THEOLOGICAL

TRANSLATION FUND LIBRARY.

VOL. VII.

THE

RELIGION OF ISRAEL.

By DR. A. KUENEN.

VOL. III.

THE RELIGION OF ISRAEL

TO

THE FALL OF THE JEWISH STATE.

BY

DR. A. KUENEN,

PROFESSOR OF THEOLOGY AT THE UNIVERSITY OF LEYDEN.

Translated from the Dutch

BY

ALFRED HEATH MAY.

VOL. III.

WILLIAMS AND NORGATE,
14, HENRIETTA STREET, COVENT GARDEN, LONDON;
AND 20, SOUTH FREDERICK STREET, EDINBURGH.
1875.

TRANSLATOR'S PREFACE TO VOL. III.

THIS volume also has had the advantage of revision by the author, and by the Rev. Adam Milroy, of Moneydie, near Perth.

The analytical table of contents of the three volumes is given at the end of the present.

CONTENTS OF VOL. III.

THE RELIGION OF ISRAEL.

CHAPTER IX.

Judaism and Parseeism.

After Nehemiah had left the stage of history, the Jews remained under Persian rule for nearly a century. Our information as to their fortunes during that time is very defective. Flavius Josephus gives us but a single fact, and that of such a nature that it makes a very sad impression. The high-priest Johanan had a brother named Jeshua, who managed to ingratiate himself with Bagoses, a general of Artaxerxes II. surnamed Mnemon (404-361, B.C.), and obtained from him the promise that he should be appointed high-priest in Johanan's place. Probably this promise became known, or Jeshua, to hasten its fulfilment, sought a quarrel with his brother. At any rate the two brothers came to blows in the temple and Johanan killed Jeshua. Bagoses thereupon forced his way into the sanctuary and laid a heavy impost upon the people.* Thus the union of the spiritual and temporal power in one person already bore bitter fruit. The high-priesthood was made an object of intrigue; foreigners considered themselves qualified to bestow it and saw in it a means for their own profit. This incident, also, does not give us a favourable opinion of the spirit which prevailed in the family of the high-priest.

There are no other accounts which make amends for the silence of the Jewish historian. It may be assumed as probable, that during the wars and disorders which foretold the approaching fall of the Persian monarchy, Palestine did not remain unharmed. Especially the Jews cannot but have suffered during the war of Artaxerxes III. surnamed Ochus, against

* Jud. Ant. xi. 7, § 1.

Phœnicia and against Egypt (350 B.C. and the following years). But if they themselves have not preserved the remembrance of these events, the influence which they had upon their condition certainly was not great. They were indeed much too weak to play a part in politics, and, if they did oppose the Persian king, they were certainly compelled to do so.

In another, the spiritual domain, they were not idle during this century. It is true, the historical records do not mention what they carried out or prepared upon this ground before their incorporation into the empire of Alexander the Great, but yet proofs of their activity are not wanting and we can express ourselves on the subject with confidence.

"Moses received the thorah from Sinai and delivered it to Joshua, and Joshua to the elders,* and the elders to the prophets, and the prophets delivered it to *the men of the Great Synagogue;* these last spake three words: be cautious in pronouncing judgment; make many disciples; make a hedge around the thorah." So wrote one of the Jewish teachers about 200 years after the commencement of our era.† "The thorah" which he mentions is the so-called oral law or tradition, which, according to his conviction, had been revealed to Moses on Sinai as well as the written law, and had since been regularly handed down. We can understand without difficulty that he should make Joshua, the elders and the prophets deliver this tradition in turn. But who are *the men of the Great Synagogue* who replaced the prophets? and what do the three words mean which are put into their mouths?

We search in vain in earlier and later Jewish writings for a clear and unequivocal answer to the first question.‡ Their authors evidently had a misty and confused idea of that "Great Synagogue." They were sure that it had existed and had exercised great influence. They derived from it some most important elements and usages of later Judaism, *e.g.*, the liturgical prayers and the admittance of some of the sacred books into

* Josh. xxiv. 31; Judges ii. 7.

† Pirke Abôth. i. 1.

‡ Comp. *Hk. O.* iii. 414, sq.

the Canon. Here and there the number of its members seems to be fixed at 120. But the returns of their names are borrowed from the narratives of the Old Testament relating to the time after the exile, and are full of the most singular anachronisms. The most admissible representation seems to be that of the same author whose words I have just given. When he says immediately afterwards of Simeon the Just—*i.e.* of the high-priest Simeon II., about 200 B.C.—that he was "of the remnants of the Great Synagogue,"* it follows that this synagogue existed uninterruptedly for a considerable time, so that it fills up the empty space between the latest prophet and the teachers of the second century before our era. There are indeed satisfactory reasons for assuming that a college such as that of which tradition tells us under the name of "the Great Synagogue" was at work just at that time.

Let us call to mind what Ezra aimed at and by what road he endeavoured to attain his end. Henceforth the law of Moses was to be the rule of the faith and conduct of the Israelites; in their personal, domestic, and civil life they were to guide themselves by its precepts. For the attainment of this end it was necessary that that law should be made known and maintained, explained and applied. The necessity for this was so obvious that Ezra cannot have overlooked it. Moreover, the persons who should take this weighty task upon them, were indicated as it were. It was but natural that the great work should be carried on by those who had begun it: a *Scribe* had introduced the law, *Scribes* should see that it was executed. Who was there to dispute this task with them? After Ezra's time, just as before it, the priests continued to occupy the first rank in the Jewish state. Upon them devolved the guidance of public affairs and with them rested the ultimate decision. Many of them may have felt themselves drawn to the study of the Law, but the priesthood as such and in its entirety could not well devote itself to it; it had other and, it believed,

* Pirke Abôth. i. 2.

equally important and honourable duties to perform; in any case it laid no claim to exclusive competence for that study. Besides this, it was not in Ezra's plan to charge the priests, and in the first place their natural head, the high-priest, with the prosecution of his task. His reformation was rather opposed than furthered by many of them; Nehemiah, his fellow-thinker, had also met with more resistance than co-operation from them.* There would have been a bad prospect for the cause which these two men advocated, if its future had been made to depend upon the priests alone. Thus it lay quite in the nature of the case that the Scribes—who had already begun to form a separate order in Babylon†—should take up and carry on their work. Let it not be imagined, however, that the Scribes assumed a more or less hostile attitude towards the priests. At first this was not even to be thought of: the power of the priesthood was based beyond all controversy upon the very Law at the preservation of which they aimed, and was in point of fact great enough also to command their respect. Moreover, as we observed just now, many Scribes were of priestly descent, or at all events had sprung from the tribe of Levi. As Ezra himself was priest and Sopher, so this combination will originally have been the rule. Thus the co-operation of the two orders was provided for, and at first there was no talk of discord. The germs of the strife which was to burst out subsequently were present: a seer could even at that time predict that one day there would arise a conflict between the hereditary privileges of the Priest and the influence which the Scribe acquired by voluntarily devoting himself to his task. Nay, to us, who know the result, it seems most natural that in that struggle victory should remain with those who had entirely identified themselves with the Law; most natural that in Judaism, as it was sketched above, the lawyer triumphed over the functionary, the Sopher over the Priest. But, as I have said, at that time strife was scarcely yet

* Vol. II. p. 235, sq.

† Vol. II. p. 155, sq.

thought of, much less the outcome of the struggle. The Scribes could enter upon their task and go on in the path which Ezra had shown them, without contradiction on the part of the priests, nay, in agreement with them.

Now of the organization of the Scribes we know absolutely nothing. Did Ezra provide for their mutual co-operation and regulate it, at all events in its main features? Or was it the case that after his death a nucleus was formed naturally, with a view merely to exigencies actually occurring, from which the Sopherîm extended their activity over the whole of Judæa? One is as conceivable as the other. In either case Jerusalem was the recognised chief seat of the Scribes. There, then, we place "the Great Assembly" or "Synagogue." For, after what we have said, is it not obvious that no other than the Sopherîm, Ezra's successors, are referred to by this name? We are forced to this conclusion from all sides. "The men of the Great Synagogue" make their appearance precisely at the time when the Scribes must have begun their task. The activity and the "sayings" which tradition ascribes to them, are exactly those which we expect from Ezra's successors: we shall see this more clearly directly. The name, also, which they bear, is now easily explained. We shall shortly find that the synagogues and the Scribes are closely connected. It was thus most natural that their central assembly at Jerusalem, which was also a place of education for those who were to work elsewhere, should be called "the Great Synagogue." One can even conjecture that they held their meetings, not in the temple, but in a separate building in the capital, and that this, in contra-distinction from the smaller or less noted places of assembly, was called "the great synagogue." It is assuredly to be desired that we were not left in such uncertainty with regard to all this. Our conception lacks but too much of the clearness which results from the knowledge of details. Yet that of which we are ignorant is but a little thing in comparison with the great main facts which are beyond doubt. The *spirit* and the *manner*, namely,

in which the Sopherim worked, can be gathered with sufficient certainty from the results of their labours. For the sake of perspicuity we will pass in review *first* their labours in common, and *then* the influence which they exercised over the people.

First of all, they occupied themselves with the Law itself. "A ready scribe of the law of Moses:" there cannot but have been many soon after Ezra's time* who valued this title and earned it. But let it not be thought that they confined themselves to making copies. The text of the Thorah had been settled provisionally, it is true, but not at all in such a way that liberty to make alterations in it was forbidden. The immediate successors of Ezra of course knew very well that some portions of the Law—however old as to their contents—had been committed to writing but a short time before, and thus, with all their partiality for its regulations, they could not have any superstitious respect for its text. They were rather convinced that they were acting in their predecessor's spirit, in introducing those modifications which seemed to them absolutely necessary. It appears, at any rate, that this is what they did. *Regulations occur in the Law which are more recent than Ezra and Nehemiah.* Which regulations are these more recent additions or modifications, cannot always be said with certainty. Sometimes we can go no further than a more or less probable conjecture. But it is quite certain that alterations were made after the solemn promulgation of the Law (444 B.C.). One of these may be more particularly elucidated here, by way of example. In the record of the covenant which was brought about through the exertions of Ezra and Nehemiah, the Jews take upon themselves the obligation of bringing every year the third part of a shekel for the service of the sanctuary; the previous existence of a legal precept to this effect is decidedly shut out by the expressions used in that record.† But exactly such a precept occurs in the present Pentateuch, among the ordinances relating to the building of the tabernacle. "When"—it says‡—"thou

* Vol. II. p. 153, and elsewhere. † Neh. x. 32. ‡ Exod. xxx. 11-16.

takest the sum of the children of Israel . . . . they shall give every man a ransom for his soul unto Jahveh ; . . . . this they shall give, *half a shekel* after the shekel of the sanctuary." It may be asked, was not this a temporary precept, only intended to be observed at the numbering of the people in the wilderness ? But when we take into consideration the character of the narratives and laws relating to the tabernacle, this interpretation seems very improbable. And it is certain that the Jews attributed permanent validity to this ordinance, and upon the strength of it paid a tax of half a shekel to the temple every year.* The case therefore stands thus. After the people had voluntarily bound themselves, under Ezra and Nehemiah, to give the third of a shekel, it was deemed possible and necessary to make the contribution somewhat larger. The ordinance for this purpose was included by the Scribes in the Law itself, in the form of a precept respecting the tabernacle. Misconception, which might otherwise have been feared, was impossible, because the application of the new rule emanated from the very men who had drawn it up and knew its meaning better than any one else. Unless I be mistaken, this example is eminently adapted to teach us how the Scribes viewed their task. When the necessity for a modification of what existed became evident to them, they proceeded to make it without hesitation. But instead of announcing openly what they wished and why they wished it, they cautiously inserted in the Thorah a regulation which would give them an opportunity of introducing what seemed to them to be required.†

There is no doubt that a few other ordinances of the Thorah had the same origin, and among them, it would seem, some few regulations respecting the revenues of the staff of the temple. But most of the alterations which the Sopherîm made, were

* This is how the Chronicler already, 2 Chr. xxiv. 6, 9 (at variance with 2 Kings xii. 5), interprets the passage Exod. xxx. 11-36. Comp. Matt. xvii. 24.

† Compare, in connection with this and with the sequel of this survey, Note I. at the end of this chapter.

considerably more innocent and concerned only the form, Everywhere that they thought they perceived inequalities or omissions, they attempted to remove or supply them. Whenever, *e.g.*, the narrative raised an expectation which was not realized by the sequel, or there occurred in some law a reference with which the rest did not exactly correspond, it was their endeavour to restore the unity and accord. In this treatment of the text of the Thorah there is much that seems strange to us. In the first place, we often find it difficult to transfer ourselves to the standpoint of the Sopherîm and to admit, or even to understand, their verdict upon the incompleteness of the text or the paradoxes which occur in it: that which gave them trouble seems to us the simplest thing in the world, and, conversely, they did not stumble at what we call irreconcilable, *e.g.*, at the incessant conflict between Deuteronomy and the priestly laws. In the second place, it appears to us very singular and hardly compatible with the respect due to the Law, not to say with good faith, to simply alter what one thinks strange and fill in what one misses. But here too, in judging antiquity, we must detach ourselves from our modern ideas. What we should call great arbitrariness, was then thought to be required by respect for the Law. It is certain, *e.g.*, that the Samaritans, who honoured the Thorah as a divine book, did not scruple to make a number of alterations in it, intended partly to bring it into harmony with their peculiar position, and partly to clear away real or imaginary difficulties of a formal nature.* Now this the Jerusalem scribes did also, but on a smaller scale. They only once permitted themselves to make a more radical change. It was in the last chapters of Exodus. The narrative of the building of the tabernacle which we find there now,† usually agrees nearly literally with the precepts revealed to Moses on Sinai.‡ But the Greek translation of these chapters proves that the narrative was originally much shorter and was only

* Comp. on this subject also Note I. at the end of this chapter.

† Exod. xxxv—xl. ‡ Exod. xxv—xxxi.

made more conformable to the former precepts by degrees. We should consider that the execution of Jahveh's commands by Moses might be taken for granted, or at all events that it needed but few words to tell it. The Sopherîm thought otherwise. To them it seemed that the scrupulous execution of each separate command should be expressly stated in the narrative. What a singular combination of over-anxiety and boldness! It guarantees better than anything else that, whatever small alterations the Sopherîm may have allowed themselves, the main points not only remained untouched, but here and there were even placed in a somewhat clearer light. Hence it is that it was necessary to give a review of the contents of the Thorah, not here, where we are treating of the final redaction, but in the preceding chapter: "the Great Synagogue" did not depart from the spirit in which Ezra had laboured; it may have added a few regulations to his, but not one of the really important precepts of the priestly law was revoked or modified by that body.

But the Sopherîm did not occupy themselves exclusively with the Thorah. Jewish tradition tells us that the activity of "the Great Synagogue" extended to the entire canon of the sacred writings. Subsequently even the closing of the whole collection was attributed to it.* If, however, upon the strength of the above-mentioned† evidence as to Simeon the Just, we regard the year 200 B.C., or thereabouts, as the limit of the "Great Synagogue's" existence, the definite fixing of the canon is ascribed to it incorrectly: some of the writings included in it are younger than the year named, and moreover it is a positive fact that in much later times the admission or rejection of some books was disputed as an open question.‡ On the other hand, there is nothing to hinder us from assuming, in conformity with tradition, that the Sopherîm of Jerusalem furthered the collection of the sacred books. The first impulse towards this important work may have been given by Nehemiah himself, of

* Comp. *Hk. O.* iii. 421, sq. † p. 3.

‡ We shall revert to this in Chapters X and XII. Comp. also *Hk. O.* iii. 415, sq.

whom we read that "he founded a library and gathered together the writings concerning the kings and (of) the prophets and the (songs) of David and epistles of (Persian) kings concerning temple-gifts."* The very words of this account prove that there is no question here of admittance into a canon or of addition to the Mosaic law already invested with authority. Nehemiah seems to have had no other object than to preserve from destruction important writings from and relating to the previous centuries, and weighty state documents, in which the people were immediately interested. But it was very likely that a certain authority would soon be attributed to some of these relics. The writings of the prophets especially, after the decay of prophecy, were necessarily valued more and more highly. The Sopherîm would therefore collect them first of all, and perhaps propagate them more widely. To these, no doubt, they very soon added the historical books, which were attributed, not incorrectly,† to prophets, and, in the Hebrew Old Testament, still form one division with the books which we call prophetic. But as early as towards the end of the fifth century B.C., there were other writings besides these, which seemed to deserve a place by the side of the prophetic writings. In the account relating to Nehemiah we found mention of "the songs of David." Other poetical productions came into notice as well as these. So at all events the foundation was present of a third collection, which was afterwards to be added to "the Law" and "the Prophets," but the extent of which still remained indefinite for a very considerable time.

We have already said, but it must be emphatically repeated, that it was not originally intended to add to the Thorah a number of other books which, like it, were invested with a divine authority minutely described. But it results from the nature of the case that the prophetic writings, at any rate, were before long recognized as sacred books. The prophets themselves claimed to be respected as Jahveh's interpreters and desired that their

* 2 Macc. ii. 13. † Comp. Vol. I. 210, sq. and Vol. II. p. 104, sq.

written prophecies should be looked upon as Jahveh's words; in the course of time prophetic inspiration was gradually interpreted more mechanically and supernaturally; the fall of the Chaldean monarchy and the return from the exile were looked upon not only by the second Isaiah,* but also by his contemporaries and the succeeding generations, as the realization of the predictions of the older prophets, as actual proofs, therefore, of the divine origin of their preaching. After the prophets had left the stage of history, this view necessarily gained ground and by degrees acquired greater sharpness of outline. It was undoubtedly also embraced by the collectors of the prophecies. But however high their estimation of the prophetic words may have been, they did not place them upon a level with the Thorah. Much less did they attribute divine authority to the historical books: two centuries after Ezra's time, as will appear further on,† this was still entirely unthought of. So much the more did men feel themselves completely at liberty with respect to other literary remains which were admitted into the collection with the prophetic and historical books.

The word "collecting," of which I have more than once made use above, admits of a narrower and a wider interpretation. It can mean the bringing together of existing collections or book-rolls, and also the forming of those book-rolls themselves. To prevent all misunderstanding, it should be especially stated here that we speak of "collecting" in the latter sense. The critical study of the prophetic books shows that most of them were brought into their present shape not by the authors themselves, but afterwards, and frequently long afterwards. Hence it is that in some books, in consequence of an error which is easily explained, prophecies of various authors and different ages have been joined together and attributed to one author. Thus Isaiah ben Amoz, Hezekiah's contemporary, had ascribed to him not only his own prophecies, but also documents of much later times, from the latter half of the

* Vol. II. p. 123, seq.

† In Chapter X., in treating of the books of Chronicles.

Babylonish exile, and of even later date still.* And, conversely, prophecies from the 8th and the beginning of the 6th centuries B.C. were placed under the name of Zechariah ben Iddo, whom we learnt to know as a contemporary of Zerubbabel and Joshua.† The Sopherîm of Jerusalem, who charged themselves with the bringing together and redacting of existing documents, are answerable for these and other errors of the same sort. They were obliged in so doing to use a certain amount of freedom, and thus were in danger of making mistakes. For the rest, they usually confined themselves to admitting and arranging what they found. It was only here and there in the prophetic and historical books that they made the small alterations in the text which seemed to them absolutely necessary, to prevent misconception or for other reasons.‡

At least as important as the exertions of the Sopherîm in collecting the sacred books was their care for *the explanation and application of the Law*. It is of the highest importance that we should try to form an accurate idea of this: the right understanding of Israel's further religious development depends upon it. For this purpose we will first of all examine the relation of the Thorah to the actual state of the nation, and the practice of its daily life. A little reflection shows at once that the Law was not entirely sufficient for that practice, nay, was even in part unfitted for it. Some of its elements were two or more centuries old in Ezra's time, and were written with a view to circumstances other than those which presented themselves among the Jews after the exile. The younger documents were partly written or planned in Babylonia, and therefore were not fully calculated to meet the requirements of Judæa. Hence the Law contained a number of regulations which were wholly or partly impracticable. And further, a natural result of the various ages of the laws was their mutual

* Comp. Vol. II. p. 120, sq.

† Comp. Vol. I. p. 85, sq. and Vol. II. pp. 65, sq.; 208, sq.

‡ Comp. Note II. at the end of this chapter.

antagonism, which necessarily gave rise to repeated difficulties in their application. But above all the *incompleteness* of the legislation made itself felt at once and constantly afresh. Time after time cases occurred, for which the Law had not provided, and which yet belonged to its tribunal as much as many others which it did regulate. Also, the clearness and unambiguity of the legal precepts left much to be desired: how, *e. g.*, were the penal laws* to be interpreted and applied? It was no easy or simple task to clear away all these difficulties. The solution of the difficulties could not be left to individual liberty, to the private judgment of each Israelite, or of the judges, when they had to decide on a case actually before them. That would have been opposed to the legal standpoint which had been occupied. If liberty were once admitted, it would be very difficult to lay down limits for it; diversity of interpretation or application would arise at once; then the principle "it shall be done according to the law"† would soon be virtually given up. It was necessary, therefore, to take another and a less dangerous course. As everything was particularized and regulated as much as possible in the priestly Thorah already introduced by Ezra, so now an unambiguous decision, clothed with authority and applicable to all, seemed indispensable. But from whom should it proceed? There was no power in the Jewish state which could promulgate such a decision in its own name. The priesthood was not authorized to do so, except in its own limited domain. The Scribes themselves did not claim to be competent to introduce new laws: in the very earliest times—as was indicated above—they may have taken the liberty of admitting a few regulations into the Law, but they did so reluctantly, and as the Law became better known the use of this means was less to be thought of. Thus Judaism seemed at once to have become involved in a conflict from which there was practically no outlet. Yet it managed to escape from it in a wonderful way. The written regulations were modified, brought

* Comp. Vol. II. pp. 275-277. † Ezra x. 3; comp. Vol. II. p. 222.

into harmony with each other, amplified and explained, without, at least apparently, detracting from the authority of the letter. This was done through the rise and progressive development of *the oral law* or *tradition*, which accompanied the written law as an authentic explanation, and always kept it in harmony with the changing wants of the times. The oral law was in truth the work of the Sopherîm: it was they who expounded the written records and stretched or bent their precepts in such a way that they became quite suitable for the reality. But that which they inferred from the Thorah by way of deduction, was regarded as the verdict of the Thorah itself and was considered as holy as the latter. If, therefore, it was equal with it and yet was not included in it, it could only be looked upon as Mosaic *tradition* and as an oral law, in addition to the written law. The scribes persuaded themselves and others that their work was entitled to this name and to the authority which it brought with it. If any one thinks this strange, let him reflect, in the first place, that each successive generation of Sopherîm considered itself bound by the decisions of its predecessors, and thus really, next to the written Thorah, followed tradition; in the second place, that when the notion of the existence of the oral law had once arisen, the new ordinances were naturally added in that form, just as, *e.g.*, the younger prophets, following in the footsteps of the older, delivered their preaching as "the word of Jahveh," although it lacked the characteristics by which those predecessors had recognized Jahveh's revelation, in contradistinction to the fruits of their own meditations;* and finally, and above all, that the youngest, priestly documents of the Thorah embraced the written traditions of the Jerusalem priesthood, and that many a later decision was taken from those traditions. Thus there were reasons for placing those younger ordinances or further explanations upon the same footing as the Law. Nay, it was, properly speaking, the con-

* Comp. *Hk. O.* ii. 34, 39-43.

tinuation, in a somewhat modified form, of the same process: at a given period the existing tradition—of course not in its entirety, but in its main features—was written down; that which then remained unwritten, together with all that was added to it in the course of time, was not in its turn committed to writing, but was nevertheless regarded as valid and authoritative. What then could be more natural than that men should refer it to Moses as well as the Thorah, and gradually become convinced that the oral law had existed and had been observed alongside of the written law ever since the delivery on Sinai?

It is this idea, which we already found expressed above (p. 309) in the sentence of one of the later Jewish teachers, which was the starting-point of our whole study. It now no longer surprises us. A light is now shed, too, upon the third of the words which he ascribes to "the men of the Great Synagogue." "Make a hedge around the Law," they are reported to have said. The aim and the nature of their labours are rendered in that word with striking accuracy. The Law was indeed in danger of being trampled upon and of losing its character—as a guide for faith and life,—unless care were taken that it was kept up to the requirements of the times by continual explanation, application and extension. This "the men of the Great Synagogue" did. The oral law was the "hedge" set up by them round about the Thorah—the indicated and eminently effective means of preserving Judaism. Take away this tradition, and the indefinite authority of the Law soon suffers shipwreck upon the inexorable demands of the reality, which have at all times been found to be stronger than the most rigid theory. We are not surprised, therefore, that the same phenomenon which we have just observed, with the necessary modifications, has always presented itself when the highest authority was attributed to a book or a collection of books.

Thus far we have described the silent and, so to speak, the domestic labour of the Sopherîm. We will now examine how they worked abroad. This they did first of all by means of

the administration of justice, to which, also, the first of the sayings of the men of the Great Synagogue has reference. Can it be by accident that this saying does not tell us how they themselves administered justice, but contains an admonition which they addressed to others, to the judges? We rather see in it a confirmation of our opinion that "the men of the Great Synagogue" are no others than the Scribes, who, at all events in this capacity, were not charged with the practice of the law. In every city there were judges, who punished minor offences and settled every-day cases. Upon appeal and with respect to more serious transgressions the decision rested with the reigning aristocracy, the priests of Jerusalem, to whom at the same time many Scribes belonged. The "Great Synagogue" had now to take care that sentences were everywhere pronounced in accordance with the Law. What measures they took for this purpose, we do not know for certain. But it is a plausible conjecture, that those of them who attended to the reading of the Law in the synagogues — of which more shortly — also exercised a certain superintendence over the administration of justice and communicated the decisions of the Sopherîm to the judges. What we find written down as an order of Artachshast to Ezra, may also undoubtedly be interpreted as a description of their exertions in this respect: "Set magistrates and judges, which may judge all the people that are beyond the river, all such as know the laws of your god, and ye shall make them known to them that know them not."* If Ezra and Nehemiah once established the conviction that it was necessary that the Thorah should become a truth and reality in the life of the Jews, then it is evident, moreover, that the local and the Jerusalem judges sought the instruction which they required for the discharge of their office. There was no need to force it upon them. If there were but men such as the Sopherîm who undertook this task, and, as was the case at all events at first, found their advice respected by the highest tribunal, all the rest followed of itself.

* Ezra vii. 25

The influence of the Scribes spread still more widely by means of the *synagogues*. In Babylonia, when Jerusalem and the temple lay in ruins, the custom arose among the exiles of assembling from time to time, perhaps even every sabbath-day, and listening either to some words of comfort and encouragement spoken by one of the prophets of those days, or to the reading of oracles from former times. There too the custom must have been contracted of reading the Thorah in such assemblies, instead of the prophecies, and of explaining it as much as was necessary: probably this was the duty of men such as Joiarib and Elnathan, the "teachers" who undertook the journey to Judæa with Ezra.* Now we are nowhere told that Ezra introduced this custom into Palestine, nor that others did so after him. But we do read that he made use of the reading of the Law to bring about his reformation, and that this means had the desired effect.† This undoubtedly indicated to Ezra and his supporters that they should transfer the Babylonish plant to the soil of Judæa. The regular public reading of the Thorah was quite in harmony with the character of Judaism; nay, more, it was indispensable for its continuance. It is true, the temple was now restored and common worship was in full force and high esteem, but for the attainment of the end which Ezra proposed, attendance at the temple, which for all who lived beyond Jerusalem was confined to a few times in the year, was altogether inadequate. Thus it is extremely probable that the reading of the Law became the rule among the Jews through Ezra or his immediate successors. About three centuries after his time, buildings arranged for holding regular religious assemblies were to be found all over Palestine;‡ in the New Testament period there was scarcely any place in or out of Palestine where Jews were settled that had not its synagogue, and this institution was regarded as an

* Ezra viii. 16. Comp. Vol. II. pp. 155, sq. † Comp. Vol. II. pp. 226, sq.

‡ Ps. lxxiv. 8b. This psalm was composed about 167 B.C.; "God's places of assembly" are the synagogues.

ancient and indispensable element of their religion;* this also compels us to go back almost as far as Ezra's time for the origin of the weekly assemblies. We prefer to suppose that the custom of coming together at stated times to hear the Law, spread not all at once, but gradually, starting from Jerusalem. For this nothing more was really needed than that persons who were fit and ready to lead the way should come forward. Now for this the "teachers" who had accompanied Ezra or joined him afterwards, in a word, the Scribes, were the very men. In the same way that Ezra had set out for Judæa "with the law of his God in his hand," they too will have gone round to the cities and towns of Judæa with copies of the Thorah and have given their instruction everywhere.† When they had once been started, men went on further of their own accord. Some of the Scribes may very soon have established themselves in the most thickly populated places. In proportion as the rule contained in the second saying of "the men of the Great Synagogue" was observed more faithfully and more "disciples were made," so the number of cities and villages which had their own Sopherîm increased. If at first the inhabitants of a place assembled in the open air or in a private house, the want of a separate place of assembly soon made itself felt, and in after times such buildings were not sought for in vain even in the smallest villages. A room or building arranged for this purpose was called *kenéseth*, *beth-hakenéseth*, of which name the Greek *synagogue* ("assembly") is the literal translation. In the earliest times greater liberty was certainly allowed in the meetings. The reading of a portion of the Thorah, the explanation and edifying application of what had been read, and common prayer would not, of course, be omitted anywhere. But it was left to the conductor of the meeting to decide the length, the succession and the mutual relation of these elements

* Comp. especially Acts xv. 21; 2 Cor. iii. 14, 15.

† That which is stated in 2 Chron. xvii. 7-9, at variance with history, respecting Jehoshaphat's reign, can stand, almost unaltered, as a description of this work of the Sopherîm.

of the synagogic service. By degrees, however, unity and regularity obtained in this as well: the usages of the synagogues at Jerusalem were followed voluntarily elsewhere and perhaps were soon considered obligatory. Probably it already became the custom during the Persian period, or shortly after it, to open the meetings with prayer and with the delivery of some portions of the Thorah which were considered specially adapted to remind the assembled community of the main truths and duties of their religion.* This part of the service might be called the *confession of faith;* it still bears among the Jews the name of *shema'* ("hear") or *keriath shema'* ("reading of *shema'* "), after the first word of Deut. vi. 4 ("*hear,* O Israel, Jahveh our god, Jahveh is one"). It was followed by the *prayer (thephillah),* for which—we do not know since what time—set formulas were employed which are still in use to this day, to the number of eighteen or nineteen, and of which at all events the first and the last three seem to be of high antiquity; according to tradition, they were all actually introduced by "the Great Synagogue." After this came the *reading of the Law,* which was divided for this purpose—although not until later—into smaller portions, so that the whole could be read on the sabbaths in three years, or in one year. When Hebrew had ceased to be the people's language, the reading was followed by the *interpretation.* The custom of then reading a *portion from the prophecies* and of explaining and applying it in a more or less elaborate discourse,† is of unknown origin, but certainly of old date. The meeting was closed with benediction or prayer.—Among the customs which gradually arose, was certainly that of opening the synagogue, not only on the sabbath, but on other days as well, and especially on the second and fifth days of the week (Monday and Thursday), when the country-people brought their wares into the towns to market, and exchanged them for other necessaries.

All this has purposely been treated at somewhat greater

* Deut. vi. 4-9; xi. 13-21; Num. xv. 37-41.

† Comp. Luke iv. 16, seq.

length, since, to perceive the great importance of the rise of the synagogue, it was necessary that we should have some idea of its purpose and its customs. Its significance will now require no further demonstration. The centralization of worship in the temple at Jerusalem brought with it its peculiar dangers. It was to be feared that many, who did not live within the city of the temple, would by degrees become alienated from the religion, the celebration of which they so seldom witnessed. Yet, on the other hand, after Josiah's reformation, the one lawful Jahveh-sanctuary was so universally acknowledged in its exclusive right, that no one could think of building other temples: Jahveh dwelt on Zion; on Zion he desired to be served by sacrifices and feasts. The *synagogue* provided for existing wants, without detracting from the rights of the temple. Its founders did not dream of competing with the house of Jahveh at Jerusalem: fully convinced of its holiness and indispensability, they desired but a subordinate and most modest part for their own institution. It even seems that before long care was taken to render the dependence of the synagogues upon the temple conspicuous, by letting delegates from the community which assembled in a synagogue take part in the solemnities of the temple-service.* The assembly in the synagogue could thus be interpreted as the emblem of and as compensation for attendance in the temple, common prayer as the symbol of the sacrifice, &c. No objection of any sort could be made to such an institution from the point of view of the Law by the servants of the temple. It could, therefore, pursue its task calmly and undisturbed. And so powerfully did it develop, so eminently did it answer its purpose, that, according to the evidence of history, it was in a position at once to replace the temple, when the latter perished in the flames. At first it may have been like the creeper which cannot do without the support of the stem to which it has attached

* Comp. Herzfeld, *Gesch. d. Volkes Jisraël, &c.* iii. 188, 192, sq.; Jost, *Gesch. des Judenthums*, i. 168, sq.

itself—but when the stem is cut down, the creeper will be found to have strength enough of its own to live on and even to grow luxuriantly. In the mean time this its vital power was in fact that of Judaism, from which it is inseparable and which in it expressed its real nature. From the moment that the *Law* is acknowledged as the highest power, the institution that makes itself entirely subservient to the introduction of the Law into men's lives, has in principle a claim to the first rank; sooner or later its supremacy will become an actual fact.

We now find ourselves in a position to estimate the influence of the Sopherîm upon the religious development of the Jews, and to judge accurately the character of the period which they ruled. It is customary to bring more than one accusation against them. With what right this is done, we will investigate directly. Be these accusations well-grounded or not, it behoves us to begin by recognizing their great, nay, inestimable merits. In the Thorah, now filled in and enlarged in the priestly spirit, a foundation was given them upon which they *could* go on building; their Jahvism was *capable* of being popularized.* And they made use with most praiseworthy zeal of the opportunity thus offered of furthering the interests of the people. They were the instructors of the Jewish people, in the true sense of the word, and they set themselves the task of instilling belief in Jahveh and obedience to his laws, not into this or that man, but into all without distinction. Circumstances favoured them in this task. Comparatively, it was a small community which they had to teach. The field which was entrusted to them to cultivate was easily reviewed, and they ploughed the whole of it. The synagogue, which they introduced into Judæa, and gradually made more serviceable to their end, carried the "teaching" into the farthest extremities. Under their guidance every Israelite necessarily became penetrated with the conviction that religion

* Comp. Vol. II. pp. 254-256.

was a thing which concerned him personally. Through their agency, the Thorah, with its strict and comprehensive demands, came home to each one in particular. Henceforward nobody could plead ignorance—as in the days of the prophets—or excuse himself by saying that Jahveh's word was obscure or unattainable. "That word is very nigh unto thee, in thy mouth, and in thy heart, that thou mayest do it:"* the Sopherîm had a complete right to assert that through them this saying had become true.

This beneficial activity undoubtedly had its dark side. Religion could not well be brought within the reach of all without losing something of its spiritual character. It was very likely that many would confine themselves to what one might call the observance of religious ceremonies, to circumcision, the keeping of feasts, the prescribed sacrifices and purifications. We remarked before† that the Law itself, by its manifold precepts, favoured this conception of Jahvism, and we need not say that the new ordinances of the Sopherîm had the same effect. Thus one of the chief accusations made against them is, that their labours tended to make religion consist in outward observances and thus become a mere matter of formalism. But fairness bids us not overlook the fact that a more or less sensuous and formalistic conception of religion is inseparable from every lower stage of moral development. That which is a natural result of the condition of the Jewish people ought not to be placed to the account of the Scribes alone. Capacity for something higher and better could only develop itself by degrees. We must also remember that a similar conception of Jahvism had prevailed in Israel long before the time of the Sopherîm. The prophets had had to fight against it with all their might.‡ In their days it was even a good deal less innocent than now. Rebukes such as those of Jeremiah against the temple-frequenters of his time§ had become almost super-

* Deut. xxx. 14. † Vol. II. pp. 285, sq. ‡ Comp. Vol. I. pp. 57, sq.
§ Jer. vii. 3-10, and the similar passages.

fluous for the disciples of the Sopherîm, at all events they were only applicable to them very indirectly. It would therefore be most unreasonable to make them responsible for an error which they did not root out, it is true, but still less called into being, nay much rather—as will presently appear more clearly—they weakened by their instruction.

But there is something more. If we make it a reproach to the Scribes that they fostered the conception of Jahvism as a system of forms and ceremonies, justice requires us to prosecute our search further, and especially to examine how public worship was organized in their days and what direct and indirect influence they had upon it. Scarcely is our attention turned in this direction, before a most important fact strikes us: the great difference between the pre-exile and the post-exile temple-service. To express it in one word: *in the period of the Sopherîm temple-song and temple-poetry were at their prime.* The origin of both goes further back, perhaps as far as Josiah's reformation: not only priests and Levites, but also (temple-) *singers* returned to Jerusalem with Zerubbabel and Joshua.* But after the exile temple-song took a higher flight. The psalms which we still possess have been rightly called "the songs of the second temple."† Without as yet examining their contents in detail, we will now merely notice the fact that those who went up to the sanctuary, heard such songs of praise and prayer sung there. It is true, music had not been wanting in the religious ceremonies of former times,‡ but then it served chiefly to accompany the festive shouts and expressed no ideas.§ Now this was altered. Hymns in honour of Jahveh, songs of lamentation, lays with a moral tendency, were raised, either by a single singer or by a choir, according to their contents and form. Sacrifices were killed and part of them burnt upon the altar, just as formerly. But in proportion as these practices

* Comp. Vol. II. pp. 202, sq. and *Hk. O.* iii. 287-89.

† R. Dozy, *de Israëlieten te Mekka*, p. 23.

‡ 2 Sam. vi. 5, 12-15; 1 Kings i. 40; Amos v. 23; Isa. xxx. 29.

§ Comp. *Hk. O.* iii. 288.

were more common, the danger that they would be observed as meaningless ceremonies was greater. Their symbolic signification could very easily be lost sight of. On the contrary, there was no need for anyone to guess at the meaning of the temple-songs. The service itself had thus assumed a more spiritual character, and had been made subservient, not merely to symbolic representation, but also to the clear expression of ethic and religious thoughts.

This would not be noticed and valued by all. But in the estimation of those who were susceptible of religious impressions, attendance at the temple by this means acquired considerably higher significance and worth. This is much more than a mere supposition. The Old Testament itself affords us irrefragable proof of this altered view. What a pure and fervent love for the sanctuary pervades some of the psalms.* How mournful sound the complaints of those who were deprived of the privilege of going up thither. What an ardent longing inspires, for example, the poet of Ps. xlii. xliii. :

"As a hart that crieth for the water brooks,
So crieth my soul for thee, O God!
My soul thirsteth for God, for the living God:
When shall I come and behold God's countenance?"

"Send out thy light and thy truth—let them lead me,
Let them bring me unto thy holy hill and thy habitations;
That I may come unto the altar of God, the God of my joy,
And praise thee with the harp, O God my God."†

The temple which could draw such tones from the heart must in truth have afforded pure spiritual enjoyment to the pilgrim. And when the singers sang such songs as these, attendance at the temple was no longer a mere religious form, but at the same time a source of edification, a religious *exercise* in the moral sense of the word.

* I. a. in Ps. xxiii., xxvi., xxvii., lxxxiv., cxxii., cxxxii.-cxxxiv., cxli. Comp. *Hk. O.* iii. 306, sq.

† Ps. xlii. 1, 2; xliii. 3, 4. These two psalms are incorrectly separated from each other; they form one poem. Comp. Ps. xlii. 6, 12; xliii. 5.

Participation in the common worship—no burden, in the opinion of the pious Israelites themselves, but a privilege, in which they gloried with grateful affection: when we reflect upon this, is not a new light thrown upon the labour of the Scribes, in so far as it was directed towards the promotion of attendance at the temple and of the temple-service? But that light shines at the same time upon their work as a whole. We judge the Sopherîm wrongly, if we regard them as the censors of their nation, or imagine that their disciples felt oppressed under their guidance. It does not appear that the Jews, at all events at first, saw in the Law and the precepts added to it a yoke which, had it been possible, they would gladly have thrown off. Let us once more open the collection of Psalms. We search it in vain for complaints at the pressure of the Law. On the contrary, there is no lack of protestations of great liking for its ordinances and of gratitude towards Jahveh for the blessing which in and with it he has given to his people. These sentiments are expressed in a characteristic manner in the hundred and nineteenth Psalm, an alphabetical song of 22 times 8 verses, the theme of which is the praise of the Law and is worked out in endless variations. Here, one might say, the poet is lost in the scribe, and the affection for the Thorah, however well meant, is rather artistic than natural and enthusiastic. The author of Ps. xix. 7-14,* who also belongs to this period, clothes his conviction in a more attractive form:

"The law of Jahveh is perfect, converting the soul,
His testimony is sure and giveth wisdom to the simple;
The statutes of Jahveh are right, rejoicing the heart,
His commandment is pure, enlightening the eyes;
The fear of Jahveh is clean, enduring for ever,
His commandments are truth, altogether righteous:

* Vs. 1-6 are from another poet and probably of more ancient date.

More to be desired are they than gold and precious metal,
Sweeter than honey and the honey-comb."*

We certainly are not mistaken in seeing expressed in these words the feeling which animated the best among the Jews in the last century of the Persian period. Instead, therefore, of aversion to the Sopherîm, they showed a great susceptibility for following their tendency, which—as we remarked before†—was indeed born of the wants of the times, and united in itself all the requisite qualities for becoming popular in the true sense of the word.

Thus even if we must admit that the period of the Scribes was legal and not free from formalism, it appears at the same time that we might easily make too much of the evils therewith connected, and least of all are we justified in reproaching the Scribes with that which they in part had in common with the age, and in part rather neutralized than promoted. Nor is this saying enough. The work of the Sopherîm has its bright side as well as its dark side. It was their endeavour, as we saw, to make religion the property of the individual. This endeavour bore good fruit. Hitherto I have spoken as if the Scribes confined themselves to preserving and popularizing the treasures handed down to them, as if religion in their hands assumed a set form, or at all events was not developed. This, however, is only half of the truth. Their predecessors the prophets had been obliged to devote a good portion of their strength to the maintenance and defence of monotheism and to the struggle against idolatry. The Scribes made their appearance when that battle had been fought and monotheism had gained the victory. There was no necessity for them to discover new truths. If they but reflected upon the insight already obtained, they could not but arrive at most important deductions. In the idea of Jahveh's being which had grown up during the struggle, lay a mine of religious

* Ps. xix. 7-10.

† Vol. II. pp. 246, sq.

experience which had yet to be brought to light and would be found capable of many-sided application. Many Sopherîm, or, to speak more generally, many pious men in their time, perceived this and faithfully performed their task. It further lay in the nature of the case, that during their efforts to individualize religion, the national elements of prophetic Jahvism passed more and more into the background, and the universalistic human elements into the foreground. In the life of the individual, it was just the latter which could and necessarily did become reality. Surely that which is ethical belongs to man as man. The more a religious instructor applies himself to being practical and to satisfying the wants of personal and domestic life, the greater prominence will he give to those great truths in which most forms of religion agree. The prophet, whose labour is directed to Israel as a whole, involuntarily as it were lays stress on that which distinguishes Israel from other nations, on her peculiar relation towards Jahveh and all that is connected with it. The Sopher, who has to do with the single Israelite, does not, it is true, disown the national element—far from it—but yet need not draw his motives from it exclusively or in preference.

In the course of our further investigations the truth of what has been put forward here will gradually become more manifest. But it can be shown at once that our conception of the spirit of the Sopherîm and of the period which they ruled is not inaccurate. First, however, let me make one observation. Perhaps it has not escaped the reader's notice that there is a great resemblance between the practical and universalistic development of the Jewish religion, which has just been sketched, and the *Chokmah*, as expressed in the writings of the 8th and especially the 7th century before our era.* They particularly agree in this point, that the national elements in Jahvism retire as it were in both. At first sight it seems very strange, that the Scribes and the "wise" should concur: would

* Comp. Vol. I. pp. 333, sq., 387, sq.; Vol. II. pp. 45, sq.

one not rather expect them to be diametrically opposed to each other? do they not start from entirely different principles? This indeed they do. And yet there is nothing singular in their—always relative—agreement. Like causes produce like effects. The wise had taken no part formerly in the struggle between Jahvism and heathendom; in the period of the Sopherîm that struggle was at an end among the Jews. Here we have already a beginning of similarity between the two. Monotheism, embraced in full earnest, necessarily led forthwith to a calmer and juster judgment of the heathen world and of its moral and religious life. In the most recent of the prophetic writings, the oracles of Malachi, we already find a remarkable proof of this. When he represented to the Jerusalem priesthood, to their shame, that "from the rising of the sun unto the going down of the same *Jahveh's name is great among the heathen*," and that "*in all places* incense is offered unto him and a pure meat-offering"* — he must have believed that the heathen, although they gave their gods other names, yet really worshipped *Jahveh* and offered sacrifices to *him*. Nowhere in the earlier prophets do we find these thoughts expressed. There they would have been out of place, because *they* found themselves compelled by a sense of duty to be zealous against the service of those other gods. For Malachi that necessity no longer exists, and he at once rises to another view, which is much less hostile towards heathendom and does justice to the good intentions of the servant of strange gods. This was the standpoint upon which the wise had stood formerly and upon which the Scribes were able to place themselves now.—The Sopherîm had also this in common with the wise, that they made religious truth a subject for meditation and applied themselves to develop and bring to light the practical consequences which sprung from it. Thence again, in spite of the great difference which we may not overlook, they arrived, on many a particular, at one and the same conclusion. Thus it is by something more than

* Mal. i. 11.

accident that the Scribes and their disciples are so often called in the Talmud "wise" and "pupils of the wise:" in a certain sense they were actually the heirs and successors of those who had been indicated by these names in former centuries.

But I am under an obligation to prove the accuracy of the statement made concerning the modifications which the conception of Jahvism underwent in the period of the Scribes. We will again turn to the Psalms. We never, or scarcely ever, meet there with an idea which is altogether wanting in the prophets. And yet we can say that this collection represents a new phase in the development of religious thought. In the Psalms the prophetic truths are accepted, applied, made general. With regard to sin, its diffusion among mankind,* its origin† and character; to the forgiveness of sins;‡ to man's frailty and nothingness;§ to Jahveh's eternity and unchangeableness;‖ to the nature of true worship,¶ the Psalmists utter thoughts which we must admire for their purity and depth, even if they be but deductions from the ideas of the prophets. It is as if the Israelitish spirit were directed inwards upon itself in the Psalms and taking count of its riches. We are not surprised that these songs became more popular among Christians than any other part of the Old Testament. Religious truth seems here at times to have put off its national garb. To appropriate the prophetic ideas, the Christian must first divest them of their ligaments; that which the Psalmist offers him, he can often adopt unaltered: it has already passed through the crucible and so has become just fit for his use.

The devoutly religious tone of so many of the psalms must also be noticed here, and this the more, because we should hardly have expected it in productions of that age. In proportion as the conception of Jahveh's being became purer and

* Ps. xiv. 1-3; lxii. 10, Heb. (v. 9, Authorized Version); cxvi. 11; cxx. 1-4; cxliii. 1. 2. † Ps. li. 7, Heb. (5, A. V.); lviii. 4, Heb. (3, A. V.); ciii. 14.
‡ Ps. xxxii.; li.; ciii. 8-14. § Ps. xxxix.; xc.; ciii. 15, 16.
‖ Ps. xc. 1, 2, 4; xciii. 1, 2; cii. 26-28.
¶ Ps. l. comp. xl. 7, Heb. (6, A.V.), seq.

the sense of his infinite sublimity deeper, so the danger increased that his worshippers would fear him as "a god afar off," and inwardly would remain strangers to him.* But the prejudicial influence which the purer idea of the deity could have exercised and certainly did exercise upon some, was counterbalanced in others by the more personal conception of religion. It is true, the latter was not wanting in the prophets, but it comes out much more strongly in the Psalms: the communion of the individual with Jahveh is recognized there as the highest good and sought after with tears and prayer. We may already fix our attention here in anticipation on one of the fruits of this individualism. We saw before that the belief in Israel's perpetual existence as a nation was an important element in the conviction of the prophets.† But we have already found occasion more than once to remark that personal immortality was not included in that conviction.‡ This, however, necessarily changed as soon as the religious belief became more individual. From that moment the same arguments that pleaded for the perpetual existence of Israel, pleaded also for the endless life of a single human being. In a word, Judaism is on the road towards the adoption of the hope of personal immortality. We shall see hereafter in what form it appropriated it.

Can it still be necessary to caution my readers against misconception of the whole of this study? I do not, certainly, mean to say that all the Scribes, without distinction, followed the direction which has just been sketched. On the contrary, I believe that the great majority did not even think of it. But here, as everywhere, it is a question of principles and of what may legitimately be deduced from them. In opposition to the usual conception of the Scribes, I thought it my duty to point with all emphasis to the germs of higher and better things which they had in them and which they developed in their most eminent representatives. It was above all necessary to call attention to the intimate connection between the efforts

* Comp. Vol. II. pp. 111, sq., 125, sq., 246, sq. † Vol. I. p. 64, sq.
‡ l. c., p. 65, and elsewhere.

of the Sopherîm and the spirit which animated the younger psalmists. It is unreasonable and in conflict with history to place them *in opposition* to each other. When we assert that the piety of the psalmists developed itself in spite of—perhaps even from reaction against—the Scribes, we overlook both the fact that more than one trace of the influence of the Sopherîm is observable in the Psalms,* and that the (individualizing) efforts of the Sopherîm, when coupled with genuine religious feeling, *necessarily* bore such fruits as lie before us in many of the songs in the book of Psalms. This is incontestable, even though this side of the character of the Scribes did not come to light at once, or universally.

At any rate we have learnt to avoid one error: we no longer hold the period of the Sopherîm to be a time of stagnation. In reality there are no such times: now and then the movement is less rapid, but it is never absent altogether. But at all events it was not absent in the centuries which succeeded Ezra's time. For the Thorah itself was here and there rounded off and amplified; oral tradition grew up luxuriantly by its side; much, very much was done for the instruction of the people; the conception of religion did not remain stationary. All this, of which proof has now been given, bears witness much rather to active life than to stagnation. Now where life is, there is also susceptibility for receiving impressions from without. It will therefore surprise no one, that we have still to tell of this exterior influence. *Judaism and Parseeism* is the title of this chapter. We have already put off the treatment of this subject too long. But it was absolutely necessary first to examine Judaism itself and to study its inner life. It will now be easy for us to take count of the relation in which it stood to the religion of the then ruling nation, and to distinguish from the products of its own development the foreign elements which it adopted.

The circumstances under which, and the way in which, the

* Let the reader remember the predilection for the temple and the praises of the Law (above, pp. 23, sq., 25, sq.).

Jews came into contact with the Persians, were very fitted to impress them favourably towards this people and to render them susceptible to the influence which Zarathustra's followers were to exercise over them. Israel was groaning in exile and looking eagerly for deliverance, when the son of Cambyses, at the head of his tribe, threw off the yoke of the Medes and soon afterwards appeared as a conqueror. We saw before what a deep impression this revolution made upon the exiles. One of their number did not hesitate to greet Cyrus as "Jahveh's anointed," and to point to him as the coming deliverer of Jahveh's people, the restorer of Jerusalem and the temple.* As we are aware, the expectation was realized. One of the first acts of Cyrus, after the conquest of Babylon, was to grant permission to the Jews to return to their fatherland and rebuild Jahveh's house. It is true, this favourable disposition of the great king towards the Jewish nation did not always remain the same; it is true, their opponents succeeded now and then in drawing from him hard measures against the Jews; true, that the latter, in the course of years, were visited with a large share of the misfortunes to which the vassals of an Eastern despot are usually exposed — but yet that first favour was followed by many others, and, upon the whole, the disposition of the Persians remained friendly.† The Jews on their part responded to it with loyalty, which, as far as we know, was not violated even during the disorders of the last century of the Persian monarchy. When Alexander had already gained his victories on the Granicus and at Issus, the Jewish high-priest told him that he and his people would remain subject to the Persian king Darius Codomannus until that king's death.‡

Thus where the Jews came into contact with the Persians, there was also the possibility of reciprocal influence. The principal scene of their mutual intercourse can not have been Judæa. In these distant provinces of the kingdom the Persians

* Comp. Vol. II. pp. 124,138, sq.

† See in reference to all this Vol. II. pp. 143, 205, sq.

‡ Josephus, *Ant.* xi. 8 § 3.

were usually represented in very small numbers, and sometimes perhaps not at all; Syria, the province to which Judæa belonged, was certainly governed as a rule by a Syrian satrap. Babylonia was rather the ground upon which the two nations met. Many Jews stayed behind there, not only after 538 B.C., but also after Ezra's departure, 458 B.C. They were distinct enough from the population of the land to attract the attention of the Persians settled there, and they stood far enough above it to find favour with the ruling people. There, in Babylonia, therefore, the Jews became acquainted with the Persians and their peculiarities. Thence, too, some Jews may have migrated to Persia or Media,* where of course there was much more opportunity still for them to become familiar with the ideas and customs of their masters. For the rest, since the Babylonish Jews and those who resided abroad, in general, were in constant communication with their brethren in Judæa and with the temple, the centre of Judaism, the influence felt there was felt here as well.

But it is evident that the friendliness of the Persians and the gratitude of the Jews were insufficient of themselves to establish spiritual intercourse and the interchange of ideas. For this it was also necessary that there should already be a certain affinity of belief between the two nations, before they met: where this is wanting, there is a wall of partition run up, which will generally be found to be insurmountable. But the followers of Zarathustra and those of Moses fulfilled even this main condition. Nay, it may be said that there was more resemblance between their religious customs and ideas than between those of either of them and any other nation of antiquity.

This proposition need not be confirmed in detail, at all

* This migration is understood in the books of Esther and Tobit, which, it is true, cannot pass as genuinely historical—as will appear further on—but yet seem to represent the true state of affairs in this respect. Comp. among others, Esth. ii. 5, seq.; iii. 8, 15; ix. 6, seq., 13, seq.; Tob. i. 14, seq., &c.

events for those who are acquainted with "The Religion of Zarathustra," written by one of our countrymen as one of the series of "the principal religions."* There is an unmistakable affinity between Ahura-Mazda, the chief god of the Persians, and Jahveh. The spirits who surround the throne of the former correspond with the heavenly hosts at whose head Jahveh stands. Both religions show a strictly moral character. In both it is considered unlawful to make an image of the deity. Cleanness is prized by the worshippers of Ahura-Mazda as highly as by the servant of Jahveh; the purifications of both agree down to details.† Even in their ideas of the origin of the human race we notice similarities, which, most probably, must be explained by the adoption by the Israelites of an eastern-asiatic myth in a modified form.‡ We have already said enough to show that points of contact between the Persian and the Israelitish ideas and usages were indeed not wanting.

There is nothing strange, therefore, in the supposition that the intercourse between the Jews and Persians resulted in the modification or the enrichment of the religions of both or of one of the two nations. It may be said to be especially credible that the Jewish race, which was so much the less powerful and numerous, took this and that idea or ceremony from its rulers. If we also take into consideration, that the contact with the Persians coincides chronologically with important alterations in the religion of Israel, nay, that Ezra, from whom the reformation proceeded, was brought up in Babylonia—then we even think it no longer inexplicable that some have derived the whole of the later development of Judaism from Parseeism. "Not inexplicable," however, only in the sense that such a derivation has appearances in its favour. It cannot stand the test of a close examination. On

* C. P. Tiele, *de godsdienst van Zarathustra van haar ontstaan in Baktrië tot den val van het oud-Perzische rijk* (1864).

† Comp. Tiele, l. c., pp. 227, seq., 233, seq., 281, seq.

‡ Comp. Vol. I. 254, sq., 389, sq.; Dillmann in Schenkel's *Bibel-Lexikon*, ii. 49, sq.

the standpoint which we now occupy, we may even consider ourselves absolved from such an examination. All the foregoing has brought to light clearly enough the independence of Israel's religion in general and of the later Judaic development in particular. The birth and earliest history of Judaism have been explained in this and the previous chapter quite naturally, without any necessity for calling in the influence of Parseeism to our aid. Moreover, those who, on the ground of the resemblance between the two religions, make the one dependent on the other, must not shut their eyes to the no less great, nay, material difference—which is surely palpable enough. We will not dwell any longer, therefore, upon this opinion, which, besides, is now altogether obsolete.

It is quite otherwise with regard to a remark made by the author of "The Religion of Zarathustra," to whom we have just referred. He draws attention to the great affinity between the organization of the Jewish synagogue and the Persian worship. "The sacrifices and other sacred ceremonies of the Parsees were not tied down to a fixed religious centre; they were performed in all places, on every holy hill. Ezra did not follow this example and respected the ancient Israelitish tradition, only permitting the sacrificial service in the temple at Jerusalem. Places of worship, however, in which the faithful offered up prayer in common, sang religious songs and read the books of the law or the prophets, he established all over the land; and it would seem that this salutary reformation was an imitation of the custom of the Parsees to read the sacred books before the Mazdayaçnians, to repeat the ancient prayers before them, and to sing the holy songs before them or with them, at stated times."* One might assent to this entirely, without thereby detracting in any way from the independence of Judaism. But that assent can only be given with some limitation. We found, namely, that the synagogue cannot be regarded as a foreign plant; it was born on foreign

* Tiele, l. c., p. 283.

soil, it is true, but yet of Israelitism itself.* Thus the most that can be assumed is, that the Parsee worship hastened the development of the seed which already existed, or, in other words, that Ezra and the Sopherîm were the more ready to transplant the synagogue to the soil of Judæa, because such a worship as was practised there was also in use among the Persians, and was evidently a powerful means of cultivating religious feeling among the people. Interpreted in this way, the influence of Parseeism can be recognized, not only in the organization of the synagogue, but also in the whole priestly legislation, in the redaction of which Ezra, as our previous investigations show, took an active part. The precepts concerning *clean* and *unclean*, which occupy so large a space in it,† are of Israelitish origin.‡ But intercourse with a people such as the Persians, who possessed similar regulations and made their faithful observance a point of honour, may have contributed to cause the priestly traditions to be carefully written down, and, after they were committed to writing, to make them find acceptance with the Jewish nation.

Be this as it may, it can in no case surprise us that here and there elements of Parseeism were adopted by the Jews, or at all events by their spiritual leaders. There was no actual introduction of Parsee ideas or ceremonies. But more than one originally Parsee notion was first embraced by a few, then applauded by many, to be gradually naturalized at last in Judaism. If we examine more closely under what circumstances and how this occurred, we find that during and after the exile wants arose in Israel which Parseeism met, as it were. The Jewish religion develops itself independently and on its own ground in a certain direction. In consequence of this, voids make themselves felt in the traditional ideas. Where this is found to be the case, but only there, what is wanting in Judaism, and yet seems as if it ought not to be wanting, is borrowed from Parseeism. If I be not mistaken, the exami-

* Above, pp. 17, sq. † Vol. II. pp. 259, sq. ‡ Vol. II. pp. 31, sq., 94-96.

nation of the facts themselves will show that the influence of Zarathustra's followers remained confined within these limits. Only one exception must be made here, and that with respect to the Purîm-feast: it is very probable that it was borrowed from the Persians, but it cannot be demonstrated that its introduction satisfied a want which arose among the Jews themselves as a fruit of their own religious life. But other circumstances are involved here, as will appear in Chapter X, when we return to this subject. We will pass over the Purîm-feast for the present and confine ourselves to the remaining facts. To make our review of them as complete as possible, and not to disperse unnecessarily things which are closely connected, I will fix my attention not only upon the period of which we are now treating, but also upon the preceding and following centuries.

Perhaps even in Ezekiel, but certainly in Zechariah the son of Iddo, the contemporary of Zerubbabel and Joshua, we discover traces of the influence of the Persians, and this in *the doctrine of angels*. The belief in the existence and the activity of higher beings who are servants of Jahveh and carry out his will, is old-Israelitish.* In proportion as men conceived the distance between Jahveh and creation to be greater, or, to put it in another way, as the conception of Jahveh became more transcendent, the angels' office necessarily increased in scope and importance. Now the conception of Jahveh did indeed develop itself in that direction, from the beginning of the Babylonish exile.† We cannot wonder, therefore, that angels play so important a part even in Ezekiel and still more in Zechariah, and particularly appear as messengers between Jahveh and his envoy,‡ which does not occur at all in the older prophets. But at the same time it is probable that in this Zechariah at least imitated the Persians, with whom the heavenly

* Vol. I. p. 42. In the older historical narratives too, and above all in *Genesis*, angels occur repeatedly, and especially "the angel of Jahveh," who appears as his representative and speaks as though he were Jahveh himself.

† Comp. Vol. II. pp. 111, sq., 127-129. ‡ Comp. Vol. II. pp. 111, 211, sq.

spirits usually carry out Ahura-Mazda's commands. In one respect, at all events, the prophet is decidedly dependent upon Parseeism. When he speaks, namely, of *seven* eyes engraved upon a stone which Jahveh lays before the high-priest;* or of the *seven* arms of the golden candlestick;† or once even—according to a very probable correction of the text—of "*the seven watchers* of Jahveh, which run to and fro through the whole earth"‡—we naturally connect this with the *ameça-spenta's* ("non-slumberers"?) who surround Ahura-Mazda and are described as leaders of the heavenly host.§

The doctrine of angels continued to develop among the Jews in the same direction. In the 3rd century before our era we already find traces of belief in guardian angels of single nations.‖ A century later the author of the book of Daniel uses the same idea.¶ He, too, is the first who mentions the names of angels,** which proves that men began to think of them more and more in the likeness of man and ascribed to them a personal character, an individuality of their own. The same author uses, to indicate a certain class of heavenly spirits, the word "watchers,"†† which we just now believed we had found in Zechariah and which also occurs elsewhere.‡‡ Heaven gradually becomes more thickly populated with a number of higher beings, differing in their rank and the sphere of their activity, charged with a definite task and known by proper names. In some of these it is believed that we have Persian names of angels, translated or adopted with a slight modification.§§ But irrespectively of this, the influence of Parseeism in this increasing abundance of heavenly spirits is unmistakable.

* Zech. iii. 9.

† Zech. iv. 2.

‡ Zech. iv. 10. Usual reading, "the seven *eyes* of Jahveh, &c." The correction is put forward by Dr. A. Kohut, *über die jüdische Angelologie u. Daemonologie in ihrer Abhängigkeit vom Parsismus*, p. 6, n. 17.

§ Tiele, l. c., pp. 142, seq.

‖ Comp. Deut. xxxii. 8 (lxx.); Sirach xvii. 17.

¶ Dan. x. 12, 20, 21; xi. 1; xii. 1.

** Dan. viii. 16; ix. 21 (Gabriel); x. 13, 21; xii. 1 (Michael).

†† Dan. iv. 13, seq.

‡‡ The book of Enoch, chap. xx. seq.

§§ Comp. Kohut, l. c., p. 24, sqq.

Perhaps this is shown even more plainly in the Jewish belief in *wicked spirits*, and in the pre-eminently Wicked One, Satan. We ought, however, to make a distinction here. *Satan* is a Hebrew word which means "opposer," "accuser." Before the exile the poetical idea had already arisen in Israel, that in the council of heaven, among "the sons of God"* who surrounded Jahveh's throne, there was a "Satan," who had taken upon himself the task of pleading the unfavourable interpretation of man's character, and therefore could be charged by Jahveh with the allotment of misfortunes to mankind. This is the part which Satan plays, as we know, in the introduction to the book of Job.† Here he is still a servant of Jahveh, just as much as the other angels, and undertakes to carry out Jahveh's will. But the task which is given him is in accord with his nature, as expressed in the name which he bears. In the vision of Micaiah ben Imlah‡ all angels may equally aspire to carry out Jahveh's decision respecting Ahab's fall, and, in reply to a question addressed to all, "the spirit" (of prophecy) volunteers to perform the task; the poet of the Jobeid knows one among those heavenly beings who is marked out, as it were, for such punishments.—If we now open the prophecies of Zechariah, we find Satan still drawn there almost as he is drawn in the book of Job. He stands opposite Jahveh's throne, on the right hand of the high-priest Joshua, to accuse the latter.§ There is this amount of difference, that in this prophet Satan receives a rebuke on account of his attack on Joshua and on Jerusalem, so that he is already beginning to oppose Jahveh more than in the book of Job.‖ It would be hazardous to see the influence of the Persian notion of Anro-mainyus¶ in this small modification, were it not that the Jewish Satan subsequently acquired the traits of this spirit of darkness more and more: now there is nothing strange in the idea that the

* Ps. xxix. 1; lxxxix. 7; Gen. vi. 2, sqq.
† Job i. ii.
‡ 1 Kings xxii. 19-23.
§ Zech. iii. 1.
‖ Verse 2.
¶ Comp. concerning him Tiele, l. c., pp. 186, seq.

relative resemblance between the two figures was very soon noticed, and led to a somewhat modified conception of Satan. The latter has become exactly like Anro-mainyus in the Chronicler (third century, B.C.), who renders the older account, that *Jahveh* incited David to number the people,* in these words: "And *Satan* stood up against Israel and provoked David to number Israel."† This shows that the conception of the moral world had undergone an important change. The older Israelitish prophets and prophetic historians had not hesitated to derive even evil, moral evil not excepted, from Jahveh:‡ the belief that Jahveh directed all things was so strong in them, that they did not recoil from this consequence. Even the second Isaiah—perhaps with an eye to, but yet at variance with, the Persian dualism with which he was acquainted —had put these words into Jahveh's mouth:

"I form the light and create darkness,
I make peace and create evil,
I, Jahveh, do all these things."§

But it is not unnatural that objections to this conception should have arisen in the minds of some: Jahveh's moral purity seemed to them to be not uninjured by being thus made the immediate cause of sin. The remedy was at hand. Anro-mainyus was not unknown to the Jews and—Satan stood ready as it were to undertake his part.

When the first step upon this road had once been taken, men gradually went further. In the book of Tobit—an ethic romance, perhaps from the first century before our era, to which we shall revert hereafter—another wicked spirit, Aehsma-daeva, called here Asmodeus, is introduced as taking an active part.‖ About the same time we find a number of wicked spirits mentioned in the revelation of Enoch, and among them, it would seem, some of Parsee origin.¶ We know from the New Testament how wide an influence the popular belief of the Jews ascribed to "demons."

* 2 Sam. xxiv. 1. † 1 Chron. xxi. 1. ‡ Comp. Vol. I. p. 48.
§ Isa. xlv. 7. ‖ Chap. iii. 8; vi. 15, seq. ¶ Kap. 6, seq. (ed. Dillmann).

In the Talmud also and in other Jewish writings various wicked spirits occur, which have not incorrectly been identified with Parsee daeva's.* Thus it is most clearly evident that on this point especially Judaism proved very susceptible to foreign notions. It is true, that at all events in theory and in the minds of really pious men monotheism remained inviolate; God's direction of all things was not limited by the operations of the wicked spirits; therefore they were always subject to him. But by the introduction of these foreign elements the religious consciousness itself was considerably altered. In no other particular was it so deeply affected by foreign influence as in this one.

This last remark would be exaggerated and incorrect, had the Jews also taken their belief in personal immortality from the Persians. But this was not the case, however much Parseeism had to do with the formation and development of that belief. Let us begin by reviewing the facts. The book of Daniel was written before the middle of the 2nd century B.C. We find in it the expectation that "many of them that sleep in the dust of the earth shall awake, some to everlasting life and some to shame, to everlasting terror."† It is certainly not probable that the writer stood alone in this expectation, nor that it arose precisely in his days. We are not surprised, therefore, to meet in a writing of somewhat older date with allusions to belief in immortality, from which we may infer that it was embraced in the 3rd century B.C., at least by some.‡ Now we can account for this fact without having recourse to Persian influence. Jahveh's supremacy was acknowledged in Israel without limitation even before the exile; his dominion extended over the dead as well. "See now"—says Jahveh in "the Song of Moses," a production of the Assyrian period,—

"See now that I, even I, am he,
And there is no god beside me.

* Comp. Kohut, l. c., pp. 48, sqq.

† Dan. xii. 2.

‡ Eccles. iii. 21, in connection with chap. vi. 6; ix. 2, 5, 6, 10; xi. 8; comp. *Hk. O.* iii, 191, and below, Chapter X.

I kill and I make alive,
When I have wounded, I heal,
And there is no one that can deliver out of my hand."*

The same thoughts are also expressed elsewhere.† Men were even able to relate that Elijah and Elisha, the envoys of Jahveh, had raised the dead.‡ The expectation that a resurrection would follow death, could easily attach itself to such a belief in Jahveh's unlimited power. Now after the Babylonish exile, as we have already seen,§ there came over the religious consciousness of the Israelite this great change, that he began to conceive his relation to Jahveh as something individual, as a personal matter, much more than formerly. So the hope—and, since Jahveh did not lack the power, the trust—in the immortality of the individual naturally superseded the belief in *Israel's* perpetual existence. The one results so regularly and naturally from the other, that the thought of foreign influence does not occur to us at all. The same is true, to a certain degree, of the form which the belief in immortality assumed, the resurrection of the dead. The first who mentions it is Ezekiel: in an ecstasy he beholds a valley full of men's bones, which afterwards become clothed with flesh and animated by Jahveh's spirit.‖ According to the prophet's own explanation, this is purely symbolic: the revival of the dead bones is the type of the restoration of the dead Israelitish nation.¶ But it is a symbol which could easily be interpreted literally, because the Israelite's ideas of the human body and soul and their mutual relation hardly admitted any other notion of man's existence after death than that of resuscitation, *i.e.*, of the miraculous restoration of the body, into which the spirit returned. It is Jahveh who gives man—or, more generally, man and beast—*spirit, i.e.*, life, the breath of life;** he is "the god of the spirits of all flesh."††

* Deut. xxxii. 39.
† 1 Kings xvii. 22; 2 Kings vi. 35; xiii. 21.
‖ Ezek. xxxvii. 1, seq.
** Gen. ii. 7; Eccles. xii. 7.
† 1 Sam. ii. 6.
§ pp. 29, sq.
¶ Verses 11-14.
†† Num. xvi. 22; xxvii. 16.

As soon as Jahveh takes back the breath of life, man and beast die;* or, as it is expressed elsewhere, "the spirit returns to God who gave it."† But that spirit does not live on, at all events not independently or individually; if anything remains of a man after his death, it is his shade, which goes down into Sheol,‡ but cannot be held to *live* there, in the true sense of the word.§ The "spirit" must therefore be breathed into that shade—or into the body of which it is the shadow—by Jahveh afresh, if the person is to begin a new life in his entirety. Of itself now it would be far from strange, if the Jews had been led by their own reflections to the notion of such an awakening, not exactly of all the dead without distinction, but of departed Israelites. Let it be taken into consideration, however, that the hope of a resurrection from the dead also existed among the Persians, and is held with high probability to be an original element of Zarathustra's doctrine.‖ Let it also be remembered that it is found in the book of Daniel, side by side with a partition of history into four periods, followed by the Messianic age, which displays great resemblance to the idea which the Persians formed of the course of the development of the world.¶ Does it not become extremely probable, therefore, that Parseeism was not entirely foreign to the rise and the first growth of the Jewish dogma? Must we not also assume here, that the germs which lay hidden in Judaism were fertilized by contact with a religion in which they had arrived at maturity?

If I have succeeded in sketching the line of thought which ended in the enrichment of Judaism with the ideas of which we have here treated, the reader will no longer wonder at the admission of these foreign elements; he will rather think it natural that the Jewish religion proved susceptible to the

* Ps. civ. 29. † Eccles. xii. 7.

‡ Consider such passages as Gen. xxxvii. 35; 1 Sam. xxviii. 19; 2 Sam. xii. 23.

§ Comp. Vol. I. pp. 64, sq.

‖ Comp. Tiele, l. c., pp. 250, seq., and especially p. 256.

¶ See on this subject Chapter X.

influence of Parseeism precisely at these points. Yet he will not on this account imagine that these newer ideas found equal favour with all, or that there was no opposition to them. Every departure from existing things excites contradiction, and particularly when it takes the shape of imitating the foreigner and can therefore be resisted as anti-national. If it be a question of the introduction of novelties into religion, such a resistance usually shows itself with special force. Thus we can but expect that the conservative spirit will not fail to declare itself among the Jews. But at the same time we are prepared to find that the Scribes—in whom we have surely noticed life and movement—will not pay that spirit unqualified homage. The Greek period, which now opens before us, will fully confirm this conception of the course of further development.

NOTES.

I.—*See pp.* 7, *n.* †; 8, *n.* *.

The subject which is merely touched upon in the pages referred to above, is very intricate, and will undoubtedly long occupy the attention of critics, nay, will perhaps never be settled in a thoroughly satisfactory manner. The researches made of late years have clearly proved that formerly the problem had been laid down too simply; thus they have brought us further on the road, it is true, but at the same time have, at any rate apparently, placed the solution further off. That which formerly passed almost as an axiom: the preservation inviolate and the handing down of the text, both of the Old Testament in its entirety and of the Thorah in particular, can now no longer be allowed. It ought rather to be admitted—especially with Geiger and Popper—that even after the (provisional) completion of the books of the Old Testament, greater and lesser modifications, interpolations, &c. have been made in

them. Thus the line of demarcation between the history of the origin of the books and the history of the text is less sharply defined than was formerly imagined; it appears that the growth —if I may so express myself—of the old-testament writings lasted longer than was at first thought.

We have not now to do with the Old Testament in its entirety, however, but only with the Pentateuch—although the book of Joshua cannot well be separated from it. We shall not treat here of the whole of the final redaction even of these books; we shall give and confirm by proofs only so much as is absolutely necessary to substantiate the results which are included in the history of the religion on pp. 6, sqq.

Let us begin by describing the point in question. To do this it is first of all necessary that we take count of the meanings of the words which are constantly used in researches such as this. We have already remarked that in treating of the Pentateuch we do not exclude the book of Joshua: it is so closely connected with the Mosaic writings that all that is true of the latter can and must be applied to that book also. But what are we to understand by the *redaction* of the Pentateuch? We mean by this: *the combination of the priestly with the deuteronomic and prophetic elements*. The reader will remember that the Deuteronomist himself joined his laws to the already existing prophetic narratives (Vol. II. pp. 39-41). From the moment that the priestly portions (laws and narratives) were combined with this legislative and historical work, the *Pentateuch* existed. How numerous and great soever any alterations which have been made since may have been, the main character of the book was fixed, so to speak, as soon as the conjunction of the two elements had taken place.

Now we already know that the priestly documents are neither from one hand nor from one time. We have shown (Vol. II. pp. 182-192) that the author of "the Book of Origins" had an older priestly legislation before him and borrowed largely from it, especially in Lev. xviii.-xxiii., xxv., xxvi. But

besides that one collection he most probably made use also of other, detached laws, portions of the priestly tradition, which, for some reason or other, had been committed to writing before his time (comp. Vol. II. pp. 94-97). It is true, therefore, that the priestly laws and narratives which were linked with those of the Deuteronomist and the prophets formed one whole—in so far as they breathed one spirit and had passed through the hands of one author—but their unity was relative, and excluded difference of origin as little as it did the mutual antagonism of the parts.

It is precisely this that renders the problem that we are now handling so intricate. *If* alterations have been made and younger portions introduced since the redaction of the Pentateuch, then they of course agreed with the youngest, *i.e.* the priestly, elements. But then it is necessarily very difficult to say in each particular case whether that which we see points to interpolations, modifications, &c., which occurred *after the redaction*, or to want of unity and uniformity in the priestly portions, in the state in which they were combined with the deuteronomic and prophetic parts *at the redaction*. Criticism must proceed here with the utmost caution, and must never lose sight of the double possibility which we have just pointed out.

But before all things it is necessary to show that the first possibility referred to is something more than an abstraction, or, in other words, that facts do really compel us to admit that modifications posterior to the redaction have been made in the text. The following considerations lead to this conclusion.

I. It will not do to reject *a priori*, on the ground of the respect which the Jews had for the Thorah, the hypothesis that such alterations have been made—let us say, for shortness' sake, since the year 444 B.C., the date of the record of Neh. x. It is true, it is undeniable that that respect restrained them from making even the slightest alteration in the sacred text at a later—the post-masoretic—period. But at first, and particu-

larly in the period over which our present search extends, this was not the case. *The Samaritan Pentateuch* exists to prove this. A complete list of its deviations from the Masoretic text is now given by H. Petermann, *Versuch einer hebr. Formenlehre nach der Aussprache der heut. Samaritaner* (Abhandlungen für die Kunde des Morgenl. vol. v. no. 1 : Leipzig, 1868), p. 219-326. Many of those differences are ordinary variations which are of no interest to us here. But in more than one place the Samaritan allowed himself to *improve* the original, chiefly by filling in that which—apparently or in reality—was wanting in the parallel passages. Of this nature are the alterations which he made in Gen. xxx. 37 (comp. chap. xxxi. 11-14); Exod. vi. 9 (comp. xiv. 12); vii. 18; viii. 19; ix. 5, 19; x. 3 (where it is expressly stated again and again that Moses really said to Pharaoh the words which Jahveh had put in his mouth)—and in about twenty other passages of the Pentateuch as well. Comp. Popper, *der bibl. Bericht über die Stiftshütte*, pp. 68-71.

Now we have not the slightest right to affirm that such a treatment of the text of the Thorah was peculiar to the Samaritan, and foreign to the Jew. Probability itself is in favour of their having both followed the same method. Besides, we have a conclusive proof of this in the Greek translation of the Pentateuch. Its agreement with the Samaritan recension is generally admitted, among others, by Gesenius, *de Pent. Samar. origine*, cett. pp. 10, sqq.; Thiersch, *de Pent. vers. alex. libr.* iii. pp. 49, sqq. Precisely because it is not perfect, but fragmentary, it furnishes the strongest evidence both for the Jewish origin of the deviations which we now meet with in the work of the Samaritans, and for their propagation in the manuscripts of the 4th and 3rd centuries B.C. It is also worthy of remark here, that we also find a few of the above-mentioned interpolations in the Greek translation, notably those in Num. iv. 14; xii. 16; xxi. 11, 12. Others, in fact the majority, are wanting, and thus were perhaps not introduced till later, after the Hebrew

code, which the Alexandrine translator had before him, was finished.*

But it is unnecessary to dwell longer upon this, for

II. it has been shown—by Dr. J. Popper, in the work just cited—that Exod. xxxv.-xl.; Lev. viii. (the description of the building of the tabernacle, &c.) stand in more than one respect upon a line with the Samaritan amplifications, and were only gradually made so conformable to Exod. xxv.-xxxi. (the precepts respecting the building of the tabernacle, &c.) as is now the case in the Masoretic text. After repeated consideration of Popper's demonstration, I must, *in the main*, agree with him. His two chief arguments [(1) the grammatical peculiarities in which Exod. xxxv. seq. differ from Exod. xxv. seq.; (2) the text of the Greek translation of Exod. xxxv.-xl.] certainly do not prove that Exod. xxxv.-xl. did not receive its present form till about the middle of the 3rd century B.C., but they do prove (1) that, at all events in part, it is from a different hand and is younger than Exod. xxv.-xxxi.; and (2) that about the middle of the 3rd century B.C. it had not yet been included in all manuscripts, and especially occurred in a shorter form in the code of the Alexandrine translator. There are, in particular, conclusive reasons for holding Exod. xxxvi. 8—xxxviii. 20, to be a younger amplification. Graf, l. c., p. 86, n. is also of this opinion. Nöldeke, on the contrary, l. c., pp. 56-61, declares against Popper, without however refuting his

* One passage in the Pentateuch was altered by the Samaritans in the interest of their temple on Gerizîm. Instead of: "When ye be gone over the Jordan, ye shall set up these stones — — — *on mount Ebal*" (Deut. xxvii. 4), they write, "When ye — — — *on mount Gerizîm.*" If, namely, Moses himself ordered an altar to be erected on that mountain, the Samaritan temple obtains an authority of which even the sanctuary at Jerusalem cannot boast. The Samaritans were so taken with this passage as proving that authority, that they twice repeated it in their Pentateuch, once in Exod. xx. 17, and once after Deut. v. 18 (Petermann, l. c., pp. 254, 308), immediately after the Decalogue, therefore, with which this precept is thus, as it were, placed upon the same footing. In this case, therefore, they were guilty of deliberate falsification of the text. The rest of the modifications which they permitted themselves to make were equally arbitrary, but were introduced in good faith.

evidence, which he only knows at second hand—p. 56, n. The diffuse repetition, considered entirely by itself, seems to me also to be no conclusive proof of the later addition; it may much rather be asserted that in the B. of O. it is quite in place and in perfect harmony with the author's style. But besides this, other phenomena occur here, namely the two just mentioned, which can be satisfactorily explained only by a difference of age and author: to these, and especially to the deviations of the LXX., Nöldeke does not do justice. Schrader (De Wette's *Einl.* i. 285, n. 48) contents himself with referring to Nöldeke. Those who do not accept Popper's conclusion are undoubtedly bound to consider his painstaking demonstration, and, if possible, to disprove it, with closer attention than they have hitherto bestowed upon it.

If the Sopherîm did not recoil from amplifications such as these, they will not have abstained from small alterations in the text, where these seemed of use, either to prevent misunderstanding or to obviate antagonism to other passages. I shall return to this point in the next note, in order now to proceed to handle,

III. the legal ordinances, which certainly, or at any rate with high probability, must be regarded as younger than the year 444 B.C. As the first proof of this, we have already mentioned and illustrated as much as was necessary, pp. 6, sq.

A. Exod. xxx. 11-16. Let what we have said there be compared with Popper, l. c., pp. 194, sqq.; Graf, l. c., p. 63.

This instance does not stand alone. It appears to me that such interpolations must be assumed,

B. in Lev. i.-vii. and viii.-x. Both these groups of laws are handled by Kalisch in his *Hist. and Crit. Commentary on the O. T., Leviticus*, Part I. (London, 1867); the former by Merx in Hilgenfeld's *Zeitschrift*, vi. (1863) pp. 41-84, 164-181. In contradistinction not only from previous exegesists, but also from Knobel (who only makes an exception in favour of Lev. x. 16-20; see below) Kalisch and Merx deny the unity of the

groups handled by them, and point out in them evident traces of working-up and amplification. In the mean time they by no means agree together, and their criticism frequently leaves upon one the impression that the separation of the original elements from those which were added subsequently is coupled with almost insuperable difficulties. This is not the place to judge their divergent opinions. I can the more readily abstain from doing so, because the redaction of the sacrificial laws is certainly partly of older date than that of the Pentateuch, and thus need not be discussed here. But, unless I be mistaken, the two groups also include documents of very late date, in which the hand of the Sopherîm after Ezra's time betrays itself. This applies first of all to Lev. x. 16-20 (comp. Knobel, *Exod. u. Levit.* p. 430, sq.; Kalisch, l. c., pp. 704, sqq.). This pericope is *a.* from another hand than the preceding one, and is based *b.* upon an incorrect interpretation of Lev. vi. 30. For surely *a.* the writer, who just before (Lev. x. 6-8) had related that Aaron and his sons were not allowed to perform any act whatever of mourning, and that, at Moses' command, they had eaten their allotted portion of the meat and thank-offerings (verses 12-15)—cannot have allowed Aaron's sadness to pass as a sufficient motive for him to abstain from eating the sin-offering, as (according to Lev. x. 17, 18) he was bound to do. In addition to this, there is the fact that the burning of the sin-offering, for which Aaron's sons are blamed in Lev. x. 17, 18, had been stated in Lev. ix. 11, 15 to have taken place under Moses' eyes without the latter opposing it or objecting to it. How can the author who tells us this have been able to relate subsequently that Moses "diligently sought the goat of the sin-offering"? But *b.* besides this the interpretation of the law from which Lev. x. 16-20 starts is inaccurate. The rule was, namely, that the flesh of the sin-offerings for the High-priest and for the people might not be eaten, but had to be burnt. This is expressed in Lev. vi. 30 in these words: "No sin-offering, whereof any of the blood is brought into

the tabernacle of the congregation to reconcile withal in the holy place, shall be eaten: it shall be burnt in the fire." The comparison of Lev. iv. 5-7 (11, 12); 16-18 (21) shows that this really refers to the sin-offerings for the High-priest and for the people. Now "the goat of the sin-offering," of which Lev. x. 16-20 treats, was a sin-offering for the people, Lev. ix. 15, and thus it was right that it should not be eaten, but burnt. But the writer of Lev. ix. had not said that the blood of that goat was brought into the holy place; he rather, in verses 8-11, excludes this ceremony—probably because Aaron and his sons were still undergoing consecration to the priestly office and therefore could not enter the holy place; perhaps, also, because he was not acquainted with or forgot Lev. vi. 30. The author of Lev. x. 15-20 is unable to get over his predecessor's silence on this point, concludes that a breach of the law has occurred, and endeavours, by his interpolation, to excuse it. The question now is, when was that interpolation made? The opinion of Knobel, who thinks that it was borrowed from the "Kriegsbuch" (!), is quite beyond our consideration. Kalisch (p. 706) points to the fact that Moses occurs here, not as an instrument of Jahveh, but as a human lawgiver who bursts into a rage and is subsequently appeased by the excuse offered by Aaron—which he might have thought of himself; Kalisch gathers from this that the representation of this dispute dates from an earlier period, and compares Num. xxxii. 6, seq. But surely it is incontestable that this pericope was written after Lev. vi. 30 and Lev. ix.? Besides this it strikingly resembles the discussions of the later Jewish doctors which have been preserved to us in the Talmud. I am ready to admit that the author is a liberal man, for he subordinates the observance of the precepts of the Law to the state of mind of those upon whom it is imposed, or, in other words, applies after his own fashion the *nil humani a me alienum puto.* But such a view was not strange among the Sopherîm either. The fact that Moses is depicted here as guilty of hastiness is, in my opinion, entirely

incidental: the legal question which the author of the interpolation wished to settle had to be brought in somehow or other, and who could do it but Moses? Comp. Lev. xxiv. 10, seq.; Num. xv. 32, seq.

A second interpolation of subsequent date may perhaps be observed in those verses of Lev. vii. which define the priests' share in the various sorts of sacrifices, Lev. vii. 8-10, 28-34, to which verses 35, 36 belong as a subscription. Chap. vi. 26: vii. 6, 7, where the sin- and the trespass-offerings are assigned to the priests, may have led to the introduction into the sacrificial laws of regulations in the interest of the priesthood with regard to the burnt-, meat- and thank-offerings as well. Comp. further Kalisch, l. c., pp. 545, sqq., 554, sqq.

C. Neither can I regard as untouched the laws relating to *the tithes*. My arguments are as follow. The bringing of the tithes to the Levites (and of the tenth part of the tithes to the priests, sons of Aaron) is ordered in Num. xviii. 21-24 (25-32). The perusal of this law leaves us in uncertainty upon a very weighty point: do the Levites receive the tenth part of the harvest only, or also of the cattle which is born in the course of the year? So much is certain, that the tithes of cattle are not expressly mentioned. It may be asserted that they are included in the general formula: "all the tithes in Israel," verse 21; "the tithes of the children of Israel," verses 24, 26, &c. But they are not indicated beyond doubt. It may even be asked whether verses 27, 30 do not exclude them. If the author of this law had been thinking of the tithes of cattle as well, would he have been able to write that the resignation of a portion of the tithes to the priests should be reckoned as an offering (therûmah) on the part of the Levites, "as though it were the corn of the threshing-floor and as the fulness of the winepress?" At all events this comparison was much more likely to be used, if the tithes consisted of the fruits of the field and the trees, and of nothing else.

In the meantime, it is certain that the tithes of cattle are

exacted in another priestly law, Lev. xxvii. 32, 33. After the tithes *of the land,* "whether of the seed of the land or of the fruit of the tree," have been mentioned in verses 30, 31, "all tithes of the herd or of the flock" are added.

How are we to look upon this ordinance? Is it really of the same purport as Num. xviii. 20-24, only somewhat clearer or more detailed? Or does it embrace a new demand in the interest of the Levites, and thus serve to supplement and extend the other (and in that case the older) law in Num. xviii.?

So long as we confine ourselves to comparing the two laws with each other, it is scarcely possible to answer this question. But, independently of these laws, there are facts which, it seems to me, must lead to a decision of the point.

In the first place, it must not escape our attention, that in Deuteronomy the tithes of *cattle* are not mentioned at all. It will be remembered that the Deuteronomist assigns the tithes of the harvest (not to the Levites, but) to Jahveh, and commands the Israelites to eat them in sacrificial meals (Vol. II. pp. 26, 257, sq.); thus he had every opportunity of mentioning the tithes of sheep and oxen as well, nay, he could not have omitted to speak of them, had he known anything of them. This is a fact of the highest significance. The priestly lawgiver pre-supposes throughout the state of things which is regulated in Deuteronomy; whenever he deviates from it he has to express himself clearly and unequivocally. This the author of Num. xviii. 20-32 has *not* done, if it was his intention to require the tithes of cattle. No one, occupying the standpoint of Deuteronomy, and reading the law in Num. xviii., would suspect that the latter gives to the tithes a wider compass than they had before.

In the second place, we observe that in the book of Nehemiah mention is made more than once of the payment of the tithes, but always in such a manner that the tithes of *cattle* are either not named or even definitely excluded. Read

Neh. x. 37-39, where the Israelites bind themselves to deliver up to the Levites "the tithes *of their ground*," and this "in all the cities of their tillage;" it is afterwards laid down that the Levites in their turn shall give the priesthood its share, consisting (verse 39)—of oxen and sheep? no—of "corn, new wine and oil;"

Neh. xii. 44-47, where again, among other offerings, the tithes are mentioned, in connection with the chambers in which they were stored in the temple: it is improbable in itself that cattle were stalled there as well;

Neh. xiii. 5, where once more—as in chap. x. 39—"the tithes of corn, new wine and oil" are spoken of;

Neh. xiii. 12, according to which passage—taken from Nehemiah's own memoirs—the whole of Judah, at his instance, brings up "the tithes of the corn and the new wine and the oil," but, as far as we know, of nothing else.

How are these accounts to be explained, unless it be assumed that the obligation to pay tithes of *cattle* did not yet exist in the days of Ezra and Nehemiah, *i.e.* was not included in the Law till after their time. Is it conceivable that the tithes should be mentioned four times, and that each time the tithes of oxen and sheep should *accidentally* be passed over in silence?

For these reasons I hold Lev. xxvii. 32, 33 to be a later interpolation. In opposition to this view, it is possible to appeal—not to Malachi, who in chap. iii. 8, 18 speaks of tithes in general, without defining them more closely, but—to 2 Chr. xxxi. 5, 6, where we read that as early as in Hezekiah's time tithes were paid of sheep and oxen, among other things. But anyone who is acquainted with the Chronicler and his method, will readily admit that this evidence proves nothing at all. All that can be deduced from it is, that Lev. xxvii. 32, 33 stood in the Law in the writer's time: it is precisely on that account that he is convinced, and mentions as an historical fact, that in the reign of the pious king Hezekiah this part of the

revenues of the Levites was also paid without fail. Comp. Graf, l. c., pp. 168, sqq.

D. It appears to me, finally, that the originality of the precept to offer a burnt-sacrifice to Jahveh in the name of the community *twice* a day, in the morning *and in the evening*, is also open to doubt.

We find this precept in Exod. xxix. 38-42; Num. xxviii. 3-8. The words "which was ordained in mount Sinai," in verse 6 of the latter law, seem to refer to the former, with which it is *almost* identical in tenor. If this be so, we must regard Num. xxviii. 3-8 as a repetition of Exod. xxix. 38-42—included in the list of the festive sacrifices for the sake of completeness. But opposed to this course there are the facts that this ordinance respecting the daily burnt-sacrifices is really out of place in Exod. xxv.-xxxi., and that the text in Exod. xxix. seems to be less original and younger than that in Num. xxviii. Popper (l. c., pp. 190, sq.) infers from this that Num. xxviii. is the original, and that Exod. xxix. 38-42 was included in the precepts relating to the tabernacle subsequently. For our present purpose this point of dispute is of subordinate importance.

The daily burnt-offering is also alluded to in other passages in the priestly legislation. Some of these allusions have peculiarities which, in connection with other phenomena which occur elsewhere, afford matter for reflection.

Lev. vi. 8-13 (Hebr. text, 1-6) is almost identical with the two laws first-mentioned. It is prescribed there that the fire on the altar is never to be put out. It appears from verse 9, that the author of the law is already acquainted with the evening burnt-offering. And as in verse 12 he talks of "the burnt-offering" which must be arranged upon the wood "every morning," it is at least probable that he has in view here—not burnt-offerings in general, but—the morning burnt-offering, to be offered in the name of the community.

In Lev. iii. 5, the *morning* burnt-offering is again under-

stood, but the evening burnt-offering is by no means excluded; the lawgiver had simply no occasion to mention it.

Lev. ix. 17. Aaron kindles a meat-offering "beside the burnt sacrifice of the morning." The remark just made is applicable here as well.

In themselves these three passages present no sort of difficulty. The difficulties come from without. For,

Ezekiel ordains, chap. xlvi. 13-15, with an eye to the future, a daily offering, but only one, to be offered in the morning. As in Exod. xxix. and Num. xxviii., it is a lamb of the first year, and is accompanied with a meat- and a drink-offering. But, according to Ezekiel, this additional gift consists of one-sixth of an ephah of flour and one-tenth of a hin of oil; according to the Pentateuch it consists of one-tenth (of an ephah) of flour, one-fourth of a hin of oil and one-fourth of a hin of wine. This difference is less remarkable, however, than that mentioned first: the absolute silence of the prophet with regard to the *evening* burnt-offering—one of the many proofs that he was unacquainted with the priestly law: how could he, knowing that law, have passed over or abolished the continual evening sacrifice? Compare Vol. II. pp. 115, sq.

This conclusion is most strikingly confirmed by 2 Kings xvi. 15—which passage proves that in the days of Ahaz, 741-725 B.C., (probably even in the days of the author, *i.e.* about the time of the Babylonish exile) *a morning burnt-offering and an evening meat-offering* were offered upon the great altar. This evidence is indirectly confirmed by 1 Kings xviii. 36, where the meat-offering is mentioned, quite in passing, as an (ordinary) evening sacrifice.

At the same time, nothing more follows from these two passages than that the priestly ordinance respecting the *two* daily burnt-offerings also did not exist before the exile—of which we were already certain, upon the ground of our previous researches with regard to other priestly laws. We are brought somewhat further by two accounts from the time after the exile, namely

Ezra ix. 4, where Ezra tells us that he sat "until the evening meat-offering"—the same expression as in 2 Kings xvi. 15. What reason had Ezra for mentioning the meat-offering (the *minchah*), if it was merely offered as an accessory to the burnt-offering? Would he not *necessarily* have written "until the evening *burnt*-offering," if such a sacrifice had been customary at that time?—and

Neh. x. 33. Here the Israelites, in the record of which we have spoken before, bind themselves to bring every year one-third of a shekel, for, among other things, "the continual meat-offering and the continual burnt-offering." Thus these two offerings are named here *side by side*, again exactly as in 2 Kings xvi. 15. No one would be likely to imagine from Neh. x. 33 that they belong together, nay, form one indivisible whole. But then surely we are not at liberty to explain the record of the covenant by the priestly law, *as it now runs*, but must rather admit that the *double* daily burnt-offering is of later date than the year 444 B.C., or, in other words, *was included in the Law after Ezra's time*.

Should any one think that it will not do to regard at all events *three* pericopes of the priestly thorah (Exod. xxix., Num. xxviii., Lev. vi. 8-13) as later interpolations, he may, necessarily, assume that the author of the record in Neh. x. involuntarily bound the people, not to that which the law newly introduced prescribed, but to the still existing custom which that law endeavoured to modify. Such an hypothesis, however, is not probable. Now that it is an ascertained fact that alterations were made in the Thorah after Ezra's time, we really have no right to set arbitrary limits to them.

With respect to the subsequent introduction both of the tithes of *cattle* and of the *evening* burnt-offering, I am unable, as far as I know, to appeal to a single predecessor. But I unhesitatingly submit my views to the opinion of those qualified to judge, although, as a matter of prudence, I have not included them in the text of my History.

Compare also upon the subject handled in this Note, my essay on the priestly elements in the Pentateuch and Joshua, in the *Theol. Tijdschrift*, vol. iv.

II.—*See p.* 12, *n.* †.

The subject touched upon in the page cited above is also much too wide to be thoroughly handled in a note such as this. I shall therefore confine myself to a few hints.

I. The recollection that "the Sopherîm" had permitted themselves to make alterations in the text of the Old Testament survived in the Jewish schools. With regard to the various forms which that recollection assumed, Geiger, *Urschrift und Uebersetzungen*, pp. 308, sqq., deserves to be consulted. It gradually became the general conviction, that the ordinary Masoretic text of the Old Testament contained *eighteen* of those "corrections of the Sopherîm" *(Thikkûnê Sopherîm)*, which are therefore enumerated in the Masorah, *e.g. Ochlah w'ochlah*, herausg. von D. S. Frensdorff (Hannover, 1864), p. 113, where the "correction" (Hebr. *thakan*) is attributed to Ezra—proving that the Sopherîm to whom it is usually ascribed are the older Scribes or "the men of the Great Synagogue." Now a careful consideration of these eighteen readings shows that they are by no means all of the same kind. It will have to be granted to Geiger (l.c.) that the tradition is incomplete and also frequently represents obscurely or even quite incorrectly the real meaning of the Sopherîm. But this much is certain, that here and there the "Thikkûnê Sopherîm" betray a tendency to remove imaginary or real difficulties by means of a slight modification in the text. This is true, in my opinion, of

Gen. xviii. 22. Original reading: "and Jahveh stood yet before Abraham." Correction: "and Abraham stood yet before Jahveh."

Num. xii. 12. Original reading: "Let *us* not be as one dead (a still-born child) at whose issue from *our* mother's womb *our* flesh is half consumed." Verse 11 shows, namely, that Aaron looks upon Miriam's leprosy as a punishment which affects him as well; they being brother and sister, it could well be said, now that the sister was a leper, that *half* the body of the one born dead, of whom Aaron speaks, was consumed. The Sopherîm made *three* alterations here: "let *her* not be;" "from *his* mother's womb;" "*his* flesh." The two latter are expressly pointed out as "thikkûnê Sopherîm;" the first is not. Comp. Geiger, l. c., pp. 384, sq.

Hab. i. 12. Original reading: "Art thou not from everlasting, O Jahveh my God, mine holy one, *who dieth not?*" Correction: "we shall not die."

Other "corrections" must be judged in the same way. But it is unnecessary to enlarge upon them here. For our purpose it is enough to know that, *according to tradition itself*, the Sopherîm sometimes acted as correctors.

II. Now it lies in the nature of the case that of these "corrections" only a few were openly acknowledged and were handed down by tradition. By far the most of them were made secretly and must now be inferred by us from the language and the context, sometimes too with the help of the old translations. Geiger, in the work quoted above and in other of his writings, has devoted great acumen to this subject. I am convinced that he goes much too far, when he ascribes almost all differences of reading to the love of correcting, and hardly notices the other causes from which those differences result—the involuntary errors of the transcribers, with their unavoidable consequences. But if he has been guilty of exaggeration, his theory is not on that account less true. Phenomena occur in the text of the Old Testament which scarcely admit any other explanation. I will give a few instances here, partly borrowed from Geiger and partly the result of my own observations — the preference being given to those which speak

plainly, and, according to the old translations, plead for modifications of the text in the period of "the Great Synagogue." As is the case sub I, a few are taken from the Pentateuch, which fared no better than the other books in this respect.

Exod. xx. 24. Original reading: "In all places where thou shalt praise my name" (Hebr. *thazkîr*). Correction: "in all places where I record my name." Comp. Vol. II. pp. 81, sq. and the treatise by Geiger cited there.

Exod. xxxii. 4. Original reading (preserved in Neh. ix. 18.): "This is thy god, O Israel, that brought thee up out of Egypt." Correction: "*These be* thy *gods*, O Israel, which brought thee up out of Egypt." According to the narrator, the golden calf is an image of Jahveh (comp. verse 5); the Sopherîm hold it to be an image of a false god. Comp. Geiger, l.c., pp. 285, sq.

1 Sam. ii. 22b (comp. Exod. xxxviii. 8). See *Godg. Bijdr.* of 1864, p. 472.

1 Sam. iv. 4; 2 Sam. vi. 2. See Vol. I. p. 259 with regard to the alterations made here.

1 Sam. vi. 15. "The Levites" certainly did not occur in the original text; they were introduced in order to bring the narrative at any rate into some sort of harmony with the (younger) legal precepts respecting the handling of the ark. Comp. Vol. II. p. 302.

1 Kings viii. 4. It has already been observed above (Vol. II. p. 301) that the original text ran: "and the Levitical priests brought it up." By the addition of *and* this was turned into: "and the priests and the Levites brought it up." This may be an accident, but still the hypothesis is more probable that we have here a deliberate alteration, intended to introduce into the narrative the distinction between priests and Levites, which men took from the Thorah and did not like to miss here.

1 Kings ix. 25. The original text ran: "And three times in a year did Solomon offer . . . . unto Jahveh *and burnt incense before Jahveh.*" These last words were utterly opposed

to the later notions concerning the exclusive fitness of the priests to perform such acts. To remove the offence, one of the Sopherîm inserted: "he that was with him" (Hebr. *aschér ittho*), so that the text now ran: "*and he that was with him* (namely, the priest) burnt incense before Jahveh." Subsequently, when the meaning of this interpolation was not understood, the two inserted words were transposed, and thus the present text, which is utterly unintelligible, originated.

But I have said enough to illustrate my meaning. To the above we must now add

III. that the Sopherîm, although they allowed themselves to make such slight alterations as these here and there—and perhaps, if Geiger's opinion is confirmed by further research, sometimes undertook larger interpolations in the text of the prophetic and historical writings—yet *upon the whole* handed down that text faithfully. The "Ueberarbeitung" which Geiger ascribes to them was not in any case such a working-up as to touch and make unrecognisable the original character of the books. The conclusive proof of the truth of this proposition lies in this, that we are able, with the help of the prophetic and historical books, to bring to light the younger origin of the priestly portions of the Thorah. Starting from the irrefragable testimony borne by the prophets and historians concerning their own time, its convictions and usages, we show that they were unacquainted with the Law—which the Sopherîm took as their highest authority. We could not possibly succeed in doing this, had not the writings of those men come down to us *upon the whole* in the form in which they themselves left them. The truth of this remark may be further confirmed, as far as the historical books are concerned, by comparing their contents with those of the Chronicles. We shall revert to this directly, in the beginning of Chapter X. We shall then see clearly that the author of the Chronicles has as it were revised and corrected throughout the statements of his predecessors, to bring them into harmony with his conception of the course

of divine revelation to Israel. Nothing less than such a recasting could render the older description of Israel's history available in the century in which the Chronicler lived. Had the Sopherîm felt at liberty, or considered it their duty, to make the prophetic histories agree thoroughly and entirely with the views of their day, the difference between those books and the Chronicles, which is now obvious to the most superficial observer, would not exist.

The Chronicler teaches us at the same time, why the Sopherîm were able to abstain from a complete redaction of the older historical books. The freedom with which he handles them, supplements and alters their accounts, would be altogether inexplicable, had divine authority been attributed to those books in his days. But if this was *not* the case, then the Sopherîm too were not obliged to alter the testimony of those writings as much as was necessary to confirm their conviction. They could then value those historians' support, but could, if need be, do without it. We have every reason to rejoice that at first they felt so independent of those witnesses of a former day, that they could hand down their statements inviolate to a later generation.

CHAPTER X.

Judaism in Palestine under the Greek Dominion and the Asmonæan Princes.

A new epoch dawns upon Palestine and upon the whole of the East in the last years of the fourth century before the Christian era. More than two centuries had then elapsed since the founder of the Persian empire had incorporated the Greek colonies on the coast of Asia Minor into his monarchy, and had come into contact with the Greeks themselves for the first time (548 B.C.). His successors Darius Hystaspis and Xerxes had thrown themselves upon Hellas with all their might, but in the fields of Marathon (490), at Thermopylæ, and in the waters of Salamis (480 B.C.), it had appeared that the small armies of free Greece could do more than the servile hordes which the eastern despot drove before him. The struggle had been continued at intervals since that time, without leading to any decisive result. In Greece itself important changes had taken place. Weakened by mutual quarrels, the cities of Hellas had been forced to submit to Philip of Macedon, in order to carry on war with Persia under his lead (337 B.C.). It was his son Alexander, not unjustly called the Great, who prosecuted his father's design, went to attack the Persians on their own territory (334 B.C.), and in a few years shattered the proud fabric of their dominion.

Part of Alexander's work perished at his death (323 B.C.). The great world-monarchy which he had founded did not survive him, and all attempts to re-establish it were unavailing. But that which gives his undertaking its real importance in

the history of the world remained in existence. The Hellenic spirit was not driven out again from Asia. The triumph of the West over the East was decided. Regarded from this point of view, the Roman dominion was rather the continuation than the overthrow of Alexander's work.

Judæa, incorporated into the youthful conqueror's empire after his first victories (332 B.C.), remained also after his death a subdivision of a *Greek* kingdom. For some time it was undecided to which of Alexander's successors the Jews should be subject, and more than once they even changed masters. But it was Hellenic princes who fought for possession of the small land, or really of Coele-Syria and the whole of Palestine, and, whatever was the result of that struggle, the Jews remained continuously exposed to the mighty influence of the Greek spirit. It will astonish no one, that a fresh chapter of the history of their religion begins with their inclusion in Alexander's empire.

It is not so easy to determine what should be the end of the survey which we have just begun. Every one knows that Antiochus Epiphanes, in 167 B.C., tried by violence to compel the adherents of the Jewish religion to worship the Greek gods, and thereby caused a rebellion which, in the year 138 B.C., was crowned with the recognition of the independence of the Jews. These events undoubtedly open a new epoch in the political history of the Jews. But, how important soever they may be to the history of Judaism, they do not afford us a suitable resting-point in our examination of it. Rather does it seem advisable to treat the history of Judaism in Palestine as one whole to the end of the rule of the independent Jewish princes, *i. e.* to the beginning of the reign of Herod the Great (37 B.C.). We shall then see clearly, both how the way had been prepared for the events which occurred under Antiochus Epiphanes by all that preceded them, and what weighty consequences directly resulted from them. Thus the preponderating importance of the Syrian tyrant's undertaking will be self-evident, without

our drawing a line of demarcation where history does not point one out.

The title of this chapter shows further that we shall at first confine ourselves to Judaism *in Palestine*. In the Persian period there were already many Jews settled out of Palestine, especially in Babylonia, and we have more than once referred to their fortunes and influence. With the beginning of the Greek period the spread of the Jews beyond their native land increased largely. In particular, many of them, still in the 4th century, migrated both under compulsion and voluntarily to Egypt, and especially to Alexandria. Their development, in many respects peculiar, of course will not escape our attention. But it differs so very much from that of the Jews in the mother-country, that it requires separate treatment, and it exercised at first so little influence upon the course of events in Judæa, that a knowledge of it is not necessary to follow those events. It is for these reasons that the chapter upon Judaism abroad does not precede the present one, but follows it. There were no preponderant reasons for stopping in that chapter also at the year 37 B.C.; it will thus exhaust its subject as much as possible and run parallel with Chapter XII ("The last century of the Jewish state"), as well as with Chapter X.

Let us first survey the political history of the Jews to the reign of Antiochus Epiphanes, at least in its external outlines. We possess a review of it—remarkably enough—in the Old Testament itself, which does not, it is true, bring to light any unknown facts, but still can teach us what events made most impression upon the Jews themselves.*

While Alexander the Great was besieging Tyre, he invited the Jews to submit to him. Their high-priest at that time, Jaddua, refused, upon the ground of the oath sworn to Darius. It was related in after times that Alexander, when he was pre-

* Dan. xi. 3-20. The passage has the form of a prediction, but was written, as well as the whole book, in 165 B.C. We shall revert to this further on.

paring to take revenge for that resistance, upon seeing Jaddua, who went to meet him at the head of the priests, repented, because he recognized in him the man who had appeared to him in Macedonia in a dream.* The probability is, that the submission of the Jews which followed shortly afterwards caused their former hesitation to be forgotten, if indeed the latter needed pardon, and did not rather, precisely on account of the contrast with the servile conduct of the Samaritans and other tribes, serve to commend the Jews in the eyes of the conqueror. He was at all events not unfavourably disposed towards them, and he even granted them some privileges and induced many of them to settle in the city of Alexandria which he had founded in Egypt.

The death of Alexander falls in the year 323 B.C.; then "his kingdom was broken and divided towards the four winds of heaven."† Ptolemæus the son of Lagus, one of his generals, soon made himself master of Palestine, seized Jerusalem on a sabbath day, and carried away many Jews captives to Egypt (320 B.C.). In the subsequent wars he was unable to retain possession of these conquests, but after the battle of Ipsus (301 B.C.) they were again assigned to him. From that time forward, therefore, Judæa, with the rest of Palestine and Coele-Syria, formed a portion of the Egyptian kingdom, the realm of the Lagidæ. So it remained for nearly a century, until 203 B.C. More than once during this time the Lagidæ fought for the possession of Palestine with the Seleucidæ, the rulers of the Babylonish-Syrian kingdom. The remembrance of the wars between Ptolemæus II Philadelphus and Antiochus II Theos (256-249 B.C.), and between Ptolemæus IV Philopator and Antiochus III the Great (220 B.C. and subsequently), has also been preserved in the book of Daniel.‡ No wonder, in truth! It was a more than doubtful privilege, to be coveted

* Flavius Josephus, *Jud. Ant.* xi. 8. Henceforward the archæological work of the Jewish historian will be indicated for the sake of brevity by *Ant.*, his work on the Jewish war by *B. J.*

† Dan. xi. 4.

‡ Dan. xi. 6, seq., 11, seq.

both by "the king of the south" (Egypt) and "the king of the north" (Syria); but too often the disputed provinces themselves had to bear the costs of the struggle for their possession.* The Jews seem usually not to have sided with either party and to have passively awaited their fate. But Ptolemæus Philopator estranged them from him—how, we do not know, for the statements concerning him in the 3rd book of the Maccabees are worthy of no credit†—so that incorporation into the kingdom of the Seleucidæ was desired by a party which gradually increased in strength. It was accomplished, as we have already noticed, in the year 203 B.C. It is true, Antiochus the Great, ten years afterwards, promised that he would give Palestine and Coele-Syria as a dowry to his daughter Cleopatra, who was betrothed to Ptolemæus V, but he did not keep that promise: the two countries remained Syrian provinces, and thus, after the death of Antiochus, came under the sceptre of his son Seleucus IV Philopator (187-175 B.C.). Of him we read‡ that he "made a treasurer pass through the glory of his kingdom," *i.e.* through Judæa, of which mission some particulars are also given us elsewhere, among other things the "treasurer's" name, Heliodorus;§ and further, that "after a few days he was destroyed, neither by violence nor in battle"—but by assassination: most historians place this to the account of the Heliodorus just mentioned, but afterwards, when a younger son of Antiochus III had reaped the fruits of that deed and had succeeded his brother Seleucus, there were some among the Jews who held him, *Antiochus IV Epiphanes*, to be the real murderer.‖ But when this suspicion arose, the new king, by the measures which shall be described at length hereafter, had already incurred the hatred of a large portion of the Jewish nation.

* Perhaps the wish, "Scatter thou the people that delight in war," Ps. lxviii. 31 b, (30 Au. Ver.) was uttered during one of these two periods, and thus v. 31 a, (30 Au. Ver.) embraces a symbolical indication of Egypt and Syria. Comp. my *Hk. O.* iii. 313. † As shall be shown in Chapter XI. ‡ Dan. xi. 20. § 2 Macc. iii. ‖ Dan. vii. 7, 8, 24.

During the century and a half which ended in the accession of Antiochus Epiphanes, the High-priest stood at the head of the Jewish State, as before. We now for the first time find mention, in addition to him, of a council of elders (*Gerousia*),* which therefore was presumably constituted at this period, after custom had long required the High-priest, in the exercise of his political authority, to consult the men of distinction, priests as well as laity: it will therefore have been from these that the *Gerousia* was formed; at any rate it does not appear that the scribes, as such, had seats in it.—The names of the High-priests have been saved from oblivion; we can determine, at all events approximately, the time of their office.† With regard to most of them we are without any details. *Simeon the son of Onias*, of whose priestly and political labours Jesus the son of Sirach gives us a poetical description,‡ and who was named by his contemporaries *the Just*, must certainly have outshone his predecessors and those who succeeded him: probably he was Simeon II, who filled the office at the close of the 3rd and the beginning of the 2nd century before our era.§ On the other hand, the father of this Simeon, Onias II, is known for his avarice; his negligence in paying the tribute due would perhaps have been fatal to the land, if one of his relations, Joseph ben Tobiah, had not warded off the danger and offered to farm the state revenues: the narrative of his doings and of the fortunes of his family, which is given by Flavius Josephus,‖ deserves to be weighed by every one who wishes to become acquainted with the course of events in Judæa at this time.

We have not to do, however, with the political life of the Jews, but with the history of their religion. Now on this

* *Ant.* xii. 3 § 3.

† They are Onias I (till 300 B.C. or thereabouts), Simeon I (till ± 285), Eleazar (till ± 265), Manasseh (till ± 240), Onias II (till ± 225), Simeon II (till ± 195), Onias III (till 170 B.C.). Comp. Herzfeld, l. c., ii: 374, sqq.

‡ In Ch. L.

§ Comp. *Theol. Tijdschrift*, iii. 507, sq., where Herzfeld's opinion upon Simeon the Just (l. c., ii: 377, sq.) is upheld.

‖ *Ant.* xii. 4.

subject we do not find a single word in the historians whom we are able to consult. Nothing indeed happened in this domain. Not a single *event* required to be written down. But of course it does not follow from this that we can pass over the whole of this period in silence. Its literary productions, viewed in the light of the occurrences under Antiochus Epiphanes, bear witness not only to continued activity and development, but also to strife and dangers, to which Judaism was exposed, strife and dangers which began to be serious for many of its adherents. To this literature we therefore now turn, with this caution: that we always examine as minutely as possible whether it expressed not only the views of its authors and of the circle to which they belonged, but also the popular spirit.

Before all things, let us remember that the description of the activity of the Sopherîm and of the development of religious ideas under their influence, which was given in the previous chapter, might be in great part repeated here. According to Jewish tradition, Simeon the Just, whom we have placed towards the end of the 3rd century, was "of the remnants of the Great Synagogue,"* whence it follows that this body still pursued its work in the Greek period. Thus the oral law gradually acquired greater scope between the years 330 and 200 B.C. The number of the synagogues increased. Psalm-writing continued to flourish. The collection of holy books grew larger, and naturally stood in higher estimation in proportion as it grew older. The notions borrowed from Parseeism became naturalized in the circles to which they had penetrated. All this need not be further set forth here. It is the direct result of our previous study. We have now to examine whether the direction in which the spiritual leaders of the people moved on, cannot be delineated somewhat more sharply, and whether we can succeed in showing how far they now advanced upon the path which they had taken.

* Above, p. 3.

To this end let us first consult the youngest historical work which has obtained a place in the Old Testament, in the third division, among the so-called *Writings* (Kethûbîm).* We find it separated there into three parts: the books of the *Chronicles, Ezra* and *Nehemiah.* The last two are regarded in the original text as parts of one whole; it is quite certain that there is a very close connection between them.† But no less can it be assumed as proved that they and the books of the Chronicles are from one author, who must have lived about the year 250 B.C.‡ There then existed older historical works upon the history of the pre-exile times, the same works that we possess still (Gen. i.—2 Kings xxv), and a few others which are now lost. Concerning the fortunes of the Jews after the exile, men could consult: first, some authentic documents, then loose historical annotations, and finally and above all the memoirs of Ezra and Nehemiah. From this material one and the same author compiled the books of the Chronicles—in the Hebrew, "the words of the days," and in the Greek translation, "Paralipomena"—as well as the books of Ezra and Nehemiah. We shall soon see that he used his predecessors *with great freedom.* He evidently felt himself fully justified in either omitting portions of their accounts or altogether modifying them by adding and remoulding. What motive he had in so doing, we will investigate directly. Provisionally we gather from his free method only this, that the older historians as yet possessed no divine authority about the middle of the 3rd century B.C.

In a historical work we look first of all for instruction as to the times and events which it describes. Nor do we look for this in vain in the writings of the youngest of the Old Testament historians. Besides large portions of the memoirs of Ezra and Nehemiah,§ he included a few contemporaneous

* The three divisions are, the Law, the Prophets (I. Joshua—Kings; II. Isaiah—Malachi, with the exception of Daniel), and the Writings (all the remaining books). Comp. above, p. 10.

† Comp. *Hk. O.* i. 335, sqq.

‡ Ibid. pp. 357, sqq.

§ Comp. Vol. II. p. 219.

documents, or borrowed from them some few particulars which we do not know from other sources. But this information, taken all together, forms but a part of his work. If we except a few fragments of older date, 1 Chron. x.—2 Chron. xxxvi. are especially either of the same tenor as the earlier historical books, or, in so far as they diverge from them, so little trustworthy, that they usually rather lead the reader astray than light his path. This verdict sounds harsh, but it can be vindicated word for word. Or rather, it no longer needs vindication. The reader of this history knows already that the Chronicler, where he stands alone or differs from his predecessors, deserves no credit. We had occasion more than once to remark that his accounts cannot be used to correct or supplement the older narratives; that it is necessary to choose between him and the earlier writers, and that in this case he can lay no claim to preference. Remember how, both by what he leaves out and by what he alone gives, he places David and Solomon in quite another light.* The small deviations, too, which we pointed out here and there, are without exception deviations from historical truth at the same time.† If any one wishes for more proofs, they have been collected in great numbers and illustrated with the necessary copiousness elsewhere.‡

But however unfitted they may therefore be to increase our knowledge of Israel's earlier history, the unhistorical statements of the Chronicler are nevertheless of great value. They characterize to us the views of the author and of the circle whose ideas he represents. Nay, they do this the more faithfully, the more unhistorical they are. We will now employ them for this purpose.

Great partiality for the Jerusalem temple and its service—this is what the Chronicler's work betrays most clearly. From

* Vol. I. pp. 321, sq. 8, 324, 328, 337, sq. † Vol. II. pp. 2, 10, and elsewhere.

‡ Comp. my *Hk. O.* i. 321, 335; Graf, l.c., pp. 114-247. In *Nieuw en Oud*, 1869, pp. 89-108, the narrative in 2 Chron. xxii. 11—xxiii. 21 is subjected to special criticism.

the very beginning his eye is fixed upon the sanctuary. In the first portion of his work (1 Chron. i.-ix.) he already treats most fully of the tribes of Judah and Benjamin—upon whose territory the temple was to rise—and Levi, which was to be called to do service in it. The ten tribes, who, in his judgment, had departed from Jahveh himself by founding another form of worship and appointing non-Levitical priests, he does not include in his historical review. He never omits to improve the opportunity of describing at length religious feasts and ceremonies.* He always pays special attention to the Levitical musicians and singers, for whom he evidently has a strong predilection.† But it is not only in the choice and treatment of historical matters that his partiality for the one Jahveh-sanctuary and its servants declares itself. More than one touch is evidently put in to glorify the place chosen by Jahveh and the priests and Levites whom he has singled out. According to him, the sacrifice offered by David on the threshing-floor of Araunah, upon which site the temple was afterwards to be built, is kindled by fire from heaven;‡ so is the first sacrifice in the temple itself.§ He makes Jahveh himself communicate to David the design of the sanctuary and all its arrangements.‖ To Abijah's reproach to the ten tribes that they have forsaken Jahveh their god by detaching themselves from David's race and from the temple, Jahveh himself, according to his account, sets his seal by directly afterwards giving Abijah and his party a decisive victory over their more powerful enemy, which victory, as he paints it, proves that no welfare is to be found save in connection with Aaron's sons and the Levites.¶ When—he relates**—Uzziah wished to offer sacrifices himself and would not be dissuaded from doing so by the priests, Jahveh interfered and punished the presumptuous king with leprosy.

* Comp. *Hk. O.* i. 318, n. 1; 357, n. 2. † See *in locis.*

‡ 1 Chron. xxi. 26; 2 Sam. xxiv. 25 gives a different version.

§ 2 Chron. vii. 1-3; 1 Kings viii. 54, seq. a different version.

‖ 1 Chron. xxviii. 19. ¶ 2 Chron. xiii. 3-18; Abijah is represented here quite otherwise than in 1 Kings xv. 1-8. ** 2 Chron. xxvi. 16-20.

It is unnecessary to adduce more examples: the author's way of thinking, unless I be mistaken, already lies clearly before us. We can call him of kindred mind to the pious men whose psalms bear witness to their sincere affection for the temple; he is not beneath them in honesty and firmness of conviction. But at the same time we may not be blind to that which distinguishes him from those poets. His attachment is less disinterested than theirs. He pleads for the authority and eminence of the order to which he himself belongs. Every encroachment upon the rights of the priests and Levites, every omission to pay what is due to them, affects him personally. Conversely, he is ready at once to greet every friend of the Levites as a faithful servant of Jahveh. In short, the hierarchical tendency of his writing is unmistakable.

From this point of view his account concerning David's exertions in connection with the approaching building of the temple deserves especial and separate consideration. It need scarcely be said that the Chronicler acknowledges the Law, particularly its youngest, priestly elements, and endeavours as much as possible to promote its observance. Time after time he refers to its precepts, even where his authorities do not contain such a reference, nay, even where the older historians evidently never thought of the Law, and calmly relate things done at variance with its regulations.* By this means the younger author has managed to remove more than one stumbling-block out of the way.† He also maintains the authority of the Law and exhorts to obedience to the Mosaic institutions in another manner: his whole writing plainly tends to show that the faithful observance of Jahveh's laws is followed by prosperity, their transgression by speedy adversity.‡ Thus he furnishes

* The instances are too many to be enumerated here. See, among other passages, 1 Chron. xv. 2; xvi. 39, 40; xxi. 28-32; 2 Chron. viii. 12, 13 (to be compared with 1 Kings ix. 25) &c.

† His care extends even to details. Thus, *e.g.* in his description of Solomon's temple, the curtain takes the place of the folding doors which, according to 1 Kings vi. 21, 31, sqq., divided the holy of holies from the holy place. See 2 Chron. iii. 14 and Vol. II. pp. 167, 190, 256.

‡ *Hk. O.* i. 330-332.

one continuous defence of the Thorah. But—and this brings us back to his accounts concerning David and the erection of the temple—the Law did not entirely suffice for all that the priests and Levites necessarily deemed desirable in the interests of the sanctuary: it contained no precepts directly referring to the temple and the arrangement of the temple-service. It is true, the Law confirmed, *e.g.*, the organization of the temple-staff, in its main features, but not in its lesser details. This want the Chronicler supplies with his long accounts of David and his measures with respect to the temple. They are intended to establish the conviction that the regulations for the temple-service which existed after the exile, were, first of all, very old, in the next place had come from David, and finally and above all had been so prescribed by Jahveh himself. Very old: they had existed ever since the building of the temple, and this alone was enough, according to the notions of those days, to give them an authority which was not to be despised. Derived from David—who stood much higher in the estimation of the people than his son and successor Solomon, and whose name thus gave additional lustre to the whole institution. Prescribed by Jahveh himself: for David declares that he has received from him the design which he transmits to Solomon, and in which not only the arrangement of the temple, its courts, gates, &c., but also the division of the priests and Levites, were laid down; thus *Jahveh* is the real author of the whole organization of the temple.

It is no longer necessary to show that all this is unhistorical. Granting that David did make beforehand some ordinances respecting the temple and its staff—of which however the older historical books do not say a word—in no case did he design *that* organization which the Chronicler attributes to him: it is of much later date, for a great part post-exilic, nay, as far as some details are concerned, even yonnger than Ezra and Nehemiah.* Thus we have to do here with a priestly fiction,

* Comp. Vol. II. pp. 204, 299-303.

as to the meaning of which we cannot be in doubt for a moment: this representation fills in what seemed to be still wanting to the higher revering of the temple and the temple-staff.

It appears, then, that the Israelitish priesthood, to maintain its authority and heighten its prestige, employed the same means which priests used elsewhere in the old world and of which the bishops of Rome made use in the middle ages. This fact must be recognized in its full scope and significance. But while we do this, we wish at the same time to bear in mind both that such "pious frauds" were considered lawful, and that they must be imputed not to a single person—*e.g.* the Chronicler—but to the whole priestly order. The individual cannot, or can hardly, be held responsible for such representations, which for the chief part he received from others and at most worked out and trimmed a little more. In this particular case we can clearly show that the Chronicler did not stand alone. In the conception of David's character which distinguishes him from the older historians, others had preceded him, or at any rate he was supported by many of his contemporaries. The titles of the Psalms, in so far as they give the names of the poets, furnish us with proof of this. A hundred or so of these songs are attributed to David or to the Levitical temple-singers, who assist him, according also to the Chronicler. Now were most of these poems really old and some of them from David himself or from David's time, misconception and the exaggeration of tradition might be called in to account for the certainly incorrect statements. But this is not the case. The titles referred to appear upon close investigation to be all without distinction inaccurate. But then they must also be regarded as literary fictions. David the warrior and poet lived in the memory of the people. According as the people itself changed, the idea of the poetical talent of the great king changed too. After the exile it naturally assumed a priestly tint. It fully permitted such songs as are included in the book of Psalms to

be ascribed to him. Men began by holding him to be the author of the pre-exile poems and afterwards wrote his name above younger psalms as well. This is of a piece with the conception of his relation to the temple, which we meet with in the Chronicler: the song-book of the congregation had also to be ascribed to him from whom the organization of the temple was derived. We are not surprised, therefore, that the Chronicler agrees with the authors of the titles with respect to the origin of the Psalms, nay, even goes some steps further than they.*

One more remark, before we quit this subject. I might really have spared myself the trouble of showing that the Chronicler did not work alone. The success which crowned his efforts, is of itself a conclusive proof that he was echoed by his contemporaries, and that he wrote quite in the spirit of the priesthood under whose influence they stood. That success was indeed very great. His book was admitted into the sacred writings, and, what is more, his conception of history was accepted. Those traits and details, too, in which he differed from the older representation, obtained a place in tradition, and were either united with that older representation or even put in its place. This is not without weight in itself, but it acquires double significance from the connection between those divergent features and the priestly legislation. This latter often conflicted with the older historical books, so much so even that its later origin and the unhistorical character of many of its statements must have been obvious to the most short-sighted. But on many points on which it was at variance with the older accounts, it was supported and, at all events apparently, confirmed by the Chronicler. The Mosaic tabernacle, for example, which is described so minutely in Exod. xxv. and the following chapters,† and which one misses with surprise in Judges, Samuel and Kings, makes its appearance again in the

* See 1 Chron. xvi. 7-36, where David appears as the author of a song which is compiled from portions of post-exile psalms, and comp. *Hk. O.* iii. 250, sq.

† Comp. Vol. II. pp. 166, sq.

Chronicler,* and thus—to anyone who trusts to this evidence—seems really to have existed. In a word, the priestly legislation and the Chronicler supported each other, and with united forces, as it were, so upheld a conception of Israel's religious development which is far from the reality, that it has been able to maintain its position for centuries. In our days for the first time criticism has unveiled the origin of the whole representation, and, building upon the evidence of the older historical documents, has given us another and better one in its place.

After all this no one will be surprised that we consult the Chronicler with great confidence as a witness to his own times, even where he treats of the past. His pictures of religious feasts undoubtedly correspond with tolerable exactness to the manner in which they were kept in the 4th and 3rd centuries B.C. Let any one who desires to form an idea of this, consult, *e.g.*, the description of the feast of the passover ordained by Hezekiah,† or the narrative of the solemn removal of the ark to Zion.‡ Both accounts contain one thing and another which are directly connected with the circumstances of time and place and could only occur once. But these particulars are shown upon a background of the author's daily experience. As he makes the Levitical musicians render David's psalm at the removal of the ark, so they sang in the temple, to the accompaniment of their instruments, about the middle of the 3rd century B.C.; as he depicts to us the concourse of people to the feast, and the co-operation of priests and Levites in Hezekiah's reign, so the feast of the passover was celebrated at Jerusalem in the centuries after Ezra.

In the same way we gather from 1 Chron. xxiv. and xxv., that in the time of the Chronicler the priests were divided into twenty-four classes, and the singers into as many choirs. But at the same time it appears from his statements, that an important change had taken place since the days of Ezra and Nehemiah—a fresh proof that we should be quite wrong in re-

* See 1 Chron. xvi. 38-42; xxi. 29, 30, &c. † 2 Chron. xxx. ‡ 1 Chron. xv. xvi.

garding this period as exclusively conservative and stationary. Not only at the return of the exiles in 538 B.C., but also still in the days of Ezra and Nehemiah, the *singers* and the *porters* were distinguished from the Levites*—which last name indicated exclusively the men who assisted the priests in the discharge of their office and performed inferior duties under them. By the year 250 B.C. this had changed. Then the conviction had become established that it was necessary that every one who was admitted in any capacity whatever into the service of the temple should be a descendant of Levi. In conformity with this, the families and lineages in which the office of singer or porter had gradually become hereditary, were also regarded then as Levitical families, and traced back by ingenious pedigrees to the tribe-father Levi. It must soon be evident to any one who examines them impartially, that these genealogies† are fictitious. But at that time there was no one who either had or took an interest in investigating them minutely. On the contrary, the temple-staff could but gain, if its privileges were held to be founded on descent: their hereditariness was guaranteed best by this means, and an end was put once and for all to the claims of others to share them. At first, of course, such genealogies were confined to the circles in which they had originated. When subsequently, by the Chronicler for example, they were made public, they were already no longer new and were therefore believed the more readily. To us who have learnt to know their true origin, by comparing them with the older documents, to us they furnish proof that Ezra's work was taken up and continued not only, as we saw before, by the Scribes, but also by the servants of the temple. The hierarchy established itself more and more, and at last found itself in possession of a complete historical

* See Vol. II. pp. 204, sq.

† 1 Chron. vi. 31-47; xxvi. Heman the singer is descended from Levi through Samuel, but the latter, according to 1 Sam. i. 1, belonged to the tribe of Ephraim. Comp. further Graf, *die gesch. Bücher*, pp. 223, sqq., 239, sqq.

system, firm and compact enough to pass for centuries as the expression of the reality.

Men no more considered themselves absolutely bound by tradition with regard to religious practices, than they were content with things as they existed with respect to the point which we have just handled. A remarkable proof of this is afforded us by the introduction of the *Purîm-feast*, which is placed with high probability in the 3rd century before our era. Had we to regard the book of Esther as a purely historical writing, this feast would have originated two centuries earlier. It is brought there into immediate connection with an event which is said to have occurred in the reign of Ahasuerus (*i. e.* Xerxes I, 485-464 B.C.). His first minister, Haman, embittered against the Jews, conceives the plan of destroying them all in one day; the 13th of the month Adar is pointed out by lot—called in Persian *pur, purîm*—for the execution of that plan, to which the king grants his sanction. But Mordecai, a Jew settled at Susa, induces his niece Esther, the wife of Ahasuerus, to intercede for her people. Their efforts are crowned with the best results. Haman falls into disgrace and is put to death. The Jews now receive permission to kill their enemies on the 13th of Adar, and use the permission largely: 75,000 of their enemies lose their lives; at Susa the massacre is also continued on the 14th of Adar. In consequence of this, the 14th and 15th of Adar are made glad anniversaries, "days of feasting and joy, and of sending portions one to another and gifts to the poor."* This is the main purport of the book of Esther. It cannot be regarded as history. It is full of gross improbabilities, and these of the sort which usually occur in imaginary narratives, in romances. It is even very doubtful whether we may assume an historical kernel, and if we could, we should still be powerless to distinguish it from its romantic garb. Fortunately, in spite of this, we can point with sufficient certainty to the intention of the unknown writer. For it is

* Esther ix. 22.

evident, from the book itself, that, when he wrote, the Purîm-feast was already kept here and there,* presumably among the Jews out of Palestine; but it is much more evident still that the author's aim was to make the feast general: "all the Jews in all the provinces of the king Ahasuerus, both nigh and far,"† had "to take upon them and upon their seed and upon all such as joined themselves to them, so as it should not fail, that they would keep these two days, according to the precept and at their appointed time every year."‡ The repeated explanation of the meaning of the word Purîm§ is also connected with this. If now we reflect that the author used the Hebrew tongue and thus composed his book probably for the inhabitants of Palestine; and further, that the writing, to judge from its language and contents, was certainly written after the fall of the Persian monarchy, we arrive at the conclusion that he wished by means of his romantic narrative to induce the Jews in the mother country to adopt a custom of their brethren abroad. It then remains undecided how that custom itself had arisen. But is it not a very obvious supposition, that the Jews in Persia had gradually begun, after their manner, to take part in the celebration of one of the great Persian feasts, the name of which is recalled to us by the word "Purîm,"‖ but that the author of *Esther* assigns another motive, in order to make that new feast acceptable? This hypothesis is in perfect harmony with what was advanced before with regard to the influence of the Persians upon the Jews. But even if the case were otherwise, and the inducement to celebrate the Purîm really lay in the deliverance of the Jews from some imminent danger, the introduction of this new feast would yet be valid as a proof that the period with which we are now occupied did not shrink from novelty, and did not consider itself rigidly bound by ancestral customs.

* Esther ix. 19. † Esther ix. 20. ‡ Esther ix. 27.
§ Esther iii. 7; ix. 26, comp. verses 28, 31.
‖ Comp. Note I. at the end of this chapter.

This assertion implies that the Purîm feast really found favour, and that the author of the book of Esther thus attained his end. Such is indeed the fact. Of the progress of this matter we know nothing. It merely appears from an otherwise enigmatical note at the end of the Greek translation of Esther, that the introduction of the feast among the Jews at Alexandria took place in the second century before our era—either at the beginning or towards the end of that century.* Probably the Jews in Palestine had set the example, and the keeping of the feast dates among them from the 3rd or else the beginning of the 2nd century B.C. If this is to be ascribed principally to the book of Esther, it tends to prove that the contents of that book met with applause, not only in later times, which is historically certain, but also among contemporaries. We may not on that account hold those contemporaries responsible for the spirit which the book breathes. It is even altogether inadmissible that they all carried their national pride so far as the author of Esther. Partiality for Judaism betrays itself with him in very unattractive, and here and there even in repellent forms. It lacks the religious character; it is by no means free from hatred and vindictiveness towards the foreigner.† I repeat, such feelings need not have been general among the Jews. But still the fact remains, that with one of them patriotism in this form became a passion, and that many approved of his conception. Hereafter phenomena will present themselves to us, which are of the same tenor with this fact.

The reader will remember the purpose for which we first dwelt upon the Chronicler and now in passing, as it were, upon the book of Esther. We wish to become acquainted with the religious development during the century and a half which elapsed from the beginning of the Greek period to the reign of Antiochus Epiphanes. One of the directions which

* Comp. again Note I. at the end of this chapter.

† Comp. *Hk. O.* i. 368, sqq.

that development then followed now lies clearly marked out before us: we have obtained an idea of the labour expended by the priests and Levites upon the erection of the hierarchical system. Of course this is but a first step. The Chronicler teaches us to know even the priesthood only from one side, and can in no wise be regarded as representing the whole Jewish nation. We therefore look around for other literary productions which originated in our period and testify to the spirit which animated it. We do not look in vain. The sages, of whose efforts in the times before the exile we have already spoken,* continued at work after the exile as well. We possess two writings which furnish proof of this. The one, *Ecclesiastes*, was included in the Old Testament; the other, *the Proverbs of Jesus the son of Sirach*, has not been preserved to us in the original Hebrew, but in a Greek translation, and occurs among the Apocryphal books of the Old Testament. Had *we* been called upon to decide which of these two books should obtain a place among the sacred writings of the Jews, we should undoubtedly have admitted the Wisdom of Jesus ben Sirach, and excluded Ecclesiastes. For whereas the latter diverges pretty widely in spirit and tendency from the rest of the products of the *Chokmah*, the former—with the exception of the difference which shall be pointed out directly—is nearly related to the Solomonic Proverbs, and, it would seem, is much better fitted than Ecclesiastes to be included in the same collection with them. The admission of the one and the exclusion of the other cannot be accounted for by the difference in age between the two books. Ecclesiastes dates from the last years of the 3rd, the Wisdom of Jesus ben Sirach from the first years of the 2nd century B.C.: the interval can scarcely amount to twenty-five years. But there is something else by which the choice, which seems so singular to us, is easily explained. In Ecclesiastes *Solomon* is introduced as the speaker:† this—truly most transparent—veil may have caused the book to be

* Vol. I. pp. 333, sq , 387, sq.; Vol. II. pp. 45, sq.

† Eccl. i. 1, 2, 12, 16; ii. 7; vii. 15, &c.

looked upon as Solomonic, and thus to be included in the sacred writings, next to the Proverbs. On the other hand, Jesus ben Sirach names himself as the author and Jerusalem as his birthplace:* in the estimation of those who decided the admission to the Canon, this in itself was sufficient reason for leaving his book out of consideration. If—as was shown above†—they were Jerusalem Scribes, they also missed in the book of Jesus ben Sirach one thing and another to which they for their part attached great value: so much the less were they disposed to make in his case an exception to the rule. Yet, as we saw, not only Ecclesiastes, but also the Wisdom of Sirach's son was preserved from destruction: we may take the material for our further studies from both.

Departing slightly from the chronological order, we will first take in hand the Proverbs of Jesus ben Sirach. His ethical observations and lessons would well deserve that we should dwell upon them for a moment. Many of them excel in acumen and precision, and breathe a deeply religious spirit. Here again, as in the Psalms,‡ the prophetic ideas are presupposed, developed, applied; if there it be the religious side which is in the foreground, here it is the moral element, of which all the richness and excellence is made manifest. But let it suffice to point to this in passing: for our purpose we must fix our attention on other points, and especially upon the author's relation to the tendencies and opinions of his time. Let us begin with the disposition which he manifests as to public worship and the priests. The question whether he himself was a priest, it is impossible to answer. But it is certain that he was a priestly man. The fear of the Lord is closely connected in his estimation with respect for the priests:

"Fear the Lord with all thy soul,
And reverence his priests.
Love thy Maker with all thy strength,
And forsake not his ministers.

* Jez. Sir. L. 27. † pp. 21, sqq. ‡ Comp. above, pp. 29, sqq.

Fear the Lord and honour the priest,
And give him his portion, as it is commanded thee,
The first-fruits and the trespass-offering and the gift of the shoulder,
And holy offering and the first-fruits of the holy things."*

He is very much prepossessed in favour of the worship in the temple. It is true, he proves himself a faithful imitator of the prophets, in that he insists on cleanness of heart, and makes the value also of the sacrifices depend upon its possession,† but side by side with this he makes mention with heartfelt admiration of the solemn and impressive Jahveh-worship in the sanctuary. Let his description of the high-priest Simeon ben Onias ("the Just"‡) and his doings§ bear witness to this:

"When he had put on the robe of honour
And was clothed with all the ornaments,
When he went up to the holy altar,
He made glorious the Court of the Sanctuary.
When he took the portions out of the priests' hands
And stood by the edge of the altar,
Compassed with his brethren round about,
He was as a young cedar in Lebanon,
And as palm trees compassed they him round about.
And all the sons of Aaron were in their glory,
And the oblation of the Lord was in their hands
Before all the congregation of Israel.
And when he had now finished the service at the altar,
By offering the sacrifice of the Most High,
He stretched out his hand to the cup,
And made a libation of the blood of the grape
And poured it out over the base of the altar,

* Chap. vii. 29-31; comp. xxxv. 4, seq.
† Chap. xxxv. 19, seq., and elsewhere.
‡ Above, p. 68.
§ Chap l. 11-21.

For a sweet-smelling savour unto the Most High and Almighty.
Then shouted the sons of Aaron,
And sounded the enchased trumpets,
And made a great noise to be heard
For a remembrance before the Most High.
Then all the people hasted with one accord,
And fell down to the earth upon their faces,
To worship their God,
The Almighty, God the Most High;
And the singers praised with their voices;
Their sweet song sounded through the temple;
And the people prayed to the Lord, the Most High,
And made supplication before him that is Merciful,
Till the glorifying of the Lord was ended
And they had finished his service.
Then he (Simeon) went down and lifted up his hands
Over the whole congregation of the children of Israel,
To give the blessing of the Lord from his lips
And to glory in his name;
And the people bowed themselves down to worship a second time,
To receive the blessing of the Most High."

Do we not, as we read this high-toned eulogy, gain a firmer grasp of the fact, that the pious Israelites longed for Jahveh's courts as a hart longs for the water-brooks? No one will doubt that the Son of Sirach bears witness here not only to what he has seen, but also to what he has felt in his heart.

His admiration for the Law of the Lord is as honest as his affection for the temple. In this respect he is very clearly distinguished from his predecessors, the sages, whose writings have been preserved to us in the Old Testament. He entirely agrees with them in praising wisdom, which, following in their footsteps, he depicts both as a divine attribute, and as a precious

possession of mankind. But according to him that wisdom is contained

"In the book of the covenant of God the Most High,
In the Law which Moses commanded
For an heritage unto the children of Israel.
She filleth with wisdom as the Phison
And as the Tigris in the days of spring;
She maketh the understanding to abound as the Euphrates
And as the Jordan in the days of the harvest;
She maketh instruction stream forth as the Nile
And as the Gihon* in the days of the vintage.
The first man knew her not perfectly,
And the last did not find her out;
For her thoughts are more abundant than the sea
And her counsels than the great deep."†

These are the same thoughts that we pointed out before in some of the Psalms,‡ but they strike us the more now that we meet with them again in one of the "wise." Could Ezra and Nehemiah have witnessed the change which their measures had gradually brought about, they would in truth have been content: two centuries and a half after the introduction of the Law, it was so identified with Israel's religion, that the philosophy of the age—if we may use the word here—acknowledged its authority and vied with the poets of the temple in setting forth its praise.

It is also evident in another way that the *Chokmah* had felt the influence of the great revolution effected by Ezra and Nehemiah. The last chapters of the collection of the proverbs of Jesus ben Sirach§ are occupied by a song of praise which again would not be out of place in the Psalms. The first part‖ celebrates God's majesty and wisdom, as they are revealed in

* Phison, Tigris (Hiddekel), Euphrates (Phrat) and Gihon are the four rivers of Paradise, Gen. ii. 11-14. † Chap. xxiv. 22-27, and elsewhere.
‡ Above, pp. 25, sq. § Chap. xlii. 17—L. ‖ Chap. xlii. 18—xliii.

nature.* But to this is joined a "song in praise of the fathers," which proves that the Son of Sirach had indeed—as is testified of him in the prologue of the Greek translation—"applied himself with constantly increasing zeal to the reading of the Law, the Prophets and the rest of the books of the fathers, and had acquired no small proficiency therein." It is true, the boundary between past and present is not sharply defined; true, that the author can include his older contemporary, the high-priest Simeon II, in his song of praise, but still it is evident that the history of his nation has already begun to assume the character of a sacred history, and that he is acquainted with the patriarchs, judges, kings and prophets from writings which occupy quite a peculiar place in his estimation. Here too we are at once reminded of the historical psalms,† which generally do not equal the "song in praise of the fathers" in poetical worth, but stand upon a level with it in style and conception. These are all proofs that respect for the past, and for the written word which bears witness of it, is increasing. Israel is on the road towards earning the name which she bears in the Koran, the name of "the people of the book."

It follows from its dependence upon the Thorah and the rest of the books which began to pass for sacred writings, that "the song in praise of the fathers" does not show the personal views of Jesus ben Sirach in clear light, but rather lets them glimmer through. It is no accident, but rather a sign of the times in which he lived, that he dwells much longer upon Aaron‡ than upon Moses,§ and devotes scarcely so many lines to the latter as to Phinehas, Aaron's grandson.‖ As little can it escape our attention that Ezra's name is not even mentioned. It is true, towards the end of the song there are some signs of fatigue and precipitation; the whole of the post-exile period is disposed of in three verses.¶ Zerubbabel, Joshua and Nehemiah, the only men

* Comp. Ps. viii.; xix. 1-7; civ.
† E.g. Ps. lxxviii. lxxxi. xcv. cv. cvi.
‡ Chap. xlv. 6-22.
§ Vs. 1-5.
‖ Vs. 23-26.
¶ Chap. xlix. 13-15 (11-13.)

whose names are mentioned, are looked upon chiefly as restorers of the temple and of the holy city. Yet it remains singular that the man whom a later generation compared, nay, almost made equal, to Moses, is passed over in silence. Is it absolutely impossible to find out the reason of this? At all events we are at liberty to hazard a conjecture. To prevent it being misunderstood, it must first be remarked that Jesus ben Sirach expatiates with great predilection, nay, with enthusiasm, upon *the Scribe*. He contrasts him with the men who pursue a handicraft, devote all their time to it and attain to great proficiency, but who

> "Are not sought for in the assembly of the people,
> Nor sit on the judge's seat,
> Nor understand the covenant of judgment,
> Who cannot declare justice and judgment
> And are not to be found where parables are spoken."*

If, however, we examine how he depicts the Scribe, it becomes evident that he has in view the "wise" man, experienced in the Writ, rather than the Sophér; in other words: rather the study than the office of the Scribe. The whole picture† is more an ideal than a piece of reality. Thus it in no way hinders us from assuming that the Son of Sirach was not himself a Scribe, nay, did not altogether agree with the Sopherîm, or at all events with the tendency which prevailed among them. The last is no conjecture, but a fact. It needs no demonstration that he was not inferior to them in respect for the Law and submission to its precepts. In other things also he was of one mind with them. But whereas they—or at any rate many of them‡—developed the belief of their forefathers and also enriched it with foreign elements, he remained true to the letter of the holy writings. If we remember the weighty points upon which some of the Sopherîm diverged from the

* Chap. xxxviii. 38-10 (33).
† Chap. xxxix. 1-15 (1-11).
‡ Comp. above, p. 44.

traditional ideas; how they expanded the doctrine of angels, adopted the belief in Satan, and above all acknowledged personal immortality,* we shall not think this difference of little moment. In all these particulars Jesus ben Sirach still stands entirely on the old-Israelitish standpoint. His ideas of the grave and sheol† are those of the time before the exile;‡ we do not find a single trace of Satan in his proverbs;§ his doctrine of angels is still very simple, and is more developed than that of the centuries before the exile only on one point of subordinate importance.‖ In connection with this it is also worthy of our attention that with him the expectation of Israel's future glory—is not wanting altogether, it is true, but yet—comes very little into the foreground.¶ All this reveals a certain soberness, a calm conservative spirit, averse from exaggeration and extremes. Upon this is based the proposition advanced above (p. 83), that the Scribes of Jerusalem did not regard our proverb-poet as one of themselves. But then cannot the silence as to Ezra be connected with this? Is it not really most natural that a Jesus ben Sirach did not feel sympathy enough for the first of the Scribes, to give him a place of honour in the series of Israel's great men?

Whatever opinion may be held with regard to this conjecture in other respects, it remains an undeniable fact, that the new ideas, the origin and introduction of which have been sketched in a previous chapter, did not meet with acceptance at once and from all. The Sopherîm, when they did not confine themselves to maintaining tradition, but also developed it and built

* Above, pp. 37-44.

† Chap. xiv. 17; xvii. 22-24, 27, 28; xxii. 11, 12, and elsewhere. Chap. xlviii. 11, 12 are perhaps spurious or else stand entirely alone.

‡ Vol. I. pp. 64, sq., and above, pp. 41, sq.

§ In chap. xxi. 30 (27) "Satan" is not the seducing evil spirit, but the accuser before the judgment-seat.

‖ Chap. xvii. 17 may be compared with Dan. x. 13, 20, sq.; xi. 1; xii. 1. See above, p. 38.

¶ Comp. chap. xxxvi. 1-19 (xxxiii. 1-11; xxxvi. 16b-22); xxxv. 18-23 (xxxii. 17-20); xxxix. 27 (23); xlviii. 10.

on upon the foundation once laid, were followed by many with a certain reluctance and, as it were, at a distance.

If this fact be not deprived of significance, it is still placed in the shade, by another one, to which we now turn our attention. In *Ecclesiastes*, written towards the end of the third century B.C., it is at once apparent that there were some among the Jews of those days whose intellectual wants were not satisfied by the traditional religious belief. It is true, the book of that name may not be regarded as the expression of the prevailing tendency of the time; it even remains doubtful whether the author had *many* supporters who entirely concurred in his conception of life and religion; properly speaking, he bears witness only to his personal experiences and to the impression which they had made upon him. Yet he too will have been a child of his time, and therefore his reflections may be used as a mirror—a magnifying mirror, perhaps—of what was then going on in some hearts. We have here to study Ecclesiastes from this point of view: the details, how important soever they may be in themselves and for characterizing the author's personality, we can pass over in silence.*

We cannot be mistaken in searching for the unnamed author of the book among the aristocracy of those days. What he tells us—or, really, makes Solomon, whom he introduces as the speaker, testify—of his experiences in life, pleads in favour of this hypothesis;† and it is fully confirmed by many of his remarks and lessons.‡ Besides this his social position, the circumstances in which he was placed must be taken into account in explaining his views; these circumstances were, in a word, most sad: anarchy, oppression and wrong harassed the land.§ All this the writer *sees;* he throws a keen glance upon the things which take place around him; he does not allow himself to be easily led away from what he has observed,

* Comp., for the rest, Note II. at the end of this chapter.

† Chap. i. 12, seq.; ii. 1-11. ‡ E. g. by chap. viii. 2-5; x. 4; 16, 17; 20.

§ Comp. chap. iii. 16, 17; iv. 1; v. 6, 8; viii. 11; x. 5-7; 16, 17; 20.

e.g. by the thought that it is unavoidable or an exception to the general rule; he is rather inclined to generalize and to judge of the reality in all its scope by the one sad fact which he has noticed. The experiences of which he tells us have been gained—not in the heavily afflicted Palestine of those days, but—"under the sun," "under the heaven," "upon the earth."* With so much the more earnestness on that account does the question occur to him, how such a course of mundane events is to be reconciled with belief in God, the Almighty and Righteous One? He acknowledges without evasion that he can discover no harmony between the two. The government of the world is an unsolved riddle to him.† But what then? Does he put an end to the dilemma by giving up his religious belief? We should expect so. But this he does not do. Both terms of the problem are retained. The reality was not to be reasoned away. But the traditional recognition of God's supremacy, wisdom and justice had also taken root too deeply to be set aside. Yet a reconciliation properly so called does not occur. The belief remains, but gives neither light nor warmth. The acquiescence which he recommends cannot be said to be a fruit of belief. He has found by experience that restless toil and moil is of no avail: therefore he wishes that man may not worry himself, but be content with the share of worldly enjoyment which God shall give him. "Eat thy bread with joy and drink thy wine with a merry heart, for God is already pleased with thy works. Let thy garments be always white and thy head lack no oil; enjoy life with a wife whom thou lovest, all the days of thy vain life which He giveth thee under the sun, all thy vain days: for that is thy portion in life and in thy labour which thou labourest under the sun."‡ In this and in other passages where the Preacher gives the

* Chap. i. 3, 14; iii. 1, 16; iv. 1; viii. 14, 16.

† Chap. viii. 17, and elsewhere.

‡ Chap. ix. 7-9, according to the translation of Dr. P. de Jong (Leyden, 1861). Comp. chap. ii. 24; iii. 12, 22; v. 17; viii. 15; xi. 9, 10.

same rule, there is no forgetfulness of God; from Him come the blessings to the use of which he exhorts. It already follows from this that a fit and moderate enjoyment of worldly goods is enjoined. Besides this—and here the belief in God's justice makes itself felt—every breach of God's commandments is punished by Him.* The writer's exhortations can even be summed up in the "fear God and keep his commandments," in the postscript of the book,† inasmuch as man's happiness remains dependent upon his obedience to them. But it is, in the most real sense of the word, the *fear* of God which is extolled here: we find no trace of love for Him or cheerful submission to his will. "Let not thine heart be hasty to utter anything before God; for God is in heaven and thou upon earth; therefore must your words be few."‡ Can clearer proof be required of the utter want of enthusiasm and cheerfulness than is contained in this precept? And, on the other hand, it must be admitted that this exhortation is quite in the spirit of the Preacher. The same caution, without *élan* and enthusiasm, he displays elsewhere. He does this also in the moral lessons which he gives here and there. Nowhere more plainly than in his rules for the behaviour to be observed towards princes and grandees§—or else it must be in this general precept: "Be not righteous over much, neither make thyself over wise: why shouldest thou destroy thyself? Be not over wicked, neither be thou foolish: why shouldest thou die before thy time?"‖

We must guard against being too hard upon the Preacher for these thoroughly gloomy results of his reflections. Let us once more remember that he wrote under the influence of very sad times. Besides this let us reflect that he is acquainted with the hope in personal immortality, it is true, but cannot share it himself:¶ thus the consolation derived from that hope

* Chap. iii. 17; v. 6, 8, Au. Ver.; viii. 8d; xi. 9; xii. 14. † Chap. xii. 13.
‡ Chap. v. 1 (2 Au. V.) § Chap. viii. 2-5; x. 4, 20. ‖ Chap. vii. 16, 17.
¶ The author speaks of Sheol in chap. vi. 6; ix. 2, 5, 6, 10; xi. 8; that he

in earlier and later times was not reserved for him. Nor must we forget that the difficulties which weighed him down, were so little of his own finding, that we also meet with them in the Old Testament in the poet of the Jobeid,* and in others as well.† What distinguishes him from his predecessors is precisely his want of enthusiasm and cheerfulness, in a word, his pessimism, which we lament indeed, but cannot impute to him as a fault. Must we not even go still further? When we take into consideration the times in which the author lived, have we a right to wonder at the uneasiness which characterizes him? We have already noticed the peculiar dangers which the more transcendental conception of Jahveh's being brought with it.‡ The Preacher is a proof that the idea which we had formed of those dangers was not exaggerated. His notion of God is pure and elevated enough; we find no anthropomorphisms in him. He does not dream of limiting God's activity to the Jewish nation: he does not once mention the peculiar relation in which God stands to that people. In connection with this our attention is called to the fact that he nowhere uses the name proper to Israel's God, the name *Jahveh*. He lived in a time when men were gradually beginning to attribute greater sacredness to that name, nay, even feared to pronounce it.§ This is also a proof of the awe which Jahveh inspired, of the increase of the distance between him and his adorers. And that the Preacher—in contradistinction from many of his contemporaries, *e.g.*, from Jesus ben Sirach—follows this growing custom and always speaks of *Elohîm*, never of Jahveh—this is in complete accord with the whole of his conception of God and of religion. "God is in heaven and thou upon earth:" these words indeed describe the whole view of the author. He lacks the feeling of God's *nearness:*

knows of the belief in immortality is evident from chap. iii. 21; with regard to chap. xii. 7, comp. above, p. 43.

* Vol. II. pp. 49, sq.

† See Ps. xxxvii., lxxiii. and comp. *Hk. O.* iii. 130, sq.

‡ Vol. II. pp. 111, sq.; 127, sq.; 246.

§ Comp. Vol. II. p. 275, n. §.

"he that is higher,"* that watches over the judges of the earth, is infinitely exalted and—far off. But surely he speaks to his people in the Law, which has proceeded from him, in the writings of his envoys the prophets, in the ceremonies of public worship, ordained by himself? In truth, irrefragable evidence proves that the Law and the temple had their warm admirers and abundantly satisfied the spiritual requirements of many pious men.† But we cannot wonder on that account that others remained unsatisfied. Would it not rather be very singular, if the study of the Law had been able to fill with enthusiasm not only those who applied themselves to it, but also those who were only acquainted with its results? Precisely because we have tried to do it full justice and to guard against misconception of its real merits, we have now no hesitation in saying that more than the Scribes could give was required to surmount the difficulties which stood in the way of the author of Ecclesiastes: it is true that they had taken the place of the prophets, but it was beyond their power to take over their task in its entirety, and to impart the enthusiasm which does not allow itself to be mastered by doubt and learns to trust and to hope in spite of it.

But, however explicable it may be, the Preacher's tone of mind remains gloomy, and—we will now add—was pregnant with great dangers. When he wrote, the Jews had already been in contact for a century with the Greeks, with Greek science, culture and art. And in very close contact. It was not limited to intercourse with the Greek functionaries of the Egyptian or Syrian kings to whose realm Judah belonged, or to the sojourn of a few Jews at the court of those princes. Independently also of the relations which were still kept up with the Jews who had migrated in great numbers to Egypt, and especially to Alexandria, abundant opportunities of becoming intimately acquainted with Greek life presented themselves in Palestine itself. While the Jews themselves gradually

* Chap. v. 7.

† Comp. above, pp. 24, sqq..

spread further beyond the boundaries of Judæa proper and established themselves at various points in the former kingdom of the ten tribes, many Greek cities, recognizable as such by their very names,* arose in Palestine. Were not these neighbours the more dangerous in that they did not behave as enemies, but as friends? Was it not to be feared that the rich and many-sided development of Hellenic life would exercise its attractive power precisely upon those who, like the Preacher, felt no longer satisfied with the eternal sameness of the somewhat confined Jewish sphere and burdened by many an unsolved doubt? If men of rank such as he yielded to the temptation, would the multitude have strength to resist it?

Every one knows that these are not merely speculative questions. Events have answered them, and have afforded proof that in the first half of the second century B.C. nearer acquaintance with Greek civilization had indeed led many away from Judaism. There even existed at that time grounds for the expectation that the Jews would gradually adopt more and more from their Syrian rulers, would lose their individuality and at last become fused with the rest of the nations which formed the empire of the Seleucidæ. Was it not evident that some of their chief men had already been won over to that closer union? And moreover was not the Syrian king, Antiochus Epiphanes, well known as strongly in favour of such a fusion of all his subjects? Yet, as we know, the result did not answer that expectation: when the first half of the second century B.C. had passed, Judaism stood more firmly than it had ever stood before. We will now examine how this result came about.

In the year 175 B.C., when Antiochus Epiphanes succeeded his brother Seleucus,† Onias III. filled the high-priestly office. His brother Joshua, or—as he was called by the Greeks—

* Paneas, Pella, Dion, Ptolemais, &c. Comp. Weber-Holtzmann, *Gesch. d. V. Israël u. der Entstehung des Christenthums*, ii. 91, sq. † Comp. above, p. 67.

Jason, managed to bribe the new king to give him that honourable and lucrative post (174 B.C.). Directly afterwards he began to introduce Greek manners among the Jews. A gymnasium was built at Jerusalem. The athletic exercises practised there attracted many; even the priests, "despising the temple and neglecting the sacrifices, hastened to be partakers of the godless display in the gymnasium."* When, a short time afterwards, games were held at Tyrus and a feast was celebrated in honour of Melkarth—the Tyrian Hercules,—Jason sent messengers thither with a contribution of money for the sacrifice, which, however, at the request of the bearers, was applied to another purpose.† Jason probably had other plans of the same nature in his mind, and would have carried them out, had he had time to do so. But after a rule of three years he was supplanted by Menelaus, who offered the king three hundred talents more for the high-priesthood (171 B.C.).‡ With the accession of Menelaus begins a period of trouble and confusion. He did not pay the promised tribute, had to account for his conduct at Antioch, and there managed to get the late high-priest Onias murdered (170 B.C.). In the meantime his deputy Lysimachus committed all sorts of tyranny at Jerusalem, which at last occasioned a tumult, of which he himself was the first victim. Menelaus, accused before Antiochus as the real author of all these disorders, managed once more to avert by bribery the danger which menaced him, nay, even to have his accusers put to death. We can easily understand that Jason now thought the time had come for winning back the dignity of which he had been treacherously deprived. From whom would his rival now find support? He appeared with an army before Jerusalem, took the city, massacred the inhabitants, but was after all obliged again to take to flight. Antiochus saw in these civil quarrels the seeds of rebellion against his authority and resolved to punish Jerusalem for them: on its march back from Egypt his army occupied and plundered the city and the

* 2 Macc. iv. 14. † 2 Macc. iv. 18-20. ‡ 2 Macc. iv. 23, sqq.

temple, many of the holy vessels of which were carried away (169 B.C.). The blow which was dealt the Jews was a terrible one: "there was great mourning in Israel, in every place; the princes and elders mourned; virgins and young men became feeble and the beauty of the women faded."* But the worst was yet to come. Two years after the capital was thus plundered, Antiochus—who in the meantime, by command of the Roman Senate, had been obliged to give up his conquests in Egypt (168 B.C.)—sent Apollonius into Judæa with a large army. Fresh disturbances had taken place there; they had been instigated by the commanders whom the king at first had left behind, but they could now be made use of to justify the plans which were to be carried out. The obvious aim of Apollonius' measures was to strike the Jewish nation in its religion and deprive it of its individuality. First Jerusalem was attacked and a terrible massacre was perpetrated among the inhabitants. To hold the remainder in subjection for good, a fort was built in the neighbourhood of the temple and garrisoned. Then followed the prohibition to sacrifice in Jahveh's sanctuary, to celebrate feasts in his honour, to observe the Sabbath and circumcision. The king's satellites scoured the land to hunt up and punish those who broke these decrees. The copies of the Law, also, were ordered to be given up and were burned; those who kept them back were punished with death. And still the measure of atrocities was not full. The temple was not only to be withdrawn from Jahveh's service, but to be desecrated as well. On the 15th of the month of Chisleu (December, 167 B.C.) a smaller altar for the worship of one of the heathen gods, probably Jupiter Capitolinus, was erected upon the great altar of burnt sacrifices; ten days afterwards, on the 25th of Chisleu, the first sacrifice was kindled upon it. Similar altars were also built in the cities of Judah, and the Jews were forced to pay public homage to the false gods. The historian from whom we take these details also

* 1 Macc. i. 25, sq.

tells us that "*many* of the people joined them (the king's functionaries), all those who forsook the Law;"* that "*many* of the Israelites took pleasure in his (the king's) religion, sacrificed unto the idols and profaned the Sabbath;"† the garrison of Akra—as the Syrian stronghold in Jerusalem was called—even consisted chiefly of such apostates, "a sinful people, transgressors of the Law."‡

This readiness on the part of many to consent to the decrees of Antiochus Epiphanes can scarcely surprise us. The prospect of reward and the fear of death have been powerful motives in all ages. Moreover, as we saw before, the belief in the God of their fathers was already undermined and weakened here and there. What seems more strange, nay, almost incredible to us, is the conduct of the king himself. What can have induced him to institute a religious persecution, in the truest sense of the word? Polytheism from its very nature is tolerant. We think it as strange that the ruler of the heterogeneous monarchy of the Seleucidæ should have no respect for religious freedom, as we consider it natural that a Josiah roots out idolatry with fire and sword. What the Jewish historians, following in the footsteps of one of his contemporaries,§ adduce in explanation of his conduct, cannot satisfy us. They see in it a manifestation of his *pride*.‖ We understand their meaning: the presumptuous attempt to dethrone Jahveh, the only True God, was necessarily interpreted by them as a sign of horrible arrogance. But Antiochus did not occupy their standpoint and therefore could not commit the sin which they ascribe to him: if he had seen anything more in Jahveh than one of the many gods, he would have taken care not to attack him, and if the god of the Jews stood in his estimation upon an equality with the tutelar gods of other nations, then his war against him was at all events no sign of self-exaltation.

* The preceding is taken from 1 Macc. i. 20, seq.; this detail occurs in verse 52.
† Verse 46 (43). ‡ Verse 36 (34). § Dan. vii. 8, 25; viii. 25; xi. 36.
‖ 1 Macc. i. 21, 24; 2 Macc. v. 21.

Thus we must search for another solution of the enigma, and to this end we will fix our attention upon Antiochus' person and character, as these are known from other sources. At first no light seems to dawn upon the subject from this side either. He is described as a benevolent man, merry even to wantonness, always ready to lay aside the royal purple and to enjoy recreation with youths of high rank or men from among the people. He is no more like a tyrant than he is like a fanatic: how comes it, then, that he acts towards the Jews in that double character? Two causes have evidently worked together to this end. It was pecuniary embarrassment, the natural consequence of extravagance and the inconsiderate bestowal of largesses, which first led him to meddle with the internal government of Judæa. In the violent commotions caused by the conduct of his favourites Jason and Menelaus, he could not well remain neutral, both because he was obliged to enforce his own decrees, and because the tumults of the Jews, during the constant wars with Egypt, could easily change to rebellion and thus become dangerous to the Syrian state. A certain spite against the Jewish nation necessarily arose from their repeated opposition to his measures, all the more because he could not altogether deny the justness of their complaints.

But coupled to this first cause, with its consequences, there was a second. There was some propensity among the Jews towards Greek civilization. It was not at the command of Antiochus, but at the request of Jason, that a gymnasium was founded at Jerusalem. But this movement, although it had originated independently of Antiochus, was nevertheless very agreeable to him. He was Greek to the core, a zealous upholder of the liberalism of those days, which was by no means free from libertinism. Hence his partiality for the service of Zeus, which god he had recognised in Jupiter Capitolinus during his stay in Rome: in the worship of that god, in his opinion, all the nations under his rule could unite; they would thus fraternize together and collectively promote cosmopolitism.

At first he will not have suspected that the Jews could object to this intimate junction with the rest of the nations: men such as Jason and Menelaus much rather convinced him that in Judæa the soil was ready. Perhaps, as soon as he found out the contrary, he would have given up his desire and abstained from all compulsion, had not the unwillingness of the Jews become patent to him in the shape of rebellious opposition to his officers. Then it seemed to him cowardly weakness to draw back and to refrain for the future from all interference in the self-government of the Jews. Rather did he believe that now he ought to go some steps further, and, by putting an end to the Jewish religion, put an effectual stop to the resistance of the Jewish nation. Thus the order given to his subjects, "that all should be one people and that every one should abandon his own particular customs,"* in combination with the march of events, became the foundation of a complete system of persecutions which had not formed part of the king's original plan.

If Antiochus, when he promulgated his decrees against the Jewish religion, had had any idea of the significance and the results of his measures, he would have avoided what soon turned out to be an unpardonable piece of folly. The army of 22,000 men which he sent into Judæa under Apollonius, was certainly in his estimation more than enough to compel the turbulent but small nation to submit to his orders. He evidently had no idea of the resistance he would meet with. In explanation, if not in justification, of his conduct, it may be observed that hitherto he had never been in contact with the mighty spirit which he had roused from its slumber. It was soon evident that Jason and his party had been grievously mistaken in the disposition of the people. The commands of Antiochus were carried out and obeyed here and there, but many disobeyed them everywhere. At first the opposition was passive. The ancestral faith was—now for the first time—sealed with the blood of martyrs. Men and women allowed themselves to

* 1 Macc. i. 44. (41b. 42a.)

be tortured and put to death, rather than break the Law and take part in the worship of false gods. The Scribes set the example in constancy and heroism.* Some striking instances of fidelity to Jahveh, even under the most frightful torture, at once made a deep impression upon the bystanders and remained alive in the memory of posterity: Eleazar and "the mother of the seven sons" have not yet been forgotten.†

But things could not go on like this. Were the "pious" to allow themselves to be slaughtered defencelessly, and so at last leave the field open to the "unfaithful"? Probably they did not put this question to themselves seriously, or at any rate did not make it a subject of mutual deliberation. The persecution took them unawares and caused great consternation everywhere. But the power to resist was present—this the martyrs proved—and was only waiting for a signal, to show itself outwardly in a manner which would astonish Antiochus Epiphanes. On their way through Judæa, the king's emissaries came, among other places, to Modîn, a town between Jerusalem and Joppa. There lived in that place an aged priest named Mattathias (or Mattithja), the father of five sons, a man distinguished and honoured. The officers of Antiochus commanded him first of all to sacrifice upon the altar which they had built at Modîn. Mattathias publicly refuses to obey. A Jewish man steps out of the assembled crowd and approaches the altar to offer his gift. Mattathias, fired with holy zeal, rushes upon him and kills him. Upon this the officers of Antiochus are slain and the altar is destroyed. "Whosoever is zealous of the Law and maintaineth the covenant, let him follow me!" cries Mattathias with a loud voice, and his sons and many others obey him. The little band seeks safety in the wilderness, but is soon discovered. Their pursuers were cunning enough always to attack them on the sabbath: the fugitives were so scrupulous that they even thought self-defence unlawful on that day and allowed themselves to be killed without resistance. It was

* Dan. xi. 33; xii. 3. † 2 Macc. vi. 18-31; vii.

again Mattathias who opposed this idea, and by so doing brought about a decisive change in the history of the rebellion. In the small skirmishes which took place from that time forward the Jews remained the victors. Their courage rose and their numbers gradually increased. When they had lost (166 B.C.) their grey-haired leader, full of hope and courage to the last, they placed themselves under his third son Judas, surnamed *Makkabi, i.e. the hammer.* They could not have made a more fortunate choice. Judas proved a hero in the true sense of the word. His valour, which knew no yielding and did not flinch from the greatest danger, was equalled by his prudence. It was still but a small band which accompanied him upon his marches, but yet he gained a series of victories. In the very same year that he became captain (166 B.C.) he defeated first Apollonius and then Seron. Antiochus began gradually to perceive that it was becoming serious. He himself went to the East, but he charged his governor Lysias to put down the Jewish revolt without delay. The army which he sent, under Nicanor and Gorgias, seemed almost too large to perform that task; when the two commanders combined strategy with superior force and attempted to surround the Jews, there could scarcely be any doubt of their triumph: yet they were overpowered separately at Emmaus and put to flight (165 B.C.). Lysias now resolved to take the command himself. But he suffered so crushing a defeat at Bethzur that he hastened to return to Antioch (164 B.C.). Judas now had his hands free. His heart drew him to Jerusalem and the temple. At first the reduction of the Syrian stronghold was not to be thought of, but he was strong enough to hold the garrison in restraint. So the sanctuary was purified, the missing vessels were supplied, the desecrated altar of burnt sacrifices removed, and a new one built in its place. When all was in readiness, the 25th day of the month of Chisleu, the day upon which, now three years ago, the first sacrifice to Jupiter Capitolinus had been kindled in the temple, was approaching. On that

same day the temple was restored to the service of the god of their fathers. Eight days were passed in grateful festivity, and, "according to the ordinance of Judas and his brethren and the whole congregation of Israel," were also dedicated in after years to the commemoration of the joyful deliverance: the feast of the "restoration of the temple" or of "lights" dates from this year. The first sacrifice was accompanied "with songs and citherns and lutes, and all the people fell upon their faces, worshipping and praising God in heaven, who had given them good success."* "This is the day"—we imagine that the temple-singers sang:—

"This is the day which Jahveh hath made:
Let us then rejoice and be glad in it.
O Jahveh, send now safety!
O Jahveh, send now prosperity!

Blessed be he that cometh in Jahveh's name:
We bless thee out of Jahveh's house.
Jahveh is God and hath shewed us light:
Bind the sacrifices with cords
Unto the horns of the altar.

Thou art my strength, and I will praise thee,
My god, and I will exalt thee.
Praise Jahveh, for he is good,
For his mercy endureth for ever."†

The Jewish nation had indeed reason to be thankful. Seldom has so great a revolution been effected in so short a space of time with such scanty means. The danger was not yet entirely averted; nay, dark days were soon to dawn again. But for the moment the people could freely give themselves up to festivity. The unmolested continuance of the Jahveh-worship

* 1 Macc. iv. 54, 55. The events related above, from the first appearance of Mattathias, are told in 1 Macc. ii. 1—iv. 61.

† Ps. cxviii. 24-29. It is not certain that this psalm was composed for this occasion, but it is very probable.

was even insured for good. Antiochus died the next year (163 B.C.) : if he perhaps, out of wounded vanity, would have persisted in his insane designs, his successors did not think of executing them; from this time forward we hear nothing more of measures against the Jews' religion. Thus it had become obvious to the most shortsighted that this religion was only to be rooted out with the nation itself. It is true, some men of high standing had turned apostates and had drawn a portion of the people with them. Had the times continued tranquil, Greek culture would perhaps still have made many a conquest, and at last might even have become dangerous to the nation as a whole; but when the enemy, who hitherto had worked in secret, came forward openly and then tried to gain his end by force, the national spirit testified loudly and unequivocally against him. The people saw their true representatives and appointed leaders in the "pious" or "hasîdîm,"* who retired with Mattathias into the wilderness and beat the armies of Antiochus under Judas the Maccabean. Thus three centuries after Ezra and Nehemiah, and in consequence of their labours, the Jewish nation was, as it were, identified with its religion. The Law, which at first had been rather forced upon the people than voluntarily accepted, had now become more precious to them than life itself. The reproach and persecution suffered for the Law's sake, tightened the bond between it and the people. After the decisive fight for the faith, we discover no traces of apostasy, nay, not even of foreign influence of any depth. Thus Antiochus, in diametrical opposition to his intention, had strengthened the foundations of Judaism. Slumbering gently on, the Jewish nation might have given up its privileges, one by one, without concern. From the moment that he shook it so ungently from its slumber, it staked its life for the religion of its forefathers.

We are not surprised that the violent shock given by the Syrian persecution not only led to the higher appreciation of

* 1 Macc. ii. 42 ; vii. 13 ; 2 Macc. xiv. 6.

what already existed, but also called new ideas into life. Such an exertion, nay, over-exertion, of strength as that of which the enterprises of Judas the Maccabean bear witness, could not confine itself to a single domain, but necessarily made its influence felt in all directions, and in the spiritual sphere as well. The Psalms furnish us with a first proof of this. They include at all events a few songs which owe their origin to the period of the persecution or to the war against Antiochus Epiphanes. We have already referred to Psalm cxviii. Besides this we can name others,* *e.g.*, Ps. xliv.—somewhat younger than the year 164 B.C.—in which the consciousness of being unjustly persecuted and humiliated, *for Jahveh's sake*, pronounces itself in a striking manner. What times must those have been in which the poet of that song, in the name of kindred minds as well as in his own name, could testify:—

"Our heart is not turned back,
Neither have our steps declined from thy way. . . . .
If we had forgotten the name of our god
And had stretched out our hands to a strange god—
Would not God search that out?
For he knoweth the secrets of the heart.
Yet for thy sake are we killed all the day long;
We are counted as sheep for the slaughter.
Awake, why shouldst thou sleep, O Lord?
Arise, cast not off for ever.
Wherefore shouldst thou hide thy face,
And forget our misery and our oppression?
For our soul is bowed down to the dust,
Our belly cleaveth unto the earth.
Arise for our help,
And redeem us for thy mercies' sake!"†

But the distinctive character of the period of persecution has depicted itself in another of its productions, *the book of Daniel*,

* Comp. *Hk. O.* iii. 309, sqq. 317, sqq. † Ps. xliv. 18, 20-26.

much more strongly than in the Psalms, the composers of which generally followed older models. That remarkable writing is in every respect worthy of special treatment in a history of Israel's religion.

In former ages events such as those which the generation of that day witnessed, would have at once roused the prophetic spirit. But since the 5th century B.C. the conviction had become established that the series of Jahveh's interpreters was closed. If any spiritual phenomenon is to occur, there must first of all exist a belief in its possibility; where this is wanting the phenomenon itself does not appear. Therefore, during the Syrian persecution, the expectations as to what the future would bring with it had to declare themselves in another form. The unknown author with whose work we are now occupied, puts his views into Daniel's mouth, into the mouth of a man, therefore, who had long been well known in Israel for his piety and wisdom.* That he fixes precisely upon him to appear as the prophet of Israel's fortunes, is more or less arbitrary; the choice may have fallen upon him because the legends of his adventures could be made to serve the purpose at which the whole writing aimed. But it is more than an accident, that a man of former times undertakes the task of prediction here. The author was to a certain extent justified in putting his views and expectations into such a man's mouth, inasmuch as they were borrowed, in great part from the older prophetic books, and especially from Jeremiah's prophecies, or at all events were derived from them. In Jeremiah—whose oracles the author already in 165 B.C. found united with others into one collection†—he met with the promise that *after seventy years* Israel's humiliation and the dominion of the Chaldeans would come to an end.‡ That prophecy, in his opinion—and in this he did not stand alone,§—had not been fulfilled by the return from the Babylonish exile: Israel's subjection to the heathen had con-

* Comp. Ezek. xiv. 14, 20; xxviii. 3.

‡ Jer. xxv. 11; xxix. 10.

† Dan. ix. 2, "in the books."

§ Comp. Zech. i. 12, and Vol. II. p. 210.

tinued since that; the Chaldeans had been overthrown, but other heathen nations had taken their place. If nevertheless it was certain that the word of Jeremiah would one day be confirmed by the result, then Jeremiah's expressions were to be interpreted differently; then he had not spoken of ordinary but of sabbath years, and thus had meant 70 × 7 years. This idea fixed itself in the writer's mind, and, it seemed to him, spread a surprising light over the distress of the time and the events which were to follow it. The arrogant attempt of Antiochus Epiphanes could be nothing else but a last, of course fruitless, effort of the heathen against Israel. The book of Daniel, as we shall see more clearly directly, is devoted to the development of this idea. If we have succeeded in pointing out its origin, is it not very natural that the author should cause it to be delivered by an older prophet, a younger contemporary of Jeremiah, from whom it was borrowed? For the rest, it is self-evident that he was the more willing to use this form, because no other was better adapted to impress his contemporaries with his ideas: a wise and pious man like Daniel could reckon upon their readiness to listen to him.

It is, first of all, by the narrative of remarkable events in the life of Daniel and his three companions that the author tries to console and exhort his persecuted brethren. The miraculous contents of his accounts will be remembered. Daniel and his comrades are in danger of defiling themselves by eating forbidden food (chap. i.), of paying homage to an idol (chap. iii.), of withholding from Jahveh the service of their daily prayer (chap. vi.). It is the heathen, represented in the first two narratives by Nebuchadnezzar, and in the last by Darius the Mede, who threaten them with their displeasure or even with death, if they refuse to conform to the heathen customs. But in spite of this Daniel and his companions remain true to their ancestral faith and to the duties which the Law imposes upon them. Their trust in God is not to be shaken. "Our God whom we serve is able to deliver us from the burning fiery furnace, and he will deliver us out of the

hand of the king. But if not, be it known unto thee, O king, that we will not serve thy god, nor worship the golden image which thou hast set up :"* in these words do Shadrach, Meshach and Abed-nego give utterance to the feeling which inspires them, and Daniel also upon other similar occasions. Their expectation is not put to shame. Their God interferes, protects them from the dangers which they defy, nay, delivers them from the jaws of death. Thus their enemies and accusers are put to confusion, and sometimes are even visited with the evil which they had intended for the Jews.† But the God of the Jews is not satisfied with protecting his faithful servants and warding off the attacks of the heathen. When the latter grow proud and dare to insult him, the only true and living God, deep abasement awaits them. We see this in Nebuchadnezzar, who, when he gave not God but himself the honour, was made like a beast of the field and was not restored until he acknowledged God's supremacy and had humbled himself—which he afterwards repeats publicly and before all his subjects ;‡ and again in Belshazzar, who dares to desecrate the vessels of the Jerusalem temple, but directly afterwards sees his sentence written upon the wall of the banqueting hall and perishes the very same night.§ All this is evidently written with an eye to Antiochus Epiphanes and the measures enacted by him. It is taken, as it were, from the lives of the persecuted Jews and is adapted for immediate application. Who can tell how many were encouraged and supported in those days of anxiety and temptation by reading these narratives? Their author knew the requirements of his time and where to find the words which would echo in the hearts of the children of his nation.

Let us also observe that in his conception of the Jewish religious duties he shows himself to be a very strict man, and even displays some tendency towards asceticism. His hero

* Dan. iii. 17, 18.

† Dan. iii. 20-22, 28-30 ; vi. 25.

‡ Dan. iv. See verses 30, 34-37 ; comp. chap. v. 20, 21.

§ Dan. v. See verses 2-4, 22, sq., 30.

Daniel prays three times a day, with his face turned towards Jerusalem.* Together with his companions, he considers it a sin to eat the food of the royal table and to drink the king's wine, and he contents himself with herbs and water.† He fasts, too, when he is preparing to receive divine revelations.‡ All this shows a certain austerity, which we shall meet with again at a later period in a more fully developed form, but of which the first signs must not escape our attention here.

The author's expectations, however, interest us still more than his exhortations to fidelity. In the former above all he proves himself a man of extraordinary faith and a very wide range of vision. We have already drawn attention to their connection with the older prophecies, and especially with those of Jeremiah, as well as to the possibility that Parsee ideas had some indirect influence upon them.§ But as they are given here, they are original, the author's own creation. Passing over the details of less importance, let us endeavour to compress into one review the main purport of the five revelations which were made to Daniel.‖

The writer is certain that the end of the seventy weeks of years is approaching, and that the tyrannies of Antiochus Epiphanes are, as it were, the throes at the birth of the better future. The year in which the lawful high-priest Onias III. was murdered at Antioch (170 B.C.), seemed to him to be the first of the seventieth or last week of years.¶ Starting from this, he found that the first sacrifice upon the altar built to Jupiter Capitolinus fell exactly in the middle of that week of

* Dan. vi. 11. (10 Auth. Ver.) † Dan. i. 8, 12. ‡ Dan. x. 3.

§ Above, p. 43.

‖ The first is really made to Nebuchadnezzar in a dream, which Daniel explains. The four beasts in chap. vii. correspond to the four parts of the image seen by N. (chap. ii.) ; in chap. viii. the war between the ram (the Medo-Persian monarchy) and the he-goat (the Empire of Alexander) is sketched ; Jeremiah's prophecy respecting the 70 years is worked out in chap. ix. ; chaps. x-xii. give a survey of the future, and especially of the events under Antiochus Epiphanes (chap. xi. 21-45) and after his death (chap. xii.). Comp. *Hk. O.* ii. 421-44.

¶ Dan. ix. 26a.

years. Therefore the suspension of the Jewish public worship, according to him, could not last more than half a week of years, or three years and a half—as he unequivocally announces more than once.* The fall of Antiochus Epiphanes coincides chronologically with the restoration of the daily sacrifice to Jahveh.† But the restoration of the state of affairs before the persecution is far from being all that the end of the seventy weeks of years will bring with it. Directly after the death of the tyrant‡ and the disturbances which accompany it,§ follows the resurrection of the dead. "Many"—it runs—"many of them that sleep in the dust shall awake; some to everlasting life, and some to everlasting shame and contempt. And the teachers shall shine as the brightness of the firmament, and they that have led so many to righteousness as the stars for ever and ever."‖ But of what nature is this "everlasting life" in which those who have risen from the dead shall partake? Daniel had already received the answer to this question. Twice—once in the dream of Nebuchadnezzar which he had interpreted¶ and once more in a very elaborated vision**—it had been foretold him that the dominion of the heathen would now soon come to an end and would be replaced by that of God's chosen people. "Four kingdoms" would succeed each other, represented in Nebuchadnezzar's dream by the four parts of the colossal image, and in the vision by the four beasts. They are the Chaldean, the Medean, the Persian and the Greek monarchies. The last, the empire of Alexander the Great and his successors, is described at length. The figure of Antiochus Epiphanes in particular stands out clearly.†† But then he is the last representative of the heathen supremacy. In Nebuchadnezzar's dream it is merely announced in general that the whole image will be shattered by a stone not cut by human hands,‡‡ or, as

* Dan. xii. 7; vii. 25; ix. 27. With regard to other chronologies see *Hk. O.* ii. 425, sq., 429, sq. † Dan. vii. 25, sq.; viii. 25, and elsewhere.
‡ Dan. xi. 40-45. § Dan. xii. 1. ‖ Dan. xii. 2, 3. ¶ Dan. ii. 29-45.
** Dan. vii. †† Dan. vii. 8, 11, 20, seq., to be compared with chap. viii. and xi.
‡‡ Dan. ii. 35, 36 (34, 35, A. V.).

is explained afterwards, that a new kingdom, which shall never be destroyed, shall be erected upon the ruins of the four kingdoms.* But in the vision this expectation is illustrated more fully and worked out more broadly. While Antiochus Epiphanes is giving vent to his blasphemies the judgment of the world takes place. The "Ancient of days," the Eternal One, takes his seat upon his fiery throne, surrounded by an innumerable host of angels, and gives orders to slay the fourth beast, *i.e.* to put an end to the Greek dominion. Then "one like a son of man comes with the clouds of heaven, and comes to the Eternal One, and they bring him near before him. And there is given him dominion and glory and kingly power, and all people, nations and languages shall bow down before him: his dominion is everlasting and passeth not away, and his kingdom is imperishable."† This son of man represents—as is said in so many words—"the people of the saints of the most High," the same Israel against which Antiochus had warred, and which for "a time and times and a half time," *i.e.* for half a week of years, had been delivered into his hands.‡ Thus the people chosen by the Eternal One and dedicated to him takes the place of the heathen. Israel stands as high above the nations as the son of man above the four wild beasts that precede him. Israel's dominion, too, is imperishable. Participation in it is the eternal life to which "many of them that sleep" are awoke.

It is with mingled sensations that we gaze at the picture thus drawn more than 2000 years ago, but of all the emotions that arise admiration is the greatest. The book of Daniel has been called "the first attempt at a philosophy, or rather at a theology of history."§ In truth, the unknown teacher to whom we are indebted for that book, is entitled to the praise that he was the first who grasped the history of the world, so far as he knew it, as one great whole, as a drama which moves onward at the will of the Eternal One. It further tends to his impe-

* Dan. ii. 44, 45. † Dan. vii. 13, 14. ‡ Dan. vii. 27, comp. 21, 25.
§ Roszmann, *die makk. Erhebung*, p. 45.

rishable honour that he believed with his whole soul in the triumph of what he considered the truth. On the other hand, however, he expected that victory at a time and in a form at which we now smile, nay, which the immediate future seemed to mock. What a striking contrast between the history of the Jews, from the year 165 B.C., and the dominion of "the people of the saints of the most High," of which the writer thought he saw the omens! But it would be foolish and unjust to reproach him for it. The belief in the infallibility of prophecy, of which his miscalculations were the result, he had in common with the time in which he lived. Also, his conviction that the only true God had revealed himself exclusively to Israel and had left the other nations to themselves, was that of all true Jews. He differs from his contemporaries in this alone, that he drew the conclusions—I had almost said: that he did not recoil from the conclusions—which resulted from the common belief. This gave him the unshaken courage of which his book bears witness, while most men were in despair or at any rate were anxious. This makes him a prophet in the true sense of the word, in spite of the shyness with which he concealed himself behind Daniel. The persecuted pious men who learnt to know the revelations made to Daniel, found in them their own faith, but not that alone, they found also the visible expression of the good hope with which that faith necessarily inspired them. Now add to this that the form of the book, in consequence of which Daniel *foretells* what was already the past or the present for the author, gave them the impression that they had an infallible oracle before them. Can we then doubt the powerful effect of the book of Daniel upon the Jewish nation of those days? Can we withhold from the writer our testimony that he deserved well of his fatherland?

In the meantime, while we give the author the praise which is his due, we must not lose sight of the reverse side of the influence which he exercised. Eminently adapted to the altogether extraordinary circumstances in which it was born, the

book of Daniel could on that very account have a very bad effect in calmer days. I just now called the writer a prophet. But let us not shut our eyes to what distinguishes him from the prophets, greatly to his disadvantage. They had always acted as preachers of repentance and aimed first of all at the improvement of the religious and moral condition of their nation; their promises as well as their threats served this end. It was quite otherwise with the author of Daniel. The exhortation to fidelity and firmness, the only one which he gives in the narrative portion of his book, is lost sight of when he comes to the prediction of the future, so that the moral tendency is entirely lost. For his contemporaries, in the altogether extraordinary circumstances in which they were placed, it was not absolutely indispensable. But a succeeding generation, which plunged deeply into the book of Daniel, was in danger of overlooking that which with the prophets had, so rightly, been the chief thing. Men naturally as it were became fanatic with regard to the great things which were to come, instead of devoting themselves to the practice of religion. And there is something more. With the best intentions the writer of *Daniel* has placed his expectations in the mouth of the wise man of that name. This fiction, accepted as truth, naturally promoted the mechanical interpretation of God's revelation to the prophets. Many a man, under the influence of the book of Daniel, has formed an entirely false conception of this revelation, to which conception the reality, as it lies before us in the true prophetic writings, has had to accommodate itself. Moreover, the disguise which he chose imposed upon the author the necessity of expressing himself obscurely and enigmatically. If he had spoken plainly, he would have betrayed himself at once. The film of mystery which, in consequence of this, overlay his writings, rendered them all the more attractive to many minds. Others were thus induced to make public, or, if you will, to veil, their expectations as to the future in a similar form. An entirely new style of literary productions, the so-

called *apocalyptic literature*, arose in imitation of the book of Daniel. Later writers put into the mouths of Enoch, Noah, Moses, Ezra, nay, even of the heathen Sibyl, revelations of the future which were partly obscure and involved pictures of what was already past or present in the times of those writers, and partly prophecy of that which they expected. The worth of these apocalypses is very unequal. Some stand comparatively high, and others far below mediocrity. But the genus to which they belong has its peculiar defects, from which not one of them is free. They are, in the unfavourable sense of the word, works of art; they smell of the lamp; it is no living, animated conviction that speaks in them, and therefore they are altogether unfit to arouse enthusiasm. A fruitless and unpractical inquiry into the future was promoted by these writings and became predominant, not with the whole of the Jewish nation, it is true, but yet in some circles. In acknowledging the writers' good intentions, we must lament that they used their strength in this direction in preference to any other. Love for the mysterious—in so far an element in religion as the Infinite Being himself is the great mystery—was artificially fed by them, with the help of a literary fiction, and was thus but too often developed at the cost of religion itself.

The highflown expectations of the author of the Daniel-apocalypse were not fulfilled. The result of the struggle was even below what there had seemed to be grounds for looking forward to at the restoration of the temple in 164 B.C. It was soon evident that less unanimity prevailed among the Jews than at first appeared to be the case. As soon as their religion was no longer in danger, many withdrew from the struggle against the Syrians. This struggle was thus continued not by the whole people, but by a small party, which also endeavoured to realize the political independence of the Jewish nation. It attained its end, but only by mixing in the involved politics of Syria, and thus denying its real origin and its exclusively national character. The Jewish princedom—soon to become a kingdom

—which now arose, flourished but a short time. Even under the first princes there appeared the rudiments of that discord which soon led to civil war. Foreign adventurers made use of the party-struggle to extend their power. About 125 years after the restoration of the temple (37 B.C.) the Jews were compelled to open the gates of their capital to Herod the Idumæan and to acknowledge him as king.

These are the main features of the period of which we now proceed to treat. Our eye remains fixed upon the religious development of the Jews. But it would be vain for us to attempt to follow it without having the course of their political history before us. Therefore we may first just touch upon the most important events.

About four years after the restoration of the temple-service, Judas Maccabæus still stood at the head of his brave followers. Antiochus Epiphanes died (163 B.C.) in Persia, but Lysias, the guardian of his son Antiochus Eupator, who was under age, continued the war against the Jewish rebels with vigour, and would have brought it to an end, in 162 B.C.,* if intelligence from Antioch had not obliged him to quit Judæa. Thus the danger of the moment was averted, but another appeared: Demetrius (Soter), the son of Seleucus Philopator, landed in Syria, gained a large number of followers and was acknowledged as king: Lysias and Antiochus Eupator lost their lives. This change was no improvement for the Jews. Demetrius pursued the policy of his two predecessors, supported the high-priest Alcimus (from 162 B.C.), and endeavoured in the very first year of his reign to destroy Judas and his adherents. But the latter gained a great victory over Nicanor, the Syrian general, on the 13th of Adar, which from that time forward (161 B.C.) was kept as a feast as the day of Nicanor. The chances of war, however, could not always be in his favour. The battle of Eleasa (160 B.C.) was disastrous for the Jews and cost them

* In this year falls the battle in which Eleazar the son of Mattathias offered himself up, in vain, for his nation; comp. 1 Macc. vi. 32, seq.

their brave commander, who alone was worth a whole army. It is true, Jonathan, his brother, was recognised as general and gained some advantages in the war against the Syrians under Bacchides, but he was unable to rise above the rank of a formidable party-chief. His position improved when Alexander Balas, the pretended son of Antiochus Epiphanes, appeared as a claimant to the Syrian throne. Jonathan acknowledged him and as a reward for this received the high-priestly dignity, which since the death of Alcimus (159 B.C.), and therefore for seven years, had been vacant (152 B.C.). From this time forward he was involved in the struggle which went on for the crown of Syria. One of the claimants, Tryphon, dreading his power, considered it advisable to render him harmless, took him prisoner (142 B.C.) and shortly afterwards put him to death. Once more it was one of the sons of Mattathias who brought succour in this distress. Simon, already an old man, took the reins of government into his hands, entered upon the high-priesthood and reigned with such great good fortune and address, that in the year 138 B.C. the independence of the Jews was recognised by the Syrian king.

Henceforward the Asmonæans—as the descendants of Mattathias were called, after one of their forefathers—stood at the head of the reborn Jewish state as high-priests and princes. Simon himself fell a victim to assassination in 135 B.C. But his son John (Hyrcanus I.) proved worthy of such a father. His reign (135-106 B.C.) is the prime of the rule of the Asmonæans. He considerably extended his kingdom, subjugated Galilee, Samaria, and the trans-Jordan districts, together with the Idumæans—the former Edomites—whom he compelled to enter the Jewish nation by being circumcised. But with his death began that series of internal disturbances which were to result in the fall of his house. His son and successor, Aristobulus I., the first Asmonæan who bore the title of king, characterized his short reign by his cruelty to the members of his own family. His brother, Alexander Jannæus (105-79 B.C.), was a born

soldier and sometimes was successful in his numerous wars. But he drove a great portion of the people to arms against him, and only retained his position with difficulty in the civil wars which followed. His widow Alexandra, in accordance with his advice, sought for support from the party which had opposed her husband, and reigned for nine years (79-70 B.C.), while of her two sons Aristobulus (II.) and Hyrcanus (II.) the latter filled the high-priesthood. It was the mother's wish that this should remain so after her death. But Aristobulus would not submit to this arrangement, collected an army and, in the very year of Alexandra's death (70 B.C.), defeated his brother, who thenceforward lived at Jerusalem as a citizen, without office. Perhaps he would have rested content with this, for he was a weak man and loved ease, but his favourite Antipater, an Idumæan, was not at all pleased at this deposition of his patron and managed to induce him once more to try the chances of civil war. In the year 64 B.C. Hyrcanus, assisted by Aretas, besieged his brother in Jerusalem. The war between the brothers was a calamity in itself, and it became doubly so when it gave inducement to the *Romans* to meddle with the affairs of the Jews. They eagerly made use of the opportunity which was offered them. First Scaurus and then Pompey the Great came forward as arbitrator: in 63 B.C. the latter made himself master of Jerusalem. In the meantime the independence of the Jews was still respected, at all events in appearance. Hyrcanus II. remained high-priest and prince (ethnarch) over a small domain. The power was really in the hands of Antipater, while, moreover, the repeated attempts of Aristobulus and his sons to obtain the dominion over the Jews had constantly to be frustrated by the Roman commanders, which shows that it was by the favour of Rome that Hyrcanus retained the government which he had received from her hand. Antipater, with great cunning, made use of the Roman civil war between Pompey and Cæsar to extend his master's authority; his own influence increased in like proportion: with his

two sons, Phasael and Herod, he ruled everything. The people, who already detested him and his race for their foreign descent, by degrees had more and more reason to complain of his violent encroachment upon their rights. The former struggle against Hyrcanus was now renewed, and his rival seemed able to count upon many supporters. Thus when Antipater was dead (43 B.C.), and his son Herod, who was betrothed to Mariamne, the granddaughter of Hyrcanus II., proceeded to take his father's place, Antigonus, the son of Aristobulus II., appeared in the lists against him. With the help of the Parthians he even became master of Jerusalem (40 B.C.). But his government was of short duration. In the very same year Herod managed to get himself recognised as king of the Jews by the Senate and the people of Rome. In the following year he was back in Palestine and the obstinate struggle between him and Antigonus began. Two years later (37 B.C.) he reduced the capital, with the assistance of the Roman legions, and became king in reality. Antigonus, the last of the Asmonæan princes, lost his life. A new epoch was opened in the history of the Jewish state.

The great fact in the history of Judaism during this period is the rise of the parties, the development and mutual relation of which ruled the religious situation down to the end of the Jewish state. If we can succeed in understanding this fact, we have in our hands the thread which we can follow farther in safety.

It will be remembered that the form of government of the Jews underwent no real change by the transfer of the supreme power from the Persians to the Greeks. Both before and after this the executive power was in the hands of the High-priest, who exercised it, at all events from the third century B.C., in conjunction with the *Gerousia*.* The high-priestly and other families of distinction formed together *the* ruling *aristocracy*. Opposed to it, among the Jews as elsewhere, there were *the*

* Above, p. 68.

people. The usual, one might almost say the normal, relation and conflict between these two was peculiarly modified among the Jews, however, by the labours of the Sopherîm, of whom we already know enough to venture to assert that they necessarily influenced politics. In the long run their conception of state affairs could not well be the same as that of the ruling priests. Engrossed in the study of the Law, strangers to the practice of state-government, they will, upon the whole, have advocated the strictly Jewish conception, whereas the aristocracy, averse from all extremes, proved themselves inclined towards toleration and to follow the foreigner, whenever it seemed advisable in the interests of the state. As soon as this difference of understanding between the priests and the Sopherîm became manifest, the people necessarily hastened to side with the latter party. They were *à priori* disposed to do this, because the Sopherîm were in opposition to the aristocracy, against whom the people naturally had grievances. But besides this the body of the people understood what the Sopherîm wanted, while the policy of the aristocrats was not comprehended and therefore not appreciated by them.

So the germs of faction were already in existence among the Jews before the reign of Antiochus Epiphanes. Or rather, the priestly aristocracy and the commoners, the latter led by the Scribes, already stood opposed to each other. The events under Antiochus at first seemed destined to put an end to the conflict, and this by entirely destroying the power of the aristocracy. Men such as Jason and Menelaus not only made respect for themselves impossible, but also undermined the respect for the illustrious circles from which they had sprung. While their popularity vanished, that of the Sopherîm increased. Their fidelity to the Law shone out brightly in the period of persecution, and raised them in the popular favour, in the same way that it procured for them the praise of the author of the Apocalypse of Daniel.* Of course they shared this popular favour with the

* Chap. xi. 33, 35; xii. 3.

men who began the struggle against the tyrant. So long as Mattathias and his sons fought for the restoration and the free exercise of the national religion, perfect harmony existed between them and the Scribes. So long, therefore, men could indulge in the hope that both, bound together by the closest ties, would found a new democratic government upon the ruins of the power of the aristocracy. But it was soon to appear that in reality the harmony was less than it seemed. The first object of the rebellion was, as we have already observed, attained, when (25 Chisleu, 164 B.C.) the first sacrifice was offered to Jahveh in the purified temple at Jerusalem. Judas and his followers evidently looked upon this as but a first step, and aimed at nothing less than the release of the Jews from foreign rule. But the Sopherîm, or at any rate many of them, were disposed to be content with the advantages already obtained, if political freedom would require too heavy sacrifices. As early as the year 162 B.C. this difference of views came to light. It was then that Alcimus, a man of priestly extraction, appeared at Jerusalem under the protection of a Syrian army, to enter upon the high-priestly dignity to which he had been appointed. Judas and his party would have nothing to do with this creature of the Syrian king; but the Scribes joined him. The hasîdîm—the author of the first book of the Maccabees tells us—could not believe that a priest of the race of Aaron would wrong them.* According to the same author—who, however, as the adherent of the Asmonæan princes, must be consulted with caution—they had cause to repent of this trust, and many of them were put to death by Alcimus.† Yet they still objected to place themselves entirely under Judas' lead. The latter, and at first his brother Jonathan as well, were and remained party-chiefs. It was not until Jonathan was appointed high-priest (152 B.C.), that he became the man of the people, and the Sopherîm too could join him with a free conscience. In the meantime it had become clearly evident that the Asmonæans cherished grander plans than the

* 1 Macc. vii. 12-14.

† 1 Macc. vii. 16, seq.

Sopherîm, and, although for a time they worked with them, they were men of a different stamp.

This difference naturally continued to exist, when the Asmonæans were raised to the high-priestly seat, and directly afterwards to the princely throne. Nay, it appeared in its true light then for the first time. The Asmonæans now found themselves placed in entirely new relations. They did not require to deny their fidelity to the Law, but circumstances compelled them to go to work with moderation, and always to take political interests into account. If by so doing they approached the former aristocracy, this, for its part, necessarily felt itself drawn towards them, and attempted to win back its influence by combining with them. On the other hand, the Scribes maintained their former standpoint, and met with even more support than before from the people, who did not forget their manly conduct under the persecution. The necessary consequence of this was, that, as was the case before the persecution, so also after it the aristocracy and the commoners were at variance; that the *aristocratic and political*, and the *democratic and religious tendencies* were now even more sharply defined than before. Under the first Asmonæans they had already from tendencies become *parties*. As *Sadducees* and *Pharisees* they struggled for the upper hand, and more than once came into violent collision.

The rise of these parties and party names is not yet completely cleared up, and, perhaps, will always remain somewhat enigmatical. A trifle is often enough to call into being such designations, which, when once used, co-operate in their turn to bind the persons whom they indicate closer together, and to distinguish them more sharply from those to whom the designation is not applied. Sometimes we are fortunate enough to be able to gather this fact, insignificant in itself but great in its results, from contemporaneous evidence. But where we cannot do this, we grope about in darkness, or at all events do not get beyond more or less probable conjectures. We are in

the latter position in this case. The name *Sadducees* is evidently derived from the proper name *Zadok*, and thus means either "descendants" or "followers of Zadok." The Zadok with whom the Sadducees were therefore connected, has been identified with the well known priest of that name, the contemporary of David,* after whom Ezekiel called the priests of Jerusalem "the sons of Zadok."† It was therefore assumed that the priests of distinction who ruled the Jewish state after the return from the Babylonish exile were called "sons of Zadok," or "Zadokites," and that they retained that name, but now as the designation of a party, when they joined the first Asmonæan high-priest Jonathan and his successors. This conjecture is attractive, above all because the Sadducees *were*, in fact, the former aristocracy, but it is burdened with insurmountable difficulties. The principal one is, that not a single trace of this supposed designation of "sons of Zadok" occurs in the Jewish post-exile literature—which would be altogether inexplicable, had that name been in general use. We prefer to suppose, therefore—in accordance, in fact, with a younger Jewish tradition—that a later Zadok, perhaps a contemporary of Jonathan the Asmonæan, gave the name of "Zadokites," or "Sadducees," to the priests and men of rank, who along with him joined the new high-priest. Our ignorance of this Zadok can scarcely avail as an objection to the hypothesis, since so many details of the history of those days are hid from us.‡

The derivation of the word "Pharisees" is as certain as its origin as a party name is uncertain. The word is taken from the popular language of those days—in which, among others, a portion of the book of Daniel is written—and means "the separated." But how came a party to be called by this name? If we knew for certain whether the party itself adopted the name, or received it from its opponents, we should have made some approach towards answering this question. As it is, we

* 2 Sam. viii. 17 ; xv. 24, seq. ; 1 Kings i., etc. † Comp. Vol. II. p. 115, sq.
‡ Comp. with the above *Theol. Tijdschrift*, iii. 495, seq.

are limited to conjecture on this subject. It has been pointed out, that, as early as in the narratives relating to Ezra and his time, men are mentioned who "separated," themselves from the foreigners and guarded carefully against all connection with them.* There is indeed a resemblance between the tendency of these strict followers of Ezra and that of the later Pharisees. But the latter can scarcely have taken their name from a separation which was no longer necessary under the first Asmonæans, since then *the whole nation* had actually separated itself from the heathen. In the meantime this designation of Ezra's time puts us upon the right track. Let it be taken into consideration, first of all, that the zeal for the faithful observance of religious duties was quickened by the persecution, and, after martyrdom had ceased to be necessary, naturally manifested itself in redoubled scrupulousness. The energy of the "pious" or "hasîdîm"† sought, as it were, an outlet, and was prepared to make the sacrifices which seemed to be required of it. Let it also be borne in mind, that to observe the Law in its full scope, with all the regulations which had been added to it in the course of time, it was necessary for the Israelite to "separate" himself in a certain degree, not only from the heathen, but also from those of his fellow countrymen upon whose obedience to the legal precepts he could not implicitly rely. How easily he could defile himself in intercourse with others without knowing it! When therefore he was in earnest in keeping Jahveh's commandments, he could very readily come to use all sorts of precautions and to draw back in alarm where others, less scrupulous than he, moved freely. This is so true, that in the later Jewish writings the word "separation" *(pherîshûth)* indicates a singular degree of piety. Without any further special inducement, therefore, the strict Jews, who seemed to exaggerate the life according to the Law, may have been called *Pharisees*, because they were distinguished, and, whenever religion seemed to require it, were "separated," from the common

* Ezra vi. 21; x. 11, 16; Neh. ix. 2; x. 29. † See above, pp. 104, n *, 120.

multitude. It is also possible that this general characteristic of their religious life came out strongly upon some particular point, and that the name by which they were known was connected with this. We naturally think here of the precautions to which the legal rules as to the tithes and the gifts to the priests, as interpreted and extended by the oral law, readily gave rise. It was not deemed sufficient that every one should take care that his own tithes and gifts were paid, it was also necessary that he should see that when he was in a friend's house he never ate anything of which the priest had not received his share; for by eating what really belonged to Jahveh and therefore was holy he would have sinned. Now if any one wished to guard against this transgression, it was necessary for him to join and to associate with those whom he could thoroughly trust. Those who did this called themselves "associates" *(habérîm)*. But it would be far from strange if others, who considered such scrupulousness exaggerated, called them *pherîshîm*, Pharisees or "the separated."*

It is indeed to be desired that we were more certain with regard to these particulars. But our insight into the main fact suffers no real detriment from our hesitation upon points of subordinate importance. Unless I be mistaken, we can already draw our conclusion, at any rate provisionally. For the present we will leave out of consideration the moral character both of the Sadducees and the Pharisees: we shall have an opportunity hereafter of combating the errors which are in circulation in this respect. Before all things we ought to know *who* the Sadducees and Pharisees were and what position they occupied in the Jewish community. Our preceding investigations throw the required light upon these points. The Sadducees formed a social order: it depended upon a man's birth or extraction, whether he could be a Sadducee or not; if he did not belong to Aaron's descendants or to the distinguished lay-families, he could not be a Sadducee, although he may have thoroughly

* Comp. Jost, *Gesch. des Judenthums und seiner Sekten*, i. 200, sqq.

sympathized with the views of the aristocracy in political and religious matters. On the other hand, any one, whatever his rank or station, could join the Pharisees. The priests could do this too, even the greatest among them. It is true that to take this step they had to set aside the prejudices or traditions of the circle in which they lived, but if they could make up their minds to this there was no one to prevent them joining that party. As far as the Scribes were concerned, they could be more or less strict in their interpretation of the Law, could incline to the policy of the Sadducees or join the Pharisees. But the former was the exception and the latter the rule. The nature of the studies with which the Sopherîm occupied themselves and from which they took their name, naturally led them to give prominence to the Law and to attach less importance to the motives derived from other sources. By far the majority of the Scribes, therefore, no matter whether they were of priestly or Levitical extraction or not, were Pharisees. Both designations—although the one indicates an office or profession and the other a religious tendency—could even frequently be used indiscriminately.* We might almost gather from the later Jewish literature, that the title of "Pharisee" was not sought after by those who were indicated by it. The teachers prefer there to call themselves "the wise,"† *i.e.* the learned (in the Scriptures or the Law): it is their opponents who address them as "Pharisees," and so at the same time pass judgment upon the principles by which they are led. But however this may be and even if "Pharisee" were a title of honour, it was in no case the name of an office, but was nothing more than the designation of a tendency or a party.

We can now, therefore, fix our attention upon the struggle between the Sadducees and the Pharisees, and elucidate by it their mutual relations. But first let us glance on one side, and notice a third party, which, while it arose at the same time as

* See the particulars from Flavius Josephus, below, pp. 137, sqq.

† Above, p. 29.

the other two, is really distinct from them, the sect, or rather *the order of the Essenes*. To this day a lively dispute is waged over its origin and character. Men are especially at variance upon the question, whether it is to be attributed to Judaism itself, or to foreign influence. The Jewish historian, Flavius Josephus, whom we have chiefly to thank for our knowledge of the Essenes,* has also occasioned this dispute, for some of the features of his description of their life remind us at once of the philosophy of Pythagoras, and are also intended to give us that impression; others, on the contrary, are evidently purely Jewish, and incompatible with the hypothesis that Pythagorean or any other pagan influence has operated here. The solution of this antagonism is not far to seek. It is to be found in the object at which Flavius Josephus aimed in publishing his historical works. He wished by means of them to give the Romans a high opinion of the Jewish nation, its institutions, religion, and culture. For the Pythagorean colour of some of their customs and ideas, the Essenes have to thank the desire of Flavius Josephus to show that his nation was not behind the Greeks in anything, not even in this matter. In the same way he arranges his description of the Sadducees and Pharisees in such a manner, that we involuntarily think of the Epicureans and the Stoics. Were there nothing else, the mere time at which the Essenes made their appearance, would prevent us from attributing a foreign origin to their modes of life and thought. How can the Greek philosophy have found favour, immediately after the war of liberation, among Jews, who, in other respects, were strict, nay, narrow-minded? But instead of dwelling longer upon this point of dispute, let us examine the Essenes more closely: even in the picture which Josephus gives us their Jewish character comes out plainly enough.

The Jewish historian just mentioned sketches to us the Essenes as he had learnt to know them in his youth—about 40 A.D. At that time most of them lived together in small

* *Ant.* xiii. 5 § 9; xviii. 1 § 5; *B. J.* ii. 8 § 2-14.

colonies or villages, at long distances from the towns, principally in the neighbourhood of the Dead Sea. Other informants, from about the same time, also describe to us such Essenic communities. But they tell us nothing certain about the time of their introduction. Are they as old as Essenism itself? or was it only by degrees that the Essenes withdrew from the Jewish society? The latter is by far the more probable. When the majority of them already lived together, there were still some who continued to move in society. It is also remarkable, that the first Essene whom Josephus mentions by name,* Judas, a contemporary of Aristobulus I., and famous for his gift of prophecy, is to be found with his pupils *in the temple at Jerusalem*, where, as we shall see directly, the later Essenes no longer showed themselves. Presumably, therefore, their separation became more and more rigid in the course of time. But we have no information as to their internal history, so that we must at once study the final point of their development. This, however, was probably reached before Herod's reign, so that this study will not be out of place here.

Ascetic communism: these two words express the peculiarity of the Essenic movement. At long distances, if possible, from the bustle of towns they built their huts, and near to these a roomy chamber in which they could assemble at the appointed hours. As soon as the colony had established itself, they began their monotonous and minutely regulated life. The Essene rose before sunrise, and said his morning prayers with his face turned towards the east, as if he were imploring the sun to appear. When the day had broken, he went to his work: agriculture, cattle-breeding, bee-keeping, and other peaceful trades were his ordinary occupations. His working dress was simple; in the winter a hairy mantle, and in the warm season an under-garment without sleeves. Besides this he always wore a leathern apron, and carried a spade or hoe, with

* *Ant.* xiii. 11 § 2.

which, whenever he responded to the call of nature, he dug a hole in a retired spot, which was afterwards carefully closed. He remained at work until the fifth hour—eleven o'clock in the forenoon. Then the Essenes took their bath, after which they put on the proper dress of their order, of white linen, and assembled for the common meal. This was eaten solemnly, preceded by a prayer from the leaders and a song of praise, and closed with a song of praise. It was further a very plain meal, consisting of bread and always one single dish of vegetable food; they abstained from meat and wine. When the meal was over, the work of the day was resumed, and pursued till sunset.

The seventh day of the week was a day of rest in the most absolute sense of the word. The Essene then abstained from all work, even—if we may believe the accounts of contemporaries—from obeying the call of nature. Like the other Jews, the Essenes assembled in their synagogues on that day. The chief thing there was the reading and the explanation of the Law and the rest of the ancestral books. In respect for Moses they were second to none; blasphemy against his name was punished with death, just as the profanation of God's name.*

Their scrupulous observance of the sabbath laws contrasts strangely with the freedom with which they withdrew from the temple-service at Jerusalem. They sent gifts to the sanctuary, but took no part in the sacrifices, and therefore also none in the high festivals. "They held their purifications," Josephus tells us, "to be more excellent." On the other hand, as we have already observed, each common meal displays more or less the character of a sacrificial meal.

The maintenance of order and discipline was entrusted to the leaders, who were chosen by the members of the order from among themselves. They set every man his daily task, received every one's earnings, and paid them into the common treasury,

* Lev. xxiv. 14-16.

from which the expenses of the meals, &c., were defrayed. From this it follows that the Essene had no property of his own. This was indeed the case. Upon entering the order every one gave up his possessions. Like the difference between rich and poor, the distinction between freemen and slaves was abolished among them. Only the difference in rank remained. The younger members owed obedience to the older ones, and all the members to the leaders. Transgressions against the laws of the order, however, if they were of a serious nature, were not judged by the leaders alone, but by at least a hundred Essenes; if they sentenced the culprit to banishment from the community, it was equal to a sentence of death, for the Essene was not allowed to eat any food that was not prepared by members of the order; it was only in a case of extreme need that access to the community was reopened for one thus condemned.

It is self-evident that it was not every one who could enter the order forthwith. An applicant was subjected to a period of probation, which altogether lasted three years. In the very first year he had to guard against all pollution. In the second year he was admitted to the baths of purification; at the end of the third to the common meal, in which members of the order alone took part. Before this, however, the novice had to take a solemn oath, the only oath which the Essenes considered permissible. By this he bound himself "to honour God; to be just towards man; to injure no man of his own accord, or by order of others; always to hate the unrighteous and assist the righteous; to be ever faithful to all, and especially to the chiefs, for no one obtained the government without God's will; if he exercised authority himself, never to abuse his power, nor to excel his subordinates in clothing or ornament; always to love truth, and endeavour to put liars to shame; to keep his hands from theft, and his soul from unholy gain; to hide nothing from the other members of the order, nor to reveal anything of theirs to others, even though he were

threatened with death." Besides this, he bound himself "to deliver the institutions to no one otherwise than he himself had received them; to guard against alienation (of the property of the order), and to keep as faithfully the books of the sect as the names of the angels." We shall revert to this last presently.

The number of novices who joined was sufficient to keep up the order—so much so, that according to a witness in the first century of the christian era,* the members numbered 4000. The Essenes could appeal to this fact to vindicate their unmarried life. But there were some among them who married, simply for the sake of perpetuating the order; these less strict Essenes were not admitted into the colonies described above, but in other respects they followed the same mode of life. The stricter ones acknowledged them as brethren, but objected to follow their example, for—as Josephus writes—"they were afraid of the licentiousness of women and were convinced that not one of them keeps her vow of fidelity to one man."

This brief description of the mode of life of the Essenes agrees in all main features with that of Flavius Josephus. I have simply permitted myself to prune and—to moderate my authority to a certain degree. Far from needing an apology for this, I fear that I have not even now gone far enough. Any one who reads Josephus' sketch with care, will easily convince himself that it is something more than the simple impress of the truth. It is a eulogy with a purpose which he gives us. Yet we have no right to charge him with the deliberate falsification of the facts. Nor is there indeed any cause for doing so. However strange may be the impression which the order of the Essenes makes upon us; however little we were prepared to meet with such a phenomenon in the history of Israel's religion—we may yet succeed in explaining Essenism by the peculiarity of the Jewish ideas and the time at which it arose.

We cannot easily exaggerate the effect of measures such as those of Antiochus Epiphanes. All that slumbers in a people,

* Philo Judæus, *quod omn. prob. liber* § 12 (ii. 457, Mang.).

and in ordinary circumstances would slumber still, is roused and driven to the surface by so violent a disturbance. In the narratives relating to the persecution and the rebellion which it caused, the Hasidæans, *i.e.* the *hasîdîm* or "pious," occur sometimes.* This name shows clearly enough who they were: the personal representatives of the reaction against the measures of the Syrian tyrant. Attachment to the ancestral religion, love for the Law and the endeavour to observe it in all things, had become a passion for them. When the danger had passed, the zeal which had been aroused, in so far as it did not at once cool down somewhat, could employ its energy in more than one direction. One of these directions we have already learnt to know: the Pharisees were most probably a product of the "hasîdîm." But the Essenes too are immediately descended from them. The name which they bear has been cited in proof of this; but erroneously; for although, in spite of all the attempts which have been made to explain it, the meaning of this name is quite uncertain, it certainly cannot be connected with that of the "hasîdîm. The life of the Essenes, however, shows plainly enough their motives and the object which they had set before them. The founders of the order, inspired with the desire completely to fulfil the Law and especially to fully realize the ideal of cleanness which they found depicted there, arrived at the conviction that intercourse in Jewish society was incompatible with this, and sought retirement. Their disciples went on further and further in the same direction, until at length the communities arose, the organization of which Flavius Josephus has described to us. The mode of life which was observed in them can be partly explained at once and without the least trouble by the motives which we have just ascribed to the founders of the order. Let the reader remember the scrupulous observance of the sabbath, the almost superstitious respect for Moses the lawgiver, &c. But there appears more than one feature, the connection of

* See above, pp. 104, 120.

which with the Law is not so obvious, nay, seems more than doubtful. Are not celibacy, abstinence from bloody sacrifices and from the common worship generally, the prohibition of meat and wine, at variance with the precepts, or, at all events, with the spirit, of the Mosaic laws? Nay, is it not evident from these features that the Essenic ideal had no Jewish origin? It is indeed undeniable that asceticism and retirement from the world are *not* taught by the Israelitish lawgivers and prophets. The philosophical grounds upon which these rest in other forms of religion are altogether strange to them. Far from condemning the love and the moderate enjoyment of life, they regard a long life, riches, a numerous family, as blessings from Jahveh and signs of his approval. It cannot be said that, *e. g.*, the poet of Ps. cxxviii. is untrue to the principles of Jahvism, when he sings:—

"Blessed is every one that feareth Jahveh
And walketh in his ways.
Happy art thou and it is well with thee,
For thou eatest the labour of thine hands;
Thy wife is as a fruitful vine within thine house,
Thy sons are like olive plants round about thy table.
Behold, for thus is blessed
The man that feareth Jahveh.
May Jahveh bless thee out of Zion,
That thou mayest see the good of Jerusalem
All the days of thy life,
That thou mayest see sons of thy sons.
Peace upon Israel!"

And yet Essenism has the right of existence upon Jewish soil and must be considered to have sprung from it. If we remember,* the idea that Jahveh is served by abstinence and painful sacrifices is entirely in accordance with the very oldest, original conception of his being. We are not surprised there-

* Comp. Vol. I. pp. 231-241, 249.

fore to observe phenomena in the pre-exile time, which remind us distantly of Essenism and may be regarded as foreshadowing it. The man "dedicated to Jahveh," the Nazarene, is bound above all other Israelites to guard against pollution, allows the hair of his head to grow and abstains from wine and spirituous drinks.* We meet with the same abstinence from wine, combined with the nomadic life, in the Rechabites.† Nor are antecedents wanting for the Essenic striving after cleanness. Scrupulous care for its maintenance shines through here and there in the Deuteronomic law;‡ even one of the most childish practices of the Essenes, the way in which they perform their bodily necessity, is the literal observance of a precept which is included in that law.§ The prohibition to eat blood and bloody meat, upon which the various lawgivers lay such great stress,|| could at all events give an inducement to scrupulously pious men to reject meat altogether. Besides all this, let it be taken into consideration that after the Babylonish exile the priestly laws were added to the older ordinances and were valued more highly than the latter. We have already seen¶ how earnestly they insist upon cleanness. It must also be expressly remembered here that the priestly legislation, in agreement, in fact, with the popular notions in the pre-exile time,** looks upon nuptial intercourse as a pollution. It is true, it only causes temporary uncleanness,†† but was it not very likely that this conception would become extended in later times, and would attach quite a special holiness to the unmarried state in the estimation of some pious men?

We have thus been able to account, without any forced construction, for by far the majority of the customs of the Essenes. Their other usages are also easily explained. Thus, *e.g.*, their non-attendance at the temple. It may not be looked upon as a

* Vol. I. pp. 193, 316, sq.; Vol. II. p. 284.
† Jer. xxxv.; comp. Vol. I.
‡ Deut. xiv. 1, seq.; xxi. 1-9; 22, sq., &c.
§ Deut. xxiii. 12-14.
|| Vol. II. p. 260, n. ¶; Deut. xii. 16, 23; xv. 23, &c.
¶ Vol. II. p. 259, sq.
** 1 Sam. xx. 26; xxi. 4, 5.
†† Lev. xv. 16-18.

sign of disregard for the common worship, or even of an objection to it on principle: the gifts which they were in the habit of sending to Jerusalem forbid us to interpret it in this way. Rather was it a natural consequence both of their retirement from Jewish society, with which, of course, they would have come into close contact in the national sanctuary, and of their abstinence from meat, which they could hardly have kept up at the feasts at Jerusalem. We should be wrong, therefore, in seeking a connection between the attitude of the Essenes towards public worship and the well-known prophetic utterances as to the worth, or rather the worthlessness, of the sacrifices.* We are not justified in assuming more than that they consoled themselves with those utterances for the deprivation which their seclusion imposed upon them. In the mean time, the freedom which they allowed themselves in this respect remains a most remarkable fact. We do not go too far in inferring from it that in the first century before our era the strict Jews already deemed the temple *not absolutely indispensable.* As yet this opinion continues to be an exception to the rule, the peculiar notion of a few who had withdrawn from social life. But let us not forget that it could not have arisen even in those few, had it been altogether irreconcilable with Judaism. We have already pointed out† that this was not the case, and now it is confirmed. For successive centuries the priests played the first part in the Jewish religion; but their rule was no more than a long *interim;* examined in its real nature, Jahvism is not a sacerdotal religion.

The ideal of morality which the Essene entertained, and which is expressed, among other places, in the oath taken upon entering the order, does not require special illustration; it is evidently borrowed from the Old Testament, from the prophets and the psalmists.‡ But what are we to understand by "the books of the order," and "the names of the angels,"

* Vol. I. pp. 57, sq. † Vol. II. p. 248; above, pp. 3, sq., 17-21.

‡ Isa. xxxiii. 15, 16; Exod. xix. 6 a; Ps. xv.-xxiv. 1-6, etc.

which the novice promises to "keep" undegenerated? And further, is there any truth to serve as a foundation for the statement made by Philo in Alexandria,* that the Essenes follow a symbolic or allegorical interpretation of Scripture, which is given them on the sabbath by one of the leaders experienced in this matter? These questions cannot be answered with certainty. The express mention of "the names of the angels" has not exactly given us a high opinion of the knowledge which was applied to expound the Scriptures, and was deposited in "the books of the order." Was it perchance connected with the art of medicine, which, according to Josephus, was studied by the Essenes? He writes that they searched for medicinal roots, and investigated the properties of stones. Did they also make use of magical formulas, in which the names of the angels occurred? This conjecture is not inadmissible. Yet it is still more probable that the secret science and the writings of the Essenes were connected with the gift of prophecy, which, according to the same Jewish author, was indigenous among them, as, besides the Judas already mentioned (p. 127), he introduces other Essenic prophets, or rather soothsayers, into his history.† Let it not be forgotten that, according to the book of Daniel, the prophecy of that time was based upon a peculiar exposition of Scripture, assumed a mystic character, and made use largely of the doctrine of angels.‡ Let it further be taken into consideration, that a life of seclusion readily gives rise to speculations as to the future. Thus it is not improbable that the secret science of the Essenes chiefly referred to such speculations, and that "the books of the order" also treated of the hidden things of the future.

The difficult question whether any document has been preserved to us of the prophetic labours of the Essenes, we will

* *Quod omn. prob. liber* § 12 (ii. 458, Mang.).

† *Ant.* xv. 10 § 5; xvii. 13 § 3; B. J. i. 3 § 5; ii. 7 § 3; 8 § 12.

‡ Comp. pp. 38, 106, sq., 112, sqq.

touch upon hereafter. It is time that we should return to the Sadducees and Pharisees, whom we have yet to examine in their mutual relation. In doing this we shall be able to leave the Essenes out of consideration. Even those who are disposed to ascribe to them no unimportant influence upon the development of religion, admit that at first little or nothing was heard of them. We were obliged to show distinctly their rise, but as Jewish society developed itself independently of them, we may leave them alone for the present.

As long as Jonathan and Simon stood at the head of the Jewish state, the discord between the Sadducees and the Pharisees did not break out into open warfare. Various causes doubtless worked together to preserve peace. The attack would have had to begin from the side of the Pharisees, for just then the aristocracy was occupied in regaining its former power, and had no reason to desire a change. But neither Jonathan nor Simon gave the Scribes and the party which they led any inducement to break the peace. Both men stood high in the estimation of all well-disposed persons, and were indeed indispensable in the constant wars or quarrels with the Syrians. Besides this, it may be assumed as probable, that they for their part held the Sopherîm in honour, and followed their advice as much as possible. At any rate this was done during the first half of his reign, as we shall see presently, by Johannes Hyrcanus, who certainly, in this respect, trod in the footsteps of his father Simon. If we take into consideration the events which had gone before, and the conduct of the Sopherîm while these events were happening, we even consider it probable that either Jonathan or Simon gave the Sopherîm some share in the government of the state. It is historically certain, that about the middle of the first century B.C. some of them sat in the Sanhedrim at Jerusalem.* Who but Jonathan or Simon can have admitted them there? Such a step is entirely in accord

* *Ant.* xiv. 9 § 4. Comp. below, p. 143.

both with the character of those men and with the circumstances of their time. We shall see directly that the sequel of history seems to assume such a concession on their part to the Scribes.

At first Johannes Hyrcanus (135-106 B.C.) lived at peace with the Scribes, even the most strict of them. "He was their pupil," says Josephus,* and thus undoubtedly acted as much as possible after their counsel. His successful wars, moreover, made him popular in a high degree, so that it was dangerous to break with him. Yet it came to that. Once—the same historian tells us—Sadducees and Pharisees were together at the table of Johannes Hyrcanus. The host remarked that the Pharisees were satisfied with their reception, and asked them whether they found anything in his government to blame? Then one of them, Eleazar, took up the word and said that, if he wished to act quite according to law, Hyrcanus must resign the high-priesthood and rule only as a prince. He alleged as his reason, that Hyrcanus' mother was taken prisoner in the war against the Syrians, so that the purity of his descent was not above suspicion. These words excited general indignation, even—according to Josephus—among the members of Eleazar's party. Probably, therefore, Hyrcanus' displeasure would have descended upon the guilty alone, had not one of the Sadducees who were present, Jonathan, kindled the fire. He asserted that Eleazar had expressed the opinion of all the Pharisees; if the Prince doubted this, he had only to ask them what punishment they thought their comrade deserved; it would then soon be evident that they were at one with him. The Pharisees—who upon the whole were merciful in the administration of justice —were, in fact, of opinion that Eleazar ought not to be punished with death, but with flogging and imprisonment. Hyrcanus looked upon this as a sign of their agreement with the slanderer, became more and more estranged from the Pharisees, and attached himself more closely to the Sadducees.

* *Ant.* xiii. 10 § 5, 6.

A few of the details of this account seem to be apocryphal. It is at least doubtful whether, *e.g.*, Eleazar stood so completely alone. But the main fact may be credible. We differ from Josephus only in this, that we attribute less weight to this incident than he does. He represents it as if, without this accidental motive, the harmony between Johannes Hyrcanus and the Pharisees might have remained undisturbed. We should rather believe that the strife could not well be deferred any longer. Hyrcanus was much too powerful and independent a prince to be kept in leading strings by the strict Scribes. And the latter, for their part, could not be content with a semi-subjection. Sooner or later, therefore, the explosion must have come.

Meanwhile the attitude of the Asmonæans towards the Sopherîm from this time forward was indicated. Aristobulus' reign was too short for anything of importance to occur. His brother, Alexander Jannæus (105-79 B.C.), had so much the better opportunity of displaying his disposition. The numerous and often disastrous wars in which he involved himself, increased the discontent of the people and strengthened the party of the Pharisees. The way in which the discord first manifested itself is characteristic.* At the celebration of the feast of tabernacles in the temple, Alexander, who was officiating as high-priest, showed that he did not care for the precepts of the Sopherîm: the water which according to them ought to have been placed upon the altar as a libation, he threw away before all the people. Thereupon the indignation of the multitude burst forth. According to custom, those present at the feast carried branches of citron or palm trees. They threw the fruit which hung upon them at Alexander, crying out that he, the descendant of a woman who had been a prisoner of war, was unworthy to be high-priest. This insult was not unavenged: 6000 of the rioters were put to death. But this was only the

* *Ant.* xiii. 13 § 5, to be compared with Talm. Bab. Succa fol. 48 b (Graetz, *Gesch. der Juden.* iii. 473, sq. 2e Ausg.).

beginning of the misery. A civil war broke out, which lasted six years and, according to Josephus, cost 50,000 of Alexander's opponents their lives. The Pharisees and their followers, not strong enough to cope with the warlike king, did not scruple to call in the help of the king of Syria, Demetrius Eucærus: so violently did party feeling rage at that time. It is true that Alexander, chiefly in consequence of the desertion of a portion of his enemies, remained the victor in the end, but still he had received so deep an impression of the power of the Pharisees and of the impossibility of resisting the popular spirit in the long run, that on his deathbed he advised his consort Salome Alexandra to trust herself entirely to the guidance of the Pharisees: he believed that by this means she could be sure of a quiet reign.

It soon appeared that Alexander had judged the disposition of the people correctly. His widow's government, which lasted nine years, was upon the whole prosperous, and would even have been undisturbed, if the Pharisees' thirst for revenge could have been restrained. Their rancour was directed chiefly against the men who had incited the late king to crucify 800 of his defeated enemies. Some of them the queen had to give up, to others she gave opportunities of flight. It then appeared that Aristobulus, her younger son, heartily advocated the interests of his father's friends, the sharers of his martial fame. When, in the narrative of Josephus,* we hear these men appeal to the faithful services which they had shown to the Asmonæan family, we can understand the sympathy of the ardent youth. We are then hardly surprised even that his mother cherished the same feelings. To her honour as regent it must be said that she allowed them to appear as little as possible. It was not until immediately before her death that she proved herself disinclined to bear the yoke of the Pharisees any longer. When the latter pressed her to pursue Aristobulus, who had taken to flight, and to make him incapable of

* *Ant.* xiii. 16 § 2, 3.

doing mischief, she refused. Was she indisposed to leave her whole family, not only the feeble Hyrcanus, but also the impetuous Aristobulus, in the power of the Pharisees after her death? Her aversion from the oppressive authority of the Pharisees surely needs no justification. But it is to be deplored that she did not even try to prevent the civil war which now began at the very moment of her death.

The names "Sadducees" and "Pharisees" are very rarely used by Josephus in the narrative of the long and varying struggle between the two brothers, Hyrcanus II. and Aristobulus II. This however is stranger in appearance than in reality. Neither the one nor the other claimant had the sympathy of the people with him; the strict Scribes and their party especially regarded both of them with indifference. As far as Aristobulus is concerned this needs no explanation: he had already shown plainly that he was of one mind with his father and a friend of the aristocracy. The elder brother, Hyrcanus, lacked the qualities necessary in a ruler; moreover, his favourite, Antipater the Idumæan, was exceedingly unpopular. Thus the pious did not side with him either. They took no part, at any rate of their own accord, in a struggle which had gradually become a question of persons. Josephus tells us that a certain Onias, whose prayer had often before been found to avail much, was solicited, during the siege of Jerusalem by Hyrcanus II., to give the besiegers the benefit of his intercession. He refused. "O all-ruling God"—he prayed—"since those who are here with me are thy people and those who are besieged thy priests, I pray Thee hear not the prayers of the former against the latter, nor do to the former what the latter beseech thee."* Would not this prayer, which cost Onias his life, have expressed the feelings of very many pious men? We are not surprised, therefore, that when Pompey was called in to settle the civil war as arbitrator, a deputation from the people, besides the representatives of the

* *Ant.* xiv. 2 § 1.

two rivals, also waited upon him and expressed the wish that they might not be governed by kings: "according to the custom of their forefathers, they were ready to obey the priests of the God whom they worshipped; but these descendants of the priests attempted to introduce another form of government and to bring the nation to slavery."* May we not regard these envoys as the spokesmen of the Pharisees? Does it not lie in the nature of the case that they were tired of the struggle, from which they expected no good for religion, and made this attempt in order, with the help of the Romans, to get rid of the ambitious champions? They did not gain their end. It is true, Hyrcanus lost the title of king and was degraded to the rank of "ethnarch," but Antipater's influence continued and even increased by degrees after the interference of the Romans in the affairs of the Jews.

If we broke off here our account of the relation between the Sadducees and the Pharisees, we might be justly accused of falling into the error opposed to that of Flavius Josephus. If the latter, in his general review of the two parties, lays too much stress upon their theological opinions, conversely, in the above sketch, it is not made sufficiently plain that they did not operate exclusively in the domain of politics. At all events, we must add a few strokes to the sketch, from which, as it stands, this conclusion may be inferred. This we will now proceed to do. Now that we have glanced at the fierce party struggle, it will be easier for us to understand and estimate the points of dispute.

First a word as to the development of the study of the ancient writings during this period. We need not say that the Sopherîm still pursued the task which we have already described; no real change took place in the tendency of their labours.† But our insight into the nature of their activity can but gain by our noticing their internal organization. Now with regard to this we possess a tradition which we are the

* *Ant.* xiv. 3 § 2. † Thus comp. above, pp. 12, sqq.

less able to disregard here, because we have already used it with advantage.* The same Jewish writer who gave us information as to "the Great Synagogue" and its last representative, Simeon the Just, tells us that Simeon was replaced by Antigonus of Socho, and that after the latter two men always perpetuated "the thorah," *i.e.* the tradition, at the same time. Their names are: Jose ben Joëser and Jose ben Johanan; Joshua ben Perahja and Nithai of Arbela; Judah ben Tabbai and Simeon ben Shetah; Shemaja and Abtalion; Hillel and Shammai.† The last two were contemporaries of Herod, so that the interval between 170 and 40 B.C. is occupied by the first four pairs. Elsewhere in the Mishna these men are called the "pairs" *(zûgôth)*, and we read that the first always stood at the head of the Sanhedrim as "Prince" *(nasi)*, and the second as "Father of the court of justice" *(ab bêth dîn)*, or, in other words, that they filled respectively the office of president and vice-president of the Sanhedrim.‡ Now this last is decidedly unhistorical. The meetings of the Sanhedrim were presided over by the High-priest; some Scribes may have had seats there, yet not they but the priests of distinction and the elders formed the majority and had the upper hand. This being the case, it cannot be regarded as altogether certain that the above-mentioned teachers always followed each other in pairs: their names are joined two and two in the tradition, because a "Father of the court of justice" belongs with the "Prince." But the names themselves are certainly historical, and there is no doubt of the accuracy of the order of their succession, which moreover receives confirmation from elsewhere.§ Thus we can still follow tradition, if we modify it at the same time, and see in the two Joses and their successors *the heads of the Scribes of Jerusalem*. In that capacity, also, Shemaia (Sameas) and Abtalion (Pollio) occur in Josephus‖—as we shall see

* Comp. above, pp. 2, sqq.

† Pirke Abôth, i. 3, sqq.

‡ M. *Chagiga*, ii. § 2.

§ Comp. Graetz, *Gesch. der Juden*, iii. especially chap. 5, seq.

‖ *Ant.* xiv. 9 § 3-5.

further in the sequel of this history. Their real task, then, was the custody, perpetuation and development of "the oral law." The new Scribes were trained under their guidance. In a word, they occupied in the schools for the study of the law the position which tradition assigns to them in the Sanhedrim. It is even possible that these schools—which of course gradually became better organized and assumed a more settled form—always had two men at their head during the period of which we are now treating, and that thus "the pairs," how much soever their position must be altered, are yet historical. But we can leave this difficult question: for our purpose a closer acquaintance with the organization of the schools is not indispensable.

He who deems the conjecture put forth above* as to the admission of Scribes to the Sanhedrim allowable, will also agree with me in considering it probable, that first of all their leaders were admitted to it. There, then, they came in contact with the aristocracy, and in conflict with it wherever it opposed their ideas. The Sanhedrim was the field upon which the questions which were pending, with respect to the interpretation and application of the ordinances of the law, were argued on either side and provisionally decided. Provisionally—for many an opinion which could obtain no majority here, was afterwards approved by another judge, the people, and carried through in spite of the aristocratic party.†

But if a real battle was waged in the Sanhedrim, the two parties must have had some things in common, from which they could start in their controversies, and which had equal authority for both. Such was indeed the fact. The Sadducees, of course, had no religious or theological system of their own. Who would look for one in an aristocratic political party?

* p. 136.

† In memory of the victories gained over the Sadducees, some days were made annual festivals. They are to be found, together with others, enumerated and explained in the Megillath Thaänîth ("fasts-roll"), concerning which comp. Graetz, l. c. iii. 415 sqq.; Derenbourg, *Hist. de la Palest.*, pp. 439, sqq.

They were simply what we should now call conservatives. They acknowledged the authority of the Law without any reservation. Nor did they reject the oral tradition, in so far as this was already established when they constituted themselves a party. All that "the Great Synagogue" had formulated and introduced was valid in their estimation also. How, in fact, could they have dared to depart from it? It would have been equal to denying what was then considered the national religion, and would have led them at once and for good into an implacable quarrel with the whole people. It is true, the rejection of the whole of the oral tradition was already ascribed to them in early times,* and since then it has been asserted that they did not admit the books of the Old Testament either, the Law alone excepted.† But both statements are based upon misconception. The first has this much truth at bottom, that they usually resisted the novelties which the Sopherîm tried to introduce. Their custom of appealing to the Law in the struggle against these new traditions, or, more generally, their disposition to hold to the letter of the Law and to reject every freer interpretation, may have given rise to the second. The best proof that they went no farther, is furnished by their controversies with "the wise" or with "the Pharisees," of which instances have been preserved to us in the Talmud: no trace is to be found in these of their setting aside either the whole of tradition or the Prophets and Writings. As conservatives of the true stamp, they simply held to existing things. Had they been more logical in this domain, they would undoubtedly have gone back further, as far as the Law itself. But we may not force upon the Sadducees such a struggle of principles against the Sopherîm—for which, indeed, they might have had to pay dearly—now that it appears that they did not enter so profoundly into the matter.

* This opinion already occurs in *Ant.* xiii. 10 § 5, 6.

† Thus some of the fathers of the Christian Church, i.a. Tertullianus, *de præscr. hæret.*, cap. 46.

One of the most characteristic features of the Sadducees' views is their rejection of the belief in immortality.* The description which has just been given of their standpoint is fully sufficient to account for this. It is true that this belief existed as early as the third century B.C., but even then it was disputed by the Preacher, and in the beginning of the second century was not yet accepted by Jesus ben Sirach.† Thus, when the Sadducees made their appearance, it had not yet become an element in the popular conviction, and therefore it was not embraced by them. We must judge in the same way of their attitude towards the doctrine of angels and evil spirits; their luxuriant development belongs to a later period, and certainly had not penetrated everywhere when the Sadducean party, so to speak, laid down its programme, to which it remained true in after times. Let us not forget, moreover, that the two doctrines just mentioned found their warmest advocates among the strictest, often the most enthusiastic Jews, in men such as the author of the book of Daniel and those of his mind, who had formed notions of the high position and the future of Israel in which the sober, practical priests and statesmen who formed the party of the Sadducees could not join at all. For these reasons they clung, in so far as these details were concerned, all the more closely to the doctrine of the Old Testament, even after this doctrine—as already was the case in the most recent portions—had been superseded in the minds of many of the spiritual leaders of the people by other, more developed notions.

The character of the opposite tendency, that of the Pharisees, now scarcely requires to be sketched. Its origin throws sufficient light upon it. The Sopherîm were naturally the leaders of the party. If the Sadducees are conservatives, *they* might be called the advocates of progress, provided that we

* On this point Josephus, the Talmud and the New Testament (Mark xii. 18, seq., and Acts xxiii. 8) are unanimous.

† Comp. above, pp. 89, 92, sq.

do not employ this name in its present sense, or, in other words, that we make due distinction between progress and increasing liberty. The full realization of the (written and oral) Law was the end which they pursued. With this before their eyes they multiplied, and if necessary increased the weight of, their ordinances. If the interests of religion required it, they did not scrupulously bind themselves to existing usages, nor even to the letter of the Mosaic precepts: their interpretation was often freer and—more arbitrary than that of the Sadducees. According to the express evidence of Josephus,* they were less severe in their penal regulations than their opponents—a natural consequence, partly of their character as the opposition party, and partly of the freedom with which they applied the Law. It is equally natural that, while from this legal standpoint they could not disown the privileges of the priests, they limited them as much as possible, by extending, if necessary, to everyone the duties which really were imposed upon the priests alone. Their fundamental principle was democracy in religion, and they did not shrink from any one of its consequences.

Who can still wonder that in the struggle between the Sadducees and the Pharisees the multitude sided with the latter? Josephus repeats more than once, that they could always rejoice in the possession of the popular favour.† Even the wives of the Sadducean aristocrats were pharisaically disposed at heart, and sometimes proved it by their deeds.‡ In public opinion the Pharisees were regarded, and not wrongly, as the true representatives of Judaism. There were undoubtedly some among them in earlier and later times who misused the national religion as a cloak to their selfish designs. Such false members creep into every party, and that of the Pharisees was not raised above this danger. But there are no grounds for making the whole movement responsible for the hypocrisy of a few, who were not attached to it in their hearts. The Pharisees' intentions were pure. If their firmness often seems to

* *Ant.* xiii. 10 § 6. † *Ant.* xviii. 1 § 4, and elsewhere. ‡ *Ant.* xvii. 2 § 4.

us not free from callousness—the fault does not lie with them, but with the legal principle which they had in common with the opposite party, but which, in contradistinction from it, they rigidly maintained. Under Alexandra they abused their victory and gave their vengeance the rein in an inexcusable manner, just as, during the reign of her husband, they conspired with the enemies of their land.* But does not justice require us, in judging their conduct, to take into account the cruelties of Alexander Januæus and the corruptive influence of so fierce a party warfare? Does not history teach us, moreover, that religious zeal easily becomes one-sided, changes into fanaticism, and then knows as little of toleration as of delicacy in the choice of its means?

But it is really premature to wish to estimate the value of the efforts of the Pharisees. Our review of the struggle between them and the Sadducees is not yet finished. In the Talmudic literature, as we have just reminded our readers,† various points of difference between the two parties are named, and the proofs are given which were adduced by each side. It is true, all this ought not to be included in a history such as the present, but still a few examples are indispensable to it. We must keep them, however, for another chapter, which will be devoted to Judaisn during the last century of the Jewish state. There we shall once more meet with the Sadducees and Pharisees. The examples which we are able to give are borrowed for the most part from the struggle which they then carried on. Thus there alone are they quite in their right place.

But before we give our undivided attention to the period which ends with the fall of Jerusalem, let us glance at the memorable development of Judaism out of Palestine. When Herod was acknowledged as king, Alexandrian Judaism had already a whole history behind it, and, after that epoch as well, lays claim to our interest.

* Comp. pp. 38, sqq. † p. 144.

NOTES.

I.—*See pp.* 80, *n.* ‖ ; 81, *n.* *.

The book of Esther is not an authentic historical writing: in this nearly all critics are now unanimous. But they give very divergent answers to the question, whether the narrative has any foundation on fact, and if so, what facts? Herzfeld (*G. d. V. J., &c.* ii. 3-9) leaves out the most improbable features and accepts the rest as history. But this method of applying historical criticism—one might call it the reducing method—is not allowable in the present case at any rate. The impossibilities and improbabilities do not lie upon the surface here, but pervade the whole narrative. Any distinction between a supposed historical nucleus and unhistorical additions is and remains arbitrary. The book of Esther, in a word, is *a romance.* The explanation it offers of the Purîm-feast is not taken from the reality, but *invented* to make that feast popular. A Persian word *pur* meaning *lot* is quite unknown. Besides this, for more reasons than one it cannot be assumed that the Jews named the festival of their deliverance from the danger which threatened them under Ahasuerus, *purîm, i.e. lots.* He who granted this to the author of Esther would have to regard the whole narrative as history, including just those features against which the most important objections exist. He would have to assume, (1) that Haman really made known months beforehand the day upon which he would deal the Jews the decisive blow; (2) that the circumstance, insignificant in itself, of that day having been chosen *by lot* was also made known to the Jews; (3) that they called their festival, not by some word that characterized it, but by a name which means nothing and for the uninitiated remains entirely unintelligible.

If now the etymology of *purîm* given by Esther be *wrong,*

the conjecture is obvious that the author deemed it inexpedient to make known the real meaning of that name. In proportion as he shows that he attaches more weight to his explanation, the probability becomes greater that the real origin of the name was less adapted to recommend the feast to the Jews of Palestine, for whom the book was written. In other words, the hypothesis that purîm was originally a *Persian* feast is strongly supported by an attentive consideration of the book of Esther. Thus we are not surprised that this opinion is gradually finding more advocates.

The form in which this opinion is advanced by E. Meier (*Hebr. Wurzelwörterbuch* p. 716; *Gesch. der poet. Nationallit. der Hebr.* p. 506) is inadmissible. He points to the Persian word *behâr*, spring. But granting that the transition from *b* to *p* (or *ph*) would present no difficulty, the resemblance in sound between the two words is much too slight for us to consider them to have originally been identical.

The derivation put forward by von Hammer (*Wiener Jahrb. der Lit.* vol. xxxviii. pp. 48-50) and subsequently by P. de Lagarde (*Gesammelte Abhandlungen*, pp. 161, sqq.), and supported by sound reasoning by the latter in particular, is much more probable. He quotes an account by the Byzantine historian Menander, according to which an envoy from the emperor Justinus could not be admitted at once into the presence of the Persian king, because the latter, for ten days, was keeping the feast of *Fûrdigan*, dedicated to the memory of the dead. This account is confirmed by Persian evidence: the ten days were the last five of the month of Abân, the 8th of the Persian year, and the five intercalary days which were inserted every year to restore, in some measure at least, the harmony between the actual and the civil year (which otherwise could only have had $12 \times 30 = 360$ days among the Persians). It is expressly stated that this feast—which is also called *furdiyán*, *fôrdigán* and *fordiyán*—was a joyful feast and was celebrated joyously by common meals. This agrees entirely with the character of

the *purîm* (or *phurîm*) (Esther ix. 22). But the names also strongly resemble each other. The resemblance becomes still greater, when, with de Lagarde (p. 164), we correct the Greek text of Esther ix. 26 by the MSS. and read there *phurdaia*, as in Josephus (Ant. xi. 6 §13) we read *phurdioi* (sc. hemerai). It appears to me, however, that chap. iii. 7 renders it doubtful whether the Hebrew text originally had this form as well.*

The above agrees with the ideas expressed by Dr. Meyboom (*Raadselachtige verhalen uit het O. en het. N. V.* p. 90, seq., and especially p. 114) as to the book of Esther and the origin of *Purîm*. This scholar is wrong, however, in making the Persian *purdegán* (or *furdigán*) a new year's and a spring feast. He himself reminds us that the Persian year contained $12 \times 30 + 5 = 365$ days. But if this were so, it was a *movable* solar year, and the five intercalary days traversed all the seasons in 1460 years, therefore the feast connected with those intercalary days cannot have been of a cosmical nature. Or does he mean perchance that the Persian year, in some way or other, was kept in harmony with the actual solar year—*e. g.* by the insertion of a few days when it was found that the spring months would fall too early? Something of this sort seems to be suspected by de Lagarde. "Mir scheint," he writes, l. c. p. 260, "die lehre vom persischen kalender noch sehr der aufhellung zu bedürfen: von einem beweglichen sonnejahre muss Firdausi nichts gewusst haben: er könnte sonst nicht wunschen dass dem und dem das geschick sein möge wie im Farwardîn das gesicht der erde; ähnliche ausdrücke sind vor

* De Lagarde, l. c. pp. 162, n. 2, and 163, denies that *furdigán* has anything in common with *Farwardián* and *Farwardîn*. *Farwardîn* is the name of a Persian month, the 1st of the year: it is true *furdigán* cannot be connected with this, for although—as will appear shortly—the five intercalary days were afterwards placed at the end of the 12th month, they were never reckoned with the 1st. But in new-Persian *Farwardián* or *Farwardigán* are the five intercalary days themselves, so called because on those days *hymns* (or prayers) were offered up to the *Ferwers* (the spirits of the dead) (Vullers, *Lex. Pers. Lat.* ii. 671). Is there then no connection between *furdigán* (a feast of 10 days including 5 intercalary days, in honour of the dead) and *farwardigán* (also *fawardigán*, the 5 intercalary days dedicated to the *Ferwers* or genii)?

Malik-schah nicht selten und beweisen dass der Farwardîn durchaus und immer ein frühlingsmonat war." If this must be granted, my objection to the interpretation of *purdegán* (or *furdigán*) as a spring-feast nevertheless retains its full force, since the five intercalary days, which always belonged to this feast, were not inserted at the end of the 12th month (=towards the beginning of spring) till later, and at first were placed after the 8th month (Abán). Comp. Ideler, *Lehrb. der Chronol.* i. 479 (*Handb. der Chron.* ii. 448, sqq.), but especially de Lagarde, l. c. p. 163 (where proof is given that in A.D. 565 the intercalary days still followed the month Abán).

The mythological explanation of the book of Esther, advanced by Dr. Meyboom, l. c. pp. 115-118, hereby falls through as well. According to that explanation the narrative is founded on a nature-myth, in which the struggle between the Sun (Esther), the Moon (Mordecai) and the winter (Haman) is sketched. Even in itself this conception does not seem very probable: the Jewish nationality of Esther and Mordecai is so prominent that the idea of a struggle in the realm of nature does not occur to the reader at all. Moreover it is not shown that *the Persians* formed such notions of the mutual relation of the elements as are portrayed *ex hypothesi* in the book of Esther. And finally, the etymologies with which Dr. Meyboom supports his theory, are, to say the least, very doubtful: Hadassa does not mean "the quick one," but "myrtle;" Mordecai is neither "the little man" nor "the shadow-melter," but a derivative of the name of the god Merodach, &c. But what decides this case is: if the Persian feast *purdegán*, from which the Jewish *purîm* is descended, was not kept in the spring, its subject cannot have been the defeat of winter by the celestial powers.

We must also make a few remarks here upon *the age* of the book of Esther. Dr. Meyboom (l. c. pp. 109, seq.) is inclined to place it in the *second* century B.C., shortly before or in the beginning of the Maccabean period, and considers that the writer means "to rouse the national spirit of the Jews and make them

feel that the Jewish people, even though it seem betrayed and sold, nay, hopelessly lost, cannot be destroyed, but must triumph over all its foes; that therefore the Jews must not sit still, but must risk the struggle in the full assurance of their final triumph." This writer would then have been "a Jew of the practical but less religious tendency which we find ruling in the days of the Maccabees and which afterwards became known under the name of the Sadducean." To this chronology I prefer the 3rd century B.C. The national party which, in the reign of Antiochus Epiphanes, wished to maintain inviolate the independence of the Jewish nation and preached rebellion against the Syrian tyrant, was fervently religious and placed the religious question quite in the foreground. In my opinion, the book of Esther cannot have emanated from that party. The "practical, but less religious, tendency" of which Dr. Meyboom speaks, did not assert itself until it was no longer necessary "to awaken the national spirit of the people to the struggle," "the national enthusiasm to the war of deliverance." On the other hand, the book of Esther is quite in its place in the 3rd century B.C.; just at that time the national and yet not pious tone of the book may have had weight in some circles. Esther and Ecclesiastes do not exactly breathe the same spirit, but they may very well have been written in one and the same century.

It is much to be regretted that the note at the end of the Greek translation of Esther is so obscure: could we understand it, it would probably throw some light, at all events, upon the age of that translation. This note states that "in the 4th year of the reign of Ptolemy and Cleopatra, Dositheus, who said he was a priest and (?) Levite, and Ptolemy his son, introduced this letter about *phrurai* (or phurdaia; comp. above, p. 150), of which they said that Lysimachus the son of Ptolemy had translated it in Jerusalem." Hitzig, *Gesch. des Volkes Israel*, p. 438, is not indisposed to identify the Dositheus mentioned here with the general of that name whom we know from Jose-

phus, (*Ant.* xiii. 3 § 1 : *contra Ap.* ii. 5). In that case the Ptolemy in whose reign Dositheus came into Egypt is the 6th, *Philometor,* with whom his consort Cleopatra is usually mentioned; the 4th year of his reign is 178-177 (according to Hitzig, 170-169) B.C. Fritzsche (*Exeg. Handb.* i. 72, sq.) also thinks of him. But other Ptolemies besides this were married to Cleopatras, among others Ptolemy VIII. (Soter II.), whom Nöldeke (*Die alttest. Lit.* p. 88) considers is meant here. In that case the translation was introduced into Egypt in the year 114 B.C.—which seems to me to be more admissible than the supposition that this took place 60 years before. But, as we have already admitted, the whole note is too obscure for us to choose definitely between these hypotheses.

II.—*See p.* 90, *n.* *.

My view of Ecclesiastes starts from the supposition that the book is one whole, and it would have to undergo important modifications, if that supposition could not be maintained. The unity of Ecclesiastes has lately been attacked afresh in this country, by Mr. P. A. S. van Limburg Brouwer, in the *Tijdspiegel* of 1870, vol. i. 283-302, who does not confine himself to denying that unity, but makes an attempt to show *two* writers, of very divergent tendencies, and to divide the book between them. The reasons why I cannot agree with this very ingenious hypothesis must be set forth here.

It is generally admitted both that Ecclesiastes does not contain a continuous discourse, and that the writer is not throughout consistent with himself. These facts have both been granted by de Jong *(De Pred. vert. en verklaard;* Leiden, 1861), by Hooykaas *(Proeve eener gesch. van de beoefening der wijsheid onder de Hebreën ;* 1862, pp. 267, seq.) and by myself (*Hk. O.* iii. 172-205). But we consider them by no means irreconcilable with the unity of the book, for (1) the proverbial form excludes

a strictly logical discourse, and (2) the author seemed to us to be *undecided*, and therefore speaks here in this way and there in another, here more sceptically and there less so. The same opinion is expressed by Th. Nöldeke: "Mit Unrecht haben frühere Erklärer die Abgerissenheit der Rede und den Widerspruch der Gedanken so stark gefunden, dass sie entweder die innere Einheit ganz vermiszten und das Werk als ein Conglomerat verschiedener Bruchstücke auffaszten, oder stellenweise einen förmlichen Dialog annahmen." *(Die alttest. Lit.* p. 174.)

Van Limburg Brouwer thinks differently. He finds in Ecclesiastes instances of "inexplicable antagonism," "two complete studies of life and the world which are diametrically opposed to each other, and either of which entirely annuls the other." He considers it "psychologically absolutely inexplicable that the Preacher should have believed them both at the same time, or one at one moment and the other at the next." "How can a man such as the Preacher . . . . have asserted in one breath, as it were, that wisdom is good and yet utterly vain, enjoyment desirable and loathsome, life beautiful and death better, good things good and nothing but vanity, white black and black white?" (p. 286.)

It is a pity that the esteemed author, instead of drawing these contrasts, which do indeed seem inexplicable, did not rather place the texts themselves, with their contexts, side by side, and determine their exact meaning. Then, in my opinion, it would have been clearly evident that the Preacher's utterances to the disparagement of life, wisdom, enjoyment, may not and cannot be looked upon as absolute, but are quite reconcilable with the recognition of the *relative* value which we find elsewhere acknowledged in his work. A writer such as the Preacher must least of all be taken at his word. Under the influence of this or that experience, he expresses himself very strongly, only, in connection with another subject, to correct himself. He *seems* to contradict himself time after time, because he does not think of restraining his words as, with a view to

another series of deliberation, he ought to do. And the effect of this fault in the presentation of his ideas is the more damaging, because, *besides this*,—as Van Limburg Brouwer, too, will consider in itself very conceivable—he has *not* arrived at harmony between the traditional religious belief and the results of his experience.

On the strength of these instances of inexplicable antagonism Van Limburg Brouwer considers himself justified in distinguishing two writers in the book of Ecclesiastes. The first, a thorough sceptic, "the non-preacher," is the author of somewhat more than a quarter of the book; the other, the real Preacher, against whose exhortations the former, perhaps, directed his remarks, displays all the characteristics of the post-exile chokmah, and, with a practical end in view, announces his doctrine of morals, which is not high-flown, but still harmonizes tolerably well with traditional ideas. Both writers are to be understood best by taking the trouble to read consecutively the pericopes or verses assigned to them. The work of the sceptic, whom we will call A, is restored by Van Limburg Brouwer in this manner :—

Chap. i. 2^a, 2^b—11, 14, 15, 17, 18; ii. 1, 2, 4—8, 11, 12^a, 14^b—16; vi. 8; ii. 17—23; iii. 9; iv. 4, 6; v. 9, 10, 14—16; vi. 3^b—5; vii. 8^a, 1^b; iii. 16; iv. 1—3; vii. 15; viii. 10; ix. 11, 14, 15; viii. 14; ix. 2, 3^a; vii. 23, 24; viii. 17^b, 1^a; vii. 27, 28^1; xii. 8.

That which remains after these verses have been deducted belongs to B, and is *not* transposed by Van Limburg Brouwer, but is left as he finds it in the present text of Ecclesiastes. He evidently imagines that the redactor of the book which we possess took B as his basis, and inserted A's text into it piecemeal.

I. My first objection to the whole hypothesis is taken from this idea of the redactor's task. What an extraordinary thing that redactor has done! From time to time he followed in his interpolations the order adopted by A, whom he desired to fuse with B. Strangely enough, he could often do that without

difficulty. Thus, *e.g.*, he found himself able to insert between chap. i. 1, 12, 13, 16; ii. 3, 9, 10, 12^b, 13, 14^a (belonging to B), verses 2-11, 14, 15, 17, 18, of chap. i., and verses 1, 2, 4-8, 11, 12^a, 14^b—16, of chap. ii., in the same order in which they occurred in A. Let the reader take the trouble to read these two series and he will admit that this redactor had every reason to believe in the *harmonia præstabilita*. But in spite of this he soon proceeds to deviate from the order followed in A. Chap. vi. 8, which in A immediately followed chap. ii. 16, and formed a not unfit transition to chap. ii. 17, he does not employ till much later, and then places it in such a manner, between chap. vi. 7 and 9, that superficially it seems altogether misplaced. *Et sic in ceteris.* Examine once more the sketch of A which is given above. The redactor tears apart sentences which together form one verse, and puts one here and another there. Is such a thing conceivable? Is it supported by any analogy?

II. A second objection seems to me to be equally important. The language and the style of Ecclesiastes, as is universally admitted, are very peculiar. Now all the peculiarities by which they are marked are to be found in A as well as in B. I have failed to discover any real difference between the two. In a note upon chap. i. 13 (B), Van Limburg Brouwer writes (p. 295): "It is perhaps worth remarking here, although in itself it may prove nothing, that the one, the supposed author [A], says, "under the sun," and the other [B], "under the heaven," while the one also uses a different form from the other to express: "I gave my heart to," or "I directed my mind towards," &c. We do indeed read "under the heaven," in chap. i. 13; ii. 3; iii. 1—which three verses were assigned to B. But the other expression, "under the sun," occurs both in B (viz., chap. iv. 7, 15; v. 12, 17; vi. 1, 12; viii. 9, 15, 17; ix. 9, 13; x. 5) and in A (viz. i. 9, 14 ii.; 11, 17-20, 22; iii. 16; iv. 1, 3; ix. 3, 11). The second formula, "I gave my heart," B (chap. i. 13; viii. 9, 16) and A (chap. i. 17) have again in common. Even supposing that the grammatical

criticisms in favour of the hypothesis were accurate, they would still lose their force before all the considerations which exist to the contrary. We will give a few instances of similarity in language and style, in weighing which it must not be forgotten that they are at the same time idioms peculiar to Ecclesiastes. We find, then, the words or expressions—

"the pursuit (hebr. *re'ûth)* of wind," chap. i. 14; ii. 11, 17; iv. 4, 6 (A), and chap. ii. 26; vi. 9 (B);

"the pursuit (hebr. *ra'jôn)* of wind," chap. i. 17 (A) and chap. iv. 16 (B);

"vexation" (hebr. *'inján)*, chap. ii. 23 (A) and chap. i. 13; ii. 26; iii. 10; iv. 8; v. 2, 13; viii. 16 (B);

"profit" (hebr. *jithrôn)*, chap. i. 3; ii. 11; iii. 9; v. 15 (A) and chap. ii. 13; v. 8; vii. 12; x. 10, 11 (B);

"prosperity" (hebr. *cishrôn)*, chap. ii. 21; iv. 4; v. 10, and thus exclusively in A, but the verb to which this substantive belongs occurs twice in B (viz. chap. x. 10; xi. 6);

"I said (hebr. *amarti)* in my heart," chap. ii. 1, 15 (A) and chap. iii. 17, 18 (B);

"I spoke (hebr. *dibbarti)* in my heart," chap. ii. 15 (A) and "with my heart," chap. i. 16 (B);

"vain days of life," chap. vi. 12; ix. 9 (B), but "vain days" both in B (chap. ix. 9^b) and in A (chap. vii. 15);

"madness" and "folly," combined in various ways in chap. i. 17; ii. 12; vii. 25 (A), as they correspond to each other in the parallel portions of chap. x. 13 (B). The scarce word "folly" occurs once again in chap. ix. 3^b (B);

"over much" (hebr. *jothér)*, chap. ii. 15 (A) and chap. vii. 16 (B);

"before" (hebr. *chébar)*, chap. i. 10; ii. 16; iv. 2 (A) and chap. ii. 12^b; iii. 15; vi. 10; ix. 6, 7 (B).

Not only have A and B the use of the abbreviated *particula relativa* in common, but they also agree in its connection with other particles, of which, as is well known, hardly any examples are to be found in the Old Testament, except in Eccle-

siastes. Comp. chap. i. 17; ii. 15, 16, 21; iv. 2; vii. 24; viii. 17 (A) and chap. iii. 22; vii. 14; viii. 7 (B).

Compare together also chap. ii. 7 (A) and chap. i. 16; ii. 9 (B)—to which passage I shall return directly.

In my opinion Van Limburg Brouwer's hypothesis has now been refuted. If A and B each occurred separately in the Old Testament we should without hesitation attribute them to one author, upon the strength of a resemblance such as this. So much the more do we maintain their common origin now that they have been handed down to us as parts of one whole.

III. We are led to the same conclusion, thirdly, by the examination of the contents of A. This work contains meditations of *Kohéleth*, of "the Preacher," as is evident from the verses, chap. i. 2^a; vii. 27; xii. 8, which Van Limburg Brouwer ascribes to A. Now in B "*Kohéleth*" is a name for Solomon (chap. i. 1, 12). Is it this, therefore, in A as well? This question, in my opinion, must be answered in the affirmative. In the first place, because, unless I be mistaken, *Kohéleth* is a name invented by the writer of our book (or, *ex hypothesi*, by B), intended from the very first to be a surname of Solomon, and unadapted to be used in any other sense. But, in the second place, it is positively clear that *Kohéleth* is Solomon in A, see chap. ii. 4-8, and especially verse 7 ("above all that were in Jerusalem before me"), which, let it be particularly observed, is identical with chap. i. 16; ii. 9, two passages from B; and further chap. vii. 15 (comp. *Hk. O.* iii. 181, n. 3 sub. 1^o). This comes, in other words, to this, that A and B have also their literary form in common, although in B (chap. i. 1.) it is properly introduced and explained, while A adopts it without comment. Thus A presupposes B. But besides this—and here especially lies the objection to the new hypothesis—besides this A has no conclusion. If A was written with an eye to B, in a literary form derived from the latter, for the purpose of refuting the views advanced there, the author of A ought to say plainly what he wants and what he thinks should be substituted for

the lessons and exhortations of B. But the author of A does not respond to this reasonable demand. He brings us no further. To convince himself of this, let the reader again read the writing A, as printed in Van Limburg Brouwer's treatise (pp. 290-93). How is this to be reconciled with the relation in which *ex hypothesi* A and B stand to each other ?

IV. No less important, in my estimation, is a fourth and last objection. V. L. B. sketches the author of B. thus: "An honest, conscientious, religious man, who . . . praises wisdom and the fear of God and gives to his contemporaries his practical rules of life in a number of moral lessons. He is also a cheerful man, who knows how to enjoy and appreciate all that is good on earth, and recommends not a sombre asceticism, but a temperate and reasonable enjoyment of life, and considers wisdom, justice and piety the best means of obtaining it. Thus his moral standard is not a particularly high one; it is out and out utilitarian; not goodness for its own sake and virtue for virtue's sake, without hope of reward or fear of punishment, but goodness and righteousness solely as practical means to insure a happy life. Nor is his notion of God an elevated one; his God (Elohîm) governs heaven and earth wisely; punishes the wicked and rewards the righteous, desires that men fear him and show him honour, and therefore proves himself well-disposed towards those with whom he is pleased, but wrathful and not easy to propitiate towards those who forget him or attempt to oppose him" (l. c. pp. 293, sq.). This sketch, however much truth it may contain, is not, in my opinion, altogether accurate. Attention is paid here only to the good and harmless side of the ideas and lessons of the Preacher, to the exclusion of all particulars which plainly show that he was not so "cheerful," "conscientious" and "religious." It appears to me, conversely, that the exhortations to enjoy life, the out and out utilitarian standard of morals and the observations relating to Elohîm, which we meet with in B, *pre-suppose just such views of life as are put forward in A.*

"Der Verfasser ist gewisz nicht, wie man aus der wiederholten Aufforderung zum Genusz schlieszen könnte, ein heiterer Lebemann gewesen, sondern ein Mann voll tiefer Schwermuth. Wir können mit Wahrscheinlichkeit annehmen, dasz er die Welt mit warmen Herzen erfaszt und flüchtiges Glück genossen, aber viele schmerzliche Erfahrungen gemacht und bittere Enttaüschungen erlebt hatte." This is what Nöldeke writes (l. c., pp. 172, sq.) about the author of the whole book, but the same applies also to the (supposed) writer of B. Read how even at the very first exhortation to enjoy life he contradicts and refutes himself as it were (chap. ii. 24^b), and further consider passages such as chap. i. 13^b (not very cheerful!); iii. 1-8, 10, 11 (a bitter complaint at man's position in the world, where everything takes place at the time which God has appointed, but—has concealed from man; comp. de Jong); 14 (in truth, not an encouraging conception of God!); 17-22 (could the author say more plainly that the enjoyment of life is a *pis aller* to him, and nothing more?); v. 1, 5^b, 6^b (comp. above, p. 92); 19 (where enjoyment is praised because it makes a man forget himself); vi. 1, 2, 7, 9-12 (all very sombre and caustic remarks); vii. 2, seq. (a singular cheerfulness!); vii. 13 (God's work unchangeable); viii. 17^a (what bitterness there is in this conception of the world's organization and course!); 12 (separated by v. L. B. from verse 11, which he attributes to A, but quite in conformity with it); xii. 1, seq. (which verses are quite misunderstood by v. L. B., when he calls it absurd to make verse 8 ("all is vanity") follow them. On the contrary, the words which remind the reader of the rapidity with which youth passes away and of the defects of old age are most aptly concluded by verse 8—provided that we do not apply it to the "remember now thy Creator," to "God himself," or to "the return of the spirit to God," but to the main idea of the whole pericope verses 1-7, which in either case furnishes a fresh proof that the author of B. is painted very one-sidedly by v. L. B. in the sketch given above).—All

the texts quoted here ring out the same note as that struck and kept up in A. The ideas expressed in them, far from conflicting with or excluding the thoughts uttered in A, breathe one spirit with these and reveal the same turn of mind.

In my opinion there can be no doubt of the outcome of all this. The latest attempt to solve the problem which Ecclesiastes presents to us is not only untenable, but deters us from trying to remove the difficulties by this means. It may be difficult to prove the unity of Ecclesiastes, but it is much more difficult to deny it. In fact, it asserts itself.

CHAPTER XI.

The Jews in the Dispersion: Hellenism.

Is it not very singular that long before the fall of Jerusalem, in the year 70 of our era, so many Jews had already settled out of Palestine? To the rule that the love of his native land is innate in man, the Israelite formed no exception. From the very earliest times it was one of his ideals to "prolong his days in the land which Jahveh his god had given him."* When in later years the removal of the nation from Palestine was expected or had partly taken place, the return of the whole of Israel to the fatherland became an important element in the promise of a better future held out by the prophets.† In the Persian or in the beginning of the Greek period, the Psalmist, in the name of all, could utter this prayer:

> "Deliver us, O Jahveh our god,
> And gather us from among the heathen,
> To praise thy holy name,
> And to triumph in thy praise!"‡

Here, quite in accordance with the ideas of the time, the glorifying of Jahveh is made to depend upon the Israelites being united in the land in which their god had fixed his habitation. How was it, then, that already at that time so many who still had a home in Judæa lived abroad?

At first, as we know, emigration to other regions was compulsory. After the ten tribes had been carried away, in the 8th century B.C., by the Assyrians, many inhabitants of the kingdom of Judah were transferred by the Chaldeans, in the

* Exod. xx. 12; Deut. v. 16. † Comp. Vol. I. p. 66: and elsewhere. ‡ Ps. cvi. 47.

years 597, 586, and 581 B.C., and therefore as many as three times, to different lands belonging to their extensive dominions, while others sought refuge in Egypt. The change of residence also caused a change in their mode of life: agriculture and cattle-breeding were replaced by commerce. It is to be assumed that the Jews, or at any rate many of them, took readily to this change, and what at first had been a hardship to them soon became a necessity. This explains how it was that so large a number remained behind in Babylonia after the year 538 B.C., and among these some whom subsequent events proved to be not wanting in interest in the religion of their forefathers. So, after the year mentioned, the Jews generally became accustomed to the notion that they could preserve their nationality and their religion beyond their real fatherland. When, therefore, new paths were opened to emigration, many were found to take them. And seldom was the opportunity of seeking a fortune elsewhere so attractive as in the Greek period. New towns were being built and, often not without trouble, populated. More or less important privileges and advantages were granted to those who would settle in them. Migration to such gathering points was especially acceptable to the Jews, whether it were that they could be sure of meeting some of their fellow-tribesmen there, or that a certain number of families went there at the same time: all who bore the name of Jew felt mutually related and combined together, so that for each one in particular the dangers of colonization were lessened and the chances of success more than doubled. For the same reason, too, they were received almost everywhere with open arms. In very early times they were already esteemed as quiet citizens. There was no fear that the Jews would conspire with the other elements of the population. The Greek kings especially—*e.g.*, the Lagidæ in Egypt, the Seleucidæ in Syria and Babylonia—could be sure that the Jews would not make common cause with the original inhabitants of their lands, to drive out the foreign masters. Rather might they hope, in

case of rebellion, to meet with support from them. The Jewish colonies were directly interested in the maintenance of the Greek supremacy, and, on the contrary, had much to fear from the ascendancy of the ancient inhabitants of the land. All these causes co-operated towards the same end, and soon gave a great impulse to the settlement of the Jewish nation beyond its native country.

The preceding remarks contain at the same time the explanation of a fact which is not less remarkable than the dispersion of the Jews itself: I mean their fidelity to the service of the God of their fathers. A few individuals, perhaps, fell away and became fused with the heathen among whom they lived. But the Jewish *communities* abroad preserved their religion together with their nationality. How this could be is evident. If the distinction between the Jews and the heathen were once great enough to lead the former to fraternise together and separate themselves from the worshippers of false gods, this very fact contained the guarantee for the permanence of their individuality. They then naturally made good use of the means at their disposal to encourage the religious life. They kept up relations with the mother country and sent their tribute to the temple at Jerusalem. They built synagogues and assembled in them regularly. Of course, all this would either have fallen into disuse or have been found insufficient in the long run, had not the Jahveh-worship been a popular religion in the full sense of the word. But the emigration took place when the Sopherîm had already been at work for some time, and the belief in Jahveh as the only true God had entered the very marrow of the Jewish nation. Let him who will take count of the distance which had been covered since the days of the prophets, compare the attitude of the foreign Jews in the Greek period with that of Jeremiah's contemporaries.* It was as natural that the latter should disappear as Jews without

* Jer. xliv. 15, seq. Compare Vol. II. pp. 57, sq., 102.

leaving a trace behind them, as that the former should retain their place in the history of the Jewish nation and religion.

Let us now endeavour to picture to ourselves the course of Jewish emigration.

We turn first to Babylonia. Even after the departure of Ezra and his colony, in the middle of the 5th century B.C., Jews remained there in great numbers. Let it serve as proof of this, that about the beginning of our era, two brothers (Chasinai and Chalinai) founded an independent Jewish kingdom at Nearda, which, it is true, was soon subdued by the Babylonians, as a punishment for its depredations, but the capital of which, like Nisibis, continued to be inhabited exclusively by Jews.* In Adiabene, also, they were very numerous and were held in high esteem, so much so that the royal family in that country—in the first century of the Christian era—adopted the Jewish religion and gave the clearest proofs of its respect for the temple at Jerusalem.†

After Alexander the Great, Babylonia and Syria formed one kingdom under the Seleucidæ. By this the migration of the Jews to the Syrian towns was promoted still further. Thus we find very considerable Jewish communities at Antioch, Damascus, and Palmyra. Commercial interests also attracted them to Arabia at an early period, at any rate in the 2nd century B.C.‡

It was the Seleucidæ who opened for them the way to Asia Minor. We read of Antiochus the Great (223-187 B.C.) that he caused 2000 Jewish families to be transferred from Mesopotamia and Babylonia to Lydia and Phrygia, in the hope that they would help him to maintain his authority over those two countries.§ They had already obtained the rights of citizens in Ionian cities, in the reign of Antiochus Theos (260-247 B.C.).‖ From the coast of Asia Minor they spread over the islands

* *Ant.* xviii. 9. † *Ant.* xx. 2 § 1, sq., and below, chapter xii.

‡ Comp. as to the still older colonies Dozy, *de Israëlieten te Mekka*, pp. 146, seq.

§ *Ant.* xii. 3 § 4. ‖ l. c. § 2.

of the Ægean sea, whence they crossed to Europe. In the New Testament period we find their synagogues, which already at that time were no longer of yesterday, in all parts of Macedonia and Greece.* The community at Rome, too, is a very old one: as early as the year 139 B.C. the Jews were driven out of Rome and Italy, because they had admitted Italian proselytes to the keeping of the sabbath.†

Nearly two centuries before this the Jews had already begun to migrate to Egypt, which country continued to be their chief place of residence after Palestine down to the fall of Jerusalem. After the conquest of Egypt, Alexander himself selected the spot upon which a new city, to be called Alexandria after himself, was to arise (331 B.C.). Judæa was already in his power at that time. We are not surprised, therefore, that he either invited or ordered the Jews to go and settle at Alexandria, and granted them great privileges.‡ Their number was soon to increase considerably. In the bloody war which broke out after Alexander's death Jerusalem was taken (320 B.C.) by Ptolemæus, the son of Lagos, and a great part of the population were carried prisoners to Egypt. According to a later account—the "letter of Aristeas," which we shall have to mention again shortly—many of those who were carried away became the slaves of Macedonian warriors, and were first released by Ptolemæus Philadelphus (285 B.C.), to the number of more than 100,000.§ Both accounts are certainly exaggerated. The number of these prisoners could not have been so large, their condition under the first Ptolemæus must have been more endurable. So much is certain, that when the latter obtained undisputed possession of Coele-Syria and Palestine by the battle of Ipsus (301 B.C.), many thousands went voluntarily to Egypt and settled chiefly at Alexandria.‖ They were

* Comp., *i. a.*, Acts xvi. 13; xvii. 1, 10; xviii. 4.

† Th. Mommsen, *Röm. Gesch.* ii. 429.

‡ Josephus *Contra Apion*, ii. 3, 4, 6; *B. J.* ii. 18 § 7.

§ See the edition of M. Schmidt (Merx, *Archiv.* I.) pp. 15, sqq.; *Ant.* xii. 2 § 2, sq. ‖ Josephus *Contra Apion*, i. 22.

made equal there to the Macedonians, and thus far above the Egyptians. In the course of time their number no doubt increased, but from the very first it must have been considerable, if in the first century of the christian era—as a contemporary informs us*—two of the five districts of the city were inhabited exclusively by Jews and some were settled in the other three as well.

In the interior of Egypt, without doubt, the number of the Jews was comparatively very small. There everything remained as of old, even after the Greeks had become the ruling people; thus the Jews did not meet with a favourable reception. Yet the spirit of enterprise led some of them to Nubia and Ethiopia. They also settled, by order of Ptolemæus I., at Cyrene and in the surrounding places in Libya, where in much later times they formed very large and powerful communities.†

The great significance of this astonishing dispersion of the Jewish race becomes obvious upon reflection. The historian of the Christian church sees in all these Jewish communities so many outposts of Christianity. He finds it easy to show that Christian missions at first followed the track indicated by the scattered Jews. But Israel exercised a most important influence abroad, irrespectively of those later events. Its religion necessarily drew attention, and, by the very sharpness of its contrast to paganism, attracted many. It is true, men usually took no account of the peculiarity of the Jewish faith and attached more value to the rites than to the ideas; it is true that Judaism became thus mixed, often in a very strange manner, with other forms of religion, to which it was diametrically opposed—but still the worship of the God of the Jews found warm friends and adherents on all sides. The number of those who were wholly or half converted gradually increased. As the patriotism of the Jews detached itself from its native soil without losing on that account its warmth and heartiness,

* Philo ii. 525 (ed. Mang.). † *Ant.* xiv. 7 § 2; *B. J.* vii. 11 § 1, seq.

so—and now in the most real sense—"from the rising of the sun even unto its going down, the name of Jahveh" became "great among the heathen,"* while at the same time the close relation between him and the people who for centuries had called themselves after him remained undisturbed.

It will surprise no one, therefore, that the dispersion of the Jews is sketched here somewhat more fully: it also occupies a most important place in the history of the Jewish religion. On the other hand, we should exceed our plan, if we collected the accounts relating to the fortunes of the individual Jewish communities, and attempted to form them, as far as possible, into one whole.

We will therefore end our general review here, in order to confine ourselves henceforward almost exclusively to the Egyptian, or, rather, to the Alexandrian Jews and their very peculiar development.

Alexandria was, to begin with, a *Greek* city, and it remained so in the first succeeding centuries. This was the necessary result of its origin. But besides this it was a commercial city, the mart for the commodities which the nations upon the shores of the Mediterranean Sea obtained from Africa: the cosmopolitan language was then the Greek. In addition to this, Ptolemæus I. and his successors applied themselves to make their capital the focus of Greek culture and science. This purpose was served by the building of the Museum, in which learned men were provided with residence, board and opportunities for study and mutual intercourse. For the same purpose they brought together a library which was without an equal in ancient times. Students of the various branches of science, adherents of the various systems of philosophy, poets and orators, therefore, soon streamed to Alexandria. Of course, all was not gold that glittered there. Bad taste and mean flattery of the royal patrons of letters prevailed but too often. The Egyptian capital cannot stand comparison with Athens, in

* Mal. i. 11; comp above, p. 28.

spite, or rather precisely in consequence, of the artificial forcing of letters into bloom. Yet it contained the best that the Greek world at that time, in the centuries after Alexander, produced. The sciences, and especially mathematics, astronomy and geography advanced with giant strides. And if much folly and false learning were retailed in the busy intellectual market of the great city, it still gave the thirst for knowledge the satisfaction which it sought, and at any rate, by the great diversity of its products, prepared the way for the growth of new ideas and of a new intellectual life.

It was in the midst of such a society that the Jews now found themselves. At Alexandria too, as elsewhere, they stood alone and formed an order in the state. They had their own head called *Ethnarch* (chief of the people) or *Alabarch*. They elected him, and the king sanctioned their choice. He collected the yearly tribute and was responsible for its regular payment. They further had their own judges, who judged offences according to the Mosaic law. In the first century of the Christian era the Alabarch was assisted by a Sanhedrim of 70 members, which, like the one at Jerusalem, was no doubt at the same time the supreme court of justice and the highest governmental assembly. It may be assumed as probable that such a body is of older date and that it is only by accident it is not mentioned before. In spite of their individuality and separation, the Jews constantly came into contact with their fellow citizens, and especially with the Greeks, who constituted with them the free and privileged population of Alexandria. This intercourse was naturally coupled with the use of the Greek tongue. Thus the Jews soon began to employ that language, nay, it was not long before in many of them it replaced their mother tongue and gradually caused the latter to be forgotten. They became Greek-speaking Jews, in contradistinction from the Hebrew-speaking* inhabitants of Palestine. In the New

* "Hebrew" is here the national language in Palestine, which, as is well known, by degrees adopted more and more Aramæan elements, and diverged further from the language of the Old Testament.

Testament they are called for this reason *Hellenists,* while the rest of the Jews are called *Hebrews.** For the sake of brevity we too can make use of these designations and indicate by *Hellenism* the peculiar intellectual movement which arose in this section of the Jewish nation.

In consequence of the increasing use of the Greek language, the Alexandrian Jews soon felt the want of a *Greek translation of the Mosaic law,* and this seems to have been prepared about the middle of the third century before our era, before the end of the reign of Ptolemæus Philadelphus (285-247 B.C.). Its age cannot be determined with absolute certainty. It still exists, it is true, but everyone will understand that it cannot be seen from a translation which follows the original closely, whether it originated at the time just named or 70 or 80 years later. There is no lack of stories as to its origin, but they are of so fabulous a nature that no one can accept them in their entirety, and many doubt whether there is any truth in them at all. The oldest of these accounts, the source of all the rest, we still possess. Its very form at once awakens suspicion. It pretends namely to be a *letter of Aristeas,* one of the courtiers of Ptolemæus Philadelphus, to his brother Polycrates, intended to inform the latter as to the way in which the translation of the Jewish law was accomplished. But this is merely a literary allegory, by means of which the real author, an Alexandrian Jew, who may have lived about the beginning of our era, endeavours to give weight to his notion of the origin of the translation. His object is evidently to give prominence to the high value and official character of the work. At the advice of Demetrius Phalereus — he relates — Ptolemæus II. resolved to have the laws of Moses translated into Greek, and afterwards placed in the Alexandrian library. In order to gain the goodwill of the Jews in Palestine, he began by purchasing the freedom of their brethren in Egypt, who were slaves, which cost him a sum of 660 talents. He then despatched an embassy to Eleazar the

* Comp. Acts vi. 1 ; ix. 29, etc.

high-priest,* who thankfully accepted the king's costly presents, and sent him seventy-two learned Jews, six from each tribe. They met with a brilliant reception in Egypt, and after a time set about the work, which was completed in seventy-two days, and gained the universal approval and admiration of the Jews, the king and his courtiers. The translators returned home laden with presents. This fable, accepted as good coin even by Philo Judæus† and Flavius Josephus,‡ also passed for history in later times with the fathers of the church. It was embellished by them still further, and, among other things, by a statement, which is already found in Philo, that the seventy-two envoys had all furnished literally the same translation!

It is a plausible conjecture of one of the most recent historians of Israel§ that the translation of "the Seventy" has not to thank "the letter of Aristeas" for its name, but was already called so previously, because it was officially recognized by the seventy members of the Alexandrian Sanhedrim, so that, conversely, the fable of the seventy (or seventy-two) translators arose from the name of the translation. The sending of the translators by the high-priest of Jerusalem evidently serves, as well as their great number, to enhance the importance of the work. It is not historical, and we assume without the slightest hesitation that the translation was made *by Alexandrian Jews*. But not only by them, but for their use, and not —as the pretended Aristeas writes—for Ptolemæus II. That he, or one of his successors, made himself acquainted with the Mosaic laws translated into Greek is very credible, but it is not probable that he gave the first impulse to an undertaking in which the Hellenists had a much larger interest; the authority of "the letter of Aristeas"—and of the contemporaneous documents composed in the name of Aristobulus‖—is altogether insufficient to confirm this fact.

* Compare above, p. 68, n. †. † II. 138-141 (ed. Mang). ‡ *Ant.* xii. 2.

§ Hitzig, *Gesch. des Volkes Israel*, p. 341.

‖ Comp. with respect to Aristobulus below, p. 176, and Note I. at the end of this chapter.

On the other hand, it may very well be, that the translation was made *in the reign of Ptolemæus Philadelphus*. Upon this point "Aristeas" may have been true to tradition. His evidence has internal probability in its favour: in the year 250 B.C. most of the Jews had already been established in Egypt for fifty or seventy years, and thus the want of a translation of the law may have made itself felt strongly enough; moreover, its use in the Jewish-Alexandrian literature—of which more directly—proves that at all events it cannot be much younger.*

It was once thought that the Greek translation already showed traces of new ideas, supposed to have been taken by the translators—for it is easy to distinguish more than one—from the Greek philosophy.† If this were true, the beginning of the history of the Jewish-Alexandrian theology would coincide with the production of that translation. It would then afford proof that the influence of that philosophy made itself felt at a very early period. But the passages which have been quoted in support of this opinion do not prove what it was desired to infer from them. They prove rather that the translators, upon the whole, follow the views which were also current in Judæa in the 3rd century B.C. Thus instead of giving the name *Jahveh* —like any other proper name—in Greek letters, they write "the Lord," and endeavour as much as possible to soften down the anthropomorphic notion of God's nature and activity, or to do away with it entirely by small paraphrases.‡ We found phenomena of the same sort in the writings of Palestine as well.§ Thus even if the Greek translation was made without the co-operation of the then Jewish high-priest, he would probably have taken no objection to its theological character.

In spite of this want of colour, the translation of the Pentateuch into the language of the civilized world of those days is

* Comp. here too Note I. at the end of this chapter.

† Thus Gfrörer, Dähne, and others.

‡ See, *e.g.*, the translation of Gen. vi. 6, 7; xv. 3; Exod. xxiv. 9-11; Num. xii. 8, etc.

§ Comp. Vol. II. p. 275, and above, p. 93.

still unmistakably of great importance. It may not have been prepared for the purpose of making the Mosaic institutions known among the heathen, but still it enabled many, to whom they were quite inaccessible, to become familiar with them. We must not form an exaggerated notion, however, of its spread among the Greeks. At any rate, the influence which it had among the Alexandrian Jews themselves was greater, at all events at first. It gave the signal as it were for the rise of a tolerably extensive Jewish-Alexandrian literature, which, to judge by its remains, presupposes throughout the Greek translation first of the Law and then of the rest of the sacred writings. Even though it does not belong to our task to relate the history of that literature in full, still its chief productions fall within the sphere of our researches; and it is worth sketching as a whole.

As in Judæa they began to collect other books relating to the history of Israel and of her religion, shortly after the promulgation of the complete Mosaic law,* so in Egypt the translation of the rest of the holy writings will have followed that of the Pentateuch, after no long interval. We are ignorant of any details as to the progress of this work. It is evident from the text itself that various translators—differing also in knowledge and skill—worked at it. Most of the books were translated in the second half of the 3rd and the first half of the 2nd century B.C. At all events, when the grandson of Jesus ben Sirach came to Egypt in the 38th year of King Ptolemæus Euergetes (II, also surnamed Physkon, who began to reign in 170 B.C.), *i.e.* in 132 B.C., he found there a Greek translation of "the Law, the prophecies, and the rest of the books," which, as he observes with as much freedom as accuracy, differed a good deal from the original text and made quite another impression upon the reader.† Thus, either the whole of the Old Testament which we now possess, or at any rate by far the greater part of it, was then translated, but—as it also follows from the

* Comp. above, pp. 9, sqq.

† See the Prologue to the translation of the Proverbs of Jesus ben Sirach.

words just quoted—as yet had no manner of authority, and was tested by the original by anyone who had the power and inclination to do so. The fact that the grandson of Jesus ben Sirach felt himself impelled to translate his grandfather's work also into Greek, may certainly serve as a proof that the Jews at Alexandria were not wanting in interest in religious literature.

The way in which the Greek translators of "the prophecies and the rest of the books" performed their task, convinces us that in their time these writings were not yet held to be equal to the Law at Alexandria—no more than was the case in Palestine in the 3rd century B.C.* While the prophetic books upon the whole were translated literally, and only the oracles of Jeremiah were handled more freely and, *e.g.*, arranged differently,† in most of the historical books we find lesser or greater divergences and additions.‡ The book of Esther may be said to have been worked up afresh rather than translated. The translator made it his object to introduce, wherever it was possible, the religious interpretation of events, which is wanting in the original; in consequence of this, the Greek Esther has, in fact, a different character from the Hebrew book. A composition of equal freedom is the so-called "Third Book of Ezra," which includes, besides a portion of the 2 Chronicles and of the ordinary book of Ezra, a narrative of a contention between Zerubbabel and two others, carried on before Darius, in which Zerubbabel at last gains the victory.§ The apocalypse of Daniel also underwent important modifications in translation, while the well-known episodes "Daniel and Susannah," "Bel and the Dragon," "the prayer of Azaria and the song of the three young men in the fiery furnace," were added to it.‖ All this is

* See above, pp. 62, 70.

† Comp. *Hk. O.* ii. 240, seq.

‡ See, *e.g.*, the translation of 1 Kings ii. 35, 46; iv. 20, seq.; v. 31, sqq; xii. 24, seq., etc.

§ 3 Ezra iii. 1—v. 6.

‖ These documents occur among the Apocrypha of the Old Testament as "appendices to the book of Daniel."

just referred to here because it pleads in favour of the interest which the Alexandrian Jews took in religious literature, and of their spontaneity in this domain. But some of the additions merit our attention for another reason as well. A literal translation of a prophetic or historical writing shows scarcely, if at all, how the translator himself thinks, what thoughts fill his mind, what influence he would like to exercise. On the contrary, where he comes forward independently, he will usually betray this more or less plainly. This is the case, *e.g.*, with the author of the story of "Bel and the dragon." There is no doubt as to its object. It is intended to show the unreasonableness of idolatry, and to unveil the tricks of its priests. But then it also transfers us into the midst of the state of affairs in which the Jews at Alexandria lived. Their daily contact with paganism in its various forms necessarily moved them. They could not remain cold or indifferent under it. In the face of that paganism, the desire naturally arose in them to give account of their own religious belief, to make that belief known more widely, to defend and recommend it, to point out the untruth of idolatry. This intention is clearly evident, in fact, in a large portion of the Jewish-Alexandrian literature. In all respects it is worth the trouble to carefully study, in its various periods, this campaign of Judaism against the heathen world.

The expression which I have just used seems rather warlike, applied to the oldest Hellenic writers, of whose works we still possess a few fragments. They did not really aim at anything more than drawing the attention of the Greeks to the Jewish nation and making known its remarkable fortunes. It was with this object that Eupolemus, Artapanus and others wrote their historical works, and that Ezekiel, Philo the elder and Theodotus manufactured—the word is used advisedly: the Muses had no share in this work—their poems,* the first a drama entitled "the Exodus," the second an epic upon Jerusalem, &c. In the said historical writings, to judge by their

* Fragments in Eusebius, Praep. Evang. ix. 17-39.

remains, the accounts of the Old Testament were handled with considerable freedom and combined in a singular manner with those of other writers. It is as if the authors felt that, to obtain access for their fellow-countrymen to the workshops of the Alexandrian scholars, they must make some concessions, and therefore willingly do so. Their heterogeneous interpretations have naturally very little interest for us here.

Our attention is attracted much more strongly by the writings which are devoted entirely to the defence of Judaism or to the combating of heathenism. Upon a preliminary review we are at once struck by *their peculiar form*. They are almost all fictitious documents (*pseudepigrapha*), *i. e.*, they are placed under the names of older authors and are purposely written in such a way that the unsuspecting reader does not doubt the accuracy of the titles. Before I attempt to explain this phenomenon, I wish to give an idea of the frequent use which the Alexandrian Jews made of this literary fiction. In a certain sense the same thing was done even by the translators of the books of Esther and Daniel, insomuch as their additions joined immediately on to the original text and gave the impression that they belonged to it. The "letter of Aristeas," which we have already come to know as the oldest evidence concerning the 70 translators of the Law, furnishes us with a fresh example. The fragments of Aristobulus speak no less plainly.* Those who uphold their authenticity recognize in them the hand of an Alexandrian Jew, who lived in the reign of Ptolemæus Philometor (180-146 B.C.) and dedicated to this king an exposition of the Mosaic laws; of the same Aristobulus, therefore, who also occurs in the second book of the Maccabees,† as "king Ptolemæus' teacher, who was of the stock of the anointed priests." If we accept this opinion, then Aristobulus did not scruple to attribute to Orpheus, Homer, and Hesiod verses which were composed or altered either by himself or by one of his fellow-believers for the express purpose of extolling Jewish

* See on this point Note I. at the end of this chapter. † Chap. i. 10.

monotheism. If the fragments are spurious, *i.e.*, not from Aristobulus' own hand, but taken from a writing under his name, there is a second literary fiction besides: then a Hellenist, presumably in the first century before our era, promulgated his own ideas under the then famous name of Aristobulus.—We have not nearly reached the end yet. A few verses falsely ascribed to Sophocles* we may pass over in silence. On the other hand, we have a very remarkable instance in a didactic poem of 230 lines, attributed to the Ionian poet Phocylides (6th century B.C.), in which the *moral* precepts of the Old Testament are recommended for observance to the Greeks, but monotheism and much more Judaism are purposely drawn into the background, so that the Hellenistic origin of the poem actually remained unnoticed for a long time. The same is true of the verses which, presumably in the first century B.C., are placed in the mouths of *the Sibyls*. This name was applied in ancient times to the priestesses of Apollo, who uttered their predictions in the oracles of this god. Some of them, *e.g.*, the Erythræan and the Cumæan, survived in legend and gradually became more and more famous.† This readily led men to forge prophecies under the name of such a Sibyl. Greek writers may have set the example, but the Hellenists imitated them and made the Sibyls appear with predictions of the events which were written in the Old Testament or which had taken place since then. It is obvious that their object in doing this was the glorification of the Jewish nation. It was still more likely that they would make use of the names of the Old Testament prophets and wise men for a similar purpose. This was, in fact, done by the author of the "Epistle of Jeremiah," devoted to the combating of idolatry;‡ the translator of the (originally Hebrew) book of *Baruch*, who added to it a portion from his own hand, and, treading indeed in the

* Clemens Alex. *Strom.* v. cap. 14 (p. 716, Pott.)

† Comp. Preller, *Griech. Mythol.* i. 216, sq.

‡ In the Authorized Translation chap. vi. of the book of *Baruch*.

footsteps of the author whose work he translated into Greek, ascribed it to the well known assistant of Jeremiah; and finally also the writer of "the Wisdom of Solomon," who—as the author of the book of "the Preacher" had done before him—introduced the great king speaking, without, however, bestowing much care upon the allegory. In conclusion let us name the third book of the Maccabees, which so far constitutes one group with all the preceding writings, that it dishes up, in an apparently historical form, a fictitious narrative which is presumably intended to sustain the faith of the Alexandrian Jews in times of persecution and strife.*

My object in giving this dry list is attained, if the reader has gathered from it that the false titles in the Jewish-Alexandrian literature are not the exception but almost the rule. How is this phenomenon to be explained? We remember at once that it occurs not only in Alexandrian, but also in Palestinian writings of Jewish origin. I mentioned just now "the Preacher" and Baruch; to these may be added the books of *Daniel, Henoch,* and many others. It appears, therefore, that the Jews upon the whole had other notions of literary good faith than we have. They saw nothing reprehensible in the use of honoured names; the only question was, whether they used them for a good purpose. Before they could adopt another standpoint, they required a more developed sense of truth than, as is evident also from the testimony of the Old Testament, they as yet possessed. To this let it be added, that a very free, not to say altogether arbitrary, treatment of old writers was in vogue among literary men in Alexandria; and the example might easily have a contagious effect. All this, however, merely explains why it was that the Hellenists *did not abstain* from this literary form; it does not teach us why they made use of it *in preference.* The cause of this seems to me to lie in the artificial character of their literature. Had it been the ripe fruit of a brisk and powerfully developed national life,

* We shall return to this book shortly. See pp. 181, 188.

it would have appeared in another shape, in its own form. Had enthusiasm for the religion of their fathers, or what one might call missionary zeal, existed among the Alexandrian Jews—why should the writers among them, the organs of the national spirit, have feared to fight with an open vizor? Unless I be mistaken, it was their sense of weakness, of want of support, that made them take to crooked ways. The strength of an army lies, men say, in the reserves: the Hellenistic writers were not urged on by their co-religionists, nor even admitted into their ranks in case of need. Their position was and remained amphibious.

But I am drifting into general considerations which, however true they may be, will not meet with universal assent until we have prosecuted our enquiry further. Besides the form, *the contents* of the Hellenistic literature attract our attention.

From the list of titles given above it is already possible to deduce a fact which deserves above all to be brought to light, and, if possible, explained. The attitude of the Hellenists towards Heathendom is not everywhere the same; *here* it shows a friendly disposition and a desire to approach it; *there*, animosity and implacability. The polemics of the "Epistle of Jeremiah," *e.g.*, are tolerably severe upon the worship of false gods, chiefly because they make absolutely no distinction between the heathen gods and their images, so that they are able to hold up polytheists as fools without much trouble. It is true, that in doing this the author follows Old Testament examples,* but that he does this at Alexandria and with regard to the Greek polytheism, is characteristic of the spirit which animates him. No less strongly did the author of the "Wisdom of Solomon" express himself, especially in chapters xiii.-xix. To him also the worship of false gods is folly itself, and, besides, the fertile source of immorality and misery. He expressly shows from the accounts of the Old Testament concerning the Egyptians and

* Isa. xl., seq.; Jer. x. 1-16; Ps. cxv. 4-8; cxxxv. 15-18.

the Canaanites, that God inflicts heavy punishment upon the worshippers of false gods, and, on the contrary, chastises his people mercifully and cares for them with tender love. "The enemies of the people, that oppress them, are all most foolish, nay, more miserable (as far as their insight is concerned) than the mind of a little child."* Could contempt for the heathen be carried further? But let the reader convince himself of the author's feelings by reading a few chapters of his book.—The Jewish Sibyl stands upon a par with the author. In her opinion, the gods of the heathen are human beings, to whom, after their death, men have begun to offer prayers—an absurd practice for which the heathen will one day be most severely punished, if they do not turn in time to the living God.—There is another group of Hellenistic writings which includes, among others, the "Letter of Aristeas," which certainly aims also at the glorification of Judaism, but depicts the heathen as able and ready both to repair the wrong done to the Jews and to acknowledge the superiority of their religion and its records. The didactic poem ascribed to Phocylides forms a still sharper contrast. It is true that the author does not adopt any heathen ideas, and usually refers to the deity in the singular. Thus he cannot be said to *renounce* Judaism. But still it cannot be denied that he does not lay the least stress upon it, and even speaks once or twice of "the inhabitants of heaven," and "the saints," so that a heathen reader would be reminded of his own gods.† This mode of writing proves that the poet considers the heathen to be capable of observing, at all events, the moral commandments of the Law, and therefore sees no absolutely insuperable hindrance in polytheism to the performance of God's will. Unless I be mistaken, the writer of "the Wisdom of Solomon" would not have granted him this.

Thus a difference of views does exist, but can it be explained? In part, no doubt, it is the result of the individuality of the

* Wisd. xv. 14.

† See vs. 71, 75, 163 of the edition of Bernays (*Ueber das Phocylideische Gedicht* Berlin, 1856).

authors. One is fond of noticing points of contact and agreement; the other does not care for these, because the gulf which separates him from his opponent seems to him impassable. But besides the personal inclination, *the changing relations between the Jews and those who professed other religions* had great influence upon the disposition of the former. In other words: the difference of standpoint to which we have just referred, can be explained historically by the fortunes of the Alexandrian Jews. The main features of their history must therefore be given here. Not unfrequently the changes in their condition are closely linked with the difference in religion between them and their rulers. For this reason also such a review must not be omitted.

The fact that the Jews in Egypt at first, nay, for more than a century and a half, led a quiet life, and upon the whole enjoyed great prosperity, undoubtedly contributed much towards their hellenization. Had the feeling towards them been hostile, they would have held themselves more aloof, and would have completely retained their national peculiarity. As it was, the two nations naturally approached and esteemed each other. All the time, that the Lagidæ ruled over the Jews in Palestine, *i.e.*, until the year 203 B.C., the harmony was not broken—nor was it disturbed under Ptolemæus IV. Philopator (222-204 B.C.), to whom the third book of the Maccabees ascribes a cruel persecution of his Jewish subjects, which, if it be not entirely imaginary, falls without doubt much later.* The Egyptian kings still remained well-disposed towards the Jews after Palestine and Coele-Syria had been incorporated into the kingdom of the Seleucidæ. They even reached their highest point of distinction under Ptolemæus VI. Philometor (180-146 B.C.) and his consort Cleopatra—who took an active part in the government. A few particulars of their history at that time will not be out of place here.

* See below, pp. 184, sq., 186, sq., relating to the events under Ptolemæus Physkon and Cajus Caligula.

We have already mentioned Aristobulus, who stood so high in Philometor's estimation, that he was afterwards called his teacher.* Flavius Josephus states further that the same prince "entrusted the whole kingdom to Jews," and that under him "the Jews Onias and Dositheus commanded the whole army," by whose address an uproar at Alexandria was quelled.† Perhaps Josephus exaggerates here, but his statement is not entirely without foundation. The Onias whom he mentions seems to be no other than the son of the high-priest Onias III., who was murdered at Antioch in the year 170 B.C.‡ We know for certain that the son, dismissed from the high-priesthood by Antiochus Epiphanes, went to Egypt, and asked and received permission from Ptolemæus Philometor to build a temple to the god of the Jews not far from Heliopolis, after the model of the sanctuary at Jerusalem. Josephus, in the letter which he writes upon this matter, makes him appeal to the good services which he had shown the king in the war.§ This leads us to the following conception of the course of events: Onias, Dositheus, and probably some more Jews of distinction left Palestine in 170 B.C. and the following years, and offered their services to Ptolemæus Philometor, the enemy of their persecutor Antiochus Epiphanes. He made use of them in his wars—against Epiphanes, and against his own brother Ptolemæus Physkon—and raised them to high ranks. Subsequently, when peace had been established, he readily gave his consent to Onias' plan of settling with a number of his fellow-believers, perhaps old soldiers like himself, near Heliopolis—*i.e.*, in a border district of Egypt, to the east of the Nile; they would be of use to him there, as outposts in the direction of the territory of the Seleucidæ. It is equally natural that Onias should now attempt to make up for the loss of the high-priestly dignity: his chances of obtaining it at Jerusalem were very small, not only during the lifetime of Alcimus (till 159 B.C.) and after the

* 2 Macc. i. 10, and above, p. 176. † *Contra Apion*, ii. 5.
‡ See above, p. 96. § *Ant.* xiii. 3, § 1.

appointment of Jonathan (152 B.C.), but also in the interval, when the Syrians, whose good graces Onias had lost for ever, had the upper hand in Judæa. Without giving way to too great expectations, he could hope that the Jews in Egypt would acknowledge him, the descendant of the lawful high-priests, and would offer their sacrifices and gifts in his temple. To promote this as much as possible, he arranged his sanctuary in such a way that it was, at all events, a distant likeness of that at Jerusalem.*

Did he attain his object? Only partially. Many Jews settled in the vicinity of the new temple and formed a sort of colony there, so that subsequently the neighbourhood was even called "the land of Onias."† Priests and Levites also proved willing to serve in the sanctuary.‡ But the love for the temple at Jerusalem was too deeply rooted and was not to be effaced, even in the inhabitants of the region in which the new sanctuary was built. A letter from the acting high-priest in Judæa had so great influence upon them, about a century later, that they at once changed sides and declared for Julius Cæsar.§ The Jewish community at Alexandria proved much less willing to join the temple of Onias. In their eyes Jerusalem was still the holy city; and, therefore, it was to it that they sent their temple-tribute,‖ and that their members went in pilgrimage. Moreover, they possessed a splendid synagogue, which did not need to yield to the insignificant new sanctuary. Upon the whole, therefore, the temple of Onias had a poor existence. Even in its smallness it seemed an abomination to the inhabitants of Judæa. They certainly did not grant Onias that Isaiah had foretold the erection of such a temple in Egypt;¶ although, on the other hand, this prophecy may have helped to retain Onias' building in existence. After the fall of the temple at Jerusalem (A.D. 70), it would perhaps have risen in importance

* *A. J.* vii. 10 § 3.
‡ *Ant.* xiii. 3 § 3.
‖ *Ant.* xiv. 7 § 2.
† *Ant.* xiii. 10 § 4; xiv. 8 § 1; *A. J.* i. 9 § 4.
§ *Ant.* xiv. 8 § 1.
¶ Isa. xix. 19; comp. *Hk. O.* ii. 74, sq.

and become a new centre for many Jews. But the Emperor Vespasianus thought that this should be prevented and ordered it to be closed; it only survived the Jerusalem sanctuary a few years (A.D. 73).*

We now return to Philometor. Josephus tells us another incident which shows us the king's interest in the affairs of the Jews, and, still more, the distinction which they enjoyed: it is only to be regretted that, to say the least, his account is very one-sided, so that the true state of the case cannot be given with certainty. A quarrel arose at Alexandria—he relates—between the Jews and the Samaritans, upon the same points of difference which had also divided them in Judæa. Philometor was induced to act as arbitrator. Both parties actually appeared before him and pleaded their causes. The Samaritans suffered defeat, and their two spokesmen, Sabbæus and Theodosius, were put to death.† Conversely, the Samaritans, in their Arabic chronicles,‡ credit themselves with the victory. For our part we can scarcely believe that blood was shed upon this occasion, by command of the Egyptian king. But it is not inconceivable that he considered himself bound to interfere in the quarrel between his Jewish and Samaritan subjects; nor that he decided in favour of the former, among whom were his friends. In any case, this incident proves that the Jews asserted themselves strongly under Ptolemæus Philometor. The dispute between them and the Samaritans bears witness to awakened religious zeal.

With the death of Philometor (146 B.C.) the period of their unbroken prosperity came to an end. It is true, they saw some happy and successful days after that, but these alternated with persecutions and calamity. Even in the reign of Ptolemæus VII. Physkon (till 117 B.C.), their condition could not have been enviable: they had proved too faithful adherents of his brother

* *A.J.* vii. 10, § 2-4. † *Ant.* xii. 3 § 4. ‡ Abu'lfathi *Annales Samaritani*, ed. E. Vilmar, pp. 95, sqq. of the Arabic text; *Liber Josuæ* ed. Juynboll, pp. 181, sqq., 310, sqq. (Arab. text. pp. 44, sqq.)

Philometor and his consort Cleopatra, for Physkon to be able to regard them with favour. Whether his feelings towards them manifested themselves in deeds, we cannot decide. The statement of Josephus, that he let loose upon the Jewish population of Alexandria elephants inflamed with wine, which, however, turned round upon their drivers and trampled some of them,* is not confirmed elsewhere, but must yet have some foundation, if it be true that the Alexandrian Jews commemorated their escape every year.† Immediately after Physkon's death, the affairs of the Jews again took a better turn: his widow Cleopatra, who reigned with her two sons, Ptolemæus Lathyrus and Ptolemæus Alexander, successively, placed two sons of Onias, Hilkia and Hananiah, at the head of her army;‡ the latter had such great influence that, to please him, the queen gave up her plan of incorporating Palestine, and made peace with Alexander Jannæus.§ We are not told whether he used his power to help his co-religionists in Egypt. Upon the whole we do not now learn much about them. Egyptian affairs got more and more into hopeless confusion; the time was evidently near when the Romans would take them in hand altogether. In the year 48 B.C. the Jews found an opportunity of doing Julius Cæsar, who had followed Pompey's adherents to Egypt, an important service,‖ for which he afterwards proved very grateful. Upon the whole the Romans were not unfavourably disposed towards them. Thus, no doubt, they looked forward with longing to the end of the Egyptian independence, which only existed in appearance. Cleopatra, the last queen, still did them as much harm as she could. But, after Antony's defeat at Pharsalus, the days of her rule were numbered: in the year 30 B.C. Egypt became a Roman province.

* *Contra Apion*, ii. 5. † l. c. and 3 Macc. vii. 16 (Greek text, 19). In the latter book the persecution of the Jews is ascribed to Ptolemæus IV. Philopator. See below. ‡ *Ant.* xiii. 10 § 1. § l. c. 13 § 3; comp. Hitzig, l. c. p. 479. ‖ *Ant.* xiv. 7 § 4; 10 § 1, seq.; comp. Mommsen, l. c. iii. 426, sqq.

Exactly 100 years lie between this epoch and the fall of Jerusalem. A series of events, which in a review such as ours cannot be passed over in silence, fall within this period. In the reigns of Augustus and Tiberius, the Jews, supported and protected in their privileges by the Romans, increased in richness and importance. But this drew upon them the envy of their fellow-citizens, which was only waiting for a favourable opportuuity to show itself openly. It broke out in the beginning of the reign of Caius Caligula (A.D. 37-41). The then governor of Egypt, Flaccus, foresaw nothing good from the new emperor, and resolved to make sure of the good-will and recommendation of the Greek population of Alexandria, by giving the Jews up to them. For nearly three months they were exposed to all sorts of ill-treatment: the populace drove them out of the quarters of the city where they were most numerous; deprived them of their synagogues—or, as they were called at Alexandria, *proseuchæ, i.e.* houses of prayer—and placed in them figures of the emperor; plundered their dwellings, and put some of them to death. Why the Jews, whose number is computed by a contemporary at a million,* did not resist, can no longer be ascertained: the peace which they had now enjoyed for more than fifty years, was certainly not at all calculated to further their power of defence, but still their passive conduct is surprising. From Flaccus they could expect no help of any kind; on the contrary, he deprived them of their full rights as citizens, which they rightly claimed to have possessed from the very foundation of the city. It is true that after a short time this foe was recalled by the emperor, but the inhabitants of Alexandria continued their hostilities. The Jews were also attacked in writings by, among others, a certain Apion, who collected all sorts of slanderous reports concerning them, and depicted them as rebels and as enemies of the emperor. Matters became more and more serious for them,

* Philo, II. 523 (Mang.). He speaks here of the Jews at Alexandria *and in Egypt*. With regard to their number in the city alone, see l. c. ii. 525.

when Caligula, an almost insane libertine, gave orders that the same honour should be shown him during his lifetime that had fallen to his predecessors after their deaths, and that places should be given up for his statue in all the temples. The Jews in Egypt and—as we shall see hereafter—in Palestine naturally refused to do this. Caligula was furious. When therefore envoys from the two parties in Alexandria presented themselves at Rome, for him to decide the dispute as to the Jews' rights of citizenship, he first refused to receive the Jewish deputation, and afterwards, when they were admitted into his presence, treated them with great insult. Philo, the brother of the alabarch, a distinguished and worthy man, to whom we shall revert presently, was at their head; he himself has left us an account of the events of which we are treating.* The envoys went home again disappointed. As long as Caligula lived, the quarrel remained unsettled. It was not till the reign of his successor, Claudius, that the Jews succeeded in obtaining the recognition of their rights.

The Alexandrian disturbances are important for more than one reason. First of all because they bring to light the hostile feeling which very many in the heathen world cherished against the Jews. The masses cannot bear that there should be any who make a distinction between themselves and the rest of mankind. They have no respect for convictions and customs which differ from their own; they have no notion of *esteeming* them. Thus it was not unnatural that the Alexandrian populace regarded the Jews with bitter hatred. It was the more enraged by their extraordinary prosperity. The slightest inducement was enough to make the smouldering fire burst out. This was the condition of affairs at that time and—how often afterwards, in heathen as well as, in later days, in christian society!—But also from a literary point of view the persecution of the Jews under Caligula is of significance.

* In his writings *In Flaccum* and *De legatione ad Cajum*, ii. 517-544, 545-600, (Mang.).

I have already made mention of *Apion's* satire—which we only know from Flavius Josephus' reply—and of *Philo's* narrative of what took place. Besides these, *the third book of the Maccabees* was written in consequence of the events in Alexandria. The author represents the case as if Ptolemæus IV. Philopator (222-204 B.C.) made the conservation of their civil rights by the Jews dependent upon their taking part in the heathen sacrifices,* and when the majority of them remained true to their religion, gave orders to assemble them all in the racecourse at Alexandria, where they were to be trampled by the elephants; the Jews were preserved from destruction by a series of miracles. It may be that there is some foundation for the very full and exaggerated description of the scene in the racecourse, and this in the reign of Ptolemæus Physkon.† But in no case was it the author's object to narrate history. From the beginning to the end he has the measures of Caligula and his officers in view. He wishes to stir up his fellow-believers to resistance, and for this purpose gives prominence to the fact that God never ceases to protect his people‡ and can make his supremacy acknowledged by the most presumptuous foe,§ while, on the other hand, apostasy from his service does not remain unpunished.‖ Thus the whole book was written to suit certain circumstances. The heaping up of gross improbabilities and the inflated style make it almost unreadable for us. But in the days of tension and anxiety in which it was written and circulated among the Jews, it could not have missed its effect.

There is another production of the Jewish Alexandrian literature which has been connected with the tumults in Caligula's reign: *the Wisdom of Solomon*. This writing could not have originated in the days of the persecution: it has not enough reality about it for this, it is written with too much calmness and study. But that it dates from the time of the

* 3 Macc. ii. 27-30. † Above, p. 185. ‡ Chap. ii. 1, seq.; vi. 3, seq.
§ Chap. vii., seq.. ‖ Chap. vii. 10, seq.

Roman emperors, is very probable. The author—as we have already observed—argues very warmly against idolatry. To show its worthlessness, he points to, among other things, its origin.* According to him, it began in the worship of the dead, *e.g.*, of a beloved child by a deeply afflicted father.† Prayer to the image of the dead one was then imposed upon those who were under that father, and so was gradually elevated into a law.‡ Thus far the writer merely advances a theory, known under the name of euhemerism, which was also defended by pagan philosophers at that time, and was adopted from them by the Jewish Sibyls.§ But when he speaks of "the worshipping of graven images *by the commandments of the tyrants*,"‖ and mentions men who, on account of the distance from their homes, cannot honour *the king* in his presence, and now make an image of him, in order thus to please him by their zeal in his absence as if he were present,¶—the allusion to the honour shown to *living princes*, *i.e.*, to the demand of Caligula, is unmistakable. If this must be admitted, then other utterances of the author's may also be connected with the fortunes of the Jews under that emperor and with the heathen of those days. Thus, *e.g.*, his censure of the unfaithful and frivolous, whose views are painted in dark colours,** from whom the righteous and faithful have much to suffer,†† but who shall stand ashamed and shall acknowledge their errors on the day of judgment.‡‡ His arguments against polytheism, also, acquire double significance when we regard them as directed against a power whose hostile disposition had been shown a short time before, and could be shown again at any moment.

Unless I be mistaken, the proposition that the changing attitude of the Hellenists towards heathendom is accounted for by their changes of fortune under the heathen rule to which they were subject, has now been demonstrated. The historical

* Wisd. xiv. 14, seq.
§ Above, p.
** Chap. ii. 1, seq.
† v. 15.
‖ v. 16b.
†† Chap. ii. 10, 11.
‡ v. 16a.
¶ v. 17.
‡‡ Chap. v. 3, seq.

review which we have before us in its entirety, will also be of use to us in our further investigations. That is to say, we have not yet finished our study of the Jewish-Alexandrian literature. It presents other phenomena which attract our attention and call for elucidation.

The diversity of feeling to which I have pointed detracts nothing from the sense of superiority above the heathen, even above the most civilized Greeks, which is peculiar to all the Hellenists without distinction. It is a natural result of their conviction that Israel alone has been chosen by God and has been favoured with his revelations. Therefore it seems, at the first glance, the more singular that so many Hellenists appropriated Greek notions. This is the case, *e. g.*, in a tolerably high degree, with the author of "Solomon's Wisdom." Here and there he uses expressions and accepts hypotheses which are borrowed from the Greek philosophy, and especially from Plato. Let a few instances suffice in proof of this. The writer believes that "the almighty hand of God made the world *out of formless matter*."* He ascribes a previous existence to the human soul, and makes Solomon declare that "he, being good, came into an undefiled body."† His conviction that "the corruptible body presseth down the soul, and the earthy tabernacle weigheth down the mind that museth upon many things,"‡ agrees with this doctrine. Following still in the footsteps of Greek philosophers, he further§ recognizes four cardinal virtues: "temperance, understanding, justice, and fortitude." But it really is not necessary to go on with this enumeration. However much harmony there may be between the Book of Wisdom and the writings of the Old Testament, there still remains a real difference in their modes of thought and views of life, which can only be accounted for by the influence of Greek philosophy and civilization. From this point of view the comparison between the description of godly wisdom in this book, and in the Proverbs of Solomon, or of Jesus ben Sirach, is most instructive;

* Wisd. xi. 17. † Chap. viii. 19, 20. ‡ Chap. ix. 15. § Chap. viii. 7.

the Hebrew ideas which occur in the latter are transferred into another sphere in the former.* And, to take an instance from practical ground as well, what a distance there is between the old Israelites and the Hellenistic author, where he advances his ideas as to immortality ;† lays down the thesis: "Better (than a numerous progeny) is childlessness coupled with virtue, for its memory does not die out, because it is known both with God and with man;"‡ or limits in a similar manner the current ideas about a long life.§

How far this influence of the Greek philosophy extended, we will investigate hereafter. Far enough, at all events, to make the Hellenists themselves see that they were going beyond the letter of the Old Testament, and advancing ideas which, so formulated, were only to be found with heathen philosophers. This insight is immediately connected

both with the conviction that the Greek philosophers had derived their ideas from the Old Testament, and especially the law of Moses ;

and with the belief that the Old Testament, and again the Mosaic law in particular, contains the elevated ideas of the Greek philosophers and proclaims them to any one who knows how to discover the true meaning of the holy writers, or the deeper sense of their words.

The Aristobulus whom we have already mentioned—or, if the "explanation of the holy laws" was not written by him, but in his name, the unknown Hellenist who comes forward as Aristobulus—is the first who plainly utters these two theses. "It is evident," he writes, "that Plato has imitated our legislation and made himself thoroughly acquainted with all that it contains. Before the conquest of Alexander and the Persians, parts of the Law had already been translated, so that it is ob-

* Chap. vii. 22-27a, to be compared with Prov. viii. and *Jes. Sir.* i. 6, seq. ; iv. 11, seq. ; vi. 18-33 ; xiv. 20, seq. ; xxiv.

† Chap. iii. 1-9 ; iv. 7, 10-14 ; v. 16, seq. ‡ Chap. iv. 1. § Chap. iv. 8, seq.

vious that the said philosopher borrowed a great deal from it. He was indeed a very learned man, just as Pythagoras has included in his own system much that is ours."* A little further on he extends this to Socrates as well, and at the same time gives us his peculiar explanation of the Law. When it mentions "the voice of God," it does not mean a spoken word, but divine works, as Moses writes: "And God spake and it was so."† Elsewhere he teaches that the Law, when it speaks of the hands, the arm, the face, and the feet of God, must not be understood literally, and gives the true meaning of each of these expressions. Let the following argument serve as an instance: "The organization of the world may, in accordance with its greatness, be fitly called God's standing. For God is over all, and all is subject to him, and has received from him its stability, so that man can discover that it is immovable. I mean this, that the sky has never been earth, nor the earth sky, the sun has never been the bright moon, nor conversely the moon the sun, the rivers never seas, nor the seas rivers . . . . . It is all unchangeable and alternates and passes away always in the same manner. With this in view one can speak of God's standing, for all is subject to him."‡

This one example will be enough to show us Aristobulus' method. He applied *the allegorical explanation.* Philosophical ideas which are utterly foreign to the Mosaic law he finds in some of its expressions, which he then interprets not literally but spiritually, or, what comes to the same thing, transfers more or less arbitrarily to subjects of which the original author never dreamt. Such, at any rate, is our view; the allegorists themselves think otherwise; they assert that their ideas are *really* to be found in holy writ, although, of course, they admit that they do not lie upon the surface. But *we* say: the idea first exists in the mind of the interpreter and is *then* pointed out by him in the Scriptures; it is the mother of his

* Eusebius, *Praep. Evang.* xiii. 12. † Eusebius, l. c.
‡ Eusebius, *Praep. Evang.* viii. 10.

interpretation, and not, conversely, born of the Scriptures by that interpretation. This shows, first, the close connection between the two convictions which we found that Aristobulus expressed: the proposition that the Greek philosophers drew upon the Law cannot be maintained, unless the Law be interpreted allegorically; while, conversely, the allegorical interpretation results of itself from the conviction that the ideas of those thinkers which are acknowledged to be true are borrowed from God, *i.e.*, from his revelation, the Law. In the second place it is evident that these two propositions do not occur accidentally in the Jewish-Alexandrian literature, but are entirely in their place there, nay, cannot be dispensed with. Thus we are not surprised that we also meet with them in other places besides the fragments of Aristobulus. We find at all events traces of them in the book of Wisdom;* also in "the letter of Aristeas."† But in none of the Hellenists are they so prominent and applied so broadly as in *Philo,* whom we have already come to know as the advocate of his co-religionists before the emperor Caligula. He is the real representative of the philosophical tendency among the Hellenists, and on that account merits our interest in every respect. Until we have made ourselves acquainted with his philosophy, we cannot pass final judgment upon the allegorical exegesis of the Scriptures and upon Alexandrian Judaism in general.

Of the circumstances of Philo's life we do not know much more than the little already given.‡ If we assume that he was born about ten years before the Christian era, and died in the year 60, we certainly are not far from the truth. It ap-

* From the description of Wisdom, chap. vii. 22, seq., it must be inferred that the author does not confine its sphere to Israel. In chap. xi. seq. he often draws attention to the symbolical meaning of the divine punishments, *e.g.* chap. xi. 7, 16, sq.; xii. 8, seq.

† See Schmidt's edition (above p. 166, n. §) pp. 68 (upon Theopompus and Theodectes), 67 (the meaning of the washing of hands) and especially 36, sqq. (allegorical interpretation of the laws relating to clean and unclean). ‡ p. 187.

pears from his writings that he had acquired a very extensive knowledge of Greek literature. The alabarch's brother was undoubtedly a man of means or at all events of independence. Thus there was nothing to hinder him from devoting himself entirely to study. He recorded the results of his meditations and researches in a series of treatises, which for the most part are continuous. This is the case, *e.g.*, with a number of essays which together form a commentary on the book of Genesis, "upon the creation," "upon the Cherubîm," "upon the sacrifices of Cain and Abel," "upon the snares laid for the good by the wicked," "upon the descendants of Cain," &c. &c.; they follow, as will be observed, the order of the sacred narratives and extend as far as the history of Joseph. Another group begins with "a Life of Moses" in three books; various treatises on the ordinances of the Law join on to this, *e.g.* "upon the Decalogue," "upon circumcision," "upon sacrifices," &c. The two writings already mentioned, "Against Flaccus" and "Upon the mission to Caius (Caligula)," which, as we saw, owed their existence to special circumstances, stand more or less alone. When Philo is free in the choice of his materials, he always starts from the Pentateuch. To him this is the sacred book *par excellence*. To it, therefore, he attaches his philosophical and moral speculations. Some texts he even uses repeatedly, and not always for the same purpose.

It is not easy to give an idea of Philo's mode of argument. His treatment of the narratives and precepts with the interpretation of which he busies himself, differs as widely as possible from ours. Perhaps this will be shown best by giving a single example, taken at random from his writings. In the third book of his "Life of Moses" he discusses, among other things, the appointment of the Levites as servants in the sanctuary and, in connection with this, the story of Aaron's rod blossoming.* "That whole rod," writes Philo, "at once brought forth blossoms like a real plant, and bent under the abundance of

* Num. xvii. 1-11.

fruit. Now this fruit was nuts, which differ in nature from the rest of fruits. For in most of them, in grapes, olives, apples, the seed is distinct from the eatable part and the two are in different places. For the eatable part is the outer one and the seed is enclosed within it. In the nut, on the contrary, the seed and the eatable part are one and the same, since both are united into one idea, and lie inside in one place, which is secured and protected by a double wall, first by the husk, and then by the shell, as strong as a wooden case. By this the nut signifies perfect virtue. For as in the nut the beginning and the end are one—the seed the beginning and the fruit the end—so is it also with the virtues. For is not each of these alike a beginning and an end: a *beginning*, because it proceeds not from another power, but from itself; an *end*, because life strives after it in accordance with nature? This is one reason (why Aaron's staff brought forth nuts); a second, more obvious reason can also be named. The husk of the nut is bitter; the inner, as it were, wooden shell is very hard and strong; the fruit, enclosed within these two, is not easy to get at. This is a symbol of the mind which is perfecting itself, teaching it that, from the moment when it applies itself to virtue, it must begin to work. Bitter and heavy and difficult is the work from which the good proceeds; in consequence of this men will hardly undertake it. For he who shuns work shuns also the good. But, conversely, he who undertakes difficulties with perseverance and courage, strives towards happiness. It is not in those who lead a lazy life and weaken their minds with daily uninterrupted gluttony, that virtue is accustomed to dwell . . . . . It is further said that of the trees which get leaves in the spring, the almond-tree blossoms the first, as forerunner of the harvest of tree-fruits, and loses its leaves the last, adorning itself as long as possible with its leaves, the ornament of its happy old age. Through both it is a symbol of the priestly tribe, and it announces that this tribe shall be the first among the whole human race to blossom, and the last, when it shall please God

to allow a new spring to dawn upon our lives, by taking away the lust which ensnares us and is the source of all our woe."*

It is in this way that Philo succeeds in discovering his own ideas in the Law. He spiritualizes throughout. Names of lands and persons become to him indications of certain virtues or vices. Egypt, *e. g.*, is "spiritless life;" Chaldea, "false knowledge;" Adam, "pure human reason;" Eve, "sensual perception;" Enoch, "repentance," &c. Sometimes the symbolical interpretation is associated with—or at any rate is recommended by—very arbitrary etymology. The name *Israel* ("God strives") means, according to Philo, "the man who has seen God;" the word "Euphrates" he brings into connection with a *Greek* verb signifying "to gladden," &c. It further speaks for itself that a symbolical meaning is also attached to the numbers which occur here and there in the Law, *e. g.*, the dimensions of the tabernacle.

But enough has been said to give an idea of the means of which Philo made use in developing his doctrine out of the Mosaic law. He might have saved all this ingenuity, or have applied it to another purpose, had his convictions agreed altogether, or at any rate in their main features, with those of the lawgiver. As everywhere else where it presented itself, so among the Hellenists, and especially with Philo, the allegorical exegesis is a proof that the Scriptures acknowledged as sacred were no longer upon a par with the religious amd philosophical development which a later age believed it had attained. Philo may have thought in good faith that his philosophical system was based upon the utterances of the Law, and was upheld by them in all its details, but in reality he had learnt from Plato and the rest of the Greek philosophers, and Judaism only influenced here and there his interpretation of what those predecessors had found out and advanced. Let a very brief sketch of his ideas give proof of this.†

* *De vit. Moys.* iii. § 22 (ii. 162, sq. Mang.).

† Only a few passages are given in this sketch. Let any one who requires more consult the well-known writings upon Philo by Gfrörer, Dähne, Ewald (*Gesch. d. V.*

Philo's notion of God is purely philosophical. The real nature of God cannot be defined or described. He is *the being*, and therefore is called in Scripture Jahveh ("he who is"). He is exalted above time and space, absolutely unchangeable, free, unknowable, and further "one and himself the all."

God is the creator of the world. All that exists is fashioned by him, and continually depends upon him, yet is produced *from matter*. Between this and God there is an infinitely great distance. Yet matter is capable of receiving the divine ideas. God communicates these to it by virtue of his goodness: it is this goodness that makes Him the creator, and constantly manifests itself in all creation.

If there be so great a distance, we might almost say so sharp a contrast, between God and matter, the necessity arises of filling up the interval or gulf. This Philo tries to do; he even bestows great care upon it. In the Old Testament he found the notion of *Angels* as being intermediate between God and creation. There also *Godly wisdom* was already described poetically as a being besides God, as an artist who helped Him at the creation,*—an idea which was adopted and developed further by the Hellenists, with evident partiality.† And in addition to this, the first narrative of the creation taught that God had called the light, the firmament, &c., into existence *by speaking;* this again naturally led to the conception of God's *Word* as something self-existent, as had already been done before Philo's time, in Palestine, as well as among the Greek-speaking Jews.—Philo made use of all this in building up his system. According to him, *forces* proceed from God, which are described now as attributes of God, then again as self-existent beings, and, in this latter interpretation, correspond with the angels of the Old Testament. One of these forces, but the highest, and at the same time comprising them all, is the divine

Israel, vi. 231, seq.), J. G. Müller (Herzog's *Real-Encyclopädie*, xi. 578-603) and others.

* Prov. viii.; see especially v. 22, seq.

† See above, p. 191, n. *; and further Baruch iii. 14, seq.

Logos. This Greek word has two meanings: that which is spoken, *the word,* but also *the thought,* the intellectual reflection of which the word is the outward sign and expression. Philo is well aware of this double meaning, nay, it is of eminent use to him. Even if he does not everywhere distinguish the two-fold Logos, the divine thought and the divine speech, yet this distinction lies at the foundation of all that he brings forward about the Logos and its relation to God and to the world. Conceived as the divine thought (immanent) the Logos is inseparable from God; as the divine word it is the likeness of God, the second God, by whom the world is created, maintained and ruled. It can also be expressed in this way: the Logos is the God manifesting himself; the ideas which are contained in it—in the divine thought—are imprinted upon matter. From this it follows, at the same time, that the Old Testament and Hellenistic notion of God's wisdom partly coincides with that of the Logos. The latter, however, has a wider compass, for it is the whole being of God, so far as it can manifest itself, which in the Logos communicates itself to matter, and after the creation is in constant activity—thus also his wisdom, but not that alone. While Philo usually keeps this distinction in view, he sometimes confounds the two expressions, a mistake into which the language of his predecessors, who had given a very wide range to the notion of God's wisdom, might easily lead him.

Philo's ideas of man, and of moral life, are closely connected with this conception of God's relation to the world. The Logos is the real likeness of God, but in the image of the Logos man is created; first, the ideal man, then the real man, who as the son of matter is far removed from God. In man, spirit and matter war against each other: the former must conquer and rule the latter, if the man is to fulfil his destiny; the spirit is able to do this by virtue of its divine origin, and of the perpetual influence which the Logos exercises upon it. Philo loves to dwell upon the activity of the Logos in the moral domain. He calls it the teacher of virtue, the mediator between God and

mankind, the high-priest, man's advocate with God. In connection with this it is very natural that the Jewish philosopher should attribute the highest value to man's communion with God, to piety, calling it the source of all the virtues. It is true that he agrees with the Greek philosophers, as the author of the "Wisdom of Solomon" had done before him, in recognizing four cardinal virtues,* but these collectively proceed from piety, "the highest and greatest virtue."† For the rest, a certain amphibiousness is unmistakable in Philo's description of the moral life. Here and there, in connection with his doctrine as to the antagonism between mind and body, he displays a strong leaning towards asceticism, and regards the body chiefly as an obstacle to man's moral development. Elsewhere the practical sense, which at the same time is the spirit of the moral doctrine of the Old Testament, retains the upper hand. His endeavours to reduce the various moral precepts to one principle, now to love, then again to faith, also deserve special notice. In this and no less in requiring that man shall honour virtue *for its own sake*,‡ Philo rises above the stand-point of the Law, and approaches that conception of the moral life which is advanced in the New Testament by Paul, and men of kindred mind. It lies in the nature of the case that he also regards religious actions as symbols, and values and enjoins them only if they express or foster the feelings which they indicate symbolically.

The question now naturally arises, whether, and to what extent, Philo, with this conception of the world and of life, continues to acknowledge the preeminence of the Jewish people above all other nations. His whole line of thought is universalistic: the activity and also the moral influence of the Logos extend, it speaks for itself, to all without distinction. But this does not prevent him from admitting the peculiar privileges and, in connection with them, the special task of the Jewish nation. Let us not forget that Philo believes that he is taking his whole system from the Law, and, as "Aristobulus" did

* Above, p. 190. † *De Decal.* § 12 (ii. 189, Mang.), and elsewhere.
‡ *De leg. alleg.* iii. § 58 (i. 120, Mang.).

before him, makes the Greek philosophers pupils of Moses. It cannot then surprise us that he still clings to the expectations of a glad future for Israel. The result of the conversion of the scattered Jews will be their deliverance from slavery and their return to the land of their fathers, which will be pointed out to them by a supernatural phenomenon—the pillar of smoke and fire of the journey in the desert. Then follows the confusion of Israel's enemies and a time of peace and unity begins. At the same time it cannot be asserted that these prospects occupied much room in Philo's mind, at any rate he speaks of them but a few times. He attaches much more importance to personal immortality, which he derives from the heavenly origin of man and thus attributes to all without distinction, or rather considers attainable by all without distinction. True, imperishable life is, namely, a fruit of virtue; sin brings death; the condition in which the dead find themselves corresponds entirely with the degree of spiritual development which they have reached on earth. Side by side with ideas such as these, Philo was able to retain the Messianic hopes, it is true, but to unite these into one whole with the former was certainly very difficult.

This last observation does not, in truth, apply only to the prophecies concerning Israel's future. The Jew distinguished himself in his life from the heathen by observing the commandments of the Mosaic law, by circumcision, by his care for cleanness, by abstinence from forbidden food, &c. From the moment that the precepts referring to these things were interpreted symbolically, the question arose, whether it was necessary for the Israelite to go on keeping them in the literal sense. The allegorical explanation spiritualized and volatilized the institutions which formed the wall of separation between Jews and pagans: was it possible and necessary, in spite of this, for the wall to remain? It is well known that Philo, for his own part, answered these questions in the affirmative: he visited, at any rate once in his life, the temple* at Jeru-

* Philo in Eusebius, *Praep. Evang.* viii. 13.

salem, advocated the interests of his nation with great zeal, and opposed with all emphasis indifference to the God of his fathers and apostasy from his laws. But the question is not only what Philo himself thought and did, but also what necessarily resulted, or, at all events, could easily be deduced, from the direction in which he progressed. In my opinion it is obvious that his views could *not* promote fidelity to Judaism. One piece of evidence in favour of this position merits our attention in a high degree. In the years 46 to 48 of our era the post of Roman governor of Judæa was filled by Tiberius Alexander. He was nephew to Philo* and—had forsaken Judaism.† Is not this a very significant fact? Though we do not hold Philo responsible for his relation's infidelity, we can scarcely help seeing in it the application of his principles. In order to combine his view of Judaism with the faithful observance of the Mosaic commandments, a degree of piety and self-denial was required, which we willingly admire in Philo, but must at the same time consider almost unattainable by most men.

Hellenism now lies before us plainly enough. That it is a most important phenomenon, needs no further demonstration. But is it not possible to describe its significance more fully? We can, at all events, attempt to do so. What value must be ascribed to that form of Judaism which was born and developed at Alexandria?

The answer to this question will vary considerably according to the standpoint which the critic takes up. The student of the *history of philosophy*, to whom we will give the first turn, regards Hellenism and especially Philo's system as indispensable and very influential stages in the transformation which Greek thought underwent in the centuries immediately before and after the beginning of our era. It lies upon the line which runs from the earlier systems to Neo-Pythagorism and Neo-

* Ewald (*G. d. V. I.* vi. 235) takes his father Alexander to be Philo's nephew.

† *Ant.* xx. 5 § 2.

Platonism. The same fusion of Western and Eastern ideas and customs which characterizes these schools, had already taken place in Hellenism, nay, constituted its real being.

We might, expect and do, in fact, hear a similar opinion from the historian of Christian doctrine. In *gnosis* the influence of Philo and his predecessors among the Alexandrian Jews is unmistakable. To convince ourselves of this, we need not leave the domain of New Testament literature. The author of the Epistle to the Hebrews had undoubtedly read Philo and constantly reminds us of him. The unknown writer of the fourth Gospel makes even more use than he of the Philonic Logos-doctrine, which he—as well as his contemporary Justin the martyr—associates with the person of Jesus. Any one who calls to mind the later development of ecclesiastical christology, will perceive the importance of the service thus shown by Philo to Christianity in its infancy: it was he who placed the church in possession of a formula commensurate with the ideas which she cherished with regard to her founder, and with the exalted destiny which awaited her. But it was not the Alexandrian Logos-doctrine alone which the Christians were able to turn to their own advantage: Hellenism in its entirety can be said to have buoyed out their road. What an extensive use they made of the Greek translation of the Old Testament! We are not surprised that they accepted the "Letter of Aristeas" as genuine, and soon carried the representation given there of the origin of the translation still further and ascribed to it an entirely supernatural character: it deserved it of them, to be thus exalted and made equal to the original text.

Thus Alexandrian Judaism performed important, nay, invaluable service. No one can assert that the intellectual work of the Hellenists bore no fruit. Hitherto, however, we have only seen that this fruit was plucked *by others*, by philosophy and Christianity. Was it not also of use to *Judaism itself?* Surely Hellenism is a form, a peculiar development of the Israelitish religion: has it proved as such to have possessed vital power? Has it continued to exist *as Hellenism?* Has it

been able permanently to satisfy the spiritual wants of *the Jewish people*, or at all events given birth to another, still higher form of Judaism which proved capable of doing this?

The answer to these questions forces itself upon us as soon as we have put them. But before we give it with full confidence, we must examine whether Hellenism perchance had an indirect influence upon the future of Judaism. Upon this point opinions are divided to the present day. Some think that the real elements of the Alexandrian Judaism were adopted by the inhabitants of Judæa and thus preserved from destruction. Others deny this influence or at any rate confine it within very narrow bounds. It is felt at once that, before we go further, we must choose between these two views of history.

We know already that uninterrupted intercourse took place between the Alexandrian Jews and the mother country. To the proofs mentioned let it also be added, that the family of *Boëthus*, which was invested with the high-priestly dignity by Herod, was of Alexandrian extraction.* It further appears from the Acts of the Apostles that many Greek-speaking Jews had established themselves at Jerusalem,† and that the Cyrenians and the Alexandrians had their own synagogues there.‡ Under such circumstances an interchange of ideas was unavoidable. But it took place upon a very limited scale. On the whole, the Judaism of Palestine took its own course. From the very first the men who gave the tone to religious development, the Scribes, looked upon the foreign Jews and their efforts with some suspicion, and, from their own standpoint, which we described above, they had every reason to do so. Evidence exists that the translation of the Law into Greek displeased them, at all events in later times, and the conjecture is obvious that from the very beginning it was not approved of by all without distinction.§ In short, there is no proof of Hellenism having

* See the next chapter. † Acts ii. 5, 9-11. ‡ Chap. vi. 9.

§ Comp. Geiger, *Urschr. und Uebersetzungen*, pp. 419, sqq.; 439, sqq.; and Note I. at the end of this chapter.

exercised any *real* influence in Judæa, while the hypothesis that it did do so has probability against it.

There would be one not unimportant exception to this rule, however, had we to consider that Essenism was transplanted from Egypt into Palestine. But we know already that this opinion, although advocated by authorities of weight, cannot be embraced.* It finds its principal support in the belief that in the first century of the Christian era, and at a still earlier period, a sect or order existed in Egypt—that of the *Therapeutæ*—with which the Essenes had some things in common; so that one might imagine that the latter imitated, after their fashion, the life of the Therapeutæ, and at the same time gave it a more practical tendency. These Therapeutæ, however, are not mentioned anywhere but in a writing attributed to Philo, "upon the contemplative life."† This awakens suspicion at once. If the description given there agreed with the truth, we should most probably meet with those Therapeutæ in pagan or Christian writers of the second or third centuries. But, besides this, various phenomena present themselves in the treatise itself, which prevent us from ascribing it to Philo. It dates most probably from the third century of our era, and describes to us—not an actually existing association of male and female ascetics, but—the ideal of a life devoted to contemplation, which the unknown author imagined, and the chief features of which are borrowed from the various forms of asceticism with which he had become acquainted from others or from personal observation. We have already rejected the supposition that Essenism was of foreign origin, because it seemed to us altogether superfluous for the purpose of explaining the peculiarities of the order. It becomes quite untenable if it loses the support of the Therapeutæ.†

In answering the questions, then, which were put above in reference to Hellenism, we may safely leave out the influence

* See above, pp. 126, 131, sqq. † Vol. ii. 471-486 (Mang.).
‡ Comp. Note II. at the end of this chapter.

which it exercised upon Judæa. But in that case we cannot hesitate for a moment with our answer. Hellenism lacked the vital power which was necessary for its further existence. Historical theses are of but *comparative* value, and this is true here, as everywhere else. With this proviso I maintain that the Alexandrian Judaism became absorbed by the spiritual powers to which, as we saw just now, it rendered such important services. In the history of the Jewish religion after the year 70 of our era, it may be passed over almost in silence. The communities of Greek Jews undoubtedly remained in existence after the birth of Christianity, but little force or life emanated from them. Judaism in Palestine and Babylonia made proselytes; Hellenism few, or none at all. After a time Palestinian and Babylonian Judaism became *the Judaism*, and Hellenism disappeared.

The explanation of this phenomenon must be sought for partly in historical circumstances which do not touch the nature of Hellenism. Even if it had separated itself from Judaism in the East simply and solely by giving up its national tongue and adopting Greek, this alone would have made it difficult for it to maintain itself long. But however much weight may be attached to this and other circumstances of the same sort, they are not sufficient to give us the explanation we require. Is there anything in the nature of Hellenism itself which fully accounts for its want of vital power and fertility?

This problem has already been solved in part by our previous researches. The (pseudepigraphic) form of many productions of the Jewish-Alexandrian literature drew our attention to its scholastic character and its artificial origin.* Am I mistaken, or are the remarks made then fully confirmed by the facts with which we have since become acquainted? There is something forced and unnatural in the attitude of men like Aristobulus and Philo. Their views are not hewn out of one block, and, what is more, their various elements have not grown or been welded together. Especially in Philo, we are listening now to the faithful Jew,

* Above, pp. 178, sq.

then again to the pupil of the Greek philosophers. The method which he employs to link his philosophy on to the Scriptures, the authority of which he continues to respect, his allegorical explanation, is contrary to all nature. Time after time we admire the acuteness and ingenuity of which Philo's treatment of the sacred writings gives proof; but it is the admiration with which we are accustomed to look at clever tricks or feats of daring. He does not carry us along with him, and this in spite of the rich fund of pure and elevated ideas which he utters, and his spiritualism, which raises him above the Palestinian doctors of his days. His whole system reminds one of a hothouse plant. The author, we say, has only lacked one thing—liberty. The reverse side of this character of his religious doctrine is want of popularity. The intricate arguments, by the help of which he squeezes philosophy out of the Scriptures, are incomprehensible to the layman. Supposing that he could follow them, he would in no case be able to remember or repeat them. In practical life, therefore, such views are barren; or rather—as history has already taught us* —they lead to consequences which are diametrically opposed to the author's meaning.

It was to be foreseen that Judaism would not come out unscathed from its grinding and beating against Greek philosophy. It is true, it was powerful and conscious of its power, but its adversary, with whom it had to measure its strength or to come to terms, was also without an equal on its own ground, and it was on that ground that the struggle with Judaism was to be fought out or compromised. Hellenism may be regarded as a compromise between the two parties, which—like so many other compromises—contained from the first the seeds of its dissolution. It subsequently proved adapted, and as it were predestined, to render important service, after it had been taken in tow by another spiritual power. Left to itself it was unable to put forth any strength, and it soon began to languish. *It had no roots in actual life*, and therefore it fell.

* See above, p. 201.

NOTES.

I.—*See pp.* 171, *n.* ‖; 172, *n.* *; 176, *n.* *; 203, *n.* §.

One proposition and another laid down in this Chapter respecting the Greek translation of the Old Testament will be vindicated in this note.

In searching for the historical kernel of "the Epistle of Aristeas," great value is rightly attached to the evidence given by *Aristobulus*. It especially depends upon him whether, with "Aristeas," we shall attribute the initiative to Ptolemæus Philadelphus, and assume that the translation of the Mosaic laws was not prepared first of all for the Alexandrian Jews, but for the use of one of the Lagidæ.

It may be gathered from the statements of the ancients that towards the middle of the second century B.C. a Jewish philopher named Aristobulus lived at Alexandria. It is true the accounts concerning him do not go back very far. Alexander Polyhistor does not seem to have mentioned him in his work on the Jews—in which he included portions of the writings of Hellenistic authors, which Eusebius has preserved for us.* Philo Judæus and Josephus also show that they are unacquainted with him. But Clemens Alexandrinus, Eusebius, and the *Chronicon Paschale* mention him, and place him—usually at least—in the reign of Ptolemæus VI. Philometor (180 B.C. seq.). Their statements have been so frequently discussed and illustrated that they need not be handled here anew. Nearly all now agree with Valckenaer's conclusion as to the time in which Aristobulus lived.† It is in harmony with 2 Macc. i. 10. Mention is made there, in the address of a (spurious) letter

* *Præp. Evang.* ix. 17-39. Comp. Hulleman, *Comment. de Corn. Alexandro Polyhistore*, pp. 63-71. It is there shown (pp. 6-14) that his life falls in the years 100 to 30 B.C.

† See his *Diatribe de Aristobulo Judæo, philos. peripat. Alexandrino* (L. B. 1806). Aristobulus' fragments occur in Clemens, pp. 342, 713, 755, sq. 759 (Pott.), and in Eusebius, vii. 14, viii. 10, xiii. 12.

from the community at Jerusalem, which is supposed to have been written in 164 or 163 B.C., of "Aristobulus, king Ptolemæus' master, who was of the race of the anointed priests." He is certainly the same as the Jewish philosopher mentioned by Clemens and the rest; their accounts, however, are not borrowed from 2 Macc. i. 10, and therefore are confirmed by it.

Now Clemens and Eusebius have preserved fragments of a writing which—rightly or wrongly—was attributed to this Aristobulus. The title ran: *Explanation* (ἐξηγήσεις or ἑρμηνεία) *of the holy laws* (or *of the writing of Moses)*, and the book was dedicated to Ptolemæus Philometor. Graetz (*Gesch. der Juden*, iii. 432, sqq.) interprets the title differently, and thinks that Aristobulus rather dedicates a *translation* of the Law to Philometor. He is refuted by Popper (l. c. pp. 166, sqq.) and Schagen van Soelen *(Over den oorsprong der Grieksche vert. van de Pent. volgens de LXX.*, pp. 14, sq.). His attempt to refer the preparation of the LXX., *upon the strength of ancient evidence*, to the reign of Philometor displays great ingenuity, but is altogether unsuccessful.

The question is now whether the fragments in Clemens and Eusebius are indeed from the hand of Aristobulus, or were forged in his name. Did Aristobulus really write and dedicate to Philometor such a commentary on the Pentateuch? or did one of the Alexandrian Jews, in later times, mould his own reflections into the form of a writing inscribed by Aristobulus to Philometor?—*Tertium non datur.* An involuntary error—on the part of Clemens and Eusebius—is not to be thought of, as is evident from the fragment which we shall speak of directly in the second place. The fragments belong either to an authentic writing or to a fictitious book. No one will consider the fact that we also take this second possibility into consideration an excess of scepticism. *Pseudepigrapha* are so numerous in Jewish-Alexandrian literature, that we have to ask in the case of *every* writing whether it may not also belong to this genus.

Now it is well known that in one of Aristobulus' fragments

(in Clemens and Eusebius; comp. Valckenær, l. c. pp. 8, sqq.) verses from Orpheus, Linus, Homer, and Hesiod are either entirely altered, or so severed from their contexts that they seem to uphold monotheism and confirm the authority of the Mosaic law, and especially the holiness of the seventh day. That we have to do here with a—tolerably clumsy—literary fraud is now a settled thing. But I ask—with Schagen van Soelen, pp. 33-35—whether it is admissible that Aristobulus would have permitted himself to take such liberties in a writing which he published in his own name, and inscribed to one of the Lagidæ? The forgery must have been discovered at Alexandria immediately. How could Aristobulus expose himself to the disgrace which he would be sure to incur? How natural it is, on the contrary, that another man, *writing under Aristobulus' name,* should have made use of such means to advocate Judaism.

Another fragment of Aristobulus seems to speak still more plainly. It occurs in Eusebius, *Præp. Evang.* xiii. 12, and partly in Clemens, *Strom.* i. 22 (p. 411, Pott.), and deserves to be given here, because it is directly connected with the question as to the origin of the Greek translation. After saying that Plato had evidently read with interest, and borrowed from, the Jewish legislation, he proceeds thus: Διηρμήνευται γὰρ πρὸ Δημητρίου τοῦ Φαληρέως δὶ ἑτέρων πρὸ τῆς Ἀλεξάνδρου καὶ Περσῶν ἐπικρατήσεως* τά τε κατὰ τὴν ἐξαγωγὴν τὴν ἐξ Αἰγύπτου τῶν Ἑβραίων, ἡμετέρων δὲ πολιτῶν, καὶ ἡ τῶν γεγονότων ἁπάντων αὐτοῖς ἐπιφάνεια καὶ κράτησις τῆς χώρας καὶ τῆς ὅλης νομοθεσίας ἐπεξήγησις, ὡς εὔδηλον εἶναι κτἑ . . . . Ἡ δ' ὕλη ἑρμηνεία τῶν διὰ τοῦ νόμου πάντων ἐπὶ τοῦ προσαγορευθέντος Φιλαδέλ-

* Schagen van Soelen (p. 24) asks whether τῶν Περσῶν must not be read instead of καὶ Περσῶν. The sense would then be: "before the defeat of the Persians by Alexander." But ἡ ἐπικράτησις refers to the conquest of a country, in this case of Egypt. And as Aristobulus asserts that Plato was already acquainted with the translation of the Law, he was obliged to go back further than Alexander's time. It is for this reason that he makes the Persians follow Alexander—and this in a very clumsy way. Comp. Cobet, in the periodical Λόγιος Ἑρμῆς I. i. p. 175.

φου βασιλέως τοῦ σοῦ προγόνου (γέγονε), προσενεγκαμένου μείζονα φιλοτιμίαν Δημητρίου τοῦ Φαληρέως (καὶ) πραγματευσαμένου τὰ περὶ τούτων.* ("For before Demetrius Phalereus others, before the conquest [of Egypt] by Alexander and by the Persians, have translated that which refers to the exodus of the Hebrews, our fellow-citizens, out of Egypt, and all the wonders which befel them, and the conquest of the land [of Canaan], and the explanation of the whole legislation, so that it is evident, &c. But the complete translation of the whole law took place in the reign of the king who was surnamed Philadelphus, your ancestor, through the great interest and zealous exertions of Demetrius Phalereus.") The more carefully I read and weigh this passage, the more evident does it become to me that Aristobulus, the contemporary of Ptolemæus VI. Philometor, cannot have written thus. To begin with, the form itself is strange. Is it not singular that, on the one hand, the writer further defines the Hebrews as "our fellow-citizens" (or "fellow-tribesmen") and, on the other, talks of "the conquest of *the land*," without defining it more closely? Is the one in harmony with the other? But I will let this pass: the difficulties presented by the contents are more important. Let us assume for a moment that the Law really was translated in the reign of Ptolemæus II., and through the exertions of Demetrius. Is it not strange, then, that the writer thinks it necessary to inform king Philometor of this, and, after having previously spoken of the translation which was obtained through Demetrius, returns once more to the subject, and

* The emendations adopted here are from Cobet, l. c. p. 174, and speak for themselves. The μείζων φιλοτιμία is evidently that of Demetrius, not of Philadelphus; γέγονε, which is indispensable to the construction of the sentence, may very easily have fallen out after προγόνου. Moreover, the introduction of καὶ is justified by Clemens Alexandrinus, who (*Strom.* i. 22, p. 410, Pott.) adopts Aristobulus' words—without naming him—in this manner:—Ἑρμηνευθῆναι τὰς γραφὰς . . . . . εἰς τὴν Ἑλλάδα γλῶττάν φασιν ἐπὶ βασιλέως Πτολεμαίου τοῦ Λάγου, ἢ ὥς τινες ἐπὶ τοῦ Φιλαδέλφου ἐπικληθέ τος, τὴν μεγίστην φιλοτιμίαν εἰς τοῦτο προσενεγκαμένου Δημητρίου τοῦ Φαληρέως καὶ τὰ περὶ τὴν ἑρμηνείαν ἀκριβῶς πραγματευσαμένου.

states it more fully? If the matter were historical, was there any need to tell it to the king? But the converse is true. It has been shown by Hody, and by many since his time, that Demetrius Phalereus never filled the post of librarian at Alexandria, and that he was banished by Ptolemæus Philadelphus, immediately after his accession to the throne, and shortly afterwards put to death.* This does not prevent Demetrius from being described in "the letter of Aristeas" as a friend of Philadelphus: in the first century B.C., when that letter was composed, such a relation could be either believed in good faith or invented. But can Aristobulus, about the year 170 B.C., have written down this untruth, and that in a book in which he is addressing Ptolemæus Philometor? I consider this very improbable. No more do I consider it admissible that he would have told that king about a translation of the Law—into Greek, of course—prepared in the time prior to the conquest of Egypt by the Persians. Nothing can be more natural than that Aristobulus should have been *represented* to have put forward such enormities; but that he should have taken them upon his own shoulders seems almost inconceivable. All this leads to the conclusion that one of the earliest readers of "the letter of Aristeas" resolved to make Aristobulus the philosopher come forward (as a defender of the allegorical exposition of the Scriptures, and) as a witness to the dependence of the Greek upon the Jewish law and the royal origin of the Greek translation then in use. This hypothesis fully accounts for all that we read in the fragments of Aristobulus.

Thus the supposed Aristeas loses the support afforded him by the—as it was imagined—so much older Aristobulus. He is now the only spokesman for what I have just mentioned: the royal origin of the LXX. If, then, it be in itself much more probable that the Alexandrian Jews prepared that translation for their own use, there is certainly no historical evidence

* Comp. also Cobet, l. c. pp. 174, sq.

to cause us to embrace any other opinion as to its origin. Surely "Aristeas" has no authority whatever.

But *the translation itself* is made to supply at least one argument for its preparation by order of one of the Lagidæ. It is said more than once in the Talmud—upon the strength of "the letter of Aristeas," which, as Josephus bears witness, was also known in Palestine—that the Greek translation was made by "king Tholmai," *i.e.*, Ptolemæus (j. Megillah, i. 9; b. Megillah, 9a, &c.). It is also said that (thirteen or fourteen) *alterations* were made for Ptolemæus (*i.e.*, to prevent misunderstanding or wrong judgment on his part). Among other things, in Lev. xi. 6, Deut. xiv. 7, is written *she'irath* (so read for *tse'irath*) *ha-raglaïm*, instead of *arnébeth*, because Ptolemæus' *mother* (according to the Babylonish Gemara, his *wife*) bore this name. At first sight this statement seems more than enigmatical. The word *arnébeth* means *hare;* the paraphrase which the translators are said to have substituted for it means *with hairy feet.* Nothing is known of any woman's name which agreed in sound with *arnébeth.* But we open the Greek translation of Lev. xi. and Deut. xiv., and discover that the LXX. did not use the most ordinary word, λαγώς ("lagôs"), to translate *arnébeth*, but δασύπους (a compound word, which really means *shaggy-foot*). Thus the statement in the Talmud is not utterly without foundation. But what are we to think of "the mother" or "the wife of Ptolemæus," for whose sake the alteration is stated to have been made? It is usually assumed that there is a mistake here, and that *the father* of (the first) Ptolemæus should have been mentioned. His name was *Lagos*, which agrees tolerably well with *lagôs* (the ordinary word for "hare"). It must indeed be admitted that the spokesman of the Talmudic doctors interpreted and explained the use of "shaggy-foot" (Levit xi. and Deut. xiv.) in this way. To the question, Why does not *lagôs* stand there? he answered: the translators avoided the word for the sake of the ancestor of the Egyptian

kings. But it is another thing to *admit* this answer, or, in other words, to affirm that the Greek translator *really* allowed the remembrance of Lagos to prevent him from using "lagôs." Cobet has lately adduced such grave objections to this view, that the traditional opinion now seems to me to be altogether untenable.* He points out that δασύπους is a very common name for the hare, so that the use of this word by the translator requires no explanation. He further draws attention to the meaning of the name Lagos ("leader of the people"), of which the translator, in the third century B.C., cannot well have been ignorant, but which therefore must have prevented him from connecting that proper name with "lagôs"—which moreover differs in pronunciation and accent. In short, the resemblance between Lagos and "lagôs" was turned by an ingenious commentator into a motive for the Greek translator, but was not his motive in reality. And, in fact, were it otherwise, it would by no means follow from this detail that the translation was made by order of a Ptolemæus: assuming that the word "lagôs," for the above-mentioned reason, appeared to be less suitable, it was equally unsuitable if the translation were made for the synagogue.

A few words only will suffice to mention that Graetz (l. c. iii. 429) appeals incorrectly to Philo, *de vita Moys.* ii. 7 (ii. 140, sq., Mang.), in favour of the co-operation of the Lagidæ. It is clearly evident that the feast which Philo mentions in that passage has nothing whatever in common with the Greek translation of the Law. Philo—quite in accordance with the allegorical method peculiar to him—connects them with each other, but refutes himself by stating that the Greeks also celebrated this feast in large numbers. This is the opinion of Schagen van Soelen (pp. 39, sq.) and of Cobet, who, not without reason, censures the ἀλάζονες Ἰουδαῖοι (for "Aristeas" and Josephus belong to the guilty as well) for this their presumption.†

* Comp. the periodical referred to, I. 2, pp. 284-287.

† l. c. I. 1, pp. 171, sqq. In "the letter of Aristeas" that feast is mentioned,

Thus the supposed Aristeas can have adhered to the truth only in this, that he places the translation in the reign of Ptolemæus Philadelphus, or, in other words, about the middle of the third century B.C. The arguments in favour of this chronology are not decisive, it is true, but still they have great weight. When Jesus ben Sirach's grandson came to Egypt in 132 B.C., the prophecies and the rest of the books had been translated into Greek besides the Law. Now if, as is very probable, some time elapsed between the translation of the Law (which the Alexandrian Jews as well esteemed more highly than the rest of the sacred literature) and the interpretation of the prophets and the other books, then we must certainly refer the former to the third century B.C. Besides this, there is the fact that the Hellenists whose fragments have been preserved to us by Alexander Polyhistor in Eusebius, are acquainted with and make use of the Greek translation. It is true, the lifetimes of these men cannot be fixed with complete certainty (comp., among others, Herzfeld, l. c. iii. 481, sqq., 570, sqq.), but some of them must have lived about 200 B.C. Comp. also Popper, l. c. pp. 167, sq.

The opinion of the Jews in Palestine regarding the translation of the Law (and the rest of the sacred books) into Greek deserves special investigation.

Graetz (l. c. iii. 429, sq.) draws attention to an account in the (post-talmudic) tract entitled *Sopherîm*, i. 7,* which states that the day on which the Law was translated into Greek *by five men* was regarded as a day of misfortune, because the sense of the Law could not be properly given in a foreign tongue. Graetz holds this to be historical, and assumes that the pious men in Judæa at first deplored the transla-

p. 44 *in fine* of Schmidt's edition (where it is connected with the arrival of the translators), and by Josephus, *Ant.* xii. 2 § 6 (ditto). Both add that this arrival coincided with a victory over Antigonus.

* Comp. Zunz, *Die gottesd. Vorträge der Juden*, p. 95, sq.

tion as a misfortune, and that it was not till subsequently, when they remarked how powerful an influence the Greek translation exercised, that they began to think of it more favourably; then they also accepted the representations in "the letter of Aristeas;" when this had once taken place, the older conception fell into oblivion, so much so even that it has only been preserved by chance, as it were, in a writing of such recent date as the tract *Sopherîm*.

It seems to me that this conception of the course of ideas as to the Greek translation is not only opposed to probability, but is also contradicted by the historical evidence.

In the pre-Maccabean times the Jews in Palestine, it appears to me, had no particular reason to condemn a translation of their laws into Greek. There are no historical records which throw light upon their views at that time. In the absence of such records, we will confine ourselves to that which has probability in its favour.

The reaction against the measures of Antiochus Epiphanes must have easily turned in some minds into aversion from all that was foreign, and so to disapproval of every attempt to make the sacred literature accessible to the Greeks. I consider it very admissible that there were some—among the Pharisees and Essenes—who thought thus; but no traces of such views have come down to us.

On the other hand, there is no lack of evidence to show that the Greek translation was liked, so that its rejection—if it occurred at all—in any case was far from general. The grandson of Jesus ben Sirach, who arrived in Egypt (from Palestine) in the year 132 B.C., does not make the slightest objection to the translation of the Law into Greek, and himself translates his grandfather's Proverbs. By far the majority of the writers of the New Testament use the Greek translation in their quotations. This is done, among other instances, by the apostle Paul, who, although a Hellenist, was brought up in Palestine. Comp., as to his quotations, Ac. F. Kautsch, *de V. T. locis*

a Paulo Apostolo alleg. (Lips. 1869). Flavius Josephus himself gives us the narrative of "Aristeas," and in his *Antiquities* follows throughout, not the original text, but the Greek translation.

The Jews' opinion changed somewhat from the second century of our era. Among the Christians the Greek translation then possessed almost canonical authority; they depended on its readings, even when they differed from the original text. The Jews, on the contrary, naturally maintained the validity of the original (comp. Justinus, *Dial. c. Tryph.* cap. 68, 71). Under the influence of this attitude with regard to the Christians and of the internal development of Judaism, the aversion from the translation, the germs of which were perhaps already in existence, increased rapidly. The (literal) translation of *Aquila* is the Jewish counterpart of the (freer) translation which was current among the Christians. Comp. further Geiger, *Urschrift,* &c., pp. 160, sqq.

When the Talmud was compiled, the two views as to the validity of the Greek translation were in circulation side by side. The favourable opinion occurs in the passage of the Jerusalem and Babylonish Gemara quoted above (p. 212.). On the other hand, we read in *Massecheth Sepher Thorah,* i. 8, 9, that the day on which the Seventy Elders translated the Law is a day of misfortune. The one is, quite arbitrarily, combined with the other in *Sopherîm,* i. 7, 8, where *two* translations are distinguished, one older and defective, made by five men, and the other younger, prepared by the Seventy Elders. It must be granted to Geiger (*Urschrift,* pp. 419, sq. 441) that this last account is the youngest of all, and betrays its origin—from a combination of the mutually antagonistic statements—too plainly to allow us to agree with Graetz in admitting its higher antiquity and historical value.

Comp. also Schagen van Soelen, pp. 41, sqq.

II.—*See p.* 204, *n.* † ‡.

The work *de Vita Contemplativa sive Supplicum Virtutibus* has already given rise to much controversial writing. At first all agreed in ascribing it to Philo, and difference existed only as to the contents of the book. Eusebius (*Hist. Eccl.* ii. 17), namely, has expressed an opinion that the male and female Therapeutæ, whose mode of life Philo describes here, are *the Christians*. Mark the Evangelist had preached the Gospel at Alexandria, with extraordinarily favourable results, and had gained so many disciples that they had attracted Philo's notice and excited his admiration. Eusebius does not disguise the fact that this conception of Philo's work has its difficulties, but still he discovers so much and such clear evidence of the Christianity of the ascetics there sketched, that he persists in his interpretation. It was adopted by others, *e.g.*, by Jerome (*Catal. Script. Eccles.* § 11). Subsequently it was strongly contested, especially by the Protestants, but was also warmly defended. At the present day Eusebius' view is scarcely embraced by anybody. It is now an ascertained fact that Philo, even supposing Christian communities to have existed in Egypt in his time—which is very improbable—was not, at any rate, acquainted with such Christians as are described in the book *De Vit. Contempl.* The communities of the apostolic time were utterly different from the associations of Therapeutæ which are depicted in that work.

After Eusebius' opinion had been set aside, it was long regarded as a proved fact that the description of the Therapeutæ was written by Philo, and was a correct representation of the truth; that, therefore, in Philo's time, a colony of contemplative ascetics had existed in the neighbourhood of the lake Mareotis (and elsewhere in Egypt), and had led such a life as he describes with great predilection and rhetorical pathos in his work. The advocates of this opinion need not be enumerated. Most of

them fixed their attention upon the affinity between the Therapeutæ and the Essenes and attempted to determine their mutual relation. Opinions remained at variance on this point, however, for some derived Essenism from Egypt, and others the Therapeutic mode of life from Essenism, while others again regarded the two sects as branches of the same stem, which had developed each in its own way, in accordance with the difference between Palestine and Egypt.

We need not side with either party in this dispute, if Graetz's view be deemed admissible. In his *Gesch. der Juden* (iii. 463-66 ; 2 Ausg.) he endeavours to prove that the *De Vita Contempl.* is a forgery. It was written by a Christian, although not by an ecclesiastical writer, but by some one "aus dem enkratitisch-gnostischen oder dem montanistischen Kreise." Thus Eusebius was not entirely wrong when he held the ascetics described there to be Christians. In support of this opinion Graetz appeals (1) to the silence of Josephus and the elder Pliny, who, however, mention the Essenes, and would thus have mentioned the Therapeutæ also, had they known of them ; (2) to the radical difference between Therapeutæ and Essenes, which lies in the fact that the latter remain unmarried, while in the colonies of the former men and women live together ; (3) to the beginning of the book, where the Essenes are spoken of as if Philo had written a treatise upon them, whereas he had but handled them cursorily in his essay, *Quod omm. prob. lib.* § 12 (ii. 457-59, Mang.). Moreover, it is very doubtful whether this essay, as it now stands, can be attributed to Philo either. Dr. Z. Frankel has adduced objections to this, which Graetz considers well founded [and to which, in this country, Dr. B. Tideman (*het Essenisme,* p. 3, n. 1) has ascribed great weight] ; (4) and especially to the unmistakably *Christian* character of the asceticism which is described in the work under dispute. Graetz points out various traits which, in his opinion, are utterly irreconcilable with the hypothesis that the Therapeutæ were *Jewish* ascetics.

"Die philonische Beschreibung der Therapeuten ist ein spätes Machwerk, wie Graetz vollkommen überzeugend bewiesen hat." This is Jost's opinion (*Gesch. des Judenth.* i. 214, n. 2). Others also were impressed by his demonstration, *e.g.* Dr. Réville (*Revue de Théol.* 3ieme série, v. 228), who recapitulates the main proofs with zest, without, however, hazarding a final decision.

On the other hand, Graetz was opposed by the renowned historian of Greek philosophy, E. Zeller, who in the last part of his *Philosophie der Griechen* (IIIer Theil., 2e Abth., 2e Hälfte, pp. 255-57, Zweite Aufl.) devotes a long note to the refutation of Graetz's hypothesis, and does not hesitate to allow the Therapeutæ that place in his historical picture which they had occupied before. It cannot be denied that Zeller has discovered the weak points in Graetz's attack, and has laid them open with a masterly hand. To the arguments stated above he answers (1) that Josephus upon the whole says very little about the Egyptian Jews, so that his silence as to the Therapeutæ proves absolutely nothing—no more than that of Pliny; (2) that the single life of the Essenes does not form any antithesis to the admittance of women into the associations of the Therapeutæ, for the latter—according to *De Vit. Contempl.* § 8—were nearly all γηραιαὶ παρθένοι; (3) that the beginning of the book does not refer to a former *treatise* upon the Essenes, but simply recalls to memory the fact that Philo had spoken of them (Ἐσσαίων πέρι διαλεχθεὶς κτέ); (4) that the *Christian* character of the asceticism of the Therapeutæ is not proved even by those features which Graetz considers decisive evidence. After showing this in detail, Zeller remarks (5) that Graetz entirely overlooks the unequivocal evidence in favour of the *Jewish* character of the Therapeutæ. "Unsere Schrift schildert die Therapeuten, so bestimmt wie nur möglich, als *Juden*." This last point must be freely granted to Zeller. The passages which he cites in proof of his opinion can even be increased by others. In § 1 (p. 471) it is said that the Therapeutæ have

learnt to serve God "out of the sacred laws;" in § 3 (p. 475) 'the laws and the oracles proclaimed by the prophets," and subsequently "the holy Scriptures" are mentioned. The keeping of the seventh day occurs repeatedly (§ 3, p. 476; § 4, p. 477, and elsewhere). In § 7 (p. 481) the Therapeutæ are called adherents (γνώριμοι) of Moses. Other passages also speak of Moses, as § 8 (p. 481), where "the most holy precepts of the prophet Moses" occur; § 11 (p. 485), where first the passage through the Red Sea, and then "the prophet Moses" and "the prophetess Miriam" are mentioned. In § 10, finally, (p. 483) we twice find the holy Scriptures, and once, as a further explanation of that formula, the expression "the whole legislation."

In this country Graetz's arguments have been both given in their entirety and refuted in detail by Dr. B. Tideman, l. c. pp. 67-73. On most points he agrees with Zeller. With respect to the beginning of the treatise *De Vit. Cont.*, he remarks that perhaps Philo refers there to a work upon the Essenes which we no longer possess.

Now have Graetz's objections really been set aside? I cannot admit this. Although our full assent must be granted to more than one remark of his opponents, the book *De Vit. Cont.* still again and again gives one the impression of *untruthfulness*, and, consequently, of spuriousness. To do justice, we must of course remember that the author, whoever he may be, is not describing the Therapeutæ calmly and objectively, but comes forward as a panegyrist, and evidently makes it his object to recommend a mode of life such as theirs. Thus we must not make a difficulty of the pathos which characterizes his style, and must allow for some exaggeration on his part. But however disposed we may be to give these considerations their full weight, however adverse to all *a priori* arguments, time after time, in reading this treatise, we ask ourselves, Does this represent the truth? Are the Therapeutæ described here Jewish ascetics of the first century of our era, or even—accord-

ing to § 3 (p. 475) and § 10 (p. 484), where the old founders of the order are mentioned—of a still earlier period? It is not enough to prove that their tendency is allied to that of Philo; it must, in addition to this, be shown to be probable that Philo's philosophy made proselytes of this nature and in these numbers, that many Therapeutæ were to be found "in each of the Egyptian nomes, and especially in the neighbourhood of Alexandria" (§ 3, p. 474)—not to speak of Hellas and the land of the barbarians (l. c.). Is there any evidence that lends but the slightest probability to this? When we descend to details, the same question is repeatedly forced upon us. Thus, *e.g.*, when we read (§ 3, p. 475) that in the house of each of the Therapeutæ there is a room called σεμνεῖον or μοναστήριον, in which he shuts himself up, without meat or drink, with only the sacred books, to devote himself to meditation, and this all day long, from morning prayer till evening prayer, and in which he remains (p. 476) for six consecutive days, without crossing the portal of his house or even glancing into it. And further, when we learn (§ 8, p. 481) that the great feast of the Therapeutæ falls on the fiftieth day, "because *fifty* is the most sacred and natural number, in virtue of the power of the right-angled triangle, which is the first principle of the origin and existence of the universe." This is not represented to us as a reflection of the author's, but as the motive of the Therapeutæ themselves. We are not at liberty to search for the grounds of their festival in anything else. The repeated observance of every fiftieth day has nothing in common with the Jewish feast of Pentecost, which was kept once a year, fifty days after the Passover.* Therefore we emphatically repeat the question,

* M. Nicolas observes, in the treatise which we are about to quote (p. 28), that the word "Pentecôte" occurs in the Greek translation of the O. T., in Josephus, and especially in the Christian writers, but never in Philo, and derives from this an objection to the authenticity of *De Vit. Cont.*, where, he says, that word (§ 8, p. 481) is to be found. This has been rightly contradicted by Dr. B. Tideman (l. c. p. 3, n. 3), who refers to tom. ii. 206, 294 (Mang.). But the objection and the reply both start from the inaccurate supposition that the *De Vit. Cont.*

Is this true? More than once the writer puts our faith to too severe a test. Thus, among other instances, where he enumerates the different sorts of songs bequeathed to the Therapeutæ by the poets of the olden time (§ 10, p. 484); where he describes the most holy food, which is eaten last at their festive meal (l. c.); and especially where he sketches the nocturnal dance which closes the celebration of the fiftieth day (§ 11, pp. 484, sq.).

All this, taken together, leads to the conclusion that the book *De Vit. Cont.* is, to express it briefly, *a romance*, composed in Philo's name by a later writer, presumably of the third century of our era, who draws here his ideal of an ascetic life in the form of a description of a colony of Jewish anchorites—perhaps in order, by means of such a picture, to inculcate the opinion that "the contemplative life," far from being an innovation, had already long ago been led by pious men, and brought to a high degree of perfection. It is this interpretation of the treatise falsely ascribed to Philo that Professor M. Nicolas—without knowing of Graetz's work and its refutation by Zeller—has advanced in an essay entitled *Les Thérapeutes*, and published in the *Revue de Théol.* 3ième série, vi. 25-42. I entirely agree with Nicolas' main idea. He formulates it in this way (p. 34):—"Il ne faut donc pas voir dans le *Traité de la vie contemplative* la description historique de quelque institution ascétique. Il n'a jamais existé de Thérapeutes. Ce traité est une sorte de roman religieux, dans lequel la description d'une communauté ascétique a été imaginée pour servir de cadre aux vues de l'auteur sur la manière dont il voudrait que vécussent les anachorètes des deux sexes. Je ne serais même pas éloigné de croire qu'il est tout simplement un exercice de rhétorique sur un sujet très-goûté, pour ne pas

treats of the feast of Pentecost. The author has not written a single word which shows that he is speaking of a feast which is only kept once a year. Let Philo—*De Vit. Moys.* iii. 4 (ii. 147, Mang.)—rather be compared, from which the author of our treatise has taken his description of the number fifty almost literally.

dire très à la mode, au troisième siècle de l'ère chrétienne. Le rhéteur s'y montre de la première ligne à la dernière." If this interpretation be true, it lies in the nature of the case that some features of the picture are taken from reality and others from the imagination of the unknown author. Here and there Nicolas seems to have been but half successful in showing the forms of asceticism from which the writer borrowed his description. But this detracts nothing from the main fact. I do not doubt that the number of those who acknowledge the point of view indicated by Nicolas as the only true one, will gradually increase. He who with this interpretation before his mind reads the treatise over again will no longer find anything incongruous in it.

Let it not, for the rest, be overlooked, that the utter silence as to the book *De Vit. Cont.* in the times anterior to Eusebius remains a real objection to its authenticity. Graetz pointed to Josephus and Pliny. Even should it be thought that their silence may be accounted for, does it not still remain very strange that Clemens Alexandrinus also makes no mention at all of the Therapeutæ ?

CHAPTER XII.

The last Century of the Jewish State.

When, about the year 130 B.C., John Hyrcanus subdued the Edomites and forced them to adopt circumcision and thus to become incorporated with Israel, a great and long-coveted triumph seemed to have been gained, and a national desire to have been at last fully satisfied. How many times had Edom's hostility caused the prophets to invoke Jahveh's punitive justice upon Israel's elder brother! But their prayer had never been entirely granted. Often as they were overpowered, the rude mountaineers always managed to regain their independence and to harass their former masters by their incursions. Now at length their resistance seemed to have been quelled, and the fulfilment of Jahveh's saying insured, "The elder of Rebecca's sons shall serve the younger."* But this hope was once more to be disappointed. The victory which had given such great satisfaction was found to contain the germs of defeat; Edom was again to show that he was untamable, and to shake off the yoke laid upon him by Jacob.† The weak Hyrcanus II. took Antipater the Edomite—or the Idumæan, as he is usually called, after the Greek historians — into his service, and soon became a blind tool in the hands of this industrious and crafty statesman. Antipater and his family rose higher and higher in authority. The end at which he was aiming was reached at last, although not by himself, but by his son Herod, who in the year 37 before our era, took possession of Jerusalem, as the king of the Jews acknowledged by Rome.

* Gen. xxv. 23. † Gen. xxvii. 40.

Herod's reign affords an eminently tragic spectacle. One seldom meets in history with such a combination of contrasts as is seen here. Herod bears the surname of "the Great," and this not only to distinguish him from his descendants, who bore the same name and also filled the throne. There is no doubt that he was a man of excellent talents. The mere fact that, in spite of the efforts of his numerous adversaries, and in the midst of the important changes which the Roman empire was undergoing just at that time, he managed to keep possession of the royal dignity, would be enough to prove this. But besides, his reign was glorious in the full sense of the word. He succeeded in making the comparatively small Jewish state respected and valued everywhere. Augustus showed on more than one occasion that he was very partial to him. The emperor's favourites and the princes of the East sought his friendship. He did what he could, or rather, perhaps, more than he could, to beautify his capital and increase the outward splendour of his kingdom. The temple was replaced by a much grander and more magnificent structure; many another building in Jerusalem bore witness to his riches and good taste. Elsewhere in Palestine memorials of his power arose: the rebuilding of Samaria, called Sebaste in honour of Augustus (Sebastos), and the founding of Cæsarea were the most conspicuous, but by no means the only ones. Even cities which did not belong to his realm were enriched by him with splendid buildings, gymnasia, theatres, &c. His care for the interests of the Jewish nation seemed to give him still more claim to the gratitude and love of his subjects. He was always ready, too, to stand in the breach for the dispersed Jews as well. The inhabitants of Palestine found out more than once that he was glad to mitigate their wants and to lighten their burdens. Yet, in spite of all this, the Jews hated him most thoroughly. They could not endure the Idumæan, the favourite and flatterer of the Romans, the usurper of the throne of the Hasmonæans. Nor could it be denied that they had reasonable

grounds for complaint. They had to pay but too dearly for the lustre of Herod's reign. Their religious conviction was wounded by the king and his race time after time. Moreover, his domestic life was marked by intrigues and crimes which even now fill us with horror and pity, and undoubtedly made a most painful impression upon his contemporaries. Our space does not permit us to relate them in detail,* and—we are glad of it. Let it suffice to recall to mind that his brother-in-law Aristobulus, his wife Mariamne, his mother-in-law Alexandra, and three of his own sons were put to death at his command. It is true, Herod did not commit these crimes — and how many others!—out of evil wantonness, but was forced to do so by circumstances or by the victims themselves. But how terrible was the state of affairs which necessarily led to such catastrophes; and how natural it seems to us that the unhappy man who played the chief part in these tragedies should have become an object of abhorrence to his contemporaries.

Many of the acts of Herod's reign are closely linked with the religious condition of the Jewish people, or with the development of the parties into which they were divided. Hence they will be spoken of presently, in connection with another subject. The same applies to the occurrences of the period which elapsed between the death of Herod and the fall of Jerusalem. Here, therefore, we need only touch upon the main points, in order that we may have the course of events clearly before us from the first.†

Herod died in the fourth year before the Christian era. In accordance with his will, sanctioned by the emperor Augustus, his kingdom was divided among his three sons, Archelaus, Herod Antipas, and Philip. The first became prince of Judæa, the second was made ruler of Galilee, the last had the trans-Jordan allotted to him. Herod Antipas and Philip were not

* Consult *Ant.* xv. 1; xvii. 8.

† The writings of Josephus, *Ant.* xvii. 9, seq. and *A.J.*, are the principal sources here as well.

undeserving rulers upon the whole, and they retained their positions for some time—the latter till the year of his death, 34 A.D., and the former till the year 39 A.D., when he was deposed and banished. Archelaus, on the contrary, caused great dissatisfaction by his measures, was repeatedly impeached, and in the year six of our era was declared to have vacated the throne. In the same year, Judæa, with Samaria, was incorporated with the Roman empire, and became a subdivision of the province of Syria. This province in its entirety was governed, in the name of the emperor, by a legate, the *præses Syriæ;* Judæa by an official of lower rank, called *procurator*, who usually resided at Cæsarea. Coponius (A.D. 6), Marcus Ambivius, Annius Rufus, Valerius Gratus (A.D. 14), Pontius Pilatus (A.D. 26) succeeded each other in this post. After the recall of the latter (A.D. 37), the governors of Syria, Vitellius and Petronius, ruled Judæa.

A new epoch seemed to dawn for the Jews upon the death of the emperor Caligula and with the reign of Claudius (A.D. 41). A grandson of Herod, by his marriage with the Hasmonæan Mariamne, who had been presented successively with the tetrarchy of Philip (A.D. 37) and that of Herod Antipas (A.D. 40), was then charged with the government of Judæa as well, and was raised to the rank of king: as such he bears the name of Herod Agrippa I. Before his accession to the throne he had led a life of adventure, and had played a more than equivocal part in the court intrigues at Rome. But he was not without talent, and always advocated faithfully the interests of the Jewish people. The joy at his elevation and at the restoration of independence did not last long however: after a reign of three years Agrippa I. died at Cæsarea (A.D. 44). He had no successor. In after years (A.D. 53) his son Herod Agrippa II. was entrusted with the government of north-eastern Palestine and with some authority over the temple at Jerusalem; but he was powerless to arrest the events which were preparing in Judæa and Galilee, and were not averted,

but rather invited, by the successive procurators, or at any rate by most of them.

The soreness between the Jews and the Romans, namely, gradually increased. Tiberius Alexander (A.D. 46), Ventidius Cumanus (A.D. 48), Felix (A.D. 52), Porcius Festus (A.D. 61), Albinus (A.D. 63), succeeded each other in the government of Judæa and Galilee, and had in this capacity to fight against constantly increasing difficulties. At length came Gessius Florus (A.D. 65). It appears as if he, tired of the endless skirmishes, desired a formal explosion, and did what was in his power to bring it about. He succeeded but too well. In A.D. 66 the Jewish war broke out. At first the insurgents, who knew no fear, gained important advantages: after the defeat of Cestius Gallus, in the same year, there was no longer any Roman army in Judæa and Galilee. But to have defended themselves in the long run with any hope of success, the Jews ought to have remained closely united, and they were divided into parties and subdivisions of parties, which distrusted and counteracted each other, or even opposed each other by force of arms. The final result of the unhappy struggle, therefore, in spite of the heroic courage of the Jews, was not doubtful for a moment, and was the easier to foresee in proportion as the Romans carried on their military operations with more solidity and prudence. The emperor Nero charged his best general, Vespasian, with the suppression of the revolt. In A.D. 67 the latter became master of Galilee, where Flavius Josephus was at the head of the Jews. Thenceforward Jerusalem was the point of attack. But Vespasian did not hurry, and, moreover, was partly occupied with the highly important events which soon took place at Rome. Nero died in the year 68; Galba, Otho, and Vitellius succeeded each other upon the imperial throne within a few months. It was with difficulty that the soldiers of Vespasian had been persuaded to acknowledge the last-mentioned, and they soon withdrew their allegiance and proclaimed their own commander

emperor (A.D. 69). Vespasian went to Rome, and left his son Titus behind to finish the war. About the middle of April of the year 70 Jerusalem was invested. The inhabitants defended themselves with the obstinacy of despair, while the leaders of the parties fought each other, and caused blood to flow in torrents. The walls yielded one after the other. On the 10th of August the temple was burnt, although this was contrary to the intention of Titus. On the 7th of September the upper part of the city, on mount Zion, fell into the hands of the Romans and met with the same fate. The after-throes of the Jewish war made themselves felt both in and out of Palestine for some time longer,* but the struggle itself was decided by the fall of the city and the temple. Vespasian and Titus celebrated their victory by a triumphal entry into Rome, and struck medals to perpetuate the overthrow of Judæa.

Even less in this period than before can the history of the religion be treated separately: political events constantly exercise the greatest influence upon it. As soon as he began to reign, Herod found himself called upon to decide in a matter closely connected with religion. Hitherto the office of high-priest and of prince had been united in the same person. This could not remain so: the people would not have put up for a moment with a high-priest who was not descended from Aaron, not even an Israelite. Thus it became a question who should be raised to that high office, and how the king should act in order to frustrate any attempt to restore its political importance. Herod's measures bear witness to crafty deliberation. First he managed to entice the aged Hyrcanus II., who lived in Palestine and was highly esteemed there, to Jerusalem, not however to make him high-priest — he was rendered unfit for that post, according to the Law,† by the

* Comp. *A. J.* vii. 6 (about Machaerus); 8 (about Masada); 10, 11 (about Alexandria and Cyrene).

† Lev. xxi. 16, seq.

mutilation which he had received at the hands of his nephew Antigonus*—but to have him at hand, and to be able to put him out of the way when such a course seemed necessary. He then conferred the high-priestly office upon Hananeel, a priest of common origin, whom he had summoned from Babylonia. There was no need for him to fear such a man, who had him to thank for everything. It must also have been stipulated from the very first that the new high-priest would only remain in office so long as the king pleased. At the end of a year Hananeel had to quit his post—not, however, because Herod was tired of him, but because he could not withstand the pressure put upon him both by his own family and by the people, to make Aristobulus, the brother of his consort Mariamne, high-priest. The youth paid dearly for his popularity, for which he had to thank his personal appearance and his Hasmonæan blood: at the end of a year he was put to death by the king's order. Hananeel was now reappointed, but only to be replaced shortly afterwards by Jesus the son of Phabi, after whom three more high-priests were nominated by Herod. The possession of this dignity for life was no longer thought of. The example set by Herod was followed by Archelaus and subsequently by the Romans; so that during the period of which we are treating in this chapter, the high-priesthood passed from one to another no less than *thirty* times—three times to persons who had held it before; so that altogether *twenty-seven* high-priests replaced each other.†

The natural consequence of these changes was a very remarkable decrease in the power of the high-priests. They lived by the grace of the king, as it were, and could only exercise influence so long as they did not transgress the bounds fixed by him, and discharged the duties of their office to his liking. If, as justice requires, we take this into consideration, we

* *Ant.* xiv. 13, § 10.

† See their names and some details concerning their persons and the way in which they discharged their duties in the *Bijb. Woordenboek voor het Chr. gezin*, i. 591-95.

cannot deny that the high-priests managed to preserve their individuality tolerably well—better even than might have been expected. This favourable opinion is based upon one fact in particular, which deserves to be elucidated somewhat more fully.

In Herod's reign there dwelt at Jerusalem a priest, Simon son of Boethus, who had formerly lived at Alexandria. His daughter Mariamne was famous for her beauty. Herod took her to be his wife—about the year 24 B.C.—and made her father high-priest. Was passion for Mariamne the chief motive for this act? or had policy a share in it? At any rate, it would not have been at all singular had Herod desired to clip the wings of the Jerusalem priesthood by the elevation of the son of a foreigner; still less singular, if he had expected to meet with less opposition and more assent to his plans from a man of Alexandria than from a priest who had been brought up in the traditions of Palestine. Be this as it may, the step which Herod took was certainly not without significance. The Talmud makes mention now and then of the *Baithusîn*, as opponents of the "wise," *i.e.*, of the Scribes. In a Jewish writing of a later date that name is explained as "followers of Baithus," in the same way that "Zaddukîm" means "adherents of Zadok." We thought above that this latter interpretation was probable,* and we consider the former admissible as well. But then this writing is wrong in making *Baithus* a pupil of Antigonus of Socho (about 190 B.C.), and we must rather identify him with *Boethus*, the head of the family which was raised by Herod to the high-priestly chair. Had Simon the son of Boethus been the only high-priest of that race, this conjecture might reasonably be rejected. But after him *five* more members of the family filled the same office—two of them a second time.† It actually appears, therefore, that, in consequence of

* p. 122.

† Viz., Joazar (4 B.C. and A.D. 6) and Eleazar (3 B.C.), both sons of Simon b. Boethus; Simon b. Boethus (A.D. 41 and 44), probably a brother of Joazar and

the preference given by Herod to Simon, a younger priestly nobility, a party or *côterie* of the Boethusians, formed itself, and was powerful enough subsequently, under the Roman procurators, to cause some of its members to be raised to the highest post of honour. The fact that their name occurs in the Talmud, which otherwise is comparatively poor in historical reminiscences, is another proof of the distinction to which this priestly party had climbed.

It now becomes a most important question, what attitude these Boethusians assumed by the side of, or rather opposite to, the other great priestly families who together constituted the party of the Sadducees. Before answering this question, however, we ought to search for the effect which the new order of things had upon the Sadducees in general. This search certainly cannot be superfluous. The reader will remember that the Sadducees were originally a political party. Through change of circumstances they had lost their political power. Would it have been unnatural if they had taken up another party standpoint? On the contrary, one can very well imagine that the priests, being excluded from the government of the land, had devoted themselves entirely to public worship. It would have been far from strange, if they had sought to compensate themselves for their loss of political power by gaining the goodwill of the people—which, of course, they could only have done by being more or less untrue to the traditions of their party. But it does not appear that anything of this sort actually occurred. As far as we can perceive, the Sadducees remained true to themselves: no trace of any essential change is to be found either in Josephus or the Talmud. Two causes may have worked together to make them continue in the path which they had followed before. In the first place, a change of direction was no easy thing. For more than a century the Sadducees had been the representatives of moderate Judaism.

Eleazar (comp. *Ant.* xix. 6, § 2, with xiv. 9, § 3, and Derenbourg, l. c. p. 155, sq.); Elioenus (or Eljoënai, A.D. 43), son of this Simon, and Joseph Kabi (A.D. 61), also a son of Simon.

Any approach to the Scribes of the Pharisaical tendency was necessarily very difficult for them. Moreover, it would probably have availed them but little. The heart of the people had long been in the possession of their opponents, and it seemed more than doubtful whether it would change sides. In the second place, by deserting their fundamental principles they would have lost all chance of getting back their power from the hands of the Prince or of the Romans. They would then have joined the ranks of the opposition, and would have had to give up all hope of favour. They could not resolve to do this. Perhaps it was without taking count of their motives, less from calculation than from instinct and the power of tradition, that they remained after the accession of Herod what they had been before. Some priests of lower rank undoubtedly joined the Pharisees; the considerations just set forth did not apply to them, or, at all events, had less weight with them; but the real body of the Sadducean party did not change their ground.

But the Boethusians? Did they show their gratitude for their promotion by adhering to the reigning power more closely than the Sadducees? Was it, at any rate, their endeavour to maintain their independence, as opposed to the older priestly nobility? Neither one nor the other. From what the Evangelists tell us of the *Herodians*,* who cannot have really differed from the Boethusians, nothing certain can be gathered. But the *Baithusîn* of the Talmud are the exact images of the Sadducees who appear there, and are even substituted for the Sadducees here and there in the accounts of the controversial debates with the Scribes. Thus Herod did not succeed in importing another spirit into the priesthood. His creatures were absorbed in it, and formed at most a fraction of the Sadducees. Are we not justified in inferring from this that the priestly aristocracy, upon the whole, remained true to its antecedents, after it had lost its political power? Would it have

* See Mark iii. 6; xii. 13 (Matt. xxii. 16).

succeeded in taking the Boethusians in tow, if it itself had left its former standpoint, or had repudiated its principles?

Thus the description of the character of the priestly aristocracy, which was given in a previous chapter,* is also applicable to the Sadducees of this period. Nothing prevents us, therefore, from completing it, as we promised to do,† with a few traits from the struggle which, according to the Talmud and other Jewish sources, was carried on between the Sadducees and the Pharisees—or, as they are often called there,‡ the Wise. We shall give the preference to those points of difference which throw light upon the peculiar tendencies of the two parties.§

It lay quite in the nature of Phariseeism that its advocates interpreted and applied the precepts concerning cleanness very strictly.‖ We are told that their extravagance in this respect drew down the ridicule of the Sadducees. "The Pharisees," they said, "will soon clean the face of the sun!"

Therefore it is the more worthy of our notice, that the Sadducees, conversely, were stricter in their demands for cleanness in the high-priest, who prepared the water of purification from the ashes of the red heifer.¶ This was evidently connected with their endeavours to increase the importance of the priestly duties. The more precautions the high-priest had to take in performing his task, the more apparent was the importance of his person and his work. The Pharisees, on the contrary, looked upon the priest as nothing more than an official, and therefore confined themselves in this matter to what was strictly necessary.

This difference of standpoint accounts for other points of

* Above, pp. 143, sqq. † l. c. p. 147. ‡ l. c. pp. 28, sq., 125.

§ Among others, Herzfeld, l. c. iii. 364, sq., 385-388; Graetz, l. c. iii. 459-463; Jost, l. c. i. 216-226; Geiger, *Urschrift*, pp. 134-149; *Pharisäer und Sadducäer*, pp. 13, sqq.; Derenbourg, l. c. pp. 132-144, should be consulted as to the—frequently doubtful—meaning of these points of difference. They also quote the passages.

‖ Comp. Mark vii. 3, 4; Matt. xxiii. 25, 26. ¶ Comp. Num. xix.

dispute as well. The Sadducees asserted that the expenses of the daily morning and evening sacrifice should be defrayed out of the gifts which were given voluntarily for that purpose; the Pharisees desired that the funds of the temple should bear this cost: this alone would show that this sacrifice was offered *in the name of the whole nation*, and that the priests, in offering it, did nothing more than execute the will of the nation.

The meat-offering, which was offered at the same time as the blood-offering, the Sadducees allotted to the priest; according to the Pharisees, it belonged to Jahveh, and was to be burnt on the altar. This point of dispute, as well as the former one, was decided against the Sadducees. This must have hurt them deeply—not only because they now lost an important source of gain, but also, nay chiefly, because they had claimed the meat-offering *as representatives of Jahveh*, to whom it really belonged according to the Law*—and they now considered that their spiritual dignity had been lowered.

The two parties were also at variance with regard to the ceremonies of the day of expiation. According to the Pharisees, the high-priest should kindle the incense after he had entered the holy of holies; the Sadducees desired that he should not draw aside the curtain until he had thrown the incense into the censer. Is this difference only a question of the interpretation of the text of the law,† so that the Pharisees must be considered to have censured and opposed the high-priest's practice from mere pedantry? or were they led here also by their desire to lessen as much as possible the lustre of the high-priesthood? Were they offended at the spectacle of the anointed of Jahveh enveloped in the smoke of incense, which bore witness so unequivocally to the entirely unique privilege which was his?

This last interpretation gains in probability, when we observe that the Pharisees attempted to shorten the distance between the priests and the laity in other ways as well. Their

* Num. xv. 1-16. † Lev. xvi. 2, 12, 13.

exaggeration of the precepts respecting cleanness also served this end: in proportion as the laity were bound to take greater precautions, they came nearer to the priest. But besides this, we read that the Pharisees arranged their common meals as much as possible after the model of those of the priests, and, in order to be able to do this on the sabbath in spite of the distances between their houses, introduced certain legal fictions, in consequence of which those houses could be looked upon as one house. The Sadducees could not approve of this imitation of the priestly custom, and they did their best to prevent it.

The quarrel between Hillel the Babylonian—of whom more directly—and the "sons of Bathira," who, no doubt, belonged to the Sadducees, must be considered from the same point of view. It concerned the question whether the paschal lamb might be slain upon the sabbath. The general rule was that the priests might perform their functions on the day of rest, and therefore might offer sacrifices without breaking the Law.* But the paschal lamb was not a priestly, but a popular sacrifice: was the sabbath to yield to this also? The "sons of Bathira" denied this: Hillel replied in the affirmative, and succeeded in carrying his opinion.

Upon other points as well this Hillel proved himself a zealous opponent of priestly privileges. According to the Law, it lay with the priest to decide whether or not a man was infected with leprosy or was cured of that disease.† Hillel pointed out that he was not to go to work arbitrarily in doing this, but had to adhere strictly to the symptoms which are mentioned in the Law itself and had no doubt been further explained in tradition. The priest could not declare a suspected man clean unless he really was clean. Thus the matter did not depend upon his judgment; he merely confirmed what was already the case.

We have remarked above,‡ that the Pharisees were much

* Comp. Matt. xii. 5. † Lev. xiii., especially v. 37.

‡ pp. 144, 146.

less averse from novelties than the Sadducees. In proof of this we may cite their partiality for the more recent customs at the feast of tabernacles: the pouring of water upon the altar and the stripping off of the leaves of the willow branches on the seventh day of the feast. The Sadducees continued to protest against both one and the other, even after the neglect of the libation by Alexander Jannæus had led to such sad results.*

The Pharisees expounded the Law much less precisely and literally upon the whole than their adversaries. This is shown by the disputes about the administration of justice which are mentioned in Jewish sources. It is said of the Sadducees (or Baithusîn) that they applied the precept "eye for eye and tooth for tooth"† without mercy, and would hear of no commutation. This is probably exaggerated, but it cannot be entirely without foundation: they no doubt adhered to the Law as closely as possible, whereas the Pharisees gladly softened it down, and did not prevent the disputing parties from agreeing when they could.

Sometimes the Pharisees, by regarding the intention of the Law, were stricter than the Sadducees. The latter punished the false witness with death only when an innocent person had lost his life through his evidence; the Pharisees required a sentence of death also in those cases in which the evil purpose of the witness, through circumstances independent of his will, had not been attained.

In the interpretation also of a small feature in the law relating to obligatory marriages,‡ the priests and the scribes were at variance. If the brother of the deceased husband refuses to marry the latter's widow, she must then take off his shoe and "spit in his face." The Baithusîn explained this literally; according to the "Wise" it meant "spit upon the ground before him." Probably this was only part of a more important

* Above, p. 138, sq.

† Exod. xxi. 23-25; Deut. xix. 21; Lev. xxiv. 20.

‡ Deut. xxv. 5-10.

difference. The Sadducees limited the obligation to marry the woman to the *brothers* of the deceased; the Pharisees extended it to his *next of kin*. Thus it was very natural that the former should deem the refusal to marry more culpable than the latter, who, precisely because they interpreted the law more broadly, were obliged to show themselves ready to consider reasonable objections to its observance.

These were not the only questions of the administration of justice which led to dissension. It appears from the controversies which have been handed down to us in the Talmud that the two parties also quarrelled over the responsibility of the master for the damage done by his slave, and over the daughter's right of inheritance. The conjecture is very admissible that the dispute over these two points was really political in its nature, and referred to the connection between Herod—son of Antipater, the "slave" of Hyrcanus II. and husband of Mariamne his granddaughter—and the Hasmonæans.* Perhaps some of the points of difference named above also had deeper meanings than we now suspect. But in most instances this hypothesis does not hold good. It is evident, therefore, that quarrels were often waged over questions which seem insignificant, nay, utterly frivolous, to us. We are the less able to overlook this, because there are proofs that the Scribes, at all events, thought quite otherwise, and considered those points of difference very important. We have already remarked,† but it will bear repeating here, that the days upon which they succeeded in carrying their interpretation against the opinion of the Sadducees, they stamped as glad commemoration days. They celebrated in this manner the triumph of their views as to the hereditary right of the daughters, the defraying of the expenses of the daily sacrifice out of the funds of the temple, the disposal of the meat-offering, and other points besides.‡ This may be truly said to be characteristic. In

* Geiger, *Urschrift*, pp. 142, sqq.; Derenbourg, l. c. pp. 134, sq.

† Above, p. 143, n.†

‡ *Megillath Taänîth*, i. 1; v. 2; viii. 3. according to the division of Graetz,

estimating the tendency of the Scribes of those days, traits such as these must not escape our attention. We shall revert to them hereafter.

For our present purpose we need not dwell longer upon the disputes between the priests and the Sopherîm. Only one point, which is intimately connected with them, still requires further elucidation. We have spoken more than once, and again just now, of the settlement of these differences, usually in favour of the Scribes. What idea are we to form of this? Upon what ground was the battle fought, and how was it decided? The answer to these questions has already been indicated,* but it becomes entirely comprehensible now for the first time. In the first place, it has now become evident to us, through the statements of the Jewish witnesses, that the distance between the Sadducees and the Sopherîm was in reality much less than is usually imagined. The points of dispute themselves show that the two parties moved upon one and the same ground. Antagonism of principle or difference of opinion upon the highest and decisive authority, which render any exchange of thought and discussion impossible, did not exist between them. Had, *e.g.*, the Sadducees, as some still suppose, been more than half unbelieving Epicureans, our Jewish informants—who certainly cannot be suspected of partiality for Sadduceeism—would have had to tell of disputes quite other than those which they now narrate to us. In the second place, it is obvious that, in the reign of Herod and subsequently, the Sanhedrim was more than it had ever been before the arena for the discussion of questions such as the above. Both parties were still represented there: this is proved by more than one account in the New Testament and in Flavius Josephus.† But the Sadducees, robbed of their political power, had no longer such an ascendancy as before. They could no longer suppress or

l. c. iii. 417, sq. Comp. J. Meyer's edition (Amst. 1724), p. 1, sq.; 39, sq.; 58, sq.

* Above, p. 143.

† Comp. the Note at the end of this Chapter.

terminate a discussion by their authority: they now had to make use of argument. It is true, they often received such powerful support from the citizen majority, that they could dictate to their opponents. But, on the other hand, the latter had the whole nation at their backs and—argued their cause not only with conviction and fire, but also with science. If we take all this into consideration, we are not surprised that the Scribes remained the victors in by far the majority of instances, after a longer or shorter struggle. In the meantime that struggle had itself lent greater weight to the points upon which they diverged from the priestly aristocracy. That which in itself is insignificant derives value from the trouble with which it is obtained. The doctrine of the Scribes, inclined from its very nature to involve itself in details, was propelled still further in that direction and betrayed into still greater subtilty by the polemics in which it had to engage.

Our study of the priests in their relation to Herod has naturally brought us into contact with the Scribes. The latter, however, held so important a position in Jewish society, that we cannot be satisfied with so indirect a treatment. First of all the internal development of Scribe-doctrine attracts our attention.

The reader will remember what we said before of the "pairs" who, we then found, stood at the head of the schools of law at Jerusalem.* Shemaiah and Abtalion immediately preceded the reign of Herod; they were succeeded by Hillel and Shammai, who will thus have been about contemporaneous with Herod. They formed the last "pair." Thenceforward Hillel's descendants stood at the head of the Scribes and the dignity of leader was transmitted regularly from father to son. Before the fall of Jerusalem, Simon I., Gamaliel (I), and Simon II. had filled this important post.

The statements of Josephus concerning the attitude which

* Above, p. 142.

the Pharisaic party—from which he does not usually distinguish the Scribes—assumed towards Herod, leave much to be desired with respect to fulness and perspicuity. Hillel, otherwise the most famous of the heads of the schools, he does not mention at all; Shemaiah and Shammai he seems to confound together: he only knows of one Sameas, who in the year 47 B.C. earnestly rebuked his fellow members in the Sanhedrim for their want of courage to punish Herod, then commander in Galilee, for his arbitrary conduct;* who subsequently, during the siege of Jerusalem by the same Herod, advised the citizens to resist no longer,† and who, on account of this advice, stood high in Herod's favour, but yet refused to swear allegiance to him and the Romans.‡ If this really be all applicable to one person, then the Jewish historian has not mentioned either Shemaiah or Shammai, probably the latter, at all. Worse than this omission or confusion is the want of continuity between the rest of his accounts. On the one hand, he states that the Pharisees—who were more than 6000 in number§—would none of them take the oath of allegiance to Herod and in consequence incurred a fine, which the wife of Pheroras, Herod's own brother, paid for them; out of gratitude for this service they announced that the royal dignity would not devolve upon Herod's descendants, but upon Pheroras; this came to the ears of the king, who thereupon caused to be put to death the most guilty of the Pharisees and the members of his family who favoured them.‖ We should gather from this that the whole Pharisaic party was hostile to Herod. But elsewhere Josephus himself makes a certain distinction, when he relates that Sameas, Pollio (=Abtalion) and their followers, when they refused to take the oath, were pardoned by Herod *for Pollio's*, or rather—for so he ought to have written—*for Sameas' sake*.¶ This distinction comes out still more clearly

* *Ant.* xiv. 9, § 4. † *Ant.* xv. 1, § 1. ‡ *Ant.* l. c. and 10, § 4.
§ *Ant.* xvii. 2, § 4. ‖ *Ant.* l. c.
¶ *Ant.* xv. 10, § 4, to be compared with cap. 1, § 1.

in his statement, just mentioned, relative to Sameas' advice during the siege of Jerusalem:* the exhortation to give up resisting Herod breathes quite another spirit than that which is revealed in the Pharisees' plot with the wife of Pheroras.

The solution of this antagonism is surely not far to seek. Josephus ought to have stated outright what now merely underlies his narrative, that the unity of the Pharisaic party was broken. It is true that Herod had not a single adherent among them, and thus it is very comprehensible that the whole of the Pharisees refused to swear allegiance to him. But this did not prevent them from taking two divergent paths after the elevation of the Idumæan. Some of them, whose closer acquaintance we shall make presently, thought it their duty to oppose Herod, and were thus able to stoop to such conspiracies as that with the wife of Pheroras, who in other respects, if Josephus portrays her accurately, was really unworthy of them. They were the turbulent spirits of the party, disinclined to bear the yoke, not always wise in the choice of the means by which they were to obtain their freedom. But the majority of the Pharisees abstained from all attempts of this nature, withdrew more and more from the domain of politics, and, in proportion as the condition of their country became more lamentable, plunged with the greater zeal into the observance and study of the Law. It will be remembered that many Scribes had already adopted this line of conduct under the Hasmonæan princes.† The less they liked those princes, the easier was it for them—not exactly to approve or applaud, but —to bear patiently their deposition in favour of Herod. The advice which Sameas gives in Josephus does not prove that he happened to think more favourably of Herod than his fellows, but it may be regarded as the expression of the feeling which prevailed among the chiefs of the Jerusalem scribes, the leaders of the Pharisaic party. Hence it is, also, that the important and fatal history of the Jews during the last century of Jerusalem's

* *Ant.* xv. 1, § 1.

† See above, pp. 120, sq., 140, sq.

existence is mentioned comparatively seldom in the Talmud: the doctors whose ordinances and mutual debates are recorded there, did not trouble themselves with the things of this world, and worked calmly on at the development of "the doctrine," while the political condition of the nation underwent changes of the greatest weight.

Let us try to form at least an idea of what went on in the law schools at Jerusalem within this period.

Before all others, *Hillel's* person attracts our attention. He occupies a very high rank in Jewish tradition. As Ezra was to Moses, so he is compared to Ezra, with whom he has, among other things, his Babylonish extraction in common. If his image is accurately engraved in the legends current concerning him—and there is no reason to doubt it—Hillel was indeed an eminent personage. His lessons or proverbs are not only striking in form, but they bear witness to deep earnestness and to a broad, unfettered conception of religion. Let this exhortation serve in proof: "Belong to the disciples of Aaron (the meek); love peace and seek after it; love mankind and bring them to the Law."* This last is intended in the widest sense, and applies not only to the Jews, but to all men. Once—says the Talmud—when a heathen asked Hillel to show him the whole Jewish religion in a few words, he answered: "*Do not unto others that which thou wouldst not should be done to thee:* this is the whole extent of the Law; all the rest is merely the explanation of it; go now and learn to understand that."† Hillel practised himself the virtues which he recommended to others, and especially meekness, which, if the narratives be not inaccurate, he sometimes even carried to excess.‡ At the same time, however highly we may value all this, it gives us but a very imperfect idea of what Hillel was as the leader of the Scribes. In this capacity he is sketched somewhat more fully by what we said above§ about his opposition

* *Pirke Abôth*, i. 12.

‡ Comp. F. Delitzsch, *Jesus und Hillel*, pp. 31, sqq.

† b. *Sabbath*, 31 *a*.

§ p. 236.

to the priests. But his mode of argument must be noticed here especially. That which the Sopherîm gradually added to the written law, both to illustrate it and to extend it, passed, as the reader will remember, as tradition. Hence it was that men always found themselves embarrassed when a fresh case occurred in regard to which the *halachah*—the law of custom, we should say—contained no precept; hence it was also that in differences of opinion an end was put to all contradiction by him who could—or at all events dared to—appeal to the authority of former doctors. Hillel, we read, applied *seven rules* to the explanation of the law, and affirmed with the help of these the new explanations which he gave. It seems unnecessary to enumerate them all here. One of these rules applied analogy to the interpretation of a precept of the law; a second legalised the inference from the greater to the lesser *(a majori ad minus)*; a third concerned the meaning which was to be attached to the use of the same word in two different laws. But enough has already been said to show the character of the method which was followed by Hillel, and has since been applied by others as well. It guaranteed to the Scribes much more freedom than they had had before, but—at the same time it opened the door wide to terrible arbitrariness and subtilty. It was fortunate that the inventor, at any rate, used this method in the spirit of meekness, and for the purpose of removing some troublesome hindrances. But it was possible for others to abuse that of which he made a good use.

Next to Hillel in Jewish tradition stands Shammai. He was a much stricter man, true to traditional notions, afraid of too much latitude. Hillel and he often differed in opinion, although not upon main points. Two schools actually formed themselves, which the Talmud calls "the house (or the family, the household) of Hillel" and "the house of Shammai," and concerning the divergent opinions of which it gives us numerous but sometimes contradictory, accounts. Even if our space allowed us to follow the war between the two schools in detail

we should abstain from doing so, because it had no material influence upon the course of religious development. The character of the Scribes' doctrine remained the same, whether the preference were given to the stricter interpretation of this or that text, with Shammai and his school; or whether Hillel and the Hillelites managed to triumph with the broader explanation. Things did not go so far as a rupture between the two schools, and this posterity put down to the meekness hereditary in "Hillel's house."

The two rivals were succeeded in the conduct of the school by the descendants of Hillel: by Simeon I, Gamaliel (I), Simeon II. Of the first, a contemporary of Archelaus and the earliest procurators, we know almost nothing. We know the second, from the Acts of the Apostles, as a member of the Sanhedrim, in which assembly he gives very temperate advice and carries it by a majority.* The ordinances which the Talmud ascribes to him breathe the same spirit. It does not appear that he took an active part in the movements of his time. Kypros, the consort of Herod Agrippa I, appears to have valued him highly;† but he did not allow even this to tempt him to enter the domain of politics. Under his lead also the school prosecuted its task peacefully and calmly.

Before long, however, circumstances rendered absolute neutrality impossible. During the years which preceded the fall of Jerusalem, Simeon the son of Gamaliel stood at the head of the Scribes. When the war—against the wish of all who were in power—had broken out, he took part in the direction of common affairs. He belonged to the great national party and proved equally averse from the ambiguous policy which Flavius Josephus followed‡ and from the raving zealots.§ We imagine that the majority of the Scribes assumed the same calm and dignified attitude. The particulars which are given‖ concerning

* Acts v. 34, seq.; comp. also xxii. 3.

† Derenbourg, l.c. p. 213.

‡ See § 38, 39 of Josephus' autobiography.

§ *A. J.* iv. 3, § 9.

‖ Derenbourg, l.c. p. 286, sqq.

the most famous among them, Johanan ben Zacai, render it probable that he—and certainly not he alone—withdrew into the school much more than Simeon II did, and watched the fierce party-struggle with indifference. On the other hand, there were some doctors who shared in the great contest after their manner. The Talmud makes mention more than once of "the eighteen words" or "rules" which regulated, or rather confined within very narrow limits, the intercourse of the Jew with the heathen. The period at which these "words" were fixed can be named with a high degree of probability. It was in A.D. 66. The Romans had retired from or had been driven out of Jerusalem; the war was soon to begin. It was necessary that the Jews who were then living out of Palestine in the midst of the heathen should know how they were to behave towards them. It was with this want in view that the new ordinances were drawn up, and—very naturally under the circumstances—they were prompted by a spirit hostile to the heathen. Now it is worthy of notice, that the assembly in which these ordinances were enacted, was, according to the Talmud itself, of an entirely peculiar nature. The disciples of Shammai had the upper hand in it, nay, are even said to have partly kept the Hillelites away by force, and partly compelled them to agree to their resolutions.* Thus the Scribes' participation in political life was an exception to the rule. Under the powerful influence of the events of the year 66, the party which was disposed to act obtained *temporarily* the upper hand. But it was the weaker in numbers, for it had to carry its plans by surprises and violence. The more moderate party had soon regained their ascendancy, for, as we have already seen, Simeon ben Gamaliel had a seat in the provisional government which established itself at Jerusalem. Let it also be observed that the parts which tradition ascribes here to the schools of Hillel and Shammai, are completely in harmony with what we

* Comp. with the above, Graetz, l. c. iii. 355, seq., 494, sqq.; Jost, l. c. i. 437, sqq.; Derenbourg, l. c. 272, sqq.; *Hk. O.* iii. 442, sq.

are told about these two men themselves: Shammai's school, in the spirit of its founder, zealously advocates separation from the heathen; while the unwillingness of the Hillelites reminds us of their leader's inclination to open wide the door to Judaism. For the rest, it was more than an accident that "the eighteen words" were elevated into law. Their upholders had the advantage of the more moderate Scribes in being truer to their principles, and therefore, in a crisis such as was then passing, carried off the victory. We shall see this still more clearly hereafter.

Were any one to imagine that he could infer from all this that the Scribes, or at any rate most of them, had no heart for the people or their wants, he would be altogether mistaken. They had their own notions of the true and most pressing requirements of the nation. They saw the cure in observance of the Law and in nothing else. To this, therefore, they devoted all their energies. During this period they still continued to instruct the people. They read and expounded the Law and the Prophets in the synagogues, just as before. They endeavoured to get public worship and the administration of justice organized in entire accordance with Jahveh's revealed will. Men may reproach them—we shall soon see with what justice—for pursuing a doctrinal ideal, and because, lost in its contemplation, they had no eye for what took place around them and for the new wants which arose. But we should wrong them, if we doubted their love either for Judaism or for the Jewish nation, even for a moment.

The Scribes' intentions were irreproachable, their zeal was great, but—what was the result of their work? This is the question which we will now proceed to answer.

"The Jewish nation identified, as it were, with its religion:" we have already been able to describe the fruit of the labours of the Sopherîm in these words.* They will also apply, and this without any limitation whatever, to the

* Above, p. 104.

time of which we are now treating. No trace of desertion to heathenism, or even of lukewarmness in maintaining the ancestral belief and the divine Law, is to be found in the history of the whole period. Pontius Pilate hung up golden shields, dedicated, as it appeared from the inscription, to the emperor Tiberius, in Herod's palace at Jerusalem, not far from the temple: this led to urgent remonstrances, first addressed to the procurator himself and then to Tiberius, in consequence of which the offence was removed.* Upon another occasion the same Pilate had brought the Roman standards, with the image of Cæsar, into Jerusalem at night. The discovery of this desecration of the city caused a violent disturbance. The men of Jerusalem went in great numbers to Cæsarea, where the procurator lived, to induce him to take away the abomination. Pilate refuses, but in vain: the multitude will take no denial. At length he resolves to try the effect of fear. He has the supplicants surrounded by his soldiers and orders them now to go home quietly. But they threw themselves down upon the ground and declare that they will rather die than put up with the transgression of the Law. The Roman yields to this persistency and gives orders for the removal of the offensive representations of the emperor.†

This took place in the year 25 of our era. Fifteen years later a much greater danger was fortunately averted through the unanimity with which the people asserted their religious privileges. Caius Caligula, a libertine without the least self-command, then swayed the sceptre over the Roman empire. We already know that he wished to receive in his lifetime the honour of worship which his predecessors had enjoyed after death, and that he gave orders that his image should be placed in all the temples.‡ He was aware that the execution of this order would meet with opposition in Judæa. But he was exasperated with the Jews, partly in consequence of what had happened at Alexandria, and resolved to carry out his plan,

* Philo, *Leg. ad Cajum*, § 38 (ii. 589, sq. Mang.).

† *Ant.* xviii. 3, § 1; *J.* ii. 9, § 2, 3. ‡ See above, p. 186, sq.

cost him what it might. Petronius, the governor of Syria, was charged with the enforcement of the imperial edict and crossed the borders of Palestine with a numerous army, including two Roman legions. The Jewish nation was totally unprepared for an armed resistance. But there were other means by which it could attempt to make Petronius relinquish his intention. It was just the time for sowing the fields, but no man thought of going to his work. The mere idea that so great a sacrilege was going to be committed had brought the whole land into a feverish tension. The Jews went by thousands to Ptolemais, where the Syrian governor had stationed himself, and implored him not to carry out the emperor's order. It was in vain that he pointed out to them that resistance to the expressed will of the despot was most dangerous not only for him, but for the Jewish nation itself. All without distinction, great and small, persisted in their entreaty and obstinately refused to yield an inch. Petronius could not permanently withstand such an expression of the national will. Yet it was only with great reluctance that he granted the Jews' prayer, for he knew Caligula and foresaw how he would receive his indulgence. The tyrant, in fact, burst into a rage and sentenced the governor to death. The assassination of the emperor saved Petronius' life: the news of Caligula's death arrived in Palestine before the sentence.*

Events such as these certainly do not prove that all the Jews of those days, without exception, were pious servants of Jahveh. It must even be admitted that the jealous strictness with which the nation defended its religious customs and guarded them from all violation, is compatible with laxity in the observance of the moral precepts of its religion. So much is evident, however, from these spontaneous movements, which ran like electric shocks through the length and breadth of the land: that the Jewish nation was thoroughly sincere in its belief. Its religion had grown up with it, and had become inseparable from the national life.

* *Ant.* xviii. 8, § 2-9; *A. J.* ii. 10; comp. Philo, l.c. § 42, 43 (ii. 594, sqq. Mang.).

If now the Scribes, in this period as before, were the leaders and teachers of the nation and the real representatives of Judaism, the people must have held them in very high respect. And unequivocal proofs of this are at hand. When Josephus assures us,* that the Pharisees enjoyed the confidence of the nation and were on that account mightier than the Sadducees, although the latter held the high appointments, this is also true of the period we are now handling. His statement† that the women were generally partial to the Pharisees, is applicable to Herod's reign. His testimony relative to Simeon ben Gamaliel:‡ "a man of the sect of the Pharisees, who are considered to exceed the rest in strictness with regard to the ancestral laws, full of understanding and sagacity, capable of restoring by his counsel the sadly confused affairs of the state," belongs to the last years of our period. In the New Testament also proofs of the high esteem in which the Pharisees and the Scribes were held are not wanting.§ The homage which the people paid them may account for the pride and arrogance which are there laid to their charge.‖

But while we observe that the men "who sat in Moses' seat"¶ were honoured and praised by the Jews, we must not be blind to a whole series of facts which give us a mean opinion of *the influence* of the Scribes, and of *the nation's submission to their guidance.* For the present I will name but one such fact: the rebellion against Rome in which our period concludes. Was this the work of the Scribes? or was it at any rate approved and applauded by them? Neither the one nor the other. When war with Rome had been decided upon, the doctors did not draw back; they were too good patriots for this; but the decision was taken in opposition to their wish and advice. The greater the importance of this decision, the more plainly does it bear witness to difference of opinion and tendency between the Jews and those who were regarded as

* *Ant.* xviii. 1, § 4. † *Ant.* xvii. 2, § 4. ‡ *Life of Josephus*, § 38.
§ Phil. iii. 5; Acts xxvi. 5. ‖ Comp. Matt. xxii. 6, 7. ¶ Matt. xxiii. 2.

their leaders. When once our attention has been drawn to this, we discover, as was to be expected, the traces, or at all events the germs, of that difference at a much earlier date. It is of the last importance to trace them out and bring them to light. If we succeed in this, we shall have made considerable progress in the knowledge of the religious condition of the Jewish people.

Before all things it must be remarked that the care of the Scribes did not embrace all who belonged to the Jewish nation. The reader of the New Testament will remember that it speaks of "multitudes who are weary and heavy laden, as sheep having no shepherd."* And elsewhere of "the lost sheep of the house of Israel."† This designation indicates a not inconsiderable portion of the Jewish population of Palestine, which the Pharisees regarded as unclean and repudiated. He who calls to mind the origin of this party,‡ surely will not be surprised at this sentence of rejection. The Scribes, too, would have been unlike themselves, had they thought otherwise of these "lost sheep." In the Talmud therefore they are judged very unfavourably and bear the name of "*ammê ha-árez*," *i.e.*, nations of the land, which places them upon a level with the heathen.§ Indeed, the great grievance against most of them must have been, that they did not observe the necessary precautions in their intercourse with the heathen, who were to be met with in great numbers within the borders of Palestine. Others, such as the publicans, were the creatures of the Romans, and were looked upon as unclean for that reason. Others again led immoral lives or had sinned in this way formerly, and found, now they had come to repentance, that the strictly Jewish society was closed against them. In a word, it was a very mixed multitude, in which, however, the better elements were by no means wanting. In Galilee, the popula-

* Matt. ix. 36 ; Mark vi. 34. † Matt. x. 16 ; xv. 24.

‡ Comp. above, pp. 123, sqq.

§ Comp. the passages cited by Herzfeld, l. c. iii. 381, n. 58.

tion of which had been very mixed from the most ancient times, the "*ammê ha-árez*" were comparatively more numerous than in Judæa: there, at so great a distance from the centre of their activity, the Scribes were less powerful than in the capital and its immediate vicinity. Yet this did not prevent them from measuring the Galileans by the same standard as they applied in Judæa, and, when they found them wanting, from condemning and excluding them. The nature of their views forbade them to admit excuses and to temper the severity of their demands. The Law spoke plainly and unequivocally, and they were forced to obey it. Moreover they were disposed, by virtue of their legal principle, to explain the transgression of the law rather as unwillingness than as inability. Josephus expressly states that the Pharisees considered that human liberty had great influence upon a man's moral condition and his lot in life.* "Everything cometh from God, except the fear of God," says a Talmudic proverb,† which may be freely regarded as the expression of the general opinion of the Scribes. Is it a wonder that, judging in accordance with it, they had no pity for the "lost sheep," and—left them to their fate? A very unfavourable conception of the cause of their error was coupled with the fear of defiling themselves by associating with them: how could they, in spite of this, be merciful?

Although a formal separation had thus arisen between these outcasts and the Jewish doctors, it must not be thought that all the rest of the nation followed the guidance of these leaders. On the contrary, *many* did not feel satisfied with it, and moved in a direction other than that which the doctors pointed out to them. While they acknowledged their merits and retained their respect for them, they followed paths in which the Scribes did *not* guide them. Formerly this phenomenon had occurred only

* *Ant.* xiii. 5, § 9, xviii. 1, § 3; *A. J.*, ii. 8, § 14. Josephus' attempt to make the Sadducees, Pharisees, and Essenes philosophical sects accounts for his terminology, l. c.

† Really "from Heaven" and "the fear of Heaven." Comp. Graetz, l. c. iii. 455.

as the exception, if at all. Beginning with the reign of Herod, we see it arise and gradually increase in force, until at last the whole nation is drawn into a struggle of life and death with Rome, a struggle which the doctors of the Law had not recommended, but, on the contrary, had done their utmost to avert. It is as if the reins of government were first taken out of their hands now and then, and at last torn away altogether; as if *the heart of the people* were first no longer wholly theirs, and at length—even though it were but for a time—becomes altogether estranged from them.

Even if we must now and again enter upon the domain of political history in order completely to understand this remarkable revolution, the matter is too important to be passed over.

We have already remarked more than once that Flavius Josephus sometimes places facts in a false light, usually to make them less offensive to his readers, the Roman grandees. His representation of the events which we have now to trace, also bears witness to this endeavour. In reading his narrative, it might easily escape our attention that the first beginnings of resistance to the rule both of Herod and of the Romans occurred when Hyrcanus II was still nominally prince of Judæa. Yet this appears indeed to have been the case. It was in the year 47 before our era. Herod, appointed governor of Galilee by his father, then in high favour with Julius Cæsar, had his hands full at once with the suppression of disturbances. He was successful, and killed a certain Ezechias (Hezekiah), *a brigand chief*, with a number of his followers. So relates the Jewish historian. But when he tells us further that the Sanhedrim at Jerusalem complained to Hyrcanus of the death of this Ezechias, and that the mothers of the men whom Herod had killed left the prince and the people no rest until the murder of their sons had been avenged—it is very evident that we have not to do here with ordinary brigandage. Ezechias and his adherents were the extreme members of the strictly national

party. Sameas (Shemaia), who spoke in the meeting of the Sanhedrim, at which Herod was present, condemned their acts of violence, but did not hesitate to call their pursuer guilty and his deed a murder.* In fact, there was more conformity than difference between the Scribes and the supposed "brigands." They both held Antipater and his party to be usurpers; it was only as to the attitude to be assumed towards them that they were at variance.

When Herod had ascended the throne with the help of the Romans, the opinion concerning him, as was to be expected, did not improve. Yet the unwillingness of the people to submit to the foreigner only manifested itself a few times, but then in an unmistakable manner. At the very beginning of his reign the great popularity of Aristobulus the Hasmonæan, whom Herod, pressed on several sides, had been obliged to appoint high-priest, bore testimony to this. At the feast of tabernacles (of the year 36 B.C.) the people's liking for him and aversion from Herod was so apparent, that the latter resolved to get rid of the young man and thus to avert the danger which menaced his crown. †—We cannot go on in this way, however, but must confine ourselves to the occasions upon which the discontent of the people resulted in hostilities. This happened towards the end of Herod's reign. The king was dangerously ill, and the news of his death was expected every moment. Two scribes, Judas son of Saraphæus, and Matthias son of Margalôth, then considered that the time had come to appear openly against him and the direction which he followed. Josephus describes them as "the most eminent exponents of the ancestral laws," but besides this extols their eloquence, and gives us clearly to know that it was the younger generation which listened to them and was led by them. Herod had caused a golden eagle to be placed over the great gate of the temple. Hitherto no transgression of the Law‡ had been seen in this, nor had Herod intended anything of that nature. But

* *Ant.* xiv. 9, § 2-4. † *Ant.* xv. 2, § 7; 3, § 3. ‡ Exod. xx. 4.

it was not difficult for the two scribes to set their followers against this image—the Roman ensign!—and to induce them to pull it down and destroy it in broad daylight. The daring perpetrators of this deed were immediately seized, and Herod lived just long enough to have the ringleaders put to death (12th March, 4 B.C.).* But the spirit of resistance, which had manifested itself in their achievement, was not to be put down so easily. The whole occurrence gives us an opportunity of sounding as it were the state of men's minds at that time. The Scribes as a body might refuse to recognise men such as Matthias and Judas as its representatives, and abstain from participating in their acts; they could reckon, in case of need, upon the sympathy and co-operation of the people, and especially of the rising generation. The Jewish nation was already inclined to leave the majority of its teachers to their studies and to turn to *the men of action*.

Events themselves prove that we have a full right to ascribe such a tendency not to the few, but to the many. Immediately after Herod's death some Jews went to Archelaus, his successor, and demanded that the authors of the deaths of Judas and Matthias should be punished. This demand in itself shows how strong the agitating party felt. But besides this it is evident from the conduct of Archelaus, who attempted to pacify the rebels with negotiations, that he did not despise them.† The complainants would not hear of concession; they continued to resist and were driven away by violence, and 3000 of them actually lost their lives.‡ Peace was now restored for a moment. But while Archelaus and his brother Antipas contended before the tribunal of Augustus at Rome as to the validity of Herod's last will, all Palestine was in a ferment. A regular battle was fought at Jerusalem between the Jews

* *Ant.* xvii. 6, § 2-4; *A. J.* i. 33, § 2-4. The date is certain, because in the night after the death of Judas and Matthias, an eclipse of the moon took place, which can have been no other than the eclipse of 12/13 March of the year of Rome 750. Comp. J. A. van der Chijs, *de Herode Magno*, pp. 60, sq.

† *Ant.* xvii. 9, § 1.

‡ l. c. § 2, 3.

and Sabinus' soldiers,* while Judas, the son of the "brigand chief" Ezechias, plundered the royal palace at Sepphoris in Galilee.†

These disturbances have, not without reason, been called the prelude to the Jewish war. But the rebellion of Judas the Galilean bears this character much more plainly. This Judas is probably the same as the son of Ezechias just mentioned, of whom Josephus at all events does not relate that he lost his life at Sepphoris or after the violence committed there.‡ His rebellion falls in A.D. 6, when Archelaus was banished, Judæa incorporated into Syria, and, in connection with this, the Roman census introduced there by Quirinius.§ A portion of the people, taking the advice of the high-priest, Joazar ben Boethos, did not oppose this measure. But Judas, supported by a Pharisee named Zadok, called the Jews to arms in defence of their liberty. According to him the census was slavery and Israel could not submit to it; it was right to trust in God, but they could not count upon help unless they themselves put their hands to the work and resisted to the utmost of their power.‖ No details of this rebellion and its suppression have been handed down to us. But Josephus plainly intimates that Judas carried *very many* with him, and does not omit to draw attention to the connection between his principles and the subsequent struggle with Rome. Hitherto, he writes, there had been three sects among the Jews, the three with which we are already acquainted. Judas was the founder of a fourth, which in other respects coincided with the Pharisees, but distinguished itself from them by an unshaken love of freedom: its adherents hold God to be the only Lord and Master, and prefer to die

* l. c. 10, § 2, 3. † l. c. § 5.

‡ For the identity of the two, Graetz, l. c. iii. 201; Derenbourg, l. c. p. 161; against it, Renan, *Vie de Jésus*, p. 62, n. 1; Keim, *Gesch. Jesu von Nazara*, i. 196, 314, n. 1.

§ In *Luc.* ii. 1 he is called Cyrenius, the *census* is placed some years earlier, and, instead of Judæa, "the whole world" is named.

‖ *Ant.* xviii. 1, § 1.

and to expose their friends and neighbours to punishment rather than address any man as "lord." Under Gessius Florus—Josephus continues, after praising the invincible courage of the followers of the new sect—under Florus, and in consequence of his misdeeds, *the* (whole) *people* began to suffer from this delusion.*

Josephus does not yet use the term *Zealots* in speaking of Judas and his party. But it is probable that the insurgents themselves liked to be called by that name.† In fact, they wished to be zealots for the honour and service of the God of Israel, as formerly Phinehas, the grandson of Aaron, had been, who slew the idolatrous Simeonite with the sword, without the formality of a trial;‡ as Mattathias had been some centuries later, who punished obedience to the commands of Antiochus Epiphanes in the same way.§ We need scarcely remind the reader, that all sorts of vices and passions, personal revenge, avarice, unbridled ambition, could be concealed under the cloak of such a "zeal" for the ancestral God. The events of the years 66 to 70 have been recorded for us by the political adversary of the Zealots; his narrative is partial in a high degree, and must therefore be used with the greatest caution. But even the warmest advocate of the Zealots would have had to admit that many of them brought strange fire to the altar and can scarcely be regarded as representatives of a religious principle. Yet, conversely, our just abhorrence of the crimes of these men must not hinder us from allowing that the starting point of the party was indeed the national religion. Nay, we can very well imagine that upright and well-disposed men joined it and preferred "the fourth sect" to Phariseeism.

It is really as conceivable that the Scribes themselves were entirely satisfied with the ideal which they had in view, as that,

* l. c. § 6.

† Simon, one of the apostles of Jesus, bore the surname of *Cananites* (Mark iii. 18, Matth. x. 4), a word taken from the popular language of that time, translated rightly in Luke vi. 15; Acts i. 13, by the Greek word *Zelotes*.

‡ Num. xxv. 6, seq. § 1 Macc. ii. 23, sqq.; above, p. 101.

conversely, a great portion of the people were not satisfied with it in the long run and followed other paths. Experience shows that anyone who occupies himself zealously and persistently with one object, ends by liking it, nay, by as it were identifying himself with it. The study and observance of the Thorah became the earnest Scribe's only occupation; to devote himself entirely to this was the greatest blessing for him, next to which all the rest sank into utter insignificance. If we remember that the Thorah, in the conviction of the Jews, was the expressed will of God, we shall not blame the Scribe for this his conception, nay, we shall even think its exaggeration very natural—however offensive it may seem to us. It sounds very strange to read what actually stands in the Talmud, that God himself studies the Law for the first three hours of every day.* But is not this—and so much more of the same sort†—the direct consequence of the principle from which the Scribes started? Now, however, the doctors fell into the usual error of *doctrinaires:* they thought that what filled their own minds entirely must be sufficient to satisfy the wants of others. In this they were mistaken. It may have been the case with one part of the nation, but another part disappointed their expectation. This latter had great respect for the conscientious piety of its leaders, admired their learning and penetration, sided with them whenever they came in conflict with the Sadducees, but—could not help finding their researches very dry and the result of all their labour very unsatisfying. They had learnt from their Scribes themselves to value their privileges as Jahveh's chosen people very highly. But now they also wished to enjoy those privileges. What benefit did they derive from the knowledge of the Law? Could it reconcile them to the humiliating slavery under which they bent? Once more: what compensation did it offer them for the loss of the liberty and the dominion which they claimed as the chosen people of the only true God? To these

* *Abodah Sarah*, von Dr. F. C. Ewald, p. 19.

† See l. c. p. 20, 23, and elsewhere.

questions they received no answer. Thus, then, they continued to yearn longingly for something better, and almost anyone who roused them to *action* was listened to by many with open ears. In not a few, the desire to enjoy the blessing which apparently ought to have resulted from Jahveh's selection, at last became a passion: they preferred *dying* for their religion to *living* for the Law as the Scribes recommended.

Zealotism was as much the result of Scribe-doctrine, as it was a bitter disappointment to the Scribes themselves. It proves that their doctrine had met with acceptance, but at the same time that their lead was no longer sufficient. The Jewish nation, reared by them, forsakes their guidance and follows the banner unfurled by other leaders.

The rise and increasing power of Zealotism could not but be obvious to everyone who observed the Jewish nation with any interest. On the other hand a superficial observer might not perceive that during the last century of the Jewish state a change gradually came to pass in the nation's ideas, especially in connection with the future. The *Messianic hope* came much more into the foreground than it had done before, or rather: began to take up much more room in the nation's heart. The intimate connection between this modification of the popular notions and the extension of Zealotism is unmistakable: it was the belief in Israel's future which drove the Zealots to action and sustained them in the struggle; the realization of the nation's hopes was the end at which they aimed. No one will be surprised therefore that we now fix our attention upon the forms in which that belief occurred.

For some time we have quite lost sight of the hope in Israel's glory, which, it would seem, was so important an element in Judaism. Since we exposed the ideas of the author of the Daniel-apocalypse,* we have had no occasion to speak of the doctrine as to the future. During the period which elapsed

* Above, pp. 106, sqq.

between the publication of the book of *Daniel* and the beginning of Herod's reign, from 165 to 37 B.C., this doctrine did not remain stationary, it is true, but it had no perceptible influence upon the course of religious development. Thus our silence on this point cannot be put down to negligence. Yet, to thoroughly understand the phenomena which present themselves in the last century of the Jewish state, we must glance backwards and connect what we observe there with the revolution which took place in this domain.

I spoke just now of "the Messianic hope." Perhaps it will not be superfluous to remind the reader that this expression is used in a narrower and a broader sense. The Messianic hope in a narrow sense—one might call it the hope of the *Messiah*—is the anticipation of the appearance of an "anointed" one (Hebrew: *mashiah*), a king of David's house, who would restore the kingdom of his great ancestors, unite the twelve tribes of Israel under his sceptre and govern them in peace and prosperity. This is distinct from the Messianic hope in a broader and metaphorical sense: the hope in a better and blissful future, in Israel's glory, in fact. How absolutely necessary it is to keep these two conceptions apart, needs no demonstration: the very writings of the prophets show that unshaken hope in Israel's future existed even where no trace was to be found of the desire for the restoration of the Davidic monarchy.*

Now it is not difficult to perceive that the condition and the fortunes of the Jewish nation after the first victories gained in the war of independence, were not adapted on the whole to stimulate and revive the hope in Israel's future glory so strongly as to make it a power in the national life. It was, as we saw before,† a time of great disturbance and trouble which the Jewish people experienced after the restoration of the temple (164 B.C.), a time of wars, intrigues and negotiations, in which warriors and statesmen were required and were actually formed. Such periods force men to practical activity, and so absorb all the

* Comp. Vol. I. pp. 64, sqq.; Vol. II. pp. 71, sqq. † See above, pp. 114, sqq.

available power of the nation, that hardly any time remains for longing for the future—or at all events for becoming engrossed with it. Let us not forget, moreover, that the parties of the Sadducees and Pharisees and the order of the Essenes formed themselves in this period, and that the struggle between the first two under John Hyrcanus I. and his successors raged violently: thus to the political entanglement was added party faction, which in its turn spurred men on to immediate action and rendered many averse from all that savoured of meditation. Or are we speaking too generally, and must we at any rate make a distinction between the three parties? In a certain sense, undoubtedly. The Sadducees denied personal immortality, which the Pharisees and Essenes accepted; they had upon the whole much less ideal, more sober views of life than the men of the two other parties. Yet the tendency of the Pharisees and the Essenes was also entirely practical. The former endeavoured to realize their ideal in Jewish society, the latter in their associations. So long as the Hasmonæans governed the state they did not encounter any insuperable difficulties which compelled them to give up their plans and to live in the future instead of the present. The people, who allowed themselves to be led by their Scribes, followed them also in this, and, as far as we can trace, did not give way to excited or fanatical longing for the glory which was to come.

Still less could the expectation of the appearance of the Son of David be a motive power of much significance or activity in the life of the Jewish nation during the period which ends in the accession of Herod. Everything tended, and had, in fact, tended for centuries, to force that idea into the background. In the Babylonish exile the remembrance of the rule of David's descendants was still lively, but—not exactly of such a nature as to excite a desire for their restoration: that desire is not expressed in the prophecies of Deutero-Isaiah and his contemporaries.* Afterwards it was stimulated somewhat by the ap-

* Vol. II. pp. 130, sqq.

pearance of Zerubbabel, and thus we find evident traces of it in his contemporaries Haggai and Zechariah.* But his descendants did not keep the position which he had occupied; the priests, on the contrary, retained their power and gradually extended it; men became more and more accustomed to their rule and there was nothing to remind the Jews of the Davidic monarchy. Thus it remained after the war of independence and the elevation of the Hasmonæans to the princely and shortly afterwards to the regal dignity. It has been truly remarked that John Hyrcanus, the conqueror of the Samaritans and the Edomites, combined in himself more than one feature of the ideal which the prophets had formed of the Son of David. There was therefore the less inducement for a lively hope that this ideal would one day become a complete reality in a branch of the now almost forgotten family of David.

A caution against misconception may be added to the foregoing remarks. I do not mean to say that the Jews *gave up* the hope of Israel's restoration and glory; nor that they *altogether ceased* to believe in the revival of the Davidic monarchy. I have asserted neither the one or the other. I have merely thought it necessary to deny that the Messianic hopes, in the broader, but especially in the narrower sense, played at all an important part in the life of the Jewish nation during the Hasmonæan period. They remained in existence, but at the same time in repose. Comparatively little power emanated from them, because circumstances neither called them forth, nor drove the popular spirit in that direction. Let us not forget, for the rest, that besides the fortunes of the Jewish nation there was another and lasting power, the influence of which we must not exaggerate, it is true, but still must not overlook. I mean the sacred, and especially the prophetic, literature. From Ezra's time its authority was continually on the increase, and it was no doubt used in like proportion. Even though the prophets were not able to communicate their enthusiasm to the minds of their

* Vol. II. pp. 113, sq.

readers, they continued to confine their attention to that which Israel had to expect from the future, and, according as the prospects opened by them were more attractive, there was the less fear that they would fall into oblivion or vanish altogether.

The writings of the Hasmonæan period are extant, to prove the accuracy of this general view. It is not my intention to enter into details about their origin and contents. They ought to be mentioned and sketched in this history only so far as they throw light upon the subject which we are now handling.

I think I must give the preference to an official document which was drawn up at the nomination of Simon the Hasmonæan as prince of the Jews (138 B.C.). "The Jews and the priests," it says,* "have found it good that Simon shall be their leader and high-priest for ever, *until there shall arise a trustworthy prophet.*" What a remarkable clause! It reminds us, in part, of Zerubbabel's order that some men whose extraction from Aaron's race was doubted, should not eat of the most holy offerings "*until a priest should arise with urîm and thummîm;*"† and in part of the sad complaint of the historian of the Maccabæan wars: "there was great misery in the land, the like of which had not been *since the day when there was no longer any prophet to be seen among Israel.*"‡ It proves that the Jews still regarded their condition as provisional and temporary and looked forward to something better. But at the same time it teaches us what it was that they expected. They do not speak of a Messiah, but of a *prophet,* who would tell them definitely what they had to do, who would make known to them the undoubted will of Jahveh as to the government of the state and many other matters. There is no trace of exaggeration in this—otherwise honourable—desire.

The venerable Tobit, in the ethical romance named after him, speaks in a higher tone of the future of Jerusalem and of his nation. We have already mentioned this book once to draw

* 1 Macc. xiv. 41. † Ezra. ii. 63; Neh. vii. 65. ‡ 1 Macc. ix. 27.

attention to the belief in the working of evil spirits which it utters.* Here, in referring to it again, we must not omit to point out that, upon the whole, it leaves a good impression of the childishly-pious and practical mind of the author,† but at the same time brings clearly to light the peculiar defects of the legal conception of the moral life. The hero of the narrative believes no little in the efficacy of his good works,‡ and looks upon "prayer, fasting and alms" as infallible means of obtaining forgiveness of sins and God's blessing.§ In his way, he realizes the ideal of Judaism and may be regarded as a type of the virtues which the Scribes—probably in the first century before our era — attempted to cultivate among the people. Tobit has no doubt of Israel's future. "The Jews"—he expects—"shall return from their places of captivity and rebuild Jerusalem gloriously, and the house of God shall be built up splendidly, as the prophets have announced. Then shall all the nations turn in sincerity to the fear of Jahveh the Lord and bury their idols, and all the nations shall praise Jahveh. And God's people shall praise him, and Jahveh shall exalt his people, and all who love Jahveh the Lord in truth and sincerity shall rejoice and show mercy to all our brethren."‖ If here the universalistic side of the prophetic anticipations is turned towards the reader, in the romantic narrative in which Judith is the principal person, "woe" is denounced, entirely in accordance with the spirit of this book—a companion picture to *Esther*,¶—upon "the nations that rise up against the race of the Jews: Jahveh the Almighty shall punish them in the day of judgment by giving up their bodies to the fire and the worms, so that they shall weep with pain for ever."** Beyond

* Above, p. 40.

† See *e. g.* chap. iii. 4, seq.; v. 17-22, &c.

‡ *E. g.* chap. i. 2-7, 10-12, 16-18.

§ See especially chap. xii. 6, seq.

‖ Chap. xiv. 5-7. Comp. also chap. xiii. 9-18.

¶ Comp. above, p. 81.

** Chap xvi. 17. I do not agree with the well-known opinion of Volkmar as to the age of the book of *Judith*. The objections to it are set forth, i.a., by R. A. Lipsius in Hilgenfeld's *Zeits. für wissenschaftliche Theologie*, 1859, i. 39-119; Derenbourg, l. c. pp. 404, sq., 408, sq.

such reminiscences as these, obtained from the reading of the prophetic works,* we find nothing in either writing.

The author of the book of *Enoch* is more independent. If the writing which we now possess under that name were entirely the work of a Jewish author of the Hasmonæan period, we should then have to ascribe to him very developed and in great part new ideas as to the Messiah, his person and his work. But a good portion of the present book† is regarded with great probability as an addition by a Christian hand. The original writer also—a contemporary, it would seem, of John Hyrcanus I.—expatiates upon the future, and this in that mysterious form in which, as we have already observed,‡ the apocalyptic writers love to clothe their ideas and hopes. We will not trouble ourselves here with the unravelling of the metaphor in which he gives us the history of the centuries preceding his own lifetime and his prophecies of the future. Let it suffice to state that the author sees in the wars of John Hyrcanus the foretokens of a general attack of the heathen upon the Israelitish nation.§ While Israel bravely repulses this assault,‖ the judgment of the world is held, being described to us with features borrowed from the book of *Daniel*.¶ After this a new temple rises** and Israel receives the homage of the nations.†† At length the Messiah is born: the writer refers to him under the image of "a white bull with great horns, which all beasts of the field and all birds of the air fear and call upon for ever."‡‡ But soon after all species of animals are changed into white bulls, among which the bull first mentioned is conspicuous as the largest, while the Lord rejoices over all.§§ It appears, thus, that the author who gives us the fruits of his reflections in the book of *Enoch*, does not find him-

* With *Jud.* xvi. 17, comp. Isa. lxvi. 24.

† Namely, chap. xvii.-xix., xxxvii.-lxxi., cvi.-cviii. Comp. Hilgenfeld, *die jüdische Apokalyptik*, pp. 148, sqq.

‡ Above, pp. 113, sq.

§ Chap. xc. 13, seq. (Dillmann.)

‖ v. 19.

¶ vs. 20, seq.

** v. 29.

†† vs. 30, seq.

‡‡ v. 37.

§§ v. 38.

self at liberty to omit the Messiah from the picture of the future which he draws, or, rather, adopts from his predecessors. But he plays a very subordinate part in it, and might even be absent from it without causing any real vacancy.

Nearly the same must be said of the Hellenist who—presumably in the first century before our era—put his views of the heathen world into the Sibyl's mouth,* and whom we mention here in spite of his Hellenism, because he certainly does not differ from his fellow believers in Judæa as far as the Messiah-hope is concerned. He touches cursorily first upon David's race, with an allusion to the promise of an everlasting dominion;† then upon a king whom God shall send, who will put an end to the war, and under whose rule Israel will luxuriate in riches and abundance.‡ In a fresh description however of that happy future this "king" is not mentioned at all. § As for that future itself, the poet depicts it with evident delight, but borrows his metaphors, like the author of the apocalypse of Enoch, from the prophets and psalmists.

Unless I be mistaken, these particulars of the literature of the Hasmonæan period fully confirm the opinion already advanced as to the state of the Messianic hope at that time. The writers whose ideas we have described, cannot exactly be said to express the popular conviction; least of all an author such as that of *Enoch*, of whose writing no trace is to be found in the later Jewish tradition, and who thus seems to have reaped very little applause from his own countrymen by his ingenious calculations and strange allegory.‖ Did he perchance belong to the Essenes and did his apocalypse at first remain confined within a narrow circle? However this may be, and even if these writers did stand very much alone, still they could not escape the influence of the spirit of the times. In their own manner and their own forms they represented what was in

* Comp. above, pp. 177, 180. † Lib. iii. 288, sq. (Friedlieb). ‡ l. c. v. 652-60. § l. c. vs. 702, seq. 766, seq. ‖ That which the Epistle of Jude says of Enoch, vs. 14, seq., is taken from our book.

circulation among the people. Therefore the people too retained the hope in Israel's future glory, of which the Scriptures bore witness, and did not quite lose sight of the son of David, but—the prophetic ideal kindled no enthusiasm, and, above all, the outlook to the restoration of the Davidic monarchy was little more than a tradition to which it was almost impossible to assign a place.

Now after the elevation of Herod to the throne a great change came over this popular feeling. Perhaps it is more accurate to say after the subjection to the Romans, for Herod indeed reigned in their name, and had their mighty support been withdrawn from him, he would not have been able to stand for a moment. It was precisely for this reason that his yoke lay so heavily upon the shoulders of the Jews: they felt that the whole weight of the world-empire was pressing upon them. They could scarcely hope, in the ordinary course of things, to be freed from this burden. Thus the promise of restoration spoken by God's envoys naturally came into the foreground. From the misery of the present many fled to the description of an age of liberty, nay, of supremacy. But—and what is more natural?—others were not content with that *description*, and considered that the time had arrived to turn it into reality. Things had come, they thought, to such a pass that the rescue *could* be delayed no longer. If hitherto the prophecies had not been fulfilled, it was perhaps the fault of the passiveness in which that fulfilment had been awaited: God from heaven would fight with them, if his people began the struggle and thus proved themselves conscious of their calling and eager for the realization of the divine promises. This was the stand-point occupied by the Zealots: their intrepid action was the reverse side of their unshaken but unreasonable faith.

We can hardly expect to find this interpretation of the requirement of the time expressed in literary productions of those days: zealotism did not operate upon literary ground. The few Jewish writings which can be referred with any probability to this period, "the book of Jubilees" and "the

ascension of Moses,"* have emanated from other circles, and merely teach us that the thought of the future had revived there as well. The *Psalter of Solomon*, a collection of eighteen songs, originally composed in Hebrew, but only preserved to us in a Greek translation, gives something more.† The age of these songs is not quite certain, but the opinion that the poet has before his mind the sieges of Jerusalem in the years 63 and 37 B.C., is the most admissible.‡ He proves himself a faithful imitator of the psalmists of the Old Testament, and this would perhaps be still more obvious, if we possessed his work in the original. Living in the midst of the oppression, he looks forward with longing to a better future, which he describes, more or less at length, repeatedly.§ The Messiah himself is much more prominent here than in the documents which we have studied hitherto,‖ a natural consequence, partly of the author's adherence to the writings of the Old Testament, and partly of the peculiar circumstances in which the Jewish nation was then placed, and which naturally reminded it of the warlike David and his race. Thus we are prepared by these poems for that revival of the Messiah-hope in its narrower sense of which the events and writings of somewhat later date bear testimony. Our minds at once revert here to the Gospels, in which, if we remember, the longing for the coming of the Son of David is also ascribed to the people itself.¶ Their evidence has been called suspicious, because they were written in the belief that the Messiah had really appeared in Jesus of Nazareth.** But phenomena which pre-

* The former published, in Æthiopian, by Dillmann (1859), and translated by the same writer in Ewald's *Jahrb. der bibl. Wissenschaft* (Band ii. and iii., 1850, sq.); the latter last by Hilgenfeld, *Messias Judæorum*, pp. 435, sqq. See l. c. pp. lxx. sqq., as to the earlier editions. † Last published by Hilgenfeld, l. c. pp. 1, sqq.

‡ The *Psalter* is placed at about this time by Langen, *das Judenth. in Pal. zur Zeit. Christi*, pp. 64, sqq.; Hilgenfeld, l. c. pp. xi. sqq.; Delitzsch, *der Psalter*, ii. 381. § See, e.g. Ps. vii. 9; xi. 8, 9; xv. 14, 15; and the next note.

‖ Ps. xvii. 5, 8, 9, 23-30, 35-49; xviii. 6, 8.

¶ See Mark xi. 10; x. 47; and a number of other passages.

** Comp. the treatise of W. Lang, included in the *Bibl. van Mod. Theol.*, compiled by J. H. Maronier, vi. 445-528, and my remarks to the contrary, l. c. vii. 437-466.

sent themselves in Judaism itself point back to the same popular belief. In an apocalyse which saw the light in the very last years of the first century of our era, the so-called fourth book of Ezra, the Messiah appears and reigns, after having defeated Israel's enemies, for a period of four hundred years.* Some years after the publication of this apocalypse (A.D. 132), Barcochba was acknowledged as the Messiah, not only by the Jewish people, but also by the doctors, and especially the famous Rabbi Akibah.† In spite of the bitter disappointment in which the insurrection of the Jews at that time resulted, the belief in the coming of the Son of David still prevailed among them.‡ In the Aramæan translation of the prophetic writings, which at that time was still delivered verbally in the synagogues, and was written down subsequently, we meet with it again,§ and also in the Talmud: the doctors whose opinions and discussions are given to us there, are, it is true, at variance with regard to the person and the work of the Messiah, but doubts as to his future appearance are rare exceptions.‖ If we connect all this together, we cannot but admit that the Messiah-hope awoke from its sleep in the last century of the Jewish state, and began a new life. Flavius Josephus, too, gives evidence of this, in spite of the trouble which he takes to throw a veil over this portion of the belief of the Jewish nation, a veil which has also to cover his own shame. He expressly declares¶ that "the Jews were incited to the war (with Rome) chiefly by an ambiguous oracle in the holy Scriptures, that in this time some one from their land should rule the world." He himself had applied this oracle to Vespa-

* The literature upon this apocalypse in Hilgenfeld, l. c. pp. xviii. sqq. and its latest edition, l. c. pp. 35, sqq. The expectation related here occurs in cap. vii. 26, sqq. (pp. 63, sq. Hilg.).

† Comp. i. a. Derenbourg, l. c. pp. 415, sqq.

‡ Justin Martyr, *Dial. cum Tryph.* cap. xlix (ii. 2, p. 158, Otto).

§ See the passages from the so-called Targum of Jonathan in Buxtorf, *Lex. Chald. Talm. et Rabb.* col. 1270, sq.

‖ The passages are collected by Schoettgen in vol. ii. of his *Horæ hebr. et talm. in N. T.* (1742).

¶ *A. J.* vi. 5, § 4.

sian,* and had thus played the traitor to the most costly treasures, to the belief of his nation. And now again, in mentioning the oracle, he connects it with the Roman general, and accuses his fellow-countrymen of having misunderstood it. But he cannot deny that their hope in the approaching appearance of the promised ruler was one of their principal motives in the desperate struggle with Rome. Thus he shows plainly enough the great expectations of the instigators of the armed rebellion, even if it be but in this one passage of his historical narrative.

No one among the men who placed themselves at the head of the people, either in the preliminary skirmishes or in the actual war with Rome, was regarded as the Messiah or gave himself out as such. Nor was this the case, it would seem, with *Theudas*, who made his appearance as a prophet under the procurator Cuspius Fadus (A.D. 44-46), and, when many joined him, was seized and put to death.† It was not until the insurrection under Adrian, to which we have already referred, that the Jews were led by a Messiah (Bar-Cochba). Thus men confined themselves to the intense longing for the coming of David's Son. Probably, however, the idea which was formed of him was warlike enough. Before the Messiah could reign as a prince of peace, it was necessary that he should place himself at the head of the nation, and defeat the enemy. The Old Testament prophecies also furnished materials for such an image. For the rest, it speaks for itself that where the want of deliverance from Rome was felt less strongly, the Messiah was brought less exclusively into connection with it. No fixed doctrine at all yet existed as to his person or work. The most divergent notions of them may have prevailed. Nay, the faith in the appearance of David's descendant must still have been much less general than the hope in Israel's deliverance from her

* *A. J.* iii. 8, § 9.

† *Ant.* xx. 5, § 1. Comp. Acts v. 36, where Theudas occurs incorrectly as predecessor of Judas the Galilean (v. 37).

material and spiritual misery: the *Messianic* hope flourished where the *Messiah*-hope was hardly, if at all, to be found.*

We now understand the terrible struggle between Israel and Rome better than we did before. Our study of the Messianic hope points directly to its real and deepest source. It is true, if we are called upon to explain why, in contradistinction from the other nations which were incorporated into the Roman empire, the Jewish people bore the yoke so unwillingly and finally risked the unequal war with the colossus—we must not overlook single personages and events. We must thus pay attention to the extortions of the Roman procurators, to the provoking measures of a Gessius Florus, to the mutual antagonism of the parties, to the ambition of some of the party-chiefs. But all this, however important it may be, does not adequately account for the great fact. Its deepest root lies in the Jewish religion and in the influence which it necessarily had upon the people. The land inhabited by the Jews was a small subdivision of the Roman world-empire. It derived from its relation to the dispersed Jews rather more importance than it would have had of itself. But in spite of this it was still most insignificant—a bit of one of the many provinces over which Rome swayed the sceptre. Yet in its own estimation the nation that occupied this district was the first nation upon earth. It was conscious of possessing privileges and of holding a rank to which the supremacy of the entire world could not be compared. It looked down, not only upon its neighbours, but also upon the masters to whom it, as well as those neighbours, was subject. By the side of the self-consciousness of the chosen people of the only True One, that of the Roman citizen was almost humility. In the abstract it is conceivable that such a feeling, however lofty it may be, should *not* bring him who is penetrated with it into conflict with the powers which are established and set over him. The man whom God has chosen, can voluntarily confine himself to the spiritual

* Comp. above, p. 260.

domain in which he is convinced he occupies the first rank; he can relinquish, in the full consciousness of his dignity, all claims in worldly affairs and leave them entirely to others. But history in former and later times has taught that such self-restraint, even where an attempt is made to practise it, is very difficult to keep up. With regard to the Jews in particular, it was not to be thought of for a moment. The separation between the spiritual and the temporal domains was not completed in those days or at any rate among that people. The great saying: "Render unto Cæsar the things that are Cæsar's and unto God the things that are God's,"* had been spoken, it is true, but passed unnoticed. Justice even requires that in judging of what then took place in Palestine we should leave this demand out of consideration altogether. The conditions upon which its realization depends did not exist. The Jewish religion was practised in set forms and usages, and on this account alone came constantly into contact and repeatedly into conflict with the temporal power.† Moreover all who uprightly professed that religion were convinced in their hearts that in this capacity they had a right, first of all to liberty, and therefore to the recognition of their privileges and to the dominion which in their minds was inseparable from it. That is what they thought—what they could not but think until they outgrew the authority of the writings which they recognized as holy. They may have disagreed with regard to the maintenance of those rights: some, so long as their religious liberty remained untouched, may have put up without very great reluctance with the political slavery which others deemed quite insupportable---that subjection was but provisional and temporary, and at any moment it could be replaced by resistance to a state of affairs which was looked upon as a subversion of the natural order of things. *Thus the struggle between Israel and Rome was inevitable,* and, once kindled, must be a struggle of life and death. *For a national religion Judaism was*

* Mark xii. 14-17.

† Comp. above, pp. 248, sqq.

too great, too proud. The nation which earnestly adopted such a faith must either rule the world or be destroyed as a nation by the world. The Jews were not strong enough to do the former. Hence they were compelled to undergo the latter.

Is this the conclusion of Israel's religious development? Does it end in one of those painful conflicts which we see to be inevitable, but to which we still cannot reconcile ourselves?

Another issue of the struggle was possible than that which lies before us in the triumph of Rome over Israel. Nay, another issue was required. In a conflict between the spiritual and the temporal powers surely the victory must always remain with the spiritual? In a certain sense this rule was upheld by the fact that, in spite of the overthrow of the Jewish *nation*, the Jewish *religion* survived. But we do not feel quite satisfied with this. Were this saying enough, the Jewish nation would have been the one to suffer, while Judaism would have remained what it was, and there would have been nothing to compensate for the victory of Rome. If we just now pointed out correctly the deepest cause of the conflict, we are justified in expecting another result. If Judaism was indeed too great, too proud, for a national religion—then it must necessarily cease to be a national religion and become a world-religion. Every one knows that this latter and highest development of Israelitism began, nay, was completed in principle, within the limits of this period. The last century of the Jewish state is the first of the Christian era. We have still to point out, therefore, the place which the rise of Christianity occupies in the history of Judaism.

We have already drawn attention, in passing, to the spread of Jewish ideas and customs in the heathen world and to the conversion of many heathen to Judaism.* The voluntary adoption of the worship of the God of Israel is mentioned once in the prophecies of the second Isaiah,† perhaps also in a couple

* See Vol. II. pp. 159, sq., and above, p 167, sq. † Isa. lvi. 3, 6, 8; comp. xiv. 1.

of the latest Psalms.* John Hyrcanus not only subdued the Edomites, but forced them to adopt circumcision and thus to allow themselves to be entirely incorporated with the Jewish people.† The inhabitants of Iturea were included in the Jewish nation in the same way by his son Aristobulus I (106 B.C.).‡ From these compulsory conversions, which of course were effected for political purposes, we must distinguish the phenomena which occurred subsequently and especially during our period. Wherever the Jews were established they made converts, particularly among the women. Flavius Josephus mentions with great satisfaction that "many Greeks had changed to the Jewish laws," and among these were some who, in spite of the Jewish war and its consequences, had remained true to their new faith.§ Elsewhere he informs us that most of the women of Damascus had embraced Judaism.‖ It appears from the Acts of the Apostles that also in Asia Minor and elsewhere proselytes were not wanting.¶ The Roman historians and poets complain that "the detestable Jewish superstition" found adherents on all sides.** A well-known saying which is attributed to Jesus,†† might lead one to believe that the conversion of the heathen was zealously carried on from Palestine, and that the Scribes especially made it their task. We do not however find clear traces of such a formal mission to the heathen anywhere else. The conversions were rather the result of the zeal of a few than of general measures concerted in Judæa. Let the conversion of the royal house of Adiabene, which we know of from Josephus‡‡ and the Talmud,§§ suffice to convince us of this.

The province of Adiabene on the Tigris had its own kings, who, however, were vassals of the great Parthian kingdom. About the beginning of our era it was governed by Monobazus,

* In Ps. cxv. 11 ; cxxxv. 20, "those that fear Jahveh" are distinguished from the Israelites ; probably proselytes are meant.

† *Ant.* xiii. 9, § 1. ‡ *Ant.* xiii. 11, § 3. § *Contra Apion*, ii. 10.

‖ *B. J.* ii. 20, § 2. ¶ Chap. xiii. 43, 50 ; xvi. 14 ; xvii. 4, 17 ; xviii. 7.

** Comp. the numerous passages cited by E. Renan, *les Apôtres*, pp. 253-260.

†† Matt. xxiii. 15. ‡‡ *Ant.* xx. 2-4. §§ Comp. Derenbourg, l. c. pp. 222, sqq

whose sister and consort Helena bore him a son, who received the name of Izates. He became the favourite of his parents and the heir apparent to the throne, although Monobazus had older sons. Afraid of the consequences of the envy which this excited, his father sent him, while still a youth, to a neighbouring prince named Abennerig, who received him with kindness, gave him his daughter Symacho in marriage and entrusted to him a province of his kingdom. There Izates became acquainted with a Jewish merchant, Ananias (Hananja), who had converted the female members of Abennerig's family to Judaism and now converted Izates as well. When the latter had assumed the government of Adiabene upon his father's death, he soon found that Helena his mother had also embraced the Jewish religion. Izates wished to come forward openly for Judaism, but by Helena's advice he kept his conversion secret and refused to be circumcised: she was afraid that this act would estrange his subjects from him. Ananias, who had accompanied Izates to Adiabene, approved of this advice and was of opinion that "the king could honour God without circumcision, if he had firmly resolved zealously to observe the Jewish ordinances: this was more important than circumcision." Not long afterwards, however, Izates was confirmed in his original intention by another Jew, Eleazar of Galilee, who pointed out to him that he ought to show his respect for the Mosaic laws first of all by observing their precepts. He now hesitated no longer. Helena, for her part, evinced her love for the Jewish religion by a pilgrimage to Jerusalem (A.D. 47), where she made use of the treasures which she had brought with her to relieve the distress of the inhabitants, who just at that time were tormented by a famine.—The further adventures of Izates, have less interest for us here. According to Josephus, whose narrative, however, bears signs of party prejudice, he was prosperous in everything, rendered the Parthian king Artabanus important services, and was evidently helped by God in the struggle with his own grandees, who rebelled against his change of religion.

So much is certain, that he himself, his mother and his elder brother and successor Monobazus, always remained true to Judaism. This is shown not only by the arrival of five of his sons at Jerusalem, where they were instructed in the Jewish language and laws, but also by the erection of a mausoleum, at a short distance from the holy city, in which the bones of Helena and Izates were laid side by side. The remains of this building still exist to the present day, and are known by the name of "the tombs of the kings."

Of course it is not the question whether these conversions led to permanent results. They derive their importance from the fact that they give us a clear notion, on the one hand, of the zeal of the Jews to propagate their faith, and, on the other hand, of the capacity of the heathen to receive it. Judaism extends its borders. The difference of opinion, too, between Ananias and Eleazar is most remarkable. Both are convinced that the Jewish religion is destined and adapted to spread and to make conquests. But with respect to the manner in which this is to take place, their ideas diverge. Ananias, whom we can regard as like-minded with Hillel,* proves himself disposed to make concessions, and even deems circumcision not indispensable, if only the Law be observed in the main ; Eleazar, a disciple, in this respect, of Shammai, insists upon unconditional submission to all the legal precepts. This, in fact, was the great problem upon the solution of which the future of Judaism depended. So long as Eleazar's maxim was followed—and we already know that in the end it retained the upper hand at Jerusalem, by force of circumstances†—the Jewish religion could make but few proselytes. Dispensations from that rule, such as that granted by Ananias, could, it is true, remove a solitary obstacle, but were insufficient in the long run, even in the estimation of those to whom they were given. To become a world-religion it was necessary that Judaism should not merely conceal or renounce its national character for a time, but

* Above, pp. 243, sq. † Above, pp. 246, sq.

should lay it aside in sober earnest. "If a corn of wheat fall not into the ground and die, it abideth alone; but if it die, it bringeth forth much fruit."* Would Israel prove herself capable even of this latter act of self-denial?

It is easy to explain and vindicate the answer which history itself has given to this question. If the historian of the Israelitish religion performs his task as he ought, he points to a number of lines which all start from the Old Testament and the later development of Judaism and end at—*Jesus of Nazareth.* The years in which his labours fall were evidently pregnant with great events. Not only in the heathen world, but also among the Jews themselves the want of something higher and better had been created, and acted as a spur upon all who felt conscious of power, to make them bring that power into action and to try what they could do. The expectation that Jahveh's promises to his people would now at last be fulfilled, was revived in many; the coming of the kingdom of God was longed for more fervently than before. To the proofs of this which we have already adduced, the appearance of John the Baptist may be added. In the cleanness of the people, of which the baptism which he administered was the symbol and the promise, he saw, it would seem, the condition upon which the realization of the Messianic prophecies depended: it was in order to hasten the dawning of "the day of Jahveh" and to prepare the people for it, that he assembled hosts of listeners around him and preached repentance so severely.† Besides this, the condition of the people showed that the religious and moral ideal could not be reached by the road which the Scribes had chosen. In spite of all the trouble which they had taken, there were still many who "hungered and thirsted after righteousness."‡ Their wants called for satisfaction and were a living protest against scribe-doctrine. But if the Scribes could not satisfy these wants, who could help them? This question was

* John xii. 24.

† Comp. about him Keim, *Gesch. Jesu von Nazara*, i. 491-523.

‡ Matt. v. 6.

answered by the history of Israel and, upon the strength of that history, by the popular hopes. *A prophet* was to arise,* a "man of spirit" and of force. Not an Elijah, for times had changed; violence and passion, which characterized the earlier envoys of Jahveh and seemed indispensable for the conflict with the strange gods, had now become superfluous. The calm and peaceful labour of the Scribes had levelled the ground upon which the interpreter of the God of their fathers could now work with advantage. Nay, many a word had already been spoken in the law-schools at Jerusalem, especially by Hillel and his party, in which the preacher after the heart of the generation then living could acquiesce.

But it is unnecessary to go on in this way. The want existed, the hope was excited, the way more than half levelled. But in spite of all this the higher development of Judaism would not have taken place, had not a man appeared in whom that higher truth had become a reality. The distinction between the spiritual and the sensuous, between the lasting and the temporary, between the universalistic and the national element was not made in the Law itself. From the standpoint of the Law, therefore, it was illegal to promote the one at the expense of the other. No one could call upon the Scribe to give up this and that regulation of the Law for the sake of his own nation or of the heathen. From his point of view that would have been an inconsequence difficult to justify. It was necessary that he who granted freedom in uprightness and without self-reproach, should be wholly free himself. Now such a one was Jesus of Nazareth. He had risen above the legal standpoint. Not by means of critical researches into the origin and growth of the Law: these were as foreign to the spirit of the time as in our days they are natural and in place. By virtue of his pure and fervent piety he stood in such intimate communion with the God of Israel, that he heard his voice directly and no longer required the mediator of the Old Cove-

* Comp. above, p. 263.

nant. The prophecy that Jahveh would give his law in the inward parts of the children of Israel and write it in their hearts,* had become realized in him. He was—and was conscious of being—the equal of those whose conception of religion was laid down in the Mosaic laws and the other sacred writings. Therefore he was in a position and considered himself entitled to sift what he found there, in order to free the grain from the chaff, and to loosen the imperishable truth from the temporal form which held it enclosed and threatened to stifle it. He was therefore able, in a word, both to practise himself and to recommend in his preaching to others *the purely spiritual religion of the heart.*

Thus the altogether unique significance of Jesus is unmistakable. Christianity is *the religion of Jesus,* his creation, the fruit of his most excellent individuality. But it is no less true that in Christianity *the religion of Israel* fulfilled its destiny and became a world-religion. The correctness of this view is denied by many of those who profess Judaism at the present day. Their objection is not without foundation, when and as far as they place themselves upon the national standpoint. If, namely, the religion be regarded as one of the peculiarities of the nation among which it was born and developed itself, then it is right to estimate it the more highly in proportion as it proves better adapted to keep that nation in existence *as a nation.* From this point of view, therefore, Christianity is a heresy from Judaism, a son who leaves the house of his parents to wander abroad and there to forget his origin. Then the Talmud and Rabbinism stand infinitely higher, for they, as history tells us, so intrenched the Jewish people that, in spite of persecution and while a new world grew up, it has remained in existence to the present day. But who does not recoil from this consequence? Who can assert in earnest that Talmudic Judaism must be regarded as the final result of the labours of the prophets and psalmists, nay, of the Scribes as well? Thus by

* Jer. xxxi. 33.

degrees the number of the Jews is increasing, who freely admit that Rabbinism is not the final outcome of the religious development of the Israelitish people, but a temporary petrifaction of the Jewish spirit, which has now outgrown these forms. Their own religion has its main characteristics in common with Christianity as announced by Jesus. As for the reproach which they make to the Christian church, that it has not always remained true to its origin, and has adopted elements which, compared with Judaism, must be looked upon rather as apostasy towards heathendom than as development and progress—many Christians had already recognized this before the Jews did, and had set to work to reform it. Thus not even the Israelite can make any real objection to the standpoint which we Christians take up, and which, in contradistinction from the national, we will call the universalistic standpoint. The whole is greater than one of its parts. Humanity and its interests stand higher than the Jewish nation and its existence. The spread of ethical monotheism through the Roman world, and, shortly afterwards, among the barbarians who established themselves upon the ruins of Rome's power: this is so grand and noble a task that its accomplishment is not bought too dearly at the expense of nationality. In Christianity, which undertook this task, we see the true continuation of Israelitism. Does not the Old Testament itself enjoin this view? I do not refer here to the Messianic prophecies, for it is just the question whether Christianity may be regarded as the fulfilment of them. He who denies this, can appeal to many a national and particularistic feature in those predictions. There is something else by which the accuracy of our interpretation is confirmed. The Old Testament clearly betrays here and there a consciousness that the Israelitish religion is more than the Israelitish nation. Think of Jeremiah.* He showed that he perceived that patriotism must be subordinate to the maintenance of divine truth. If he be entitled

* Comp. Vol. II. p. 69, sq.

to a place of honour among the true prophets of Jahveh, and the book of his prophecies among Israel's sacred writings—then the standpoint of the Old Covenant also forbids us to break the cudgel over the founder of the New; then the latter, by annulling the national principle, did not lose his right to be called Israel's greatest son.

The tragic end of the struggle between Israel and Rome now surprises us less than before. Christians have much too long, in spite of history, regarded the fall of Jerusalem as a divine retribution for the murder of the Messiah. It is time that the last remnants of that view should disappear. But even then the student of history will still see a connection between the rejection of the prophet of Nazareth and the last conflict with Rome. Judaism—too great, too proud for a national religion—was and remained a fruitful source of contest between the Jewish nation and its conquerors. Had the majority of the people been able to take the road indicated by Jesus, perhaps the struggle of life and death would have been prevented. But the condemnation of Jesus was a powerful protest against universalism, the energetic assertion of the legal and strictly national principle. From that moment Israel's fate was decided. Her religion was to kill her. But when the temple burst into flames, that religion had already spread its wings and gone out to conquer an entire world.

NOTE.

I.—*See p.* 239, *n.*†.

That which occurs here and elsewhere in this work (above, pp. 68, 136, 143) about the Sanhedrim is further developed, and so far as necessary supported by proof, in a treatise, *Over de samenstelling van het Sanhedrin*, published in the Versl. en Med. der Koninkl. Acad. van Wetenschappen, Afd. Letterkunde, vol. x. 131-168 (1866). The

contents of that paper may be condensed into a few words as follows. The Talmud describes to us a Sanhedrim *of Scribes,* presided over by "the pairs" and afterwards by the descendants of Hillel. Such a Sanhedrim is in itself historically improbable, and, moreover, we do *not* meet with it in the New Testament and in Flavius Josephus. According to the—only too fragmentary—statements of these works, the Sanhedrim is composed of distinguished Priests, Elders and Scribes, and its sittings are conducted by the high-priest. A judicial and administrative body such as this grew in the course of time out of the *gerusia* (or Senate) which assisted the high-priest in the Greek period. It differs from the latter principally in this, that it also includes Scribes among its members; probably it was the first Asmonæans who opened the door to them, and thus gave them some share in the government of the state.

I subsequently met with similar ideas in J. Derenbourg, to whose *Essai sur l'histoire de la Palestine* (1867) I have more than once referred. I am glad to be able to confirm, among other things, my opinion respecting the Talmudic Sanhedrim by an appeal to so competent a judge. With regard to the organization, &c., of the Sanhedrim—writes Derenbourg, l. c. p. 87—Jewish tradition gives tolerably minute particulars: "nos sources thalmudiques ont réponse à tout; mais quelle confiance méritent ces traditions, assez nettes et assez précises en général, mais contradictoires dans certains cas spéciaux, et souvent en désaccord avec d'autres indications, qui se rencontrent dans ces mêmes sources." He then recapitulates the well-known accounts of the Sanhedrim of 7 and 23 and the great Sanhedrim of 71 members, and proceeds in these words (p. 89): "Mais s'imagine-t-on que, depuis Hyrcan jusqu' à l'époque de la domination romaine, l'organisation soit restée invariablement la même, bien que les fonctions et la compétence du Sanhédrin aient naturellement changé? Quiconque connaît les procédés du Talmud conviendra que nous possédons probablement un com-

promis entre les traditions des différents temps et les transformations de tout sorte, que l'institution a traversées, compromis fondé sur de savantes et minutieuses déductions tirées des versets de la Bible. Les souvenirs, combinés avec les textes, ont dû se plier à cette autorité irrécusable, et l'ensemble a pu fournir un système bien imaginé et très-acceptable, mais incertain au point de vue historique."

In the mean time it appears from Derenbourg's work that he makes a somewhat different use of the right given him by this view of Talmudic tradition from that which I had felt myself at liberty to make. This is not the place to handle all our points of difference. I merely wish to show the grounds upon which my divergent views are based with respect to a few of these points.

Derenbourg assumes (p. 84, sqq.) that the supreme court of justice during the first years of the reign of John Hyrcanus bore the name of "court of the Asmonæans," which we find employed in a Talmudic tradition (*Sanhedrin* 82 *a* and *Aboda zara* 36 *b*); that Hyrcanus, after his rupture with the Pharisees, reorganized the administration of justice and instituted the Sanhedrim; and that he placed Joshua ben Perahia and Nithai of Arbela (comp. above, p. 142) at the head of that body. It seems to me that these suppositions are at least very hazardous. We know very little about "the court of the Asmonæans," too little to pronounce an opinion upon it. But if Hyrcanus had founded the Sanhedrim upon the occasion referred to, would he have given the presidency to two Scribes—links in the chain of Talmudic tradition? Can this be regarded as "le seul fait certain" (p. 93)?

Under Salome Alexandra—D. goes on to say (p. 86)—the courts of justice were occupied by the Pharisees, and "under Hyrcanus II., the son of Alexander (Jannæus), they felt themselves powerful enough to demand from the king himself that he should appear before their judgment-seat (pour pouvoir exiger du roi lui-même qu'il parût devant eux en justice)." We

must refer here to *Ant.* xiv. 9, § 4, from which passage it is evident at once that it is not the king, but Herod who had to appear as the accused before the Sanhedrim: Derenbourg here amalgamates with Josephus' account the Talmudic conception of the same fact (*Sanhedrin* 19 *a*), which at the same time he himself considers less historical (pp. 146-148). But besides this we cannot allow that the Sanhedrim which called Herod to account was composed of Pharisees, nor that Shemaiah and Abtalion were then *at the head* of that body (p. 148). The contrary appears from the narrative of Josephus, which, in the face of the confusion of the Talmudic tradition, certainly deserves the preference. Hyrcanus II., the High-priest and Prince, is president of the Sanhedrim; Sameas (Shemaiah) is nothing more than one of its members; the assembly does not consist of men of kindred mind to this Scribe, but is earnestly censured by him for its faint-heartedness.

If Derenbourg, in this passage, evidently ascribes too much power to the Pharisees, elsewhere, it appears to me, he underrates their influence. I refer to pp. 200, sqq. of his work. He holds that the Sanhedrim which sentenced Jesus consisted exclusively of the members and adherents of the powerful family of Hanan (the Annas of the Gospels), so that the doctors of the law had no seats at all there. A few years later Gamaliel, Hillel's grandson, was able to make his voice heard there—not because he was a member of the body *jure suo*, but—because the high-priest and his party had found themselves compelled to give him a seat, because he was in high favour both with the people and with king Agrippa and his wife Cypros. "Grâce sans doute à l'influence de la reine Gamliel avait su pénétrer dans le Sanhédrin des prêtres" (p. 213). Derenbourg is perfectly right here in rejecting the tradition which makes Gamaliel president of the Sanhedrim. "D'après notre exposition," he writes, p. 201, n. 3, "la question si Gamliel présidait déjà le Sanhédrin n'a plus aucune raison d'être. L'admission du Pharisien était déjà un acte de condescendance

de la part de ces prêtres orgueilleux envers un homme protégé par la femme d'Agrippa et exerçant une grande influence sur le peuple; mais le pontife seul eut la présidence." But here again he goes too far, when he regards even membership of the Sanhedrim as a favour on the part of the priests. In the Gospels and the Acts the "Scribes" do not appear as members of the Sanhedrim by way of exception but constantly (comp. p. 140, seq. of my paper quoted above). It is also improbable in itself both that "the sons of Hanan" would have admitted Gamaliel, had they been at liberty to exclude him, and that Gamaliel would have consented to sit in such a court alone, without his fellow-thinkers and fellow-scribes. On the other hand, everything is in place, if we assume that the Sopherîm, from the days of the first Asmonæans, had a right to be represented in the Sanhedrim.

In his narrative of the events which preceded the fall of Jerusalem, Derenbourg once more reverts to the Sanhedrim. The conclusion which he draws from his sources, on p. 286, must have our full consent: "Simeon ben Gamliel n'était ni nasi ni chef du Sanhédrin; il n'occupait aucune autre fonction que celle de membre de ce collège, et n'avait d'autre influence que celle qu'il devait à son caractère personnel et à l'illustration de sa famille." On the other hand, I only half agree with what he writes on pp. 262, sq. "Au début de la guerre le prestige qu'exerçaient encore le sacerdoce et ses alliés fut tel, que le Sanhédrin — — — — qui, par l'absence de toute autre autorité, rentrait dans la plénitude de ses anciens pouvoirs, le peupla exclusivement de membres des riches familles pontificales et de quelques Pharisiens d'une illustre naissance." This is perfectly true so far as it means that the Zealots were not at first included in this supreme governing body and court of justice. But how do we know that only "some Pharisees of high birth" had seats in the Sanhedrim? And what right have we to ascribe their admittance into that body to the "prestige" of the priestly families? It appears

to me that here also the preference must be given to the hypothesis according to which the superior priests (and the distinguished laymen, "the Elders") had a right together with the Scribes to membership in the Sanhedrim. See pp. 146, sq. of the paper of mine to which I have referred. That they acted together against the Zealots, is perfectly true, but is easily explained by the aversion of each from a party which rejected all authority and had already shown itself in all its licentiousness.

CHAPTER XIII.

The History of Judaism after the Fall of Jerusalem.

Our task is ended. Our study of the history of the Israelitish religion was to come down to the year 70 of the Christian era, * and that limit we have now reached.

But the author may not yet lay down his pen. Judaism survives to the present day, and underwent many an important change after the fall of Jerusalem. For more reasons than one the reader's attention must be drawn to this later development also. It is remarkable enough in itself to excite and enchain our interest. Besides this, it throws light upon the preceding events, which fell within the sphere of our study, and clears up their meaning and their mutual connection. On the other hand, however, there is one great difficulty. Only a cursory review of the course of the later history of Judaism can be given here. Has it no claim to a longer and complete treatment? Is it even possible to compress it within so narrow a space? The first question I answer in the affirmative without hesitation. With regard to the second: so brief a sketch would be unworthy of the subject only if it pretended to exhaust it. If, on the contrary, it induces the reader to seek elsewhere what cannot be offered to him here, its unavoidable shortness is rather a recommendation than a reason for censure. To promote that end, a list of the principal works upon the history of the Jews and Judaism is given at the conclusion of this chapter. †

Judaism survives the fall of Jerusalem and the destruction of the Jewish state. We, who know the history of the preceding

* Vol. I. pp. 3, 4. † See the Note at the end of this Chapter.

centuries, have no need to search for the explanation of this phenomenon, which at first sight appears so singular. The leaders of the Jewish nation, from Ezra downwards, of course did not dream of so sad a catastrophe. But otherwise it is as if they made the preservation of their religion their first object and took all steps to insure its safety, should it be forced to do without the support of the independent existence of the nation. We remember that without detracting from the central importance of the temple, Ezra makes *the Law* the real foundation of the religious life of his people. Side by side with the one national sanctuary rise the Synagogues, which, as they already compensated the scattered Jews for the want of the common worship long before the fall of Jerusalem, were also able to take the place of the temple after it. The Scribes make their appearance by the side of the Priests. In the struggle which waged between them since the 2nd century before our era, the Scribes retained the upper hand—as if with a view to the time when they alone would undertake the guidance of the people and the maintenance of their religion. These facts remove all surprise at the survival of Judaism after the violent blow which was dealt to it by the Jewish war.

In complete accordance with the expectations raised by these phenomena, we find *the Scribes* at the head of the Jewish nation after the destruction of city and temple. Under the lead of Johanan ben Zacai, they assemble at Jabne (Jamnia), not far from the Mediterranean Sea. There a court of justice forms itself, which is soon looked upon as the lawful successor of the Sanhedrim, exercises the same powers and at once attempts to regulate in some measure the new order of things. Gamaliel the son of Simeon * and great-grandson of Hillel speedily takes Johanan's place there and becomes Nasi ("prince") or president of the Sanhedrim. That dignity remained hereditary in his family and was also recognized by the Romans: they looked upon "the Patriarch," as they called

* See above, p. 240, and elsewhere.

the Nasi, as the head of the Jewish nation, with whom they communicated whenever matters arose in which religion was in some way or other concerned.

It was no easy or simple task which the Scribes at Jabne undertook. The Jews were deeply discouraged by the terrible calamity which had come upon them, and moreover were heavily taxed and impoverished by the Romans, as a punishment for their resistance. It was necessary that their fidelity to the religion of their fathers should be supported and their hope in the future stimulated by their spiritual leaders. When, however, the doctors applied themselves zealously to this, was it not to be feared that the plant which they reared would grow above their heads? Zealotism had suffered defeat, it is true, but was not destroyed, and the danger which threatened from this side was the greater, in that the spiritual leaders themselves could easily be persuaded to employ or to advise violence —the more easily, according as the position of the Jews really became more difficult. Upon the whole, the Scribes managed to avoid the rocks upon which they might have suffered shipwreck. Difference of opinion manifested itself among them, as was to be expected; in practice too they did not always follow the same path. But under the guidance of the Nasi, most of them, averse from all extremes, worked on calmly and peacefully. The reorganization of Judaism, which they attempted, and, when sometimes they were called off by circumstances, constantly took again in hand, kept itself free both from too great timidity and from rashness in giving up the old. But let us try to picture more clearly the nature and course of their labours.

First of all, their relation to the advocates of the struggle against Rome demands our attention. They appeared as powerless now as they had been before* to suppress the spirit of resistance against the foreign rule. In the reign of Trajan

* See above, p. 250, seq.

(98-117) and Adrian (117-138) the Jews rebelled again. Under the former it was the dispersed Jews who took the initiative: they flew to arms simultaneously in Africa and Cyprus and joined the Parthians, the enemies of Rome, in the East. The Jews in Palestine kept quiet and thus were not visited with the vengeance of the conqueror. But some years later the fire of rebellion burst out among them also, and this most unexpectedly. Adrian seems to have been not ill disposed towards them at first, and even promised them, it is related, that he would rebuild Jerusalem and the temple. When, however, this promise was kept in a sense altogether different from that in which it was made; when it became known that the city was to bear the name of *Aelia* and to be dedicated to Jupiter Capitolinus, the fury of the Jews exploded and once more they forced heavy and bloody strife upon the Romans. The war raged terribly from 132 till 135. The rebels were led by a certain (Simeon) ben Kosiba, in whom, after the first victories which he gained, men saw the promised Messiah, for which reason he was surnamed *Bar Cochba*, "star-son," since in him was fulfilled the prophecy:

> "*A star* shall proceed out of Jacob
> And a sceptre rise out of Israel:
> Which shall smite the corners of Moab
> And the crown of the sons of tumult."*

So general was the excitement, that even some of the doctors took part in the strife and paid homage to the Messiah, among them the famous Rabbi *Akiba ben Joseph*, to whom we shall revert shortly. But the most violent exertions could not do more than delay the defeat of the Jews. The tactics of Julius Severus—for to him, his best general, Adrian had entrusted the command in chief—were of more avail than the impetuous bravery of Bar Cochba and his followers. Upon the fall of the stronghold of Bethar their fate was decided. The devastation caused by the war was frightful. The subjec-

* Num. xxiv. 17.

tion of the Jews was insured for some years at all events. A *war* between them and the Romans, such as the rebellions under Nero, Trajan and Adrian are called with perfect right, never occurred again. The insurrectionary movements gradually became rarer and rarer and were put down without much trouble.

Although other doctors besides R. Akiba may have taken part in the rebellion, most of them remained wrapt in their ordinary studies, or at any rate hastened to resume them as soon as circumstances permitted. No literary memorials exist of their work in the first century after the fall of the Jewish State. But we can gather from the later accounts with sufficient certainty how they occupied themselves during that time. It is remarkable that the same Akiba, who, at variance with the traditional neutrality of the doctors, greeted in Bar Cochba the saviour of his people, stood in the first rank in the school as well, and has a certain right to be regarded as the representative of its tendency. He was this in two respects. It was necessary, in the first place, to organize Judaism in accordance with the requirements of the time. The new position in which it was placed had to be entered upon, as it were, and had to exercise its influence upon the religious customs and ideas. There were some doctors who could hardly make up their minds to do this, who clung timorously to the past and lacked the courage to depart from tradition, where this was necessary. R. Ismael ben Elisha, a man of priestly extraction, who had settled in the south of Judah and had there gathered round him a number of pupils, is named as one of the chief adherents of this tendency. Opposed to him stood R. Akiba, the Pharisee *par excellence*. He fully believed in tradition, but did not recoil from its further development. For this purpose he made use of the rules laid down by Hillel* and subsequently increased with others, but besides this he employed a method of exegesis, which certainly had this advantage, that it limited the freedom

* Comp. above, p. 244.

of the expounder as little as possible. In his opinion nothing in the Law was insignificant, everything had its meaning and its purpose, and the expositor's task consisted in finding out and showing the meaning of every little detail. This exegesis would not even be bridled in its arbitrariness by the rules of grammar. But that rendered it all the better adapted to fill in the gaps of the existing interpretation of the law and to support the new conceptions which seemed to be required by the circumstances of the times. Akiba, therefore, was admired by his contemporaries for the dexterity with which he wielded this weapon, and was mostly followed by the circle of doctors who assembled at Jabne, although on account of his humble birth he did not attain the places of honour in the Sanhedrim and only took part in the work as an ordinary member. The later Rabbis shared that admiration, compared him to Moses and called him the restorer of the Law. But perhaps he owed these titles quite as much to a second characteristic of his activity. It appears from more than one piece of evidence, namely, that he began to collect and arrange the ordinances of the oral law. The Mishna of R. Jehuda—of which more presently—is preceded by *the Mishna of R. Akiba*. Did the latter also exist in writing? or was the system of traditional laws which he framed only delivered verbally to his disciples and imprinted upon their memories? We cannot say for certain. Akiba's work, if it ever were written down, exists no longer, except so far as it was embodied in that of R. Jehuda. Hence the form and the contents of his collection can only be guessed at. But even were it true that Akiba's successors found much in it to amend, the importance of his undertaking would still remain the same. The sequel of our review will gradually show how very much Judaism, after the fall of Jerusalem, required stability. What before that epoch had always been delivered verbally and therefore had been exposed to constant alterations and additions, was then written down once for all and so transmitted unchanged to posterity. One portion of tra-

dition after the other dies out as it were: first—to use the technical terms which will be explained further on—first the *halachah*, then the *thargûm*, then the *midrash*, and then the *masorah*. This phenomenon is not strange: in proportion as more depended upon *doctrine*—and it had now in truth become the basis of Judaism and the rallying-point to all Jews—the necessity of fixing it and excluding uncertainty as to its scope and contents became more pressing. R. Akiba proved himself alive to that necessity, and by his Mishna, even if he did not yet venture to commit it to writing, pointed out the direction in which thenceforward the doctors were to move.

After the death of R. Akiba, the Sanhedrim—which was obliged to establish itself first at one place in Palestine and then at another—went further along the same road. Gamaliel III. was replaced as Nasi by his son Simeon III., who was succeeded, towards the end of the 2nd century, by his son R. *Jehuda* surnamed *the holy*. He it was who brought the Mishna into the form in which we now possess it. This is the place, therefore, to make ourselves somewhat better acquainted with that work.

The name which it bears means *repetition* (reproduction), and indicates that the legal ordinances which are included in it were —not made, but handed down from generation to generation, and constantly—*repeated* (reproduced) by the doctors. Each separate precept, as well as the whole collection, is called (a) mishna. Now as the whole of the oral law was referred to Moses,* all the instructors of the people since his time, from Joshua down to the Great Synagogue and then the Scribes, ought really to have been regarded as having "repeated" that law, and thus all might be called "repeaters." But custom has willed that only the learned men who flourished at the time of and after the fall of Jerusalem, down to and including R. Jehuda, should be indicated by that name, *Tanaim* in Aramæan. The committal of the Mishna to writing opened a new epoch and closed the series of the Tanaim.

* See above, pp. 14, seq.

The Mishna is written in Hebrew, which at that time was no longer spoken by the people, but had remained in use among scholars as the language of the holy scriptures. No one will be surprised that they had adopted words and forms which do not occur in the Old Testament. New expressions had to be invented for new things and thoughts, and it lay in the nature of the case that it was precisely these expressions which had to be used in the precepts of the Mishna. It was surely* the task of the oral law so to enlarge and apply the commandments of the Pentateuch, that they also met wants which had arisen since they had been established? This could not well be done without making frequent use of the words which the Jews either coined themselves or adopted from the Greeks and Romans. New ideas also required the enrichment of the vocabulary. The authors of the Pentateuch and the Tamain moved in different worlds of ideas. It has been remarked,† that the Mishna contains many more juridical terms than the Pentateuch. Nothing is more natural. The commandments of the Mosaic law, and especially the oldest, but still, although in a lower degree, the priestly commandments as well, are *moral admonitions;*‡ the Mishna contains *legal decisions,* and answers the questions: "What am I bound to do?" "What am I free to do?" "When am I guilty?" "How can I remain innocent?" But this is at the same time the peculiar character of the Mishna. It is a *code,* and this in an entirely different and stricter sense than the Mosaic Thorah; a collection of commandments and prohibitions which are not only more minute than the precepts of the Law, but are also prompted by another spirit. We have no right to place the Mishna *opposite* the Thorah. We even found before that "the men of the Great Synagogue" and their successors were in

* See above, p. 12, sq.

† Geiger, *Lehr- und Lesebuch zur Sprache der Mischnah,* i. 27, sq.; L. Philippson, *Weltbewegende Fragen,* ii. 1, pp. 366, sqq.

‡ Comp. Vol. II., p. 37, sq., 277.

close unison with the most recent lawgivers.* But no less can we overlook the fact that the direction followed out completely in the Mishna was only indicated in the Thorah. Let one example out of a countless number serve to explain this. The Law forbids participation in the service of idols ;† the Mishna says:

"When idolatry is in a city (an idol-feast is being kept), "then (intercourse) outside (it) is free; if idolatry be outside "it, then (intercourse) inside (it) is free. When may one go "thither (to such a city)? If the road goes not further than "that place, it is forbidden; but if another place can be reached "by that road, then it is permitted."‡

All the details into which the general prohibition to take part in idolatry can be dissected are handled with similar minuteness. It is casuistry almost without end.

All these traditional decisions were now not only collected, but arranged by R. Jehuda. In doing this he could follow more than one method. He might, *e.g.*, have taken the Pentateuch as a basis and arranged the traditions in the order of its precepts. But he preferred an arrangement under *subjects*. He first divided them into six *series* (*Seder*, plural *Sedarîm*), of which the first (*S. Zeraîm*) deals with horticulture and agriculture; the second (*S. Moëd*) with the feasts, the sabbath, etc.; the third (*S. Nashîm*) with women, marriage, divorce; the fourth (*S. Nesikîm*) with compensation and legal procedure in general; the fifth (*S. Kodashîm*) with sacrifices, first-fruits, and the temple service; and, finally, the sixth (*S. Tohoroth*) with cleanness and purifications. Each of these series is again divided into a number of dissertations (*Massecheth*, plural *Massichtôth*), the number of which is 63: these in their turn are split into (524) chapters.

From the name and dignity of its author, but also from its own excellence, the Mishna derived an authority which was not disputed in the schools of the Rabbis. But we should be

* See above, p. 6, sqq.

† *i. a.* Exod. xxiii. 24a; xxxiv. 12-16.

‡ *Abodah Zarah*, i. 4.

wrong in imagining that the doctors simply rested content with its utterances, as if the limit had now been reached, and additions or further development of the code which had been fixed were superfluous. The Mishna itself invited closer research and further elucidation. And this in more than one way. First of all by its incompleteness. Irrespectively of the question whether R. Jehuda intended to collect *all* traditions, no one will be surprised that he left many out. After the Mishna was finished, these "excluded precepts"—or *baraitas*, as they were called—came into notice of themselves. It was but natural that they also should be collected, to explain and complete the Mishna. This actually occurred. The collective *baraitas* received the name of *thosephta* ("addition") and formed a first appendix to the code compiled by R. Jehuda. But the contents of the Mishna also induced the schools to continue its work, for it had included not only the ordinances which were valid beyond doubt, but also the decisions of individual doctors, sometimes even their mutually antagonistic verdicts. Thus it furnished rich material for discussion, and seemed to call for the definite enactment of that which it itself had left undefined. This the doctors now set themselves to do. At first Palestine remained their headquarters. Gamaliel III. and Juda II., who filled the office of Nasi, or the patriarchate, from 210 to 275, and resided at Tiberias, led there the disputations of the members of the Sanhedrim, who made it their task to explain and enlarge the Mishna. The scholars of the period which begins with the closing of the Mishna are called generally *Amoraim*, the Amoras or "expounders;" their elucidation of the code, which was not written down till afterwards, is called *Gemara*, "supplement." The latter grew by degrees, and at first was handed down by word of mouth.

With the death of Juda II. began the decay of the schools of Palestine, a natural consequence of the gradually worse condition of the Jews in the Roman empire, rendered still

harder by the elevation of Christianity to be the religion of the state. But before this decay became apparent, the study of the law had already found a new fatherland, where it could develop itself in security after its expulsion from Palestine. The reader will remember what we said before about the Babylonish Jews, their great number, their prosperity, their comparative independence under the rule of the *Resh Galutha*, "the head of the exiles."* It lay in the nature of the case, that events in Palestine—the fall of Jerusalem, the disastrous wars under Adrian—should promote emigration to Babylonia, and that the Jews established there, in proportion as they grew more numerous and powerful, should feel more independent of their brethren in Palestine. Traces of a certain striving after independence of the mother country occur as early as the second century before the Christian era. But at that time Palestine, in all that concerned scribe-doctrine, had no rivalry to fear on the part of Babylonia. It was otherwise in the third century. Then, under the patriarchate of Juda II., some doctors emigrated to the regions on the Euphrates, and among them Abba Areka (died A.D. 247), who became so famous that he was called simply by the name of *Rab*, "the Master" *par excellence*. Under their leadership schools of the law were established in various cities of Babylonia, and at once competed with, and soon surpassed, the schools of Palestine. Rab and his followers also took the Mishna for their basis, so that research had one and the same starting-point in Palestine and in Babylonia: the numerous varieties of readings in the two texts of the Mishna have usually no effect upon the contents, and thus do not destroy that uniformity. But in the *Gemara*, *i.e.* in the explanation and extension of the common law-book, the doctors of Babylonia and those of Palestine follow their own paths. Circumstances brought it about that of the two Gemaras which thus arose, that of Palestine was closed first. In the third and fourth centuries the power of the patriarchate

* See above, p. 165.

decreased rapidly and Judaism in its own fatherland sank lower and lower. At last, in the year 425, the office of Patriarch was abolished, when Hillel's race died out in Gamaliel IV. About the same time, if not even earlier, the Gemara of Palestine received its present form. United with the Mishna, it bears the name of *Talmud Jerushalmi*, which means the teaching or knowledge of Jerusalem. Opposed to it there is the *Talmud Babli*, which was closed nearly a century later, about the year 500, by R. Asche and his pupil R. Abina, containing the Mishna and the Babylonish Gemara. Probably this would have been handed down by word of mouth still longer and thus would still have remained capable of extension, had the Babylonish Jews enjoyed undisturbed rest and been able to look to the future without anxiety. But from time to time, and especially about the middle of the fifth century, they had much to suffer for their faith's sake in the kingdom of the Sassanidæ, in which Mazdeism or the doctrine of Zarathustra was the state religion and was propagated with zeal. Thus there was ground for fearing that the chain of tradition would be broken, and therefore it seemed time to secure it from destruction.

The Gemaras are to be distinguished at once from the Mishna by the language in which they are written, the dialects which were then spoken in Palestine and Babylonia. But besides this they differ from the text to which they are joined, in contents and style. They usually occupy themselves, as the Mishna does, with the Law, and elucidate its precepts, or extend it, or show what were presumably its motives. But they often leave all at once the territory of the *halachah*—the technical term for *custom which has the force of law*—to enter that of the *haggadah*. This designation, which really means *narrative*, embraces what one might call the free preaching or the religious discourse of the doctors whose words are included in the Talmud. Now it is historical reminiscence, then again moral exhortation illustrated by legends or parables, which, as if for a change

and relaxation, take the place of a frequently dry discussion about the meaning of a legal ordinance. Thus the most heterogeneous matters stand in juxtaposition in the Gemaras. It is as if they would transport us to the assemblies of the doctors and make us witnesses of their irregular deliberations and debates. It has been truly asserted that there is not any book in all the literatures of the world to be compared with the Talmud: a commentary upon a code, which at the same time deserves to be called an encyclopædia! To pass judgment upon such a collection in a few words would be extremely hazardous. It affords ample material for a selection of extracts, both of admirable sayings and similes and of subleties and follies which we cannot read without a shrug. But from an historical point of view the Talmud cannot easily be valued too highly. Many generations of the leaders of the Jewish nation have deposited therein all that they thought and felt. It is often no easy task to grasp their meaning. But he who succeeds in doing this finds himself rewarded for his trouble, for the way to their life and—their heart lies open before him.

Hitherto we have spoken simultaneously of the two Gemaras, that of Jerusalem and that of Babylonia. They have indeed much in common, and particularly that great diversity of contents to which we have just referred. Still there is a difference between them. The Babylonish Gemara is the youngest—perhaps, too, it was written with an eye upon the Gemara of Jerusalem—and thus represents a later stage of tradition. The traces of the conflict of opinions out of which harmony was gradually produced, are still apparent in the older Gemara, while in the younger—which moreover was written down abroad—they have in many instances become irrecognizable or even entirely obliterated. The Babylonish Talmud is better adapted to practical life, and has therefore obtained greater authority among the Jews and become the real foundation of orthodox Talmudic Judaism. The historian, who is often more interested in the conflict itself than in the final

result, finds many an illustration in the Gemara of Jerusalem which he looks for in vain in its younger sister. It is only in the most recent times that it has been studied with this purely scientific object, and, if we may judge by the results already obtained, further investigation of its contents will place more than one point of the history of Judaism in a clearer light.

But were we to enter into this more deeply, we should run the risk of losing the thread of our historical survey. With the closing of the Talmud we have reached a resting-point, and we pause a moment to look back at the road which lies behind us. First, however, we must point out that the same necessity which led to the committal of Mishna and Gemara to writing, made itself felt in more than one section of Judaism. Traditions which had no place in the Mishna and yet were worthy of preservation, were collected and arranged and added to the Talmud in the form of treatises like those of the Mishna. In this way arose the later Massichtôth,* "upon the book of the law," "upon the copyists," "upon the Samaritans," "upon the proselytes," etc., ten of which we still possess.—The *haggadah*, which we mentioned just now as an important element in the Gemaras, although at first it was handed down by tradition as well as the oral law, was committed to writing piece by piece, and this in the form of commentaries upon the books of the Old Covenant, which commentaries are known under the name of *midrash* (really: "investigation").—The reading out in the Synagogue of a portion of the Law and the Prophets had long been followed by an interpretation into the language of the country, Aramæan, of what had been read. The same translation was given everywhere, but it was not yet written down. This also was changed in the centuries which precede the closing of the Talmud. The *Targûm* ("translation"), of the Pentateuch as well as of the historical and prophetic books, was written down and ascribed to scholars of earlier times, who perhaps had really contributed towards its first adoption, to Onkelos and Jonathan ben Uzziel. It is noteworthy here, that there exist

* See above, p. 295.

two targumîm of the Law, as well as two Gemaras: a Jerusalem targûm, which has been preserved to us in two forms, and a Babylonish, usually attributed to Onkelos.—And finally mention should be made here of the labour which was bestowed upon the determination of the text of the Old Testament. The scholars, and especially those of Palestine, did not really occupy themselves with this until later. But we may already refer to this work of theirs here, because it is intimately related to all that we have just said. The Israelites only wrote the consonants. So long as the language lived, this detracted nothing from the clearness of what was written and everyone knew how he was to pronounce and thus to understand it. But it was otherwise when Hebrew began to die out. At first the pronunciation—and at the same time the right interpretation—of the text of the Old Testament, like all the rest, was handed on by word of mouth. But a time came when the want was felt of fixing this tradition and of expressing by signs the vowels, accents and everything else that belongs to pronunciation. It was this task which the Jewish Scholars, especially in the school of Tiberias, took in hand, from the sixth century, and so finished in four or five centuries as is to be seen from the results of their work, in the present editions of the Old Testament. The targumîm to which we have just referred, which represented the traditional interpretation of the sacred text, were of great use to them in this. For the rest, they were not satisfied with providing the text with the necessary points, but they also made it their object to render it for ever impossible to corrupt that text, to diverge from the reading when it had once been laid down. For this purpose they noted down all phenomena of a grammatical nature and formed them into groups. They even counted the words and letters of each book. They deposited the whole wealth of their remarks in a work which bears the name of *Masorah* ("tradition"), they themselves being called "men of the Masorah," or Masorites. Is it not already evident from the little to which we are obliged to confine ourselves here, that

their work was of the same nature as that of their predecessors in the domain of the law? The want of fixity and immutability made itself felt on all sides; here sooner, there later, men set to work to produce them.

The history of Judaism during the first five centuries of our era may, in fact, be regarded as a continual effort to fix itself. In a certain sense this period is the continuation of the period, also of five centuries, which immediately precedes it: it is one line which begins with Ezra and runs on to the closing of the Talmud—and, in another domain, to the settlement of the Masorah. But it is easy to show that after the fall of Jerusalem, the direction of this line is somewhat altered. It is as if after that epoch the doctors no longer dare to allow the stream of tradition a free course, and begin to find it necessary to hold it back and collect its waters. We have already pointed out how the efforts applied to this end followed each other in regular succession and find their natural explanation in the circumstances of the times. We must now add that Judaism, by fixing itself in this manner, assumed a character different from that which it had borne before. Ever since Ezra's days the authority of the Thorah had been recognized without restriction, but in such a way that a great deal of latitude was left for the free activity of the doctors and for the self-development of religious life. Even then the consequences of the legal tendency had made themselves felt.* What, then, was the state of things, now that first the Mishna and afterwards the Gemara had been added? Was there still room for the application of private opinion and for those modifications of doctrine and of religious duties which would become necessary in the course of time? We need not answer this question; history has answered it for us. The Talmud has done Judaism the inestimable service of keeping it in existence; enclosed within the Talmud it has withstood the storms of time—and what storms they have been! But—there was a lack of fresh air and light between those high walls. Judaism has not remained station-

* Comp. Vol. II., pp. 285, sq. and elsewhere.

ary, but has entered upon new phases of development. Yet that development has not been founded upon the Mishna and Gemara, nay, it has taken place in spite of the authority of the Talmud. To advance further, Judaism has had to step over its petrified tradition or to push it aside.

In the beginning of the seventh century a new spiritual power made its appearance upon the stage of history: *Islam*. It was destined to influence strongly the fate of the Jews and the development of Judaism. It is unnecessary here to remind the reader how much Mohammed himself was indebted to Judaism. We can also pass over in silence his wars with the Jewish tribes in Arabia. The conquests of the Mussulmen, which, as we know, succeeded each other with astonishing rapidity, were rich in results. Within a few years all the countries of the East in which Jewish communities flourished were subject to their dominion: Palestine itself, Egypt, and especially Babylonia. In the beginning of the eighth century they also obtained a firm footing in Spain, soon to found there a flourishing kingdom, in the history of which the Jews were to occupy an important place. But we shall revert to this directly; for the present we will confine our attention to the East. Here the Jews, upon the whole, had no cause to complain of their new masters. They did not share the privileges of the "faithful," but still, like the Christians, were tolerated upon the payment of a tax, and together with the latter were favoured above the heathen. We are not surprised therefore that they soon learned the Arabic tongue and began to take part in the intellectual movement which was introduced into the Mahomedan world. This occurred especially in Babylonia, where (after the year 754) Bagdad was founded and raised to be the seat of the Califate. The internal organization of the Jews remained almost the same. The *Resh Galutha* exercised his power under the Califate as before. The Jewish schools at Pumbaditha (from the year 589) and Sura (from 689) flourished

under his patronage and supreme management. The heads of these schools bore the title of *Gaôn* (plural *Geonîm*), equal to our "Excellency," and had such great power that they could sometimes dare to oppose the *Resh Galutha*. The period which extends from the end of the sixth to about the middle of the eleventh century may be called, after them, *the time of the Geonîm*.

In our study of this period two phenomena come of themselves into the foreground: the rise of the Karaites and the labours of Saädiah Gaôn.

Our preceding review of the history of Judaism had not at all prepared us, it would seem, for the former phenomenon. Two centuries and a half after the closing of the Talmud, about the year 750, a sect forms itself not far from the centre of the Jewish learning of that day, the sect of the Karaites, which wishes to remain true to the ancestral religion, but, setting aside the whole of tradition, is guided solely by the authority of the Holy Scriptures and borrows its name—which means "adherents to the Scriptures" or "men of the Scriptures"—from this fact. It was a long time before the date of the origin and the earliest fortunes of this sect could be made out from the contradictory accounts relating to it, derived partly from its adherents and partly from its adversaries. There is no longer any doubt, however, upon these points. It was *Anan ben David*, who, in the middle of the 8th century, rejected the authority of the Talmud and soon assembled a large party round him. Less unanimity prevails as yet with respect to the motives which led him thus to set aside tradition. The statement that he seceded out of spite at the disappointment of his ambition, betrays its origin, in the camp of the opposite party, too clearly to gain credit. The opinion that Anan allowed himself to be carried away by heretical notions which had arisen among the Mussulmen shortly before, has more appearance of truth.* Upon a closer examination, how-

* Comp. Jost. l. c. ii. 295, sqq.

ever, this opinion too has much against it. Is it likely or even conceivable that a movement in the domain of Mahomedan theology would have spread among the Jews so soon, scarcely a century after they had been made subject to the Mussulmen, and have called into existence an opposition so radical as that of Anan and his followers? In any case it would have to be admitted that the germs of that opposition were already present and were fertilized by contact with the Mahomedan theology. Now we do not search for such germs in vain; it is not even necessary to call in the aid of foreign influence to account for their development. It is an established fact that the Karaites agree in various particulars with *the Sadducees*—not exactly in the denial of personal immortality and of the existence of a higher world of spirits, but in the interpretation of some of the texts of the Law and in certain religious customs. This has long been noticed, first of all by the Karaites' opponents, who are usually called Rabbanites, because they acknowledge the authority of the doctors or Rabbis. In the conflict with these men, the Karaites indignantly repudiated the charge of Sadduceeism. In a certain sense most justly, for it was made against them at a time when "Sadducee" and "unbeliever" were synonymous. But if we use the name "Sadducee" in its historical sense,* we do not wrong the Karaites by applying it to them. Then we simply mean to say that the tendency with which Phariseeism had had to contend before the fall of Jerusalem survived in them—modified in accordance with the development of the times, as was to be expected, but yet in such a manner that its original identity is unmistakable. To be able to admit this, we must suppose that Rabbanism, although in possession of undisputed power from the year 70, still had not succeeded in convincing all its opponents of their error, so that the Sadducean tradition, if I may so call it, had never entirely died out, but was able powerfully to assert itself when circumstances

* Comp. above, pp. 118. seq.

aroused and favoured it. This hypothesis, even though it cannot be proved by historical evidence, contains nothing strange or improbable and may be summoned to our aid without hesitation.

We accept this explanation of the origin of the Karaites with the more confidence, because it accounts for the comparatively meagre results which their efforts produced. When we first hear of their principles; when we find that they reject not this or that tradition merely, but *all tradition*, and wish to hold by the Scriptures themselves, we are very much disposed to entertain great expectations concerning them and to greet them as the authors of the very reformation of which Judaism was decidedly in want. They indeed worked zealously. Karaite literature, written chiefly in Arabic, is very extensive and embraces almost the whole domain of theology. They did much, in particular, for the study of the Old Testament, nay, they even infused new life into it and set an example to the Rabbanites. But upon the whole that literature does not answer our expectations. It stands no higher than that of the Rabbanites. Much rather did the latter outstrip them and point out the road upon which the Karaites then followed them, closely or at a distance. The Karaites cannot boast of such leaders as Aben Ezra, Maimonides and the other chiefs of Talmudic Judaism. Was this entirely the fault of circumstances? Must the undeniable fact that now the Rabbanites and their descendants remain almost alone in the field and that the Karaites have dwindled down to a few communities—must this fact also be regarded as fortuitous? The reason why Karaitism evinces less vital power than we had ascribed to it, is rather that it stood less high than we at first suspected. Its rejection of the Talmud arises from a predilection for pre-talmudic Judaism, and so is rather an attempt to restore the old, than the founding or announcement of something new and better. We characterized the Sadducees above* as the conservatives of their time; we may also apply this name to

* p. 144.

the Karaites. Hence it was that—to judge at any rate by their literature—they wanted life and motion. The points of dispute between Anan ben David and his contemporaries the Geonîm remain the subject of contention between the Karaites and Rabbanites. The former, as well as the latter, have their tradition, to which they adhere firmly and above which they do not rise. In fact we do them no injustice in objecting to hail their efforts as the beginning of a new life of Judaism, however earnest and well-meant they may have been.

In the meantime we must guard against blindness to the merits of the Karaites. As we have already said, they gave a fresh impulse to Talmudic Judaism and forcibly promoted intellectual development among its adherents. The Geonîm confined themselves upon the whole to the maintenance and elucidation of existing tradition. Even within these narrow limits many of them did not excel. But in the first half of the tenth century we find among them a man of unmistakable talent and great significance, Saadiah ben Joseph (died 942). He was born in Fajjûm, in Egypt, and had made himself known by, among other things, a polemic writing against the Karaites, for which the *Resh Galutha* thought good to place him at the head of the school at Sura. He did all honour to the title of *Gaôn*, for which he had this post to thank. He wrote much, in Hebrew, and especially in Arabic—in the latter tongue his principal work: "religions and dogmas." It deserves separate mention, because it is one of the oldest instances of a *scientific* treatment of the Jewish doctrine. Its character is at once apparent from the fact that Saadiah admits three sources of truth: the Scriptures, Tradition (*i.e.* the Talmud) and human reason, which in his opinion agree in everything. Need we say that the attempt to show such agreement leads to singular artifices? The Scriptures especially come to grief, for now they are interpreted rationalistically, and now again twisted into conformity with tradition. Subjection to the Talmud — which the opposition of the Karaites had

rendered all the more abject—thus bore its sour fruit. Insignificant or ordinary minds had room enough for their movements within the bounds set by such an authority. But a man of such great gifts as Saadiah was without the least doubt stunted in his growth by it. He was indeed full of zeal to promote the religious culture of his nation: his translation of the Old Testament into Arabic would suffice of itself to prove that he had acquired more than an ordinary amount of learning, and, where he felt himself free, did not fear to brave the prejudices of his time. But he remains bound to the Talmud, and in consequence of this he does not reach to the root of his subject; so that the scientific value of his writings suffers no small detriment.

The same remark continually forces itself upon us, in studying the Jewish theology of the following centuries. In other respects it is a brilliant epoch in the history of the Jewish nation that now opens before us. The centre of the Jewish church is transferred to the West. The spirit of study awakes among the Jews in Italy, in the south of France and in Germany, and the knowledge of the Scriptures and the Talmud soon rises to a considerable height. R. Gershom ben Jehuda, "the light of the exile," worked with good results in Germany (until about 1040). R. Solomon ben Isaac, or more briefly Rashi, born at Troyes in the first half of the eleventh century, gradually acquired a great reputation as an expounder of the Old Testament and of the Babylonish Talmud; his commentaries were circulated in every direction and have remained in use to the present day. Strict adherence to tradition characterizes these men, and, as a whole, the Jews settled in those countries. There was in truth no inducement or temptation for them to venture beyond their own ground: the civilization of the Christians among whom they lived was as yet but little advanced, and moreover they had no access to it. *In Spain* their position was altogether different. The Jews still love to look back, with legitimate pride, to the golden days which their

forefathers passed there. Under the Mahomedan rule, especially before the subjection of the peninsula to the fanatical Morabites (1110), they applied their rich talents successfully in more than one domain and reaped great advantages. Their political fortunes, the part which they took in the intellectual life of the time and their poetry must be passed over here in silence. But it lay in the nature of the case that the civilization which they managed to make their own reacted upon their conception of religion. The study of languages was not without fruit for the exegesis of the Old Testament: Menahem ben Sarug and Dunash ben Labrat, who contended for the favour of Hasdai ben Isaac ben Shaprut, the powerful minister of Abdo'r-rahmán (died 961), both excelled in that study, and produced writings which still retain their value. After the study of the Talmud had taken root in Spain, about the middle of the tenth century, through the arrival of a learned Jew from Italy, successive attempts were made to unite knowledge and culture with homage to the authority of tradition. It is unnecessary to collect and criticise them: they are all overshadowed by the works of Maimonides, of whom more directly. But the century in which Jehuda ha-Levi (1080-1150) composed his religious songs and wrote his famous book "Cosri," devoted to the defence of Judaism; in which Aben Ezra (1100-1175) wrote his spirited Commentaries, and Abraham ben David praised Judaism as "the sublime faith"—that century may be truly regarded as the prime of western Judaism.

The Morabite reign of terror had already lasted some years when Moses ben Maimon was born at Cordova (1135). Thus his life no longer falls in the years of the Jewish prosperity. His father even found himself compelled to migrate with all his family to Fez and to pretend to embrace Islam, after the conquest of Spain by the Almohadîn (1148). Some years later he obtained liberty of conscience by flight, and settled at Kahira in Egypt. There his son continued to reside, and wrote

the works which gained him imperishable fame. Although written out of Spain, they breathe the spirit which had prevailed among the Jews in that country; and they may be regarded as results of the development which had there taken place. The principal works of Maimonides are: an Arabic commentary upon the Mishna, of which the exposition of *Pirke Abôth*, which amounts to a system of morals, forms a part; a Hebrew writing called "a repetition of the Law," or, "the strong hand," which gives systematically in fourteen books the whole of the contents of the Talmud; a defence in Arabic of the rationality of the Jewish faith, "a guide to the perplexed"—called in the Hebrew "Morê ha-nebochîm." It is already evident from this enumeration that Maimonides does not dream of leaving the domain of the traditional belief. Rather was the giant labour which he bestowed upon the arrangement of the Talmudic precepts destined precisely to render them more accessible to his fellow-believers, and to promote their exact observance. But, on the other hand, he is convinced that blind submission to the twofold revelation is diametrically opposed to God's will: He has made known his law to Israel, in order that the latter may study it, and recognise the rational grounds upon which it rests—the result of which, it speaks for itself, must be the voluntary performance of its precepts. Maimonides devotes all his learning and ingenuity to the demonstration of the truth and universal applicability of this proposition. Upon the standpoint which he takes up he is unsurpassed. If, in spite of this, his writings did not open out any new channels for the development of Judaism, the blame must be imputed not to him, but to the untenability of the basis of his views. We need not repeat what we have already said in connection with Saadiah's attempt: it is impossible really to reconcile Scripture, tradition, and reason; the highest talents, even those of Moses ben Maimon—whom posterity has compared with and considered almost equal to his namesake the lawgiver—carry it no further than a compromise, in which

both faith and learning fall short. And, what is worse, and must not be lost sight of here especially: the *life* of the nation gains nothing by such a compromise. Submission to the Talmudic precepts is rendered somewhat less oppressive and painful by such a modified supernaturalism as that of Maimonides; it clothes itself with the appearance of reasonableness; but it is as much an unconditional duty as it was before, and therefore for the Jew who practises it it is a wall that shuts him out from sharing in the development of society. In the first centuries after Maimonides' death (1204) it was indeed scarcely possible for the Jews to mix freely with those of other persuasions in the Christian world: it was only at the cost of fidelity to the religion of their forefathers that they could obtain entrance into the society of those days. Thus at first, nay, for about five centuries longer, it was necessary that their enclosing wall should rather be heightened and fortified than thrown down. For a long time, therefore, Maimonides gave them just what they wanted: a clear review of their faith and of their religious customs; a confirmation of their legitimacy as opposed to infidel philosophy and to other forms of religion. But when the hindrances which the Christians put in their path were one by one cleared away, then Maimonides was no longer of any use to them; then they had to choose a standpoint other than that upon which he stood, before they could advance, and they could appropriate the fruits of his rich intellect only if they did not shrink from that step. In a word: Maimonides is the representative *par excellence* of *Jewish scholasticism*, but, as his starting point shows, he is nothing more than that.

In a complete history of Judaism, the conflict to which the writings of Moses ben Maimon gave rise would occupy an important place. In a review such as ours we need not dwell upon it. If the remarks we have just advanced be correct, the questions over which that conflict was waged are of no *primary* importance. It is true, it is not an indifferent matter whether

philosophy was to exercise some influence or none at all. But still the significance of this question is very much diminished when even the advocates of philosophy give prominence to its complete harmony with belief. The final outcome is always this, that practice has to comply with tradition and its precepts. Moreover, the political and social condition of the Jews, which had already left much to be desired, became still more lamentable from the thirteenth century—so much so that for the time emancipation from the fetters of tradition was not to be thought of, and all their forces had to be concentrated to preserve their religion from destruction by the violent attacks which were made upon it.

This is not the place to sketch the sad course of the inhuman persecution of the Jews. We will simply give a few features —no more than are required to furnish an idea of the crushing effect which this suffering necessarily had upon the Jewish people. From the time of the first crusade the unhappy exiles were constantly exposed to the explosions of popular fury, which but too often went unpunished or were even encouraged by those who ought to have curbed them. It gradually became a ruling conviction in Germany, France, and Italy that the Jews had *no rights;* it was only by virtue of a special permission from the sovereign, for which they had to pay heavily, that they were allowed to reside anywhere in his kingdom, and then only under very restricted conditions. The slightest pretext was enough to cause the withdrawal of that permission or to make its continuance depend upon the raising of fresh taxes. The popular hatred, fed by jealousy of the Jews' riches, resulted in open violence time after time. This happened, among other instances, in the years 1348 and 1349, when "the black death" traversed Europe, and, as far as Spain is concerned, in the year 1391, when, it is calculated, 200,000 Jews were compelled to undergo baptism and as many lost their lives. No less execrable was the step to which governments more than once proceeded: the banishment of the Jews

out of the land where they had lived for centuries, if they did not embrace Christianity by a certain time. They were driven in this manner from England (1290), and more than once from France, from Spain and Portugal (1492 and 1498), and from some parts of Germany and Italy. The lot of those who stayed behind was perhaps sadder than that of those who left the land of their abode. To escape the sentence of banishment they adopted the appearance of Christianity, especially in Spain and Portugal. They thus found themselves doomed to continual hypocrisy, while they could not escape the distrust of their fellow-citizens and of the clergy eager for persecution. In the long run therefore many "Marranites" preferred emigration to such a life. We need not remind the reader here how some of them found a hospitable asylum in Holland.

When we survey the Jewish literature of this period, we find in the first place that the study of the Holy Scriptures and Tradition was continued without interruption. There was never any want of Rabbis, who, in a narrower or wider sphere, watched over the maintenance of the religious usages and could give advice upon difficult legal questions, nor of learned men who deposited the results of their study in commentaries or other writings. There even arose in the 16th century a system of Talmudic Judaism which found favour on all sides, and, in the opinion of a competent judge,* may be regarded as the complete and definite expression of the practical requirements of Judaism. It is entitled *Shulchán 'arûch* ("prepared table"), and was written by Joseph Karo, whose family had left Spain and, with many others, had settled in Turkey. While the work of former centuries was thus supplemented and in a certain sense closed, in the second place *mysticism* flourished in this period: in the 13th century the *Cabbala* came into prominence, and it will be well worth our while to dwell upon it for a moment.

* Jost, l. c. iii. 133.

We already find mention in the Talmud of a doctrine about the creation of the world and God's being which, in the opinion of the doctors, is to be put forward only with the greatest caution. The Talmud even mentions a "book of the creation" (*sepher jezirah*), which seems to be connected with that secret doctrine. A writing with that title still exists to this day: its identity with that of the Talmud must remain an open question, but it was already in existence in the period of the Geonîm and was then commentated upon by, among others, Saadiah. This book, however, exercised but slight influence at that time: here and there a scholar busied himself with it, but beyond this circle it was little known, and a school of Cabbalists—*i.e.* of men who propagated this particular "tradition" or "Cabbala"—did not yet exist. This was changed in the 13th century. After a few doctors, and among them the famous Moses ben Nachman, had developed and again brought into prominence the ideas expressed in *Sepher Jezirah*, the book *Zohar* ("lustre"), a system of cabbalistic speculation, saw the light, which book to the present day is esteemed as highly by the Cabbalists as the Talmud is by the orthodox Jews. Perhaps *Zohar* also stands upon a par with the Talmud in another respect: as the latter combines the research and the discussions of many centuries, so *Zohar* seems to be the *résumé* of the ideas which were current among the Cabbalists and were propagated by them. Criticism first pointed to Abraham ben Samuel Abulafia (1240, seq.), but afterwards, and with more reason, to Moses ben Shém Tob de Leon, his younger contemporary, as the author of the book. In the book itself, the authorship is ascribed to Simeon ben Jochai, a famous doctor of the first century of our era, who, according to the Talmud, liked to live alone in seclusion—a mysterious figure therefore, not unadapted for the part which the book Zohar attributed to him.

It is no easy task to give an idea of the contents of the Cabbala. One of its most striking characteristics is the very

extensive use which it makes of numerical symbolism. It also proclaims the doctrine of emanation: the world issues from the "Infinite One," through a series of intermediate beings. And further, the transmigration of souls and the belief in the approaching restoration of Israel occupy a very considerable portion of the Cabbala. It is easy to imagine what flagrant artifice is required to derive theosophical speculations such as these from the Scriptures. For the rest, it is not wanting in profound ideas. But the thirst for mysteriousness prevents them from being clearly expressed. All is misty, unnatural, unhealthy.

Were the book Zohar an independent phenomenon, or had it met with acceptance only from a few, it would be most hazardous to draw from such a writing any conclusion as to Judaism and its relation to the spiritual requirements of its adherents. But the contrary is the case. *Zohar* exercised great influence among the Jews, the Cabbala won hosts of followers. Its first prosperity, in the 13th century, was followed, after an interval of comparative stagnation, by a period of renewed interest, in the 16th and 17th centuries, to which we shall revert directly. May this be regarded as a proof that many were not satisfied by the Judaism of the Talmud? Jewish scholars of the present day often lament the power exercised by the Cabbala over former generations. And indeed it cannot be denied that it led to endless fanaticisms, and frequently to extravagancies in practice. But a phenomenon such as this must be not only deplored, but explained. Is there any other explanation of it than this, that the author of the book Zohar, when he called the study of the law, as then in vogue, homage to a dead letter, uttered the thoughts of many minds? Is not the preference for "the soul of the Law," as the Cabbala was called by its adherents, a clear proof that in the estimation of many "the body of the Law" was beginning to die away?

Unless I be mistaken, the truth of these remarks is fully borne out by the events upon which we must now fix our atten-

tion. Until about the middle of the 18th century, when a new period began to dawn, the condition of the Jews in by far the majority of European countries was very lamentable. They were not permitted to take part in social progress: the Jews' quarters or ghettos, to which they were confined, are the sad symbols of the spiritual isolation in which they had to live. Undoubtedly their religious belief was not without its consolatory effect in that state of humiliation: in spite of the contempt of his fellow-citizens the Jew remained conscious of his nobility and held fast to the high destiny of his nation. But it cannot be asserted that his religion, when left to itself, proved capable of higher development. The Judaism of the Talmud was found to be "without expedient." Had it had within itself the power to produce something new, it would necessarily have shown it at this time—in the century of the Reformation and in that of the birth of modern philosophy. But we search in vain for phenomena testifying of such a vital power.

The study of the Cabbala revived in the East under Moses Cordovero (died about 1570) and Isaac Luria (1534-1573). Even with the latter, who held intercourse with the prophet Elijah and gave himself out as the Messiah ben Joseph,* it degenerated into fanaticism. A portion of his followers managed to keep themselves free from this and studied the Cabbala with scientific motives. But we are not surprised that his fantasies also made their converts. We have to regard as one of the latter *Shabbatai Zewi* (born at Smyrna in 1641), who came forward first as a prophet and then as the Messiah, obtained a great number of followers, despatched his messengers in all directions, and, although repudiated by the Rabbis, gained credence with very many in the Jewish communities. It seemed as if the movement must come to an ignominious end upon

* We already find traces in the Talmud of the belief in two Messiahs, a "son of David" and a "son of Joseph." The latter is the forerunner of the former and is destined to suffer death in the struggle against the enemies of the kingdom of God. The prophecies which referred to a suffering Messiah were applied to him. The name is perhaps borrowed from Deut. xxxiii. 17.

Zewi's conversion to Islam (1667), but it survived it. A sect formed itself, which continued to acknowledge Zewi as the Messiah and tried theoretically to justify his apostasy: the form of religion which he proclaimed, namely, stood as far above Judaism as it did above Christianity and Islam, was destined to absorb these three and consequently was indifferent to each one's particular usages. This party also made some progress: its prophet, Nathan, even occasioned a good deal of commotion here and there in European communities. Universally proscribed in the West, it lived on in the East. The Cabbala appeared to be the real cause of the schism: the members of the sect were called Zoharites or Cabbalists. One of the articles of their belief was that the Talmud was full of errors and promoted immorality. Jacob Frank (1713-1798), who gained many credulous adherents in Germany, was related, at any rate apparently, to these Zoharites. The sect of the Hasîdîm ("pious") or Beshter, in Poland, also has the Cabbala to thank for its existence.

We cannot blame the Rabbis for opposing this sect and for employing for the purpose the most powerful means of which they could make use, *the ban*. But it was a fatal sign that in spite of this display of power on the part of the spiritual authorities, the movements went on and the cabbalistic sects multiplied. If the doctrine of the Talmud had satisfied existing wants, it would have been unnecessary to take refuge in such measures. Moreover there is a danger connected with these measures, which Judaism did not escape. No one serves as a sentinel on Zion's walls with impunity: distrust and ambition are the bitter results of the performance of that duty. The persecution of Uriel Acosta (1594-1640) and the ban against Baruch d'Espinoza (1632-1677) can bear witness to this. Or, if it be thought that these men, and especially the latter, diverged so widely from Judaism that the Rabbis *could* not leave them in peace, does not the violence of the mutual controversies of the Rabbis themselves show that it was necessary

to strain every nerve in order to protect the orthodox faith, and that the days of its dominion were numbered?

In truth, when we review the fortunes and the conditions of the Jews prior to and about the middle of the 18th century, the impression left upon us is a sad one. Their latest historian speaks of a "general tendency to wildness among the Jewish nation."* This expression does not appear too strong, if we consider the disturbances and quarrels to which we have just referred. But the general social condition in which the Jews lived, especially in Germany, was even more serious than these phenomena, which at any rate showed some vitality. They were in that condition by no fault of their own, it is true. But they made no efforts to raise themselves from it. They spoke their own dialect, Jew-German as it is called. The education of their children tended not to fit them for intercourse in society, but to perpetually exclude them from it. They were hardly taught anything but the Old Testament and the Talmud. This education might have developed their intellects, if it had been of a scientific character. But this it was not by any means. The young pupils mastered the strange tongue and the strange ideas mechanically. Such instruction necessarily had a deadening effect upon their minds; used in this way the Talmud was not only a hindrance to higher development, but a curse to the Jewish nation. Its noblest powers were wasted upon cavils which, interpreted seriously and introduced into practice, could lead to no other result than that of making the wall of separation between the Jews and their fellow citizens higher and thicker than ever. If all intellectual domination be pernicious in the long run, how heavily must the weight of such a colossus as the Talmud have pressed upon the Jewish nation.

The eighteenth century was to bring deliverance. The oppressive laws and arbitrary measures against the Jews were

* The heading of chapters x. and xi. of the 10th vol. of the "*Gesch. der Juden*," by H. Graetz is, "Allgemeine Verwilderung in der Judenheit."

irreconcilable with the spirit of toleration and—in not a few of its representatives—of indifferentism in religious matters. Therefore they were gradually repealed, yet very slowly, so slowly even that in some countries of Europe this just reformation has only recently taken place and the last remnants of the oppression of the middle ages have not yet been entirely cleared away. The honour of having taken the initiative in this belongs to Frederick the Great. The measures which he enacted with respect to the Jews in 1750 would teach us how hard their lot still was in the first half of the 18th century in most countries of Germany, even if we did not know it before. If this was the first step towards improvement, how miserable the former state of affairs must have been. His "General Juden-privilegium" fixed the number of the ordinary and extraordinary "Schutz-Juden," regulated the taxes which they had to pay, made them subject to the civil courts of justice and created bodies to govern their communities. But Frederick's principles were higher than this and went further than such measures. The direct result of those principles was soon rendered apparent by their application in full in the French revolution. In the year 1791 the Jews who took the oath of allegiance to the constitution were acknowledged as citizens; five years later the same law was adopted in the Batavian republic. From that time forward the emancipation went on slowly but surely. It was promoted, directly or indirectly, by the restoration of Germany in 1812 and by the political revolutions of 1830 and 1848. Since the year 1850 at all events the most restrictive regulations in Germany have been repealed. And that which is still wanting there to the complete equalization of Jews and Christians may still be supported by deeply rooted prejudice for a time, but cannot be maintained in the long run. This also applies to Russia and Turkey, where many restrictions are still retained.

It was an inestimable blessing for the Jews that the release from their fetters was coupled with—nay, was actually pre-

ceded by—efforts to improve their intellectual and moral condition, emanating from eminent men of their own nation. At the head of these illustrious men stands *Moses Mendelssohn* (1729-1786), the friend of Lessing, called by his co-religionists themselves "the third Moses."* The mere appearance of such a personage could be regarded as the beginning of a new epoch in their history: with him they took a position as it were among the representatives of the culture and progress of that day. But besides this Mendelssohn did all he could to defend his nation from unjust attacks and above all to educate it. For this purpose he published in the years 1780 to 1783, with the assistance of like-minded Jewish savants, a new translation of the Pentateuch, which tended to substitute, not all at once but gradually, a more historical interpretation of the Law for the traditional views. The Rabbis felt the blow which was thus dealt them, and began by condemning the book. But it gradually won more friends, while the author's amiability overcame many a prejudice and misunderstanding. Mendelssohn also endeavoured by other writings, among others by a poetical redaction of the Psalms, to humanize his fellow-believers and at the same time to strengthen them in their esteem for their religion and its records. He gained his end with many of them, but—sometimes also produced results at which he had not aimed. There were some Jews, namely, who, following the road which he pointed out, left his religion and embraced Christianity. This actually occurred in several instances in his own family, although not till after his death. In fact, Judaism was still an obstacle to those who valued social intercourse, and this easily accounts for the fact that many a Jew, imbued with the ideas of the day as to revelation and religion, said farewell to the synagogue without any qualms of conscience. But others followed Mendelssohn's example in clinging to the belief of their forefathers and devoted their best energies to the development of their nation. It is impossible

* Maimonides is the second Moses. Comp. above, p. 310.

to give the names of all. Wessely, Friedländer, and Homberg were conspicuous for their learning or zeal.

It was especially upon the education of the young that Mendelssohn's friends and fellow-thinkers fixed their attention. There was much to reform in this respect, and much was done. The training of competent teachers was greatly promoted by establishing colleges. The conviction gradually gained ground, that the ordinary branches of primary education, and in the first place the study of the language of the country, ought to take their place by the side of the study of the Old Testament and the Talmud. When they had once gained this point, they began, not to suppress actual religious instruction, but yet to confine it within narrow limits. The education in the Israelitish schools began, more in one place than in another but still everywhere, to assume a more social character, while in some places it lost its denominational character altogether or the preference was even given to the mixed schools. The men who began and gradually effected this reformation, deserve to be thankfully remembered by posterity.

If it was natural to begin by educating the young, it was no less natural that the spirit now aroused should lead men to attempt the reform of Judaism itself, of its constitution and customs. The want of this reform was deeply and widely felt. The synagogic and household ceremonies were overladen with symbols and were often conducted irreverently and attended thoughtlessly, so that they were absolutely useless for exciting religious feeling. But *how* was this reformation to be organized and introduced? One modification of the religious services at once met with approval from many: the sermon or edifying address *in the language of the country*. Even the most conservative Jews could not make any real objection to this, while its practical utility was at once apparent, and some preachers made themselves known outside their communities as well, and thus earned for the synagogue the esteem of the Christians. Men were not satisfied with this however. But what more

could they do? What changes were there still to be made in addition to these, and how was the attempt to be made to bring them about? More than one difficulty was encountered in answering these questions.

One obstacle lay in the want of mutual deliberation and cooperation on the part of the various communities. In some countries of Europe the governments supplied this want. This was especially the case in France under Napoleon I., and this in a manner which attracted a great deal of attention. In the year 1806 he summoned to Paris 110 distinguished Jews from the various communities of the empire and laid before them some questions respecting the relation between their religious ceremonies and the laws of the state. When these questions had been answered satisfactorily, "Le grand Sanhédrin," consisting of 71 delegates, was called together, completed its task in seven sittings, and proposed a complete organization for the Jewish church in France. A similar organization was also established in other countries. In many German states it remained wanting. And even if it had existed in all of them, it would still have left the want of unity and cooperation unsatisfied there, because it naturally extended only to a single state. Nor must it be forgotten that peculiar difficulties are connected with all such institutions. They deprive particular communities of part of their independence. In Germany especially there were not a few communities which valued their independence highly and had made great use of it—so that to them union with other synagogues could not seem desirable.

But in reality the question was not merely how the different communities should arrange among themselves for the introduction of the necessary reforms. Other questions which arose were of much greater weight and intricacy: how far might the reformation extend? from what principles was it to start? where were the limits of Judaism which could not be passed without giving up precisely that which it was desired to retain? At first ignorance gave rise to frequent

mistakes in answering these questions. It is true, there was no lack of men who were thoroughly acquainted with Judaism, but these were to be found precisely among the Rabbis of the old school, who were averse from all change: the questions had no existence for them, and moreover the knowledge which they had acquired was entirely traditional and would not have been equal to the task. Criticism alone could give light in this case, and it did not fail to assert itself. It is now nearly 50 years ago that Jewish scholars themselves laid the foundations of a *scientific Jewish theology*. The records of Judaism have been critically examined; a clear light has been thrown upon their origin; the rich literature connected with these records has been arranged and estimated. Men such as Rapoport, Zunz, and Geiger, not to mention others, have earned laurels in this domain which cannot easily be valued too highly. The Old Testament itself, too, was drawn into the sphere of the investigations of these scholars. They had been preceded in this by Christian theologians, whose results they in great part adopted, but also further confirmed and sometimes improved. The task thus taken in hand of course is not yet finished. Many a point remains unexplained and calls for further research. But the method which is now being followed is the true one, and promises results even more satisfactory than those already obtained. The knowledge of Judaism is established for good.

But how does that knowledge stand with respect to practical requirements? Has it solved the questions put just now as to the principles and limits of the reformation of Judaism, or at any rate prepared the way for their solution? It is impossible for me to answer in the affirmative. Rather does it seem at first sight to have increased the difficulties. The course of events hitherto had been, that in single Jewish communities, or in smaller associations which formed in their midst and afterwards separated from them, the modification or abolition of

this or that religious custom was either effected or devised. This occurred at Berlin, Hamburg, Frankfort, London, and elsewhere. The opinion of the better known Rabbis upon such reforms was then obtained or given unasked. The most divergent opinions were brought to light in this way. While a few continued to condemn all deviations from tradition, others believed that at any rate the precepts of the written Thorah ought to be observed, and again a few thought that all that was required was the maintenance of the *principles* of Judaism and that *all* customs, even the Sabbath and the circumcision could, if necessary, be omitted. Attempts were made to bring the advocates of the different views together and thus to obtain unanimity through an interchange of ideas. Three such assemblies of Rabbis were held in the years 1844 to 1846, at Brunswick, Frankfort, and Breslau. But they were thinly attended, almost exclusively by the reformers, and the positive results derived from them were very meagre. Still they were not without importance. Free discussion clearly demonstrated that a real and thorough reform *on the basis of the Talmud* was not to be thought of. The movement which called itself "the progressive Rabbinism" was found to be utterly powerless. Its hope that a means would be discovered of bringing the religious laws into harmony with the requirements of social life, without quitting traditional ground, was thenceforward looked upon as a delusion.* The number of those who perceived that a choice had to be made between Rabbinism, however tempered and softened down, and a religion suited to the requirements of the times, became greater and greater. For the moment the majority of those who desire the latter seem still to be of opinion that all that is required in order fully to satisfy the wants of the times is a return to the pure and original Mosaism. In the first Jewish Synod, held at Leipzig in 1869, it was

* Comp. Jost, l. c. iii. 378, 385.

unanimously decreed that "the principles of modern society and of legislation are proclaimed in Mosaism, and further developed in the doctrine of the prophets, namely: the unity of the human race, the equality of all men in law, the equality of all men in duties and rights with respect to their country and the state, the complete liberty of the individual in his religious convictions and in the profession thereof;" wherefore the Synod declared, "that it found in the development and realization of these principles, both now and in the future, the best security for Judaism and those who professed it, and at the same time the real conditions for the inviolability and higher manifestation of the spirit of Judaism;" for which reasons they considered that "the real task of Judaism is to profess, promote, represent and propagate in all sorts of ways these principles."* But this too is an unhistorical delusion, of which further historical research will at last cure those who now, in good faith, circulate it to the glorification of Judaism. The principles which they, rightly, advocate, they do not draw from the Old Testament, but from other sources. What they call "Mosaism," in other words, the Law promulgated by Ezra, is one of the forms in which religious sentiment has clothed itself in Israel. That one form is no more valid for all times than it is for all nations. If the sentiment still works powerfully enough in the Israel of our days, it will make itself a new form, as suited to the wants of to-day as the priestly legislation was to the requirements of the post-exile period, or the Talmud to the desire for unity and stability which manifested itself among the Jews when they were dispersed in all directions and persecuted by all men. Who will venture to predict what that form will be? But it would be unreasonable to doubt its rise on this account. It has been truly said: "the Talmudic Judaism will have to yield in its turn to modern civilization, as the

* Dr. L. Philippson, *Zur Charakteristik der ersten jüdischen Synode*, pp. 6, sq.

priestly Judaism succumbed to the blows of the Roman Empire. The monotheistic, moral, spiritual Judaism will remain. If Judaism chooses this path with decision, as many of its most eminent adherents advise it to do, it will closely approach the liberal Christianity, which, for its part, by its openly avowed unitarianism, will no longer excite the same repugnance among the Jews as orthodox Christianity with its doctrine of the Trinity. A fusion of the two is not probable; but if in default of a fusion there exist mutual understanding and esteem; if intercourse and the free exchange of ideas be encouraged; if religious sects one after another lay down their weapons to devote themselves to the work of peace and of universal brotherhood—I cannot see what the religious sentiment could lose by it, and I know very well what it would gain."*

NOTE.

See p. 287, *n.* *

It seems to me that it would be of service to add to the brief review given in this Chapter an enumeration of some of the principal works upon the history of the Jews and Judaism. This enumeration does not in the least lay claim to completeness. It is chiefly intended to show the way to those who wish for further information with regard to facts which could be merely touched upon here.

I. The history of the Jews down to the present time is handled by:

J. M. Jost, Geschichte der Israëliten seit der Zeit der Maccabäer bis auf unsere Tage, nach den Quellen bear-

* Dr. A. Réville, *Rev. des Deux Mondes,* 1 Nov. 1867, p. 137.

beitet. 9 Theile (Berlin, 1820-29).—An abridged edition of this exhaustive work has been produced by the author himself, under the title of: Allg. Gesch. des Israel. Volkes, sowohl seines zweimaligen Staatslebens, als auch der zerstreuten Gemeinden und Secten bis in die neueste Zeit, in gedrängter Uebersicht aus den Quellen bearbeitet. 2 Bände (Berlin, 1832);

J. H. Dessauer, Gesch. der Israëliten mit besonderer Berücksichtigung der Culturgeschichte. Von Alexander dem Groszen bis auf die neuere Zeit (Erlangen, 1846);

H. Graetz, Gesch. der Juden von den ältesten Zeiten bis auf die Gegenwart. Aus den Quellen neu bearbeitet. Band III.-XI (Leipzig; the second edition of Band III. appeared in 1863; Band XI, comprising the period from 1750 to 1848, in 1870; the first two volumes, in which the history of the Jews from the earliest times to the death of Judas Maccabi will be handled, are now in course of publication);

J. Bédarride, les Juifs en France, en Italie et en Espagne. Recherches sur leur état depuis leur dispersion jusqu'à nos jours, sous le rapport de la législation, de la littérature et du commerce (Paris, 1867);

W. Pressel, das Volk Gottes in der nachbiblischen Zeit. In Herzog's *Real-Encyclopädie für prot. Theol. und Kirche,* Band XVII. 305-385 (Gotha, 1863);

Compare also *Mr. Isaac da Costa,* Israel en de volken; een overzicht van de geschiedenis der Joden tot op onzen tijd. (Haarlem, 1849).

II. The following works are devoted to the history of Judaism:

J. M. Jost, Gesch. des Judenthums und seiner Secten. 3 Bände (Leipzig, 1857-1863). The first volume treats of the history of Judaism from Ezra to the fall of Jerusalem in A.D. 70, so that Vol. II. and III. run parallel with our review.

A. Geiger, das Judenthum und seine Geschichte (Breslau, 1864 and 1865). The first division concludes with the sack of the second temple, the second with the end of the twelfth century; the sequel has not yet appeared.

III. With regard to the period which ends with the closing of the Talmud, or to portions of it, the following may be consulted with advantage :

H. Ewald, Gesch. des Volkes Israël, Band VII. The separate title is : Gesch. der Ausgänge des V. I. und des nachapostolischen Zeitalters (Göttingen, 1859; 2e Ausg. 1867) ;

J. Derenbourg, Essai sur l'histoire et la géographie de la Palestine d'après les thalmuds et les autres sources rabbiniques. I. Hist. d. l. P. depuis Cyrus jusqu'à Adrien (Paris, 1867). Chapters XIX.-XXIV. come especially under consideration here;

and further the numerous writings which treat specially of the Talmud and need not be enumerated here. See the articles *Thalmud* and *Rabbinismus* (the latter also for the next period by Pressel, in Herzog's *Real-Encyclopädie,* Band XV. 615-664; XII. 470-487).

Comp. *A. Réville,* Le peuple juif et le Judaïsme au temps de la formation du Talmud (*Rev. des Deux Mondes,* 1 Nov. 1867, p. 104-137).

IV. The period from 500 to 1200, *i.e.* from the closing of the Talmud down to and including Maimonides, is treated entirely or in part by :

M. Braunschweiger, Gesch. der Juden und ihrer Literatur in den romanischen Staaten zur Zeit des Mittelalters von 700-1200 (Würzburg, 1865) ;

J. Fürst, Gesch. des Karäerthums. Eine kurze Darstellung seiner Entwickelung, Lehre und Literatur. 3 Abtheilungen (Leipzig, 1862-1869).

We possess monographs, by Munk, Geiger and others, upon the most eminent representatives of Judaism during this period. The writings of *M. Kayserling* (Die Juden in Navarra, den Baskenländern und den Balearen ; Berlin, 1860 ; Gesch. der Juden in Portugal ; Leipzig, 1867) are more important for the fortunes of the Jewish people, since the year 1200 as well, than for the history of its religion.

V. The numerous works upon the Cabbala, of which we can only name a few here, refer to the period from 1200 to 1750 :

Ad. Franck, la Kabbale ou la philosophie religieuse des Hébreux (Paris, 1843). This work has been published (at Leipzig, in 1844) "aus dem Franz. übersetzt, verbessert und vermehrt," by *Ad. Jellinck,* from whom we also have :

Moses ben Schem Tob de Leon und sein Verhältniss zum Sohar (Leipzig, 1851) ;

Beiträge zur Gesch. der Kabbala (Liepzig, 1852).

Compare further the article *Kabbala* by *Ed. Reuss,* in Herzog's *Real-Encyclopädie,* Band VII. 193-207.

VI. The last century of the history of Judaism is known from the whole of the very rich literature which it has produced. It seems almost arbitrary to name a few titles. For the sake of giving something, I will refer to :

M. Kayserling, Moses Mendelssohn. Sein Leben und seine Werke (Leipzig, 1862) ;

S. Stern, Gesch. des Judenthums von Mendelssohn bis auf die neuere Zeit, nebst einer einleitenden Ueberschau der älteren Religions- und Culturgeschichte (Frankfurt,1857).

The "Biographische Skizzen" by *Ph. Philippson* (3 Hefte ; Leipzig, 1864-66), are worthy of attention, not only because the persons to whom they refer (Mozes Philippson ; Joseph Wolf and Gotthold Salomon) have played important parts, but also because they give a very striking picture of the

difficulties with which the Jews had to contend in their striving after civilization.

In 1846-47 appeared, in three parts, a 10th volume of *Jost's* Gesch. der Israëliten (see above, under I.), covering the years 1815-45. The 3rd part ("Culturgeschichte zur neueren Gesch. der Israëliten, von 1815-45") is the most important for the history of Judaism.

With respect to the numerous *periodicals*, devoted to the science or the interests of Judaism, Jost, *Gesch. des Judenthums*, iii. 354-59, should be consulted.

CONTENTS.

VOLUME I.

HISTORY OF ISRAEL'S RELIGIOUS DEVELOPMENT BEFORE AND DURING THE EIGHTH CENTURY B.C.

VOLUME II.

VOLUME III.