded as generally valid, since the thrice repeated intercalation in the course of eight years would naturally result from a purely empirical procedure. But the knowledge of this eight years' cycle is certainly even in the astronomical pieces in the Book of Enoch and the Book of Jubilees (which may be approximately regarded as witnesses for the period of Christ) extremely inexact, and it is not there made use of for the constructing of a regular intercalary system. In the astronomical pieces of the Book of Enoch the erroneous idea is taken up that the moon in the eight years is only about eighteen days behind the sun, for the lunar year is set down at 354 days and the solar year at 364 (Book of Enoch, c. 74:17; see generally cc. 72-82). The very same inexact conceptions are found also in the Book of Jubilees, c. 6 (Ewald's Jahrbücher der bibl. Wissensch. ii. 246). A calendar, built up upon such premises as these, would certainly very soon land in serious error. It was fortunate therefore that in actual practice it was disregarded, and the intercalation carried out without reference to any preconceived theory on the basis of an empirical observation made on each separate occasion. That this was still the case in the times of the Mishna is proved from the two following passages: – (1) Megillah i. 4: "If one has read the Megillah (the Book of Esther for the celebration of the feast of Purim) in the first Adar, and the year is then declared to be an intercalary year, he must read it again in the second or intercalary Adar." (2) Edujoth vii. 7: "R. Joshua and K Papias testified that the year might be declared an intercalary year at any time during the month Adar, for previously this could be done only to the feast of Purim. These same testified that one might conditionally declare the year an intercalary year. When on one occasion Rabban Gamaliel was on a journey in order to obtain a concession from the governor of Syria, and remained long away, the year was pronounced an intercalary year under the reservation that the decision would stand only if Rabban Gamaliel were satisfied. And when he arrived he was satisfied, and so it was an intercalary year." Both passages are so clear that they need no further commentary. Yet quite at the close of the year, in the month Adar, even after the feast of Purim had been celebrated, the decision might be arrived at whether or not a month was to be intercalated. There is absolutely no tracc of any previous calculation.

The rule, according to which it was determined whether to intercalate or not, was very simple. It required that care should be taken that the Passover festival, to be celebrated at the full moon in Nisan (14th Nisan), should in any case fall after the vernal equinox (μετὰ ἰσημερίαν ἐαρινήν), when the aun stood in the sign Aries. This explanation is characterized by Anatolius in the fragment of decided importance in relation to the history of the Jewish calendar given in Eusebius, Hist. eccl. vii. 32. 16-19, as the view in which all Jewish authorities are agreed, pre-eminently as that of Aristobulus, the celebrated Jewish philosopher of the time of Ptolemy Philouietor (not Philadelphus, as Anatolius erroneously says). With this also agree the statements of Philo and Josephus. If one therefore toward the close of the year noticed that the Passover would fall before the vernal equinox, the intercalation of a month before Nisan would have to be resorted to. The intercalated month was called, like the last month of the year, Adar. They were distinguished respectively as אֲדָר רִאשׁוֹן and אֲדָר שֵׁנִי (first and second Adar).

And yet, primitive as this calendar was, it had this great advantage, that serious and persistent inaccuracies, such as in the course of the year inevitably crept into a calendar calculated upon an incorrect basis, were avoided. – The very complicated later Jewish calendar, calculated upon the nineteen years' cycle, is said to have been introduced by the patriarch Hillel in the fourth century after Christ. Although this is not witnessed to with absolute certainty, it is not improbable (Ideler, Handbuch der Chronologie, i. 569 ff.).

With reference to the various beginnings of years in spring or in harvest, see vol. i. of the present work, p. 37.

The literature on the Jewish calendar, especially in its later form, is very extensive. A systematic exposition was given as early as the twelfth century by Maimonides in the passage treating of "the celebration of the New Moon" in his great work Jad Ha-chasaka or Mishne Thora (compare: Maimonides' Kiddusch Hachodesch, translated and explained by Ed. Mahler, Wien 1889). Various monographs are collected by Ugolini in his Thesaurus antiquitatum sacrarum, t. xvii. (Nic. Mülleri Annus Judaeorum luna-solaris et Turc-Arabum mere lunaris; Seldeni Diss. de anno civili Judaeorum; Maimonidis, De sanctificatione novilunii, cum versione Latina de Veilii. Christ. Langnansen, De mense veterum Hebraeorum lunari). — Of more recent date, especially: Ideler, Handbuch der mathematischen und technischen Chronologie, Bd. i pp. 477-583; Wieseler, Chronological Synopsis of the Four Gospels, pp. 401-436; Beiträge zur richtigen Würdigung der Evangelien und der evangelischen Geschichte (1869), pp. 290-321; Seyffarth, Chronologia sacra (1846), pp. 26-80 (believes that the Jewish year down to A.D. 200 was a solar year!); De Wette, Lehrbuch der hebräisch-jüdischen Archäologie, 4 Aufl. 1864, § 178-179; Gumpach, Ueber den altjüdischen Kalender zunächst in seiner Beziehung zur neutestamentlichen Geschichte, Brüssel 1848; Saalschütz, Das mosaische Recht, Bd. i. 1853, pp. 396-406; Lewisohn, Geschickte und das System des jüdischen Kalenderwesens, Leipzig, 1856 (=Schriften herausgeg. vom Institute zur Förderung der israelit. Literatur, erstes Jahr, 1855-1856); Caspari, Chronological and Geographical Introduction to the Life of Jesus Christ, pp. 2-19; Schwarz, Der jüdische Kalender historisch und astronomisch untersucht, 1872; Dillmann, "Ueber das Kalenderwesen der Israeliten vor dem babylonischen Exil" (Monatsberichte der Berliner Akademie, 1881, pp. 914-935); Zuckermann, Materialien zur Entwickelung der altjüdischen Zeitrechnung im Talmud, 1882 (gathers together the Talmudic deliverances on matters connected with the calendar); Hamburger, Real-Encydopädie für Bibel und Talmud, Abth. ii. 1883, pp. 608-628, art. "Kalender;" Mémain, La connaissance des temps évangéliyues, Paris 1886, pp. 39-43, 377-445, 481 ff.; Isidore Loeb, Tables du calendrier juif depuis l'ère chrétienne jusqu' au XXX siècle, avec la concordance des dates juives et des dates chrétiennes et une méthode nouvelle pour calculer ces tables, Paris 1886; Mahler, Chronologische Vergleichungs-Tabellen, nebst einer Anleitung zu den Grundzügen der Chronologie, 2 Heft: Die Ziet- und Festrechnung der Juden, Wien 1889; also the articles "Jahr" and "Monate" in the dictionaries of Winer, Schenkel, and Riehm, and in Herzog's Real-Encyclopaedie, 2 Aufl. vi 495-498, article "Jar" by Leyrer.

Since the Jewish year has sometimes twelve, sometimes thirteen months, it is evident that its months can only be made approximately to correspond to those of the Julian calendar. — The Macedonian names of the months came to be used in Syria from the beginning of the Seleucid domination (Ideler, Handbuch der Chronologie, i. 397). They originally also indicated lunar months. But from the time of Julius Caesar's reform of the calendar they were employed in Syria and Phoenicia to indicate the twelve months of the solar year, which is, speaking generally, identical with the Julian; therefore its several months do not exactly correspond with those of the Julian, since their beginnings are otherwise determined, and indeed were different in different large cities (Ideler, i. 433). It was not till a later period that the Julian months came to be named in Syria by Maccdonian names (Ideler, i. 429 ff.). — Besides the Macedonian names, the old native Syrian names (which were for the most part identical with the Jewish) were also used; and it may safely be assumed that their use was in strict conformity with that of the Macedonian names. Thus, e.g., the Syrian date on the inscriptions at Palmyra exactly corresponds to the Macedonian (24 Tebeth=24 Audynäus, 21 Adar=21 Dystros; see De Vogüé,

Inscriptions, n. 123, iii. 124=Le Bas and Waddington, Inscriptions grecques et latines, t. iii. 2, n. 2571, 2627). The same is true of the later Syrian calendar, where the Syrian as well as the Macedonian names indicate simply the months of the Julian calendar.

Under these circumstances it may be asked what Josephus means when he makes use of the Macedonian names of the months, as he frequently does in his History of the Jewish War. Ordinarily he uses them as perfectly parallel to the Jewish, precisely in the same way as is done in the inscriptions at Palmyra (Nisan=Xanthicus, Ijjar=Artemisius, Ab=Lous, Tizri=Hyperberetaeus, Marcheehwan=Dios, etc.; the proofs for this are given above at p. 364 f,; for the Palmyrene inscriptions see the collection in Le Bas and Waddington, n. 2571). But does he mean precisely the Jewish months when he uses the Macedonian names? In many cases undoubtedly he does so. (1) The Jewish Passover was observed on the 14th Xanthicus (Antiq. iii. 10. 5; Wars of the Jews, v. 3. 1). (2) In the time of Antiochns Epiphanes the temple was desecrated and reconsecrated on 25th Apellaios (Antiq. xii. 5. 4, 7. 6; comp. 1 Macc. 1:59, 4:52. (3) During the siege of Titus the daily morning and evening sacrifice was stopped on 17th Panemos (Wars of the Jews, vi. 2. 1); according to Mishna, Taanith iv. 6, however, this happened on 17th Thammuz. (4) The destruction of the temple of Nebuchadnezzar took place on the 10th Loos (Wars of the Jews, vi 4. 5); according to Jer. 52:12, on the 10th Ab. On the ground of these facts ancient and modern investigators have assumed that Josephus invariably intends when using the Macedonian names of the month to make the dates correspond with the Jewish months. But against this view, after the example of Scaliger, Baronius, and Usher, O. A. Hoffmann has recently advanced objections. He specially urges the point that Josephus was scarcely in a position (and if he had been, would not certainly have taken the trouble) to reckon the dates which had been transmitted to him according to another calendar, in accordance with the Jewish calendar. He just followed the calendar which his authorities followed. But in regard to the numerous dates in the Wars of the Jews, Hoffmann (p. 16) believes that Josephus must have used, as sources, the official State Papers which he found in the Roman camp. Hence it may be assumed that in these the dates were given in accordance with the Julian calendar, the months of which were simply indicated by Josephus under Macedonian names. The grounds for this opinion are undoubtedly correct. A writer like Josephus would not take the trouble to change the reckoning, but would simply give the dates as he found them. One should not therefore assume right off that in his works all the dates would be according to the same calendar, Many are given undoubtedly according to the Jewish calendar, others according to the Roman. But whether the dates in the Wars of the Jews are for the most part derived from the official Roman State Papers, seems to me more than doubtful. It is not correct to say, as Hoffmann does (p. 15), that Josephus almost exclusively gives precise dates for the enterprise of the Romans, but not for the internal events of Jewish history. A thorough examination of the facts communicated in our exposition (§ 20) plainly shows that among the details circumstantially related are many that refer purely to the internal affairs of the Jews, whereas on the other hand the exact statements about the doings of the Bomans, especially of that period, become more numerous when Josephus was first a prisoner and subsequently on his parole in the Roman camp. He had therefore personal knowledge of these things. Indeed, in his vindication of the credibility of his exposition he refers simply to his own memoranda of these occurrences which he had made for himself and not to Roman official documents (Treatise against Apion, i. 9: τὰ κατὰ τὸ στρατόπεδον τὸ Ῥωμαίων ὀρῶν ἐπιμελῶς ἀνέγραφον). Evidently, therefore, he did not use these official papers. But that he had made his memoranda according to the Jewish calendar is probable, partly from the internal probability of the matter, partly from the circumstance that particular dates are given undoubtedly according to the Jewish calendar; so Wars of the Jews, vi. 2. 1 (see above, p. 242), and Wars of the Jews, vi.

4.1-5 (see above, p. 243 f.). The oft recurring formula, Πανέμου νουμηνίᾳ (Wars of the Jews, iii. 7. 36, v. 13. 7, vi. 1. 3), cannot indeed be used as a proof that the months of Josephus actually began with the new moon. For in later usage νουμηνίᾳ signifies generally the first day of the month, even when, according to the calendar employed, the months did not begin with the new moon, as e.g. in the Roman. Compare Dio Cassius, lx. 5: τῇ τοῦ Αὐγούστου νουμηνίᾳ; Plutarch, Galba, 22: ἡ νουμηνία τοῦ πρώρτου μηνός, ἣν καλάνδας Ἰανουαρίας καλοῦσι; Steph. Thesaurus, s.v.

APPENDIX IV: THE JEWISH SHEKEL AND COINS OF THE REBELLION

THE extant coins with old Hebrew writing may be arranged in three groups: (1) The coins of the Asmonean high priests and princes which are furnished with names, and therefore are most easily determined; (2) the silver shekel and half-shekel: (3) the "Coins of Freedom," which with manifold variations celebrate the emancipation (gulla or cheruth) of Israel or Jerusalem or Sion. The most perfect agreement prevails among numismatists with reference to the first group: a pretty general agreement also prevails with reference to the second, because they are assigned by the majority of numismatists to the times of Simon the Maccabee. Most diverse are the views entertained with reference to the third group. Since the placing and determining of the first group is relatively easy and certain, it will be found that we have already communicated all that is necessary regarding it in our historical exposition. A more special investigation is required in reference to the coins of the second and third groups. It must be shown by a systematic examination of all the particulars, that with regard to the third group a much higher degree of certainty may be reached than in regard to the second, that therefore the measure of the present consensus stands in inverse ratio to the degree of scientific certainty attainable.

1. THE SHEKEL

LITERATURE

ECKHEL, Doctrina Numorum veterum, iii. 455 sqq.

CAVEDONI, Biblische Numismatik, transl. by Werhof, i. 18 ff., ii. 10 ff.

DE SAULOY, Recherches sur la Numismatique Judäique, 1854, p. 17 sqq.

EWALD, Gottinger "Nachrichten," 1855, p. 109 ff.

LEVY, Geschichte der jüdischen Münzen, 1862, p. 39 ff.

MADDEN, History of Jewish Coinage, 1864, p. 43 sqq.

DE SAULCY, Revue Numismatique, 1864, p. 370 sq.

CAVEDONI in Grote's Münzstudien, v. 1867, pp. 9-18.

REICHARDT in the Wiener Numismatischen Monatsheften, ed. G. Egger, Bd. ii. 1866, p. 137 ff.

DE SAULCY, Revue archéologique, nouv. sér. vol. xxiii. 1872, p. l sqq.

MERZBACHER, De siclis nummis antiquissimis Judaeorum, Berl. 1873.

MADDEN, Numismatic Chronicle, 1874, p. 281 sqq.

LEWIS, Numismatic Chronicle, 1876, p. 322 (Shekel of the year V.).

MERZBACHER in Sallet's Zeitschrift für Numismatik, Bd. iii. 1876, pp. 141 ff., 183 ff., Bd. v. 1878, pp. 151 ff., 292 ff.

MADDEN, Coins of the Jews, 1881, pp. 67–71, where the material is most fully given.

REINACH, "Actes et conférences de la société des études juives," 1877 (Supplement to Revue des études juives, 1887), p. cciii sqq. Separate reprint, Les monnaies juives, Paris 1887, p. 42 sqq.

The silver shekel and half-shekel are equal in weight to the Greek tetradrachmae and the double drachmae minted in the Phoenician towns, and afford us a point of connection for estimating the values of Phoenician-Hebrew coins. The superscription runs ירושלם קדשה or ירושלים הקדושה, on the other side שקל ישראל (shekel of Israel); on the half-shekels: חצי השקל (half-shekel), The whole as well as the half-shekels have, besides the indication of the weight, a number, usually accompanied with an ש = שנת, a year; e.g. שב=year II. There are extant examples of both coins from the years א, ב, ד נ (I., II., III., IV.); of the whole shekel there is also an example of שה, year V. As might be expected, we have no portrait profiles, but only simple symbols, the significance of which is still doubtful (a cup and branch of lilies?). — Since upon those coins of the "holy Jerusalem" there is no trace of any personal name, it is extremely difficult to determine their age. But it should first of all be laid down as certain that they cannot have been minted between B.C. 135 and A.D. 66. For the Asmoneans, since John Hyrcanus, B.C. 135, minted coins bearing their own names, as did also Herod and his sons. It is also clear that these coins could not have been struck under the Roman procurators, for they presuppose the political independence of Jerusalem. They can therefore be assigned only to the time before B.C. 135 or after A.D. 66. Under the latter alternative they can be referred only to the period of the war A.D. 66–70; for from the time of the Hadrian war, A.D. 132–135, we have coins of quite another sort. Ewald was the first (Göttinger "Nachrichten," 1855, p. 109 ff.) to argue in favour of the years 66–70 as the date of the minting of the shekels; and in the first edition of this work, p. 365 f., I adopted his view. Among numismatists, however, this theory is now maintained only by Theód. Reinach (1887) and Imhoof-Blumer (in epistolary correspondence with myself). All the others declare this impossible, in consequence of the antiquated style, and almost unanimously place these shekels in the time of Simon the Maccabee, B.C. 142–135. De Saulcy puts them even farther back, assigning them first of all, in Recherches sur la Numismatique Judaïque, 1854, to the time of Alexander the Great, subsequently, in the Étude chronologique des livres d'Esdras et de Néhémie, 1868 (which has not been accessible to me), and in the Revue archéologique, 1872, to the time of Ezra. — In determining this question we must take into account: (1) Palaeographical, (2) Historical, (3) Numismatical arguments.

1. We may set aside, first of all, the palaeographical, because they scarcely yield any result. The character of the writing is the so-called Phoenician or old Hebraic. But this writing for monumental purposes, such as inscriptions and coins, changed so little during the period coming under consideration, that from this nothing can be gained to help in determining our question. The character of the writing on the coins fits equally the assigning of them to the Maccabean age and to a very much later period, as, upon inquiry, Euting also has assured me, one of the highest authorities on Semitic palaeography.

2. On historical grounds the shekel can hardly have been minted in the Persian and Greek age prior to the winning of Jewish independence by Simon the Maccabee. For according to all that we know, the Jews did not, either in the Persian or in the Greek age, possess such a degree of political independence as is assumed in an autonomous minting of money of their own. This would have been distinctly impossible in the age of Alexander, from the fact that under him in Phoenicia only royal money was minted (so, e.g., in Ascalon, Ptolemais, Damascus; see Div. II. vol. i. pp. 74, 91, 97). All the more perfectly do they now seem to suit the time of Simon the Maccabee. Under him "the yoke of the heathen was taken away from Israel," and expression was given to this fact by the introduction of a native reckoning of their own, according to the years of Simon (1 Macc. 13:41, 42; compare also p. 256). May it not be just this era that is meant on the shekels? This is indeed what is assumed by most numismatists. But on nearer consideration certain not inconsiderable difficulties arise. The era of Simon begins in the year 170 of the Seleucid era=B.C. 143–142 (1 Macc. 13:41 f.); but Simon did not die before the year 177 of the Seleucid era=B.C. 136–135 (1 Macc. 16:14). One should therefore expect on the shekels the year numbers I.-VII., whereas even of the year V. we have only one example, but no single example for any later years. Merzbacher, Zeitschrift für Numismatik, v. 292 if., has therefore made the attempt to place the era of Simon about two years later. That this expedient is quite inadmissible, I think I have succeeded in proving on page 259. It would also involve this further consequence, that the minting of the shekels in a very remarkable manner was suddenly broken off with Simon, and in their place immediately under Simon's successor, John Hyrcanus, a minting of quite another kind was introduced, bearing the name of the reigning high priest. If this be not impossible, it is at least very singular. On the other hand, the hypothesis that the shekels were minted during the period of the rebellion A.D. 66–70, is beset by no kind of historical difficulties. It must therefore have the preference, if no numismatic considerations tell against it.

3. The decision from the numismatic standpoint is difficult for this reason, that the minting is of a rude or at least peculiar description, and therefore hard to classify. This explains the fact that even experienced numismatists differ from one another in their judgments. Theód. Reinach has given no convincing proof for the date of A.D. 66–70 as adopted by him. By his publication Imhoof-Blumer has been driven to an examination of the facts of the case, which has led him to accept the theory of Reinach. The grounds which he has been good enough in correspondence to communicate to me are the following: "The small diameter of the shekel and half-shekel, and their border, do hot correspond to the Syrian and Phoenician mintings of the middle of the second century before Christ nearly so well as to the silver coins minted in those districts bearing the images of Nero, Agrippina, and Vespasian, of which there are many tolerably thick examples of about 14 and 7 grs. in weight. Upon a question of style no result can be drawn from the extremely slovenly and rude types referred to, but merely on a question of technology, and in this respect they have no resemblance to the broad coins of the Syrian kings Antichus VI., Tryphon, Antiochus VII.," etc. Against this theory may be quoted the opinions of all other numismatists of the time, who pronounce it impossible, on account of the ancient appearance of the shekels, that they can be assigned to so late an age. Also it has been emphatically declared against the above statement, e.g. by Sallet in an admirable communication which he has made to me, that the prevailing view must be maintained. "The antique character of the coins is so clearly stamped, the thickness of the piece of metal so thoroughly in accordance with the antique coins minted long before Christ, the stamp and the writing are of so decidedly antique a character, that the coins must be placed in the time of the Maccabees." They are "distinctly distinguishable " from the coins of the later rebellion. In presence of this diversity of opinion among the best authorities, no one not an expert can do anything but conclude with the

confession: adhuc sub judice lis est.

2. THE COINS OF THE REBELLION

LITERATURE

EOKHEL, Doctrina Numorum, veterum, iii. 464–474.

MIONNET, Description de médailles antiques, v. 555–562, Suppl. viii. 378; Planches, xxvii.-xxviii.

Trésor de Numimatique (edited by Lenormant, 1849), pp. 118–123, pl. lvii.–lix.

CAVEDONI, Biblische Numismatik, transl. by Werlhof, i. 18–51.

DE SAULCY, Recherches sur la Numismatique Judaïque, 1854, pp. 151–170, pl. x.–xv.

EWALD, Göttinger "Nachrichten," 1855, pp. 109–122; Gött, gel. Anzeigen, 1862, p. 841 ff. (review of Levy's work).

DE VOGÜÉ, Revue Numismatique, 1860, pp. 280–292 (Eleazar coins)

LEVY, Geschichte der jüdischen Munzen (1862), pp. 83–131.

MADDEN, History of Jewish Coinage (1864), pp. 154–182, 198–210.

CAVEDONI in Grote'a Münzstudien, v. 1867, pp. 29–37.

DE SAULCY, Revue Numismatique, 1865, pp. 29–55.

GARRUCCI, Dissertazioni archeologiche, ii, 1865, pp. 31–39.

MADDEN, Numismatic Chronicle, 1866, pp. 36–65.

DE SAULCY, Numismatic Chronicle, 1871, pp. 250–253.

MERZBACHER, "Untersuchungen über althebräische Münzen" (Zeitschrift für Numismatik, Bd. iv. 1877, pp. 350–365).

DE SAULCY, Mélanges de Numismatique, ii. 1877, pp. 87–92.

SALLET, Zeitschrift für Numismatik, Bd. v. 1878, pp. 110–114.

RENAN, L'église chrétienne (1879), pp. 546–551.

MADDEN, Coins of the Jews (1881), pp. 188–206, 230–246.

STICKEL, Zeitschrift des deutschen Palaestina-Vereins, vii. 1884, pp. 212, 214.

GRÄTZ, Monatsschrift für Geschichte und Wissenschaft des Judenthums, 1887, pp. 145–176 (English translation in Numismatic Chronicle, 1888).

REINACH (THÉOD.), Revue des études juives, t. xv. 1887, pp. 56-61.

REINACH (THÉOD.), Actes et conférences de la société des études juives, 1887 (Suppl. to Revue des études juives, 1887), pp. cciii-ccxvi. — In separate reprint (Les monnaies juives, Paris 1887), pp. 42-67.

GRÄTZ, Revue des études juives, t. xvi. 1888, pp. 161-169; t. xviii. 1889, pp. 301-304.

GRÄTZ, Geschichte der Juden, Bd. iii. 4 Aufl. (1888), pp. 819-841.

REINACH (THÉOD.), Revue des études juives, t. xvii. 1888, pp. 42-45; t. xviii. 1889, pp. 304-306.

The coins of the rebellion belong to the following varieties. The material is adequately presented by De Saulcy, Recherches sur la Numismatique, 1854; Madden, History of Jewish Coinage, 1864; Numismatic Chronicle, 1875; Merzbacher, Zeitschrift für Numis·atik, iv. 1887; most fully in Madden, Coins of the Jews, 1881.

1. Ligullath Zion, the Deliverance of Zion.

Obv. לגאלת ציון ligullath Zion.

Rev. שנת ארבע, year IV.

or, שנת ארבע חצי, year IV., a half.

or, שנת ארבע רביע, year IV., a quarter.

All these are copper coins of various sizes, with Jewish emblems.

See De Saulcy, Recherches sur la Numismatique, p. 20; Cavedoni, Biblische Numismatik, ii. 11 f.; Ewald, Göttinger Nachrichten, 1855, p. 114; Levy, Geschichte, p. 44; Madden, History of Jewish Coinage, p. 47; Garrucci, Dissertazioni, ii. 32, 38; Madden, Numismatic Chronicle, 1866, pp. 48-63 (very complete in reference to the date, against Garrucci); Merzbacher, Zeitschrift für Numismatik, i. 222, iv. 364; Madden, Coins of the Jews, p. 71 sq.

2. Chêruth Zion, the Emancipation of Zion.

Obv. חרות ציון, chêruth Zion.

Rev. שנת שתים, year II.

or, שנת שלוש year III.

Small copper coins with Jewish emblems of which numerous examples are extant (Sallet, Zeitschrift, v. 110).

See De Saulcy, Recherches, p. 154; Cavedoni, Biblische Numismatik, ii. 53 f.; Ewald, Gött. Nach. 1855, p. 114; Levy, Geschichte, p. 100; Madden, History of Jewish Coinage, p. 180; De Saulcy, Revue Numismatique, 1865, p. 29 sq.; Garrucci, Dissertazioni, ii. 38; Merzbacher, Zeitschrift, i. 223, iv. 364 f.; Madden, Numismatic Chronicle, 1875, p. 320 sq.; Coins of the

Jews, p. 206.

3. Year I. ligullath Israel, of the Emancipation of Israel.

Obv. אלעזר הכהן, Eleasar the priest.

Rev. שנת אחת לגאלת ישראל, year I. ligullath Israel.

Obv. אלעזר הכהן, Eleasar the priest.

Rev. שמעון Simon.

Obv. ירושלם, Jerusalem.

Rev. שנת אחת לגאלת ישראל, year I. ligullath Israel

Obv. שמעון נשיא ישראל, Simon prince of Israel.

Rev. שנת אחת לגאלת ישראל, year I. ligullath Israel.

These are some of them silver, some of them copper, coins of various sizes and of various types. That they all belong to the same period is proved from the date "Year I. ligullath Israel," which is common to all the three. But the coins bearing the names of Eleasar and Simon cannot be separated from the other Eleasar coins.

See De Saulcy, Recherches, pp. 158–160, 165–168; Cavedoni, Biblische Numismatik, ii. 55–59; Ewald, Göttinger Nachr. 1855, p. 119 ff.; De Vogüé, Revue Num. 1860, p. 280 ff. (Eleasar coins communicated for the first time by De Voguë); Levy, Geschichte, pp. 88–92, 97–99; Madden, History of Jewish Coinage, pp. 161–166, 174–178; De Saulcy, Revue Num. 1865, p. 29 sq.; Cavedoni in Grote's Münzstudien, v. 29 ff.; Garrucci, ii. 37 sq.; Merzbacher, Zeitschrift, i. 229–232, iv. 350–353; Madden, Numismatic Chronicle, 1875, pp. 313–320; Coins of the Jews, pp. 198–206; Sallet, Zeitschrift, v. 110 ff.; Reinach, Revue des études juives, xv. 58 sq. (on the Simon-Eleasar coins).

4. Year II. lechêruth Israel, the Freedom of Israel.

Obv. שמעון, Simon.

Rev. ש״ב לחרות ישראל, year II. lechêruth Israel.

Obv. ירושלם, Jerusalem.

Rev. ש״ב לחרות ישראל, year II. lechêruth Israel.

The latter kind are found rarely, the former very frequently, in silver and copper, of various sizes and of various types. In regard to some it is still discernible that they had been made out of Roman coins of Vespasian and Trajan (Sallet, Zeitschrift, v. 110–114).

See De Saulcy, Recherches, pp. 168–170; Cavedoni, Biblische Numismatik, ii. 59 ff.; Ewald, Göttinger Nachr. 1855, p. 119 ff., Levy, Geschichte, pp. 93–96, 105–108; Madden, History of Jewish Coinage, pp. 166–174, 207 sq.; De Saulcy, Revue Num. 1865, 29 sq.; Cavedoni in

Grote's Münzstudien, v. 30 ff.; Garrucci, ii. 34; Merzbacher, Zeitschrift, i. 232-236, iv. 353-356; Madden, Numismatic Chronicle, 1875, pp. 329-333; Coins of the Jews, pp. 241-246; Sallet's Zeitschrift, v. 110-114.

5. Lechêruth Jerushalem, the Freedom of Jerusalem.

Obv. שמעון, Simon.

Rev. לחרות ירושלם, lechêruth Jerushalem.

Silver and copper coins of various sizes and with various types. Many are stamped upon Roman coins, especially upon those of Trajan.

See De Saulcy, Recherches, pp. 160-165; Cavedoni, Biblische Numismatik, ii. 56-59; Ewald, Göttinger Nachr. 1885, p. 119 ff.; Levy, Geschichte, pp. 93-96, 105-108; Madden, History of Jewish Coinage, pp. 166-174, 203-210; De Saulcy, Revue Num. 1865, p. 29 sqq.; Cavedoni in Grote's Münzstudien, v. 30 ff.; Garrucci, ii. 33 sq.; Merzbacher, Zeitschrift, i. 236 f., iv. 357-363; Madden, Numismatic Chronicle, 1875, pp. 321-328; Coins of the Jews, pp. 233-241; Sallet, Zeitschrift, v. 110-114.

The three last-named classes (Year I. ligullath Israel, year II. lechêruth Israel, lechêruth Jerushalem without date) are to be assigned with great probability, the last two indeed with certainty, to the period of the rebellion of Bar-Cochba. In regard to the last class this is admitted by all. The original Roman minting discernible upon many of them, which gives the figure of the Jewish temple, proves that they were struck not earlier than the times of Trajan. But only one period is conceivable in which this minting can have taken place: that of the rebellion under Hadrian. Yet even among the coins of our fourth class, those of the "Year II. lechêruth Israel," some examples are met with which are stamped upon coins of Vespasian and Trajan (Sallet, Zeitschrift, v. 110-114). The same therefore applies to them as to those bearing the device "lechêruth Jerushalem." It will, however, be readily admitted that those results hold not only for the copies stamped upon imperial coins, but also for others with similar superscriptions and of similar types, for the production of which imperial coins were not employed. For it is a singularly arbitrary proceeding to divide among different periods coins of precisely the same impression, only for this reason that on some an original Roman stamp can be traced, while it is not discernible on the others (so. Levy, who divides the coins of our fourth as well as of our fifth class between the first and the second revolutions). — While, therefore, these two classes certainly belong to the time of Bar-Cochba, those of "Year I. ligullath Israel" may be assigned at least with great probability to the same period. For it is admitted by all competent numismatists that they are in style extremely similar to, quite the same, indeed, as the others. The rabbinical tradition also speaks generally of "coins of Bencosiba," מעות כוזביות or מטבע בן כוזיבא.

The great variety of mintings within a few years, which has been the principal reason for numismatists dividing the coins between the time of the Vespasian and that of the Hadrianic war, is not on closer examination incapable of explanation. During the first year two leaders of the rebellion, "Eleazar the Priest" and "Simon the Prince," minted coins. In the second year Simon seems to have secured to himself the sole sovereignty. Thus it can be easily understood that on the coins of the first year he distinguished himself from the priest by the title of "prince," whereas during the second year he no longer found this necessary. Besides Simon and Eleaaar the city of Jerusalem also minted coins, and that indeed during the first as well as the second year; but these coins are very rare. Finally, Simon, besides the coins dated according to the era

of the freedom of Israel, also stamped some coins without date in commemoration of "the freedom of Jerusalem." Their great variety therefore presents no ground for assigning a portion of them to the time of the war of Vespasian.

In the history of numismatics the classification of our coins has passed through five different stages. 1. The older numismatists, Eckhel, Mionnet, and even Cavedoni, Biblische Num. i., put all the kinds together, so far as they were known, along with the shekel coins in the time of Simon the Maccabee. Only one French scholar of the last century, Henrion, recognised the fact that they belonged to the time of Bar-Cochba (see Eckhel, Doctr. Num. iii. 472). But his voice sounded unheard, although even then some copies stamped upon imperial coins were known, which had to be of necessity assigned to the age of Bar-Cochba (Eckhel, iii. 473). — 2. De Saulcy in his Recherches sur la Numismatique Judaïque, 1854, not only essentially enriched the material, but also gave expression to the correct view that all three kinds belonged to the time of Bar-Cochba. He was followed by Cavedoni, Biblische Num. ii, and Ewald. The latter also assigned to the same period the Eleasar coins first communicated by De Vogüé in 1860 (History of Israel, viii. 291). — 3. An unfortunate confusion was caused by Levy in 1862 in consequence of his arbitrary division of the coins between the time of Vespasian and that of Hadrian. He assigned to the earlier period not only all coins of "Year I. ligullath Israel," but also the greater part of those of the "Year II. lechêruth Israel" and "lechêruth Jerushalem." But some individual examples of the last two classes are met with in the time of Hadrian, and thus coins of a precisely similar stamp are separated by a period of sixty years. Those who issued coins during the age of Vespasian were the well-known leader of the Zealots, Eleasar, then Simon bar-Giora, and the scribe Simon, son of Gamaliel, upon whom the later Jewish legends bestowed the title of Nasi. On the baselessness of this legend see Div. II. vol. i. p. 183 ff. Neither could Eleasar nor Simon bar-Giora have struck the coins of years I. and II. of freedom, since they did not become party leaders until the later days of the rebellion; Simon bar-Giora only in the third year (Wars of the Jews, iv. 9. 12); Eleasar even later, and only for a short time (see above, p. 235). Notwithstanding the more than weak foundation of these hypotheses, Levy obtained at first ardent supporters in Madden, History of Jewish Coinage, 1864, and Cavedoni in Grote's Münzstudien, v. Madden's work of 1864 is consequently in those parts extremely ill-suited to afford a clear summary of the history. Also Renan was influenced by Levy, inasmuch as he inclines to ascribe only the superimposition of the stamp to the age of Bar-Cochba (L'église chrétienne, p. 546 sq.). Levy's and Madden's views were decidedly combated by Ewald, Gött. gel. Anz. 1862, p. 841 ff., and De Saulcy, Revue Num. 1865, who held fast by their earlier judgments. Yet even De Saulcy so far paid tribute to the Jewish legends as to understand by "Simon the Prince" the younger Simon, son of Gamaliel, grandson of the earlier one of that name, whose title of Nasi, however, stands historically on as weak a foundation, as in the case of his grandfather. — 4. A change for the better, however, was made by Merzbacher when he, although still influenced by Levy, abandoned his arbitrary separation of the coins of our fourth and fifth classes. He put all coins of "Year I. ligullath Israel" and all those of "Year II. lecêruth Israel" into the Vespasian age, and all those with "lechêruth Jerushalem" into the age of Hadrian. All the Simon coins of the age of Vespasian, whether with or without the title Nasi, he ascribed to Simon, son of Gamaliel. But even before him Garrucci had come one step nearer the truth when he ascribed to the Hadrianic period both the coins of the "Year II. lechêruth Israel," and those with "lechêruth Jerushalem," and assigned to the age of Vespasian only those of "Year I. ligullath Israel." His arguments also soon made an impression upon Madden (Numismatic Chronicle, 1866, p. 63 sq.), who in his later works (Numismatic Chronicle, 1875; Coins of the Jews, 1881) actually adopted the arrangement of Garrucci. In consequence of this, Madden's masterpiece of 1881 marks an important advance upon the History of 1864, not only

in regard to the wealth of material, but also in respect of its incomparably superior arrangement. – 5. The researches of Merzbacher, Garrucci, and Madden gradually unravelled the confusion wrought by Levy, and led step by step back again to the original simple views of De Saulcy. Sallet and Reinach have returned completely to these earlier views, for reasons that have been stated above. Although on other points De Saulcy is not always happy in his historical combinations, his numismatical sense has in this particular guided him aright. – Whether the weight of the arguments by which modern numismatists have been constrained to return step by step to De Saulcy's view will survive all attacks the future alone can show. An attempt to produce embarrassment anew has been made by Grätz (Monatsschrift, 1887, p. 145 ff.; Revue des études juives, xvi. 161 sqq., xviii. 301 sq.; Geschichte der Juden, iii. 4 Aufl. 1888, p. 819 ff.). There is scarcely any danger of such an attempt succeeding, for any one who has even a moderate appreciation of scientific method must regard Grätz's speculations as a tissue of groundless surmises. Compare in opposition to him. Reinach, Revue des ëtudes juives, xvii. 42–45, xviii. 304–306.

In regard to the small copper coins communicated under No. 2, with the superscription חרות ציון, chêruth Zion, years II. and III., a much greater agreement prevails than in regard to the coins of our third, fourth, and fifth classes. With almost perfect unanimity they are ascribed to the period of the war of Vespasian. This is the opinion not only of De Saulcy, who assigns to the Vespasian period only those coins, but also of Ewald, who places the shekels along with them, and of Levy, Garrucci, and Madden, who join with them a more or less considerable portion of our Bar-Cochbe coins. This latter view is indeed indefensible, because these coins differ from the others essentially in style, so that Merzbacher renounces the attempt to fix their age (Zeitschrift für Numismatique, i. 223, iv. 364 f.). But if all the coins of our third, fourth, and fifth classes are placed in the time of Bar-Cochba, it will become probable, owing to the diversity of style, that the coins of the years II. and III. chêruth Zion belong to the time of Vespasian. In this case also De Saulcy has hit upon the right explanation.

It is of the utmost importance to determine the coins of the year IV., לגאלת ציון, ligullath Zion, communicated under No. 1. Many, on account of the admitted antiquity of their style, class them along with the shekel coins. So De Saulcy, Cavedoni, Biblische Numismatique, ii.; Ewald, Levy, Madden, 1864. Yet it is just their style which leads Garrucci to separate them from the shekels, and to place them in the time of Vespasian (Dissertazioni, ii. 32); and Madden, after he had, in complete contradiction to Garrucci, maintained their conteraporariness with the shekels (Num. Chron. 1866, pp. 48–63), at last only holds so far to that opinion that their reference to the Seleucidean period seems to some extent proved (Coins of the Jews, p. 73), while even Merzbacher is of opinion that they were not of the same period as the shekels (Zeitschrift, i. 222 f.), and are therefore to be reckoned only as ancient coins of an uncertain age (Zeitschrift, iv. 364). It is thus difficult to arrive at any decided judgment upon these matters.

APPENDIX V: PARTICIPATION OF GENTILES IN THE WORSHIP AT JERUSALEM

Considering the wall of rigid separation which, as regards matters of religion, the Jews had erected between themselves and the Gentiles, it would not readily occur to one that these latter were also permitted to take part in the worship at Jerusalem. And yet that such was the case is a fact as well authenticated as any fact could be. Nor are we thinking here of the large body of proselytes, i.e. of those Gentiles who, to some extent, professed their adherence to the faith of Israel, and who on this account testified their reverence for Israel's God by sacrificing to Him.

No, we have in view such as were real Gentiles, and who, in sacrificing at Jerusalem, would by no means care to acknowledge that in so doing they were professing their belief in the superstitio Judaica. There is however but one way of understanding this singular fact, and that is by reflecting how formal and superficial the connection often is, in practical life, between faith and worship, — a connection that originally was of so very intimate a character, — and also how this was peculiarly the case at the period now in question, The presenting of a sacrifice with a view to its being offered in some famous sanctuary was very often nothing more than an expression, on the part of the offerer, of a cosmopolitan piety, nay, in many instances a mere act of courtesy toward a particular people or a particular city, and not in the least intended to be regarded as indicating the man's religious creed. And if this was a thing that occurred in the case of famous sanctuaries elsewhere, why should it not take place at Jerusalem as well? There was no reason why the Jewish people and their priests should discountenance an act intended to do honour to their God, even though it were purely an act of politeness. As for the offering of the sacrifice, that was really the priests' affair; it was for them to see that this was gone about in proper and due form. And if the sacrifice were provided, there did not seem to be any particular reason for caring at whose expense it was so. In any case the Jew was not called upon, through any religious scruple, to decline a gift of this nature even from one who did not otherwise yield obedience to the law. And accordingly we find the Old Testament itself proceeding on the assumption that a sacrifice might be legitimately offered even by a Gentile (בֶּן נֵכָר). And so the Judaism of later times has also carefully specified what kinds of sacrifices might be accepted from a Gentile and what might not: for example, all were to be accepted that were offered in consequence of a vow or as freewill offerings (all נְדָרִים and נְדָבוֹת); while, on the other hand, those of an obligatory character, such as sin-offerings, trespass-offerings, and those presented by those who had issues, and by women after child-birth and such like, could not be offered by Gentiles. The offerings therefore which these latter were permitted to present were burnt-offerings, meat-offerings, and drink-offerings. Hence it is, that in enumerating the special legal prescriptions relating to offerings, there is frequently a reference, at the same time, to the sacrifices of the Gentiles as well.

The general fact, that sacrifices were offered by and in the name of Gentiles, is one that is vouched for in the most explicit way possible by Josephus, who informs us that on the occasion of the breaking out of the revolution in the year 6 A.D., precisely one of the first things done was to pass a resolution declaring that it was no longer lawful to take sacrifices from Gentiles. By way of protesting against such a proceeding, the opposite conservative party took care to point out that "all their forefathers had been in the habit of receiving sacrifices at the hands of Gentiles;" and that if the Jews were to be the only people among whom a foreigner was not to be allowed to sacrifice, then Jerusalem would incur the reproach of being an ungodly city. History records at least several remarkable instances of the matter now in question. When we are told, for example, that Alexander the Great once sacrificed at Jerusalem, the truth of this fact no doubt depends on how far it is historically true that this monarch ever visited that city at all. But be this as it may, the simple fact of such a thing being even recorded goes to prove that Judaism looked upon such a proceeding as perfectly legitimate and proper. Then Ptolemaeus III. is likewise alleged to have offered sacrifices at Jerusalem. Again, Antiochus VII. (Sidetes), while he was at open feud with the Jews and was in the very act of besieging Jerusalem, went so far as, on the occasion of the feast of Tabernacles, to send sacrifices into the city, presumably with the view of disposing the God of the enemy in his favour, while the Jews on their part cordially welcomed the sacrifices as a token of the king's sympathy with their faith. Further, when Marcus Agrippa, the distinguished patron of Herod, came to Jerusalem in the year 15 B.C., he there sacrificed a hecatomb, consequently a burnt-offering consisting of no

fewer than a hundred oxen. Once more, Josephus tells us with regard to Vitellius, that he came to Jerusalem at the Passover season in the year 37 A.D., for the purpose of offering sacrifice to God. How frequent such acts of courtesy or cosmopolitan piety were may be further seen from the circumstance that Augustas expressly commended his grandson Caius Caesar, because on his way from Egypt to Syria he did not stay to worship in Jerusalem. Tertullian is therefore perfectly justified in saying that once upon a time the Romans had even honoured the God of the Jews by offering Him sacrifice, and their temple by bestowing presents upon it. Nor are we to suppose that it is merely proselytes that are in view when Josephus describes the altar at Jerusalem as "the altar venerated by all Greeks and barbarians," and says of the place on which the temple stood, that it "is adored by the whole world, and for its renown is honoured among strangers at the ends of the earth."

In the class of sacrifices offered for and in the name of Gentiles should also be included the sacrifice for the Gentile authorities. As previous to the exile the Israelitish kings were in the habit of defraying the cost of the public sacrifices, so Cyrus in like manner is said to have given orders that whatever means and materials might be required for this purpose should be furnished out of the royal exchequer, at the same time however with the view of prayer being offered "for the life of the king and his sons" (Ezra 6:10). The fact of a sacrifice being specially offered in behalf of the sovereign (ὁλοκαύτωσις προσφερομένη ὑπὲρ τοῦ βασιλέως) is further confirmed by still more explicit testimony belonging to the time of the Maccabaean movement (1 Macc. 7:33). Consequently we see that even then, at a time when a great proportion of the people was waging war with the king of Syria, the priests were still conscientiously offering the sacrifice that, as we may venture to suppose, had been founded by the Syrian kings themselves. In the Roman period again this sacrifice, offered on behalf of the Gentile authorities, was precisely the only possible form under which Judaism could furnish something like an equivalent for that worship of the emperor and of Rome that went on throughout all the other provinces. We learn indeed from the explicit testimony of Philo, that Augustus himself ordained that, in all time coming, two lambs and a bullock were to be sacrificed every day at the emperor's expense. It was to this sacrifice offered "in behalf of the emperor and the Roman people" that the Jews expressly pointed in the time of Caligula, when their loyalty happened to be called in question in consequence of their having opposed the erection of the emperor's statue in the temple. And we are further informed that it continued to be regularly offered down till the time when the revolution broke out in the year 66 A.D. Then we have it, on the authority of Philo, that it was not merely a sacrifice for the emperor, but one that had been also instituted by him; a step which, in spite of his strong antipathy to Judaism, Augustus would probably deem it prudent to take from political considerations. It is true, no doubt, that Josephus affirms that the expenses connected with the sacrifice now in question were defrayed by the Jewish people themselves. Possibly however this historian himself was not at the time aware that the money to pay for the sacrifice came actually from the emperor. At the same time it would appear that, on special occasions, very large sacrifices were offered in behalf of the emperor at the public expense; as, for example, in the time of Caligula, when a hecatomb was offered on each of three different occasions, first on the occasion of that emperor's accession to the throne, then on that of his recovery from a serious illness, and lastly at the commencement of his campaign in Germany.

Besides offering sacrifices, it was also very common for Gentiles to bestow gifts upon the temple at Jerusalem. Pseudo-Aristeas, for example, gives a very minute account of the splendid presents which Ptolemaeus Philadelphus gave to the temple on the occasion of his requesting the Jewish high priest to send him a number of persons who would be sufficiently competent to

take part in a translation of the Old Testament into Greek, the articles presented being twenty golden and thirty silver cups, five goblets, and a golden table of elaborate workmanship. Although this story may belong to the realm of the legendary, still it may be regarded as faithfully reflecting the practice of the time. For, apart from this, we have it vouched for elsewhere over and over again that the Ptolemies frequently gave presents to the temple of Jerusalem. Nor was it different in the Roman period. When Sosius, in conjunction with Herod, had suceeded in conquering Jerusalem, he presented a golden crown. Marcus Agrippa too, on the occasion of his visit to Jerusalem to which we have already referred, presented gifts for the further embellishment of the temple. Among the vessels of the temple which John of Gischala caused to be melted during the siege were the wine goblets (ἀκρατοφόροι) that had been presented by Augustus and his consort. Altogether it was not in the least unusual for Romans to dedicate gifts to the temple. And so, strange to say, in this way even the exclusive temple of Jerusalem became in a certain sense cosmopolitan; it too received the homage of the whole world in common with the more celebrated sanctuaries of heathendom.

APPENDIX VI: THE SHEMA AND THE SHEMONEH ESREH

The Shema and the Shemoneh Esreh occupy, on the one hand from their antiquity, on the other from the high estimation in which they were held, so prominent a position in the Jewish liturgy, that further particulars concerning them must here be given.

1. The Shema consists of the three paragraphs, Deut. 6:4–9, 11:13–21, and Num. 15:37–41; therefore of those passages of the Pentateuch, in which is chiefly inculcated that Jehovah alone is the God of Israel, and in which the use of certain mementos is prescribed for the constant remembrance of Him. The three paragraphs are expressly named in the Mishna by the words with which they begin: (1) וְהָיָה אִם שָׁמֹעַ (2) ,שְׁמַע, and (3) וַיֹּאמֶר. Around this nucleus are grouped at the beginning and end thanksgivings (Berachahs); and the Mishna prescribes that two benedictions should be said before, and one after, the morning Shema, and two before, and two after, the evening Shema. The initial words of the concluding benediction are cited in the Mishna just as they are used to this day, viz. אֱמֶת וְיַצִּיב. If then the wording of the benedictions was subsequently considerably increased, they still belong fundamentally to the period of the Mishna. This prayer, or more correctly this confession of faith, was to be said twice a day, viz. morning and evening, by every adult male Israelite; women, slaves and children were not required to repeat it. It was not necessary that it should be recited in Hebrew, any other language being admissible for the purpose. How ancient this custom of repeating the Shema was, appears from the fact that the Mishna already gives such detailed directions concerning it. It mentions moreover that it was already repeated by the priests in the temple, which assumes the use of it at least before A.D. 70. Nay, for Josephus the origin of this custom is lost in so hoar an antiquity, that he regards it as an enactment of Moses himself.

2. The Shemoneh Esreh. Somewhat more recent than the Shema, but still very ancient as to its groundwork, is the Shemoneh Esreh, i.e. the chief prayer, which every Israelite, even women, slaves and children, had to repeat three times a day, viz. morning, afternoon (at the time of the Minchah offering) and evening. It is so much the chief prayer of the Israelite, that it is also called merely הַתְּפִלָּה, “the prayer.” In its final, authentic and fixed form it does not consist, as its name שְׁמוֹנֶה עֶשְׂרֵה denotes, of eighteen, but of nineteen Berachahs. Its words, as given in every

Jewish prayer-book, are as follow: —

“1. Blessed art thou, O Lord, our God and the God of our fathers, the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac, the God of Jacob, the great God, the mighty and tremendous, the Most High God, who bestowest gracious favours and createst all things, and rememberest the piety of the patriarchs, and wilt bring a redeemer to their posterity, for the sake of Thy name in love. O King, who bringest help and healing and art a shield. Blessed art Thou, O Lord, the shield of Abraham. 2. Thou art mighty for ever, O Lord; Thou restorest life to the dead, Thou art mighty to save; who sustainest the living with beneficence, quicken est the dead with great mercy, supporting the fallen and healing the sick, and setting at liberty those who are bound, and upholding Thy faithfulness unto those who sleep in the dust. Who is like unto Thee, Lord, the Almighty One; or who can be compared unto Thee, O King, who killest and makest alive again, and causest help to spring forth? And faithful art Thou to quicken the dead: Blessed art Thou, O Lord, who restorest the dead. 3. Thou art holy and Thy name is holy, and the saints daily praise Thee. Selah. Blessed art Thou, O Lord; the God most holy. 4. Thou graciously impartest to man knowledge, and teachest to mortals reason. Let us be favoured from Thee with knowledge, understanding and wisdom. Blessed art Thou, O Lord, who graciously impartest knowledge. 5. Cause us to turn, O our Father, to Thy law, and draw us near, O our King, to Thy service, and restore us in perfect repentance to Thy presence. Blessed art Thou, O Lord, who delightest in repentance. 6. Forgive us, our Father, for we have sinned; pardon us, our King, for we have transgressed; ready to pardon and forgive Thou art. Blessed art Thou, O Lord, most gracious, who dost abundantly pardon. 7. Look, we beseech Thee, upon our afflictions, and plead our cause and redeem us speedily for the sake of Thy name, for a mighty Redeemer Thou art. Blessed art Thou, O Lord, the Redeemer of Israel. 8. Heal us, O Lord, and we shall be healed; save us, and we shall be saved; for our praise art Thou; and bring forth a perfect remedy unto all our infirmities; for a God and King, a faithful healer, and most merciful art Thou. Blessed art Thou, O Lord, who healest the diseases of Thy people Israel. 9. Bless unto us, O Lord our God, this year and grant us an abundant harvest, and bring a blessing on our land, and satisfy us with Thy goodness; and bless our year as the good years. Blessed art Thou, O Lord, who blessest the years. 10. Sound with the great trumpet to announce our freedom; and set up a standard to collect our captives, and gather us together from the four corners of the earth. Blessed art Thou, O Lord, who gatherest the outcasts of Thy people Israel. 11. O restore our judges as formerly, and our counsellors as at the beginning; and remove from us sorrow and sighing; and reign over us, Thou O Lord alone, in grace and mercy; and justify us. Blessed art Thou, O Lord the King, for Thou lovest Righteousness and justice. 12. To slanderers let there be no hope, and let all workers of wickedness perish as in a moment; and let all of them speedily be cut off; and humble them speedily in our days. Blessed art Thou, O Lord, who destroyest enemies and humblest tyrants. 13. Upon the just and upon the pious and upon the elders of Thy people the house of Israel, and upon the remnant of their scribes, and upon righteous strangers, and upon us, bestow, we beseech Thee, Thy mercy, O Lord our God, and grant a good reward unto all who confide in Thy name faithfully; and appoint our portion with them for ever, and may we never be put to shame, for our trust is in Thee. Blessed art Thou, O Lord, the support and confidence of the righteous. 14. And to Jerusalem Thy city return with compassion, and dwell therein as Thou hast promised; and rebuild her speedily in our days, a structure everlasting; and the throne of David speedily establish therein. Blessed art Thou, O Lord, the builder of Jerusalem. 15. The offspring of David Thy servant speedily cause to flourish, and let his horn be exalted in Thy salvation; for Thy salvation do we hope daily. Blessed art Thou, O Lord, who causest the horn of salvation to flourish. 16. Hear our voice, O Lord our God, pity and have mercy upon us, and accept with compassion and favour these our

prayers, for Thou art a God who heareth prayers and supplications; and from Thy presence, O our King, send us not empty away, for Thou hearest the prayers of Thy people Israel in mercy. Blessed art Thou, O Lord, who hearest prayer. 17. Be pleased, O Lord our God, with Thy people Israel, and with their prayers; and restore the sacrificial service to the Holy of Holies of Thy house; and the offerings of Israel, and their prayers in love do Thou accept with favour; and may the worship of Israel Thy people be ever pleasing. O that our eyes may behold Thy return to Zion with mercy. Blessed art Thou, O Lord, who restorest Thy glory (שְׁכִינָה) unto Zion. 18. We praise Thee, for Thou art the Lord our God and the God of our fathers for ever and ever; the Rock of our life, the Shield of our salvation, Thou art for ever and ever. We will render thanks unto Thee, and declare Thy praise, for our lives which are delivered into Thy hand, and for our souls which are deposited with Thee, and for Thy miracles which daily are with us; and for Thy wonders and Thy goodness, which are at all times, evening and morning and at noon. Thou art good for Thy mercies fail not, and compassionate for Thy loving-kindness never ceaseth; our hopes are for ever in Thee. And for all this praised and extolled be Thy name, our King, for ever and ever. And all that live shall give thanks unto Thee for ever, Selah, and shall praise Thy name in truth; the God of our salvation and our aid for ever. Selah. Blessed art Thou, O Lord, for all-bountiful is Thy name, and unto Thee it becometh us to give thanks. 19. Great salvation bring over Israel Thy people for ever, for Thou art King, Lord of all salvation. Praised be Thou, Lord, for Thou blessest Thy people Israel with salvation."

From the contents of this prayer it is evident, that it first attained its finally authentic form after the destruction of Jerusalem, that is, after A.D. 70. For it presupposes in its 14th and 17th Berachah the destruction of the city and the cessation of the sacrificial service. On the other hand, it is already cited in the Mishna under the name שְׁמוֹנֶה עֶשְׂרֵה, and it is mentioned, that R. Gamaliel II., R. Joshua, R. Akiba and R. Elieser – all authorities of the beginning of the second century – debated whether all the eighteen thanksgivings or only a selection from them must be said daily, also in what manner the additions concerning the rainy season and the Sabbath should be inserted, and in what form to pray on New Year's day. Hence it must have virtually attained its present form about A.D. 70–100, and its groundwork may safely be regarded as considerably more ancient. This inference is confirmed by the definite information of the Talmud, that Simon the cotton dealer at Jabne in the time of Gamaliel II. arranged the eighteen thanksgivings according to their order, and that Samuel the Little, at R. Gamaliel's invitation, inserted the prayer against apostates (מִינִים), which makes it consist, not of eighteen, but of nineteen sections.