

them. "Look not," says the Scripture, "at the wine when it is red." When Christian and Faithful passed through Vanity Fair the traffickers in the Fair spread all sorts of tempting wares before their eyes. But Christian and Faithful refused even to look at them. They looked upwards, "signifying that their trade and traffic was in heaven," and cried, "Turn away mine eyes from beholding Vanity." And so exactly we shall refuse even to look at foul and base things.

'John Bunyan, in his *Holy War*, says that the city of Man-Soul (which really means your heart and mine) has five gates which he calls Ear-gate, Eye-gate, Mouth-gate, Nose-gate, and Feet-gate. But of these five gates Ear-gate, Eye-gate, and Mouth-gate are far the most important. And if we keep these gates secure, if we speak no evil, listen to no evil, look upon no evil, we shall keep our hearts unharmed, we shall keep Man-Soul for Jesus Christ.'

## The Calendar, the Sabbath, and the Marriage Law in the Geniza-Zadokite Document.

BY THE REV. G. MARGOLIOUTH, M.A., BRITISH MUSEUM, LONDON.

THE present article is intended to be strictly non-controversial, both in essence and in form. Readers interested in the discussions that have arisen about the tendency and date of the documents published by Dr. Schechter towards the end of 1910 through the Cambridge University Press may, for example, turn to *The Athenæum* for November 26, 1910, *The Jewish Chronicle* for December 9, 1910, *Revue des Études Juives* for April 1911, *The American Journal of Theology* for July 1911, *Bibliotheca Sacra* for the same month, and *The Expositor* for December 1911 and March 1912. But the sole object of the present contribution is to show as clearly as possible what the documents in question teach on the topics indicated in the heading. It is indeed likely that the results thus obtained may constitute a very substantial aid in any future attempt at finally demonstrating the affinities of the writing under consideration and the age (whether, e.g., second century B.C.,<sup>1</sup> or first century B.C.,<sup>2</sup> or between 70 and 80 A.D.<sup>3</sup>) in which it was composed. But for the moment only facts relating to the topics named will be set down and discussed, and no attempt will be made to draw any inferences as to what may be termed the 'higher critical' bearing of the problem; or if any mention should perforce have to be made to one particular view or another, it will be done without the least

prejudice, and merely in the form of an unavoidable reference.

### I. THE CALENDAR.

On reading the documents<sup>4</sup> cursorily for the first time, one may receive the impression that there is nothing in them to show what kind of Calendar the body of people from whom they emanated followed. But there can hardly be a doubt that on this point the position taken in the Introduction<sup>5</sup> to Dr. Schechter's edition is fully justified. The learned editor, or one of his collaborators, was struck with the close similarity that exists between the following two passages, the first being taken from p. 3, ll. 12-16, of document A, and the second representing the Book of Jubilees, 6<sup>34</sup>.

'But with them who held fast the commandments of God, that were left among them, God confirmed His covenant with Israel for ever, for the purpose of making known to them the hidden things in which all Israel had gone astray: His

<sup>4</sup> The documents as recovered by Dr. Schechter from the Cairo Geniza consist of (i.) a historical and admonitory part, and (ii.) a special legalistic part. The former occupies pp. 1-8, and is completed (with partial overlapping) by pp. 19-20, which represent a different recension of the text. The latter (legalistic) part, which occupies pp. 9-16 of the edition, is very fragmentary. The document consisting of pp. 1-16 (A) was probably copied in the tenth century, and pp. 19-20 (B) belong to the eleventh or twelfth century.

<sup>5</sup> pp. xvi, xix-xx.

<sup>1</sup> Professor G. F. Moore.

<sup>2</sup> Professor K. Kohler.

<sup>3</sup> Professor Bacher and others.

holy Sabbath, His glorious festivals, the testimony of His righteousness, and the ways of His truth, and the desires of His will, which a man should do and live by them.'

'And all the children of Israel will forget, and will not find the path of the years, and will forget the new moons and seasons, and Sabbaths, and they will go wrong as to all the order of the years.'<sup>1</sup>

Now it is true that if this parallelism had been unsupported by sufficiently strong confirmatory evidence, the opinion could have possibly been advanced that the likeness between the two passages need not be much more than accidental, or that it was in any case of no sufficient strength to bear the weight of Dr. Schechter's definite statement that the calendar of the sectaries (as one may, without prejudicing the case, conveniently call the people from whom the writing emanated) was the same as that of the Book of Jubilees. But there is fortunately a considerable amount of other clear evidence regarding the close relationship of our documents with the Book of Jubilees and their dependence on it.

On p. 16, ll. 3-4, of our text occurs the following sentence:

'And the exact determination of their ends,<sup>2</sup> to the blindness<sup>3</sup> of Israel regarding all these, behold, it is clearly explained in the Book of the Division of the Times by their jubilees and their weeks [of years].'

That we have here before us the shortest Hebrew title of the Book of Jubilees, in either its exact original or somewhat modified form, no one can doubt, its likeness to the extended title given in the Prologue of the Book ('the history of the division of the days of the law and of the testimony, . . . of their (year) weeks, of their jubilees throughout all the years of the world') being unmistakable; but the full strength of the argument to be derived from the passage just

<sup>1</sup> Dr. Charles' translation of *Jubilees*, vi. 34; close parallels to it are Jubilees 1<sup>14</sup> 23<sup>19</sup>.

<sup>2</sup> This translation of קציתם [i.e. the coming crisis of history] is here provisionally adopted from *The Harvard Theological Review* for July 1911, p. 348 (Professor G. F. Moore); compare the present writer's rendering of the same word in p. 2, l. 10 (*Expositor*, March 1912, p. 216).

<sup>3</sup> This seems to be the correct meaning of לערוק, which Dr. Schechter emends into לזכור ('for a remembrance'). The idea is on a par with that of the 'going astray' of all Israel in the verse quoted above from p. 3, l. 14, of the document.

quoted lies in the fact that the Book of Jubilees is there referred to as an authority well-nigh (or, perhaps, absolutely) co-ordinate with the *Torah* itself. In the passage immediately preceding, the people are admonished to return to the Law of Moses, everything being 'exactly explained' in it, and the identical phrase (מדויקת, exactly explained) is then applied to the Book of Jubilees, wherein is recorded the 'determination of their ends,' with regard to which the rest of Israel had been struck with blindness. But if Jubilees, 'the Little Genesis' (ἡ λεπτή Γένεσις), as it also was called, is treated in the newly discovered documents as possessing the same (or at any rate, almost the same) divine authority as the canonical Book of Genesis, it necessarily follows that there would in the minds of our sectaries be a strong tendency to follow its teaching; and as the strictly heptadic calendar lies at the very base of the entire work, it is clearly impossible to deny that the calendar of the authors of the documents must have been the same as that of Jubilees, and that therefore the likeness between the two parallel passages quoted above is significant and substantial, instead of not being much more than accidental.

The close correspondence in many particulars between the Sabbath law of our sectaries and that of the Book of Jubilees will be dealt with in Part II. of the present article,<sup>4</sup> but it is necessary to point out in this place that, judging by the very numerous unmistakable references in our documents to this pseudopigraphon, it must have either constantly lain before our sectarian authors or—what would render the evidence more decisive still—been assimilated by them to the extent of a full knowledge by heart. Dr. Schechter's list of Biblical and other references to be found in the document may in some parts want revision,<sup>5</sup> but it is certainly remarkable that no fewer than thirty-

<sup>4</sup> For some other points of analogy the reader may be referred to p. 359 of Professor G. F. Moore's article in *The Harvard Theological Review* for July 1911. Professor Moore only finds a strong probability in favour of the identity of calendars, but it is here contended that we have certainty on this point instead of probability.—The Marriage Law appears to have lain outside the purview of *Leptogenesis*.

<sup>5</sup> A striking parallel of which Dr. Schechter should have made more than he did is that between Jubilees 6<sup>18</sup>, where we are told that after Noah's death his sons fell away 'until the days of Abraham, and they ate blood,' and document A, p. 3, ll. 1-2, where also the sons of Noah are said to have gone astray, the obedience to the divine ordinances being again in abeyance till the appearance of Abraham.

four passages of Jubilees have been brought by him into relation with the new text, whereas the references to Isaiah, which come nearer in point of numbers to those of Jubilees, only amount to twenty-nine. This shows that Jubilees loomed even more largely in the eyes of our sectaries than any other of the Books that were held sacred by them (to the canonical Genesis only twelve references are given by Dr. Schechter), thus strengthening our contention that on such a topic as the calendar there must have been agreement between the two works.

One may therefore, without much fear of contradiction, assume as certain that the calendar of our sectaries was the same as that of the Book of Jubilees, and we must accordingly now apply ourselves to the inquiry as to the exact nature of the calendar that lies before us in that famous pseudepigraphon.

The answer to this inquiry rests partly on direct statements contained in the text of Jubilees, and partly on inferences to be drawn from direct statements. Part of the result is therefore clear and indisputable, whilst another part is open to discussion and a difference of opinion.

There is first of all the clear declaration in chap. 6, that 'all the days of the commandment will be two-and-fifty weeks of days, and (these will make) the entire year complete' (v.<sup>80</sup>), and it is furthermore announced that this order of the year, which was immutably fixed and written down on 'the heavenly tables,' was divided into four equal divisions, each having thirteen weeks, constituting three complete months, and the first day (new moon) of each quarter of the year being set aside as a time of special remembrance connected with the progress and cessation of the Flood (vv. 28-29). As there is, besides, the statement in 5<sup>27</sup> that the Flood 'prevailed on the face of the earth five months—one hundred and fifty days'<sup>1</sup>—it is quite clear that we have here to deal with a solar year of twelve months, each month having thirty days, with (by inference, 12 × 30 only making 360 as against the 364 days definitely given in 6<sup>82</sup>; comp. Ethiopic Enoch 75<sup>2</sup> 82<sup>11</sup>) four additional intercalary days distributed among the four divisions of the year.

<sup>1</sup> The number of 150 days (see also Gn 7<sup>24</sup> 8<sup>3</sup>) is, however, not quite exact, as there must be at least one intercalary day in the course of five months, so that no fewer than 151 days must be postulated.

But having thus based our view of the calendar of Jubilees on the clear wording of a part of the text, we are confronted with the difficulty of reconciling this view with other indications contained in the same text. By a comparison of the statements regarding the Feast of Weeks, also called the Feast of First-fruits, contained in 6<sup>17E</sup>, 15<sup>1</sup> and 44<sup>4, 5</sup>, it becomes clear that according to Jubilees that festival was celebrated on the 15th day of the third month (Siwān). But as according to Lv 23<sup>15, 16</sup>, the Feast of Weeks was to be celebrated on the fiftieth day after the presentation of the wave-offering on the Passover festival, it follows that, contrary to the usual Rabbinic date assigned to that offering (Nisān the 16th), the author of Jubilees considered the 22nd of Nisān<sup>2</sup> to have been the day set aside for the 'sheaf of the wave-offering'; for only so can one obtain the period of seven weeks that was to pass between it and the Feast of Weeks. The reckoning must, therefore, have been as follows: The last two weeks of the seven covered the first fourteen days of Siwān, and of the remaining five weeks four must have fallen in the month of Iyyār and one in the latter part of Nisān. But if so, it is clear that Iyyār could not possibly have had more than 28 days; nor could Nisān have had more than that number of days, for not more than one week out of the seven could possibly be assigned to the part of Nisān that followed the 22nd day of that month.

These indications therefore show the existence of a lunar reckoning, in which a month could have 28 days, and the problem thus arises how to reconcile this calendar scheme with the solar year of twelve months of 30 days each, with four intercalary days, which—as we have seen—is the scheme clearly set forth in the sixth chapter of the Book of Jubilees.

Now the only solution of the difficulty so far proposed, which seems adequately to meet the requirements of either side of the case, is that given by Epstein in *Revue des Études Juives*,

<sup>2</sup> If, as seems likely, our sectaries interpreted *מחרת השבת* ('from the morrow after the Sabbath') as meaning the day after the Sabbath (the weekly day of rest) in the usual sense of the word, the date of the wave-offering could indeed only fall on the 22nd of Nisān, for the only Sabbath falling within the Passover festival would in that case be the 21st day of the month, as the first day of the festival necessarily would fall on Monday (see further on, and comp. Charles, *Jubilees*, p. 106).

vol. xxii. pp. 10-13. In Jubilees, Epstein holds, two different kinds of calendar reckonings are used. There was the civil solar year of twelve months, with eight months of 30 days and four of 31 days each; and there was besides an ecclesiastical year of thirteen months, with 28 days in each month. The entire number of days in the year is in each case 364, and the difficulty about the date of the Feast of Weeks vanishes absolutely, for the festivals would naturally be fixed in accordance with the ecclesiastical, instead of the civil year. Unless, therefore, another working hypothesis at least as good as<sup>1</sup> that of Epstein be proposed, we are bound to regard this solution—provisionally at any rate—as the correct one.<sup>1</sup>

One point more, and this part of our subject

<sup>1</sup> Professor Charles holds the same view, though perhaps with rather less determination (see his notes on pp. 54-55, 105-107 of his edition of *Jubilees*). He sees a difficulty in the fact that the four days of remembrance at the beginning of the four quarters of the year (chap. vi. 23-29) are determined by the reckoning of the solar year of twelve months, instead of the lunar year of thirteen months. But as those festivals are not in canonical Genesis and owe their institution to a special set of events, they may be allowed to stand on a footing of their own.

is finished. As according to Jubilees the heptadic arrangement of the calendar dates in an unbroken sequence from the Creation, it follows that the first day of each month of twenty-eight days or four weeks must always fall on the first day of the week (Sunday), the day from which Creation dates; and as furthermore the Feast of Weeks fell on the 15th of Siwān, and Passover and the Feast of Tabernacles began on the 15th day of Nisān and Iyyār respectively, it is clear that Sunday invariably ushered in the great festivals. The Day of Atonement, on the other hand, as falling on the 10th day of Tishsi, was always celebrated on Tuesday.

This, then, was the calendar of the Book of Jubilees, which, as we have seen, must also have been that of the documents which we are now considering. In both works stress is laid on the belief that the bulk of the nation had lamentably gone astray with regard to the correct dates of the divinely instituted festivals, and in both is the lively consciousness expressed that the upholders of their own special calendar principles were the true depositories of the immutable heavenly decrees concerning times and seasons.

## Studies in Pauline Vocabulary.

BY THE REV. R. MARTIN POPE, M.A., KESWICK.

### Of the Heavenly Places.

READERS of the Pauline Epistles have, doubtless, noticed that the Apostle not infrequently sums up the argument or the standpoint of a given Epistle in one outstanding term or phrase. Such is the *δικαιοσύνη Θεοῦ* of Romans, the *πίστις Χριστοῦ* of Galatians, the *πλήρωμα* of Colossians, the *θγαίνουσα διδασκαλία* of 1 Timothy, and *τὰ ἐπουράνια* of Ephesians.

Without discussing the question of the authenticity of the last-named Epistle, whether (in other words) it is Pauline or sub-Pauline, it is sufficient for our present purpose to point out that the occurrence of the unusual expression, *τὰ ἐπουράνια*, supports rather than otherwise the traditional view. Not only does the phrase appear five times in the Epistle; but it is so remarkable in itself, and so characteristic of this particular writing, that it is hardly likely to have been employed by one who

sought to disguise his identity under a general resemblance to St. Paul's style and thought. The word *ἐπουράνιος* does not occur in the LXX, except as an epithet of Θεός in two passages in 3 Mac. So far as Hellenistic Greek is concerned, it is a distinctively N.T. epithet; but it is also found in Homer and Plato, and therefore is evidently drawn from the classical Hellenic stock.<sup>1</sup> While *ἐπουράνιος* is found elsewhere (four times) in the Pauline Epistles, *τὰ ἐπουράνια* is found only in Ephesians; and it is the use of the phrase in Ephesians which concerns us now.

<sup>1</sup> Nägeli (*Der Wortschatz des apostels Paulus*) notes its occurrence in 2 Ti 4<sup>18</sup>, but does not include it in his list of Ionic-poetic Pauline words, where it may fitly find a place. I have had no opportunity of referring to the evidence of papyri and inscriptions for the use of the word.