

THE AGES DIGITAL LIBRARY
REFERENCE

CYCLOPEDIA of BIBLICAL,
THEOLOGICAL and
ECCLESIASTICAL
LITERATURE

T- Tammuz

by James Strong & John McClintock

To the Students of the Words, Works and Ways of God:

Welcome to the AGES Digital Library. We trust your experience with this and other volumes in the Library fulfills our motto and vision which is our commitment to you:

MAKING THE WORDS OF THE WISE
AVAILABLE TO ALL — INEXPENSIVELY.

AGES Software Rio, WI USA
Version 1.0 © 2000

T

Ta'anach

(Heb. *Taanak'*, Ἐν[Τ]ι *sandy* [Gesenius], or *fortified* [Fürst]; twice [^{<0215>}Judges 21:25; ^{<1372>}1 Chronicles 7:29] more briefly *Tanak'*, Ἐν[Τ]ι A.V. “Tanach;” Sept. Θανάχ or Θαανάχ v.r. Τανάχ, Σανάκ, etc.), an ancient Canaanitish city, whose king is enumerated among the thirty-one conquered by Joshua (^{<0621>}Joshua 12:21). It came into the hands of the half-tribe of Manasseh (^{<0671>}Joshua 17:11; 21:25; ^{<1372>}1 Chronicles 7:29), though it would appear to have lain within the original allotment of Issachar (^{<0671>}Joshua 17:11). It was bestowed on the Kohathite Levites (^{<0215>}Joshua 21:25). Taanach was one of the places in which, either from some strength of position, or from the ground near it being favorable for their mode of fighting, the aborigines succeeded in making a stand (^{<0672>}Joshua 17:12; Judges 1, 27); and in the great struggle of the Canaanites under Sisera against Deborah and Barak it appears to have formed the headquarters of their army (^{<0159>}Judges 5:19). After this defeat the Canaanites of Taanach were probably made, like the rest, to pay a tribute (^{<0673>}Joshua 17:13; ^{<0028>}Judges 1:28), but in the town they appear to have remained to the last. Taanach is almost always named in company with Megiddo, and they were evidently the chief towns of that fine, rich district which forms the western portion of the great plain of Esdraelon (^{<1042>}1 Kings 4:12). It was known to Eusebius, who mentions it twice in *the Onomasticon* (Θανάχ and Θαναή) as a “very large village” standing between three and four Roman miles from Legio, the ancient Megiddo. It was known to hap-Parchi, the Jewish medieval traveler, and it still stands about four miles south-east of Lejjum, retaining its old name with hardly the change of a letter. Schubert, followed by Robinson, found it in the modern *Ta'annuk*, now a mean hamlet on the south-east side of a small hill, with a summit of table-land (Schubert, *Morgenland*, 3, 164; Robinson, *Bibl. Res.* 3, 156; *Bibl. Sacra*, 1843, p. 76; Schwarz, *Palest.* p. 149). The ancient town was planted on a large mound at the termination of a long spur or promontory, which runs out northward from the hills of Manasseh into the plain, and leaves a recess or bay, subordinate to the main plain on its north side, and between it and Lejjun (Van de Velde, 1, 358). Ruins of some extent, but possessing no

interest; encompass it (Porter, *Handbook*, p. 371). The houses of the present village are mud huts, with one or two stone buildings (Ridgeway, *The Lord's Land*, p. 588).

Taanah

SEE TAANATH-SILOH.

Ta'anath-Shi'loh

(Heb. *Taanath' Shiloh'*, תַּנְאִיתִיחַ וְשִׁילֹחַ *Taanah'* [Gesenius, *approach*; Furst, *circle*] of Shiloh, so called prob. from its vicinity to that place; Sept. Τηνάθ Σηλώ v.r. Θήνασα καὶ Σέλλης), a place mentioned (^{<4646>}Joshua 16:6) as situated near the northern border of Ephraim at its eastern end between the Jordan and Janohah. *SEE TRIBE.* With this agrees the statement of Eusebius (*nomast.* s.v.), who places Janoh'ah twelve and *Thenaet* ten Roman miles east of Neapoli. It is probably *W. Thena.* (Θήνα) mentioned by Ptolemy (*Geog.* 5, 16, 5) of the chief cities of Samaria, in connection with Neopolis. In the Talmud (Jerusalem *Megillah*, 1), *Taahath-Shiloh* is said to be identical with Shiloh, a statement which *Kurtz'* (*Gesch. des Alt. Bundes*, 2, 70) understands as meaning that *Taanath* was the ancient Canaanitish name of the place, and *Shiloh* the Hebrew name, conferred on it in token of the "rest" which allowed the tabernacle to be established there after the conquest of the country had been completed. But this is evidently conjecture arising from the probable proximity of the two places. *Taanah-of-Shiloh* is probably the *Ain Tana* seen by Robinson north-east of Mejdol (*Later Res.* 3, 295), and by Van de Velde (*Memoir*, p. 121, although erroneously marked *Meraj ed-Din* on his Map), about a mile from the road between Aerabi and Mejdol, consisting of "a small tell with a ruin, on the first lower plateau into which the Ghor descends."

Taanith

SEE TALMUD.

Tab'aoth

(Ταβαώθ v.r. Ταβώθ), a less correct form (1 Esdr. 5, 29) of the name *TABBAOTH* *SEE TABBAOTH* (q.v.) of the Heb. lists (^{<4646>}Ezra 2:43; ^{<4646>}Nehemiah 7:46).

Tab'baoth

(Heb. *Tabbadth'*, תבבאֹת *rings* [Gesenius], or *spots* [First]; Sept. Ταββαώθ v.r. Ταβαώθ and Ταβώθ), one of the Nethinim whose descendants or family returned from Babylon with Zerubbabel (Ezra 2, 43; ^{<1076>}Nehemiah 7:46). B.C. ante 536.

Tab'bath

(Heb. *Tabbath'*, תבִּי perh. *celebrated* [Gesenius]; Sept. Ταβάθ v.r. Γαβάθ), a place mentioned in describing the flight of the Midianitish host after Gideon's night attack; they fled to Beth-shittah, to Zererath, to the brink of Abel-meholah on (I [] Tab- bath (^{<1072>}Judges 7:22)). As all these places were in or near the Ghor, Tabbath is probably the present *Tubuhhat Fahil*, i.e. "Terrace of Fahil," a very striking natural bank, 600 feet in height, with a long horizontal and apparently flat top, which is embanked against the western face of the mountains east of the Jordan, and descends with a very steep front to the river (Robinson, *Bibl. Res.* 3, 325).

Tab'eäl

(^{<2306>}Isaiah 7:6). *SEE TABELIL*, 1. Tab'eal (Heb. *Tabeel'*, אבֵּלֶּף [in: pause *Tabedl'*, אבֵּלֶּף, ^{<2306>}Isaiah 7:6, A. V. "Tabeal"], *God is good*; Sept. Ταβεήλ), the name of two men. *SEE TOBIEL*.

1. The father of the unnamed person on whom Rezin, king of Syria, and Pekah, king of Israel, proposed to bestow the crown of Judah in case they succeeded in dethroning Ahaz (^{<2306>}Isaiah 7:6). B.C. ante 738. Who "Tabeal's son" was is unknown, but it is conjectured that he was some factious and powerful Ephraimite (perhaps Zichri, ^{<1407>}2 Chronicles 28:7), who promoted the war in the hope of this result. — Kitto. The Aramaic form of the name, *SEE TABRIMMON*, however, has been thought to favor the supposition that he was a Syrian in the army of Rezin. The Targum of Jonathan renders the name as an appellative, "and we will make king in the midst of her him who seems good to us" (אנִי ;רַבִּינִי מִיִּתִי). Rashi by *Gematria* turns the name into אלמר, *Rimla*, 1,v which apparently he would understand *Remaliah*.

2. An officer of the Persian government in Samaria in the reign of Artaxerxes (^{<1507>}Ezra 4:7). B.C. 519. It has been argued that he, too, was

an Aramaean, from the fact that the letter which he and his companions wrote to the king was in the Syrian or Aramaean language. Gesenius, however (*Jesa*, 1, 280), thinks that he may have been a Samaritan.

Tabel'lius

(**Ταβέλλιος**), a Grsecized form (1 Esdr. 2, 16) of the Heb. name (^{<1540B>}Ezra 4:7) **TABEEL** *SEE TABEEL* (q.v.).

Tab'erah

(Heb. *Taberah'*, **hr[θ]i** *consumption*; Sept. **ἐμπυρισμός**), a place in the wilderness of Paran; so called from the fact that "the fire of Jehovah burned" (**hr[β]**) among the Israelites there in consequence of their complaints (^{<0113>}Numbers 11:3). It lay at the next station beyond Horeb, and must therefore be sought somewhere in Wady Saal. *SEE EXODE*. Keil argues (*Comment.* ad loc.) from the expression that it was "in the uttermost part of the camp," and from the omission of the name in Numbers 33: that the place was identical with the station Kibroth-hattaavah next named; but he overlooks the fact that both these are separately mentioned in ^{<0122>}Deuteronomy 9:22.

Tabering

(**τῳρῳ**) Sept. **φθεγγόμενοι**; Vulg. *murmurantes*), an obsolete word used in the A. V. of ^{<341E>}Nahum 2:7 in the sense of *drumming*, or making regular sounds. The Hebrew word is derived from **āṭp** "a timbrel," and the image which it brings before us in this passage is that of the women of Nineveh, led away into captivity, mourning with the plaintive tones of doves, and beating on their breasts in anguish, as women beat upon their timbrels (comp. ^{<0125>}Psalms 68:25 [26], where the same verb is used). The Sept. and Vulg., as above, make no attempt at giving the exact meaning. The Targum of Jonathan gives a word which, like the Hebrew, has the meaning of "tympantantes." The A.V., in like manner, reproduces the original idea of the words. The "tabour" or "tabor" was a musical instrument of the drum type, which with the pipe formed the band of a country village. We retain a trace at once of the word and of the thing in the "tabourine" or "tambourine" of modern music, in the "tabret" of the A.V. and older English writers. To "tabour," accordingly, is to beat with loud strokes as men beat upon such *an* instrument. The verb is found in

this sense in Beaumont and Fletcher, *The Tamer Tamed* (“I would tabor he”), and answers with a singular felicity to the exact meaning of the Hebrew. See Plumptre, *Bible Educator*, 4:210.

Tabernacle

is the rendering, in the A. V., of the following Heb. and Gr. words;

1. **ἡ ἡραοηελ**, the most frequent term, but often signifying and rendered a common “tent;”
2. **Ῥκνῖη**, *mishken*, the distinctive term, always so rendered, except (“dwelling”) in ^{<1332>}1 Chronicles 6:32; ^{<1882>}Job 18:21; 21:28; 39:6; ^{<1918>}Psalm 26:8; 49, 11; 74, 7; 87, 2; ^{<2328>}Isaiah 32:18; ^{<2499>}Jeremiah 9:19; 30:8; 51, 30; ^{<2574>}Ezekiel 25:4; ^{<3006>}Hebrews 1:6; (“habitation”) ^{<1916>}2 Chronicles 29:6; ^{<1988>}Psalm 78:28; 132, 5; ^{<2216>}Isaiah 22:16; 54, 2; (“tent”) ^{<2108>}Song of Solomon 1:8;
3. **Ἔς** [once **Ἐς**, ^{<2106>}Lamentations 2:6], *suk* (^{<1972>}Psalm 76:2), **ηκς** *sukkah* (^{<1234>}Leviticus 23:34; ^{<1663>}Deuteronomy 16:13, 16, 31, 10; ^{<1483>}2 Chronicles 8:13; ^{<1104>}Ezra 3:4; ^{<1829>}Job 36:29; ^{<2106>}Isaiah 4:6; ^{<1091>}Amos 9:11; ^{<3146>}Zechariah 14:16, 18, 19), or **ηκς** *sikkuth* (^{<1056>}Amos 5:26), all meaning a *booth*, as often rendered;
4. **σκηνή, σκήνος** (^{<4701>}2 Corinthians 5:1, 4) or **σκήνωμα** (^{<4074>}Acts 7:46 [rather habitation]; ^{<6013>}2 Peter 1:13, 14), a *tent*. Besides occasional use for an ordinary dwelling, the term is specially employed to designate the first sacred edifice of the Hebrews prior to the time of Solomon; fully called **δ[η] ἡρα** *the tent of meeting*, or (especially in Numbers) **ηδ[η] Ῥκνῖη** *tabernacle of the congregation* (Sept. **σκηνή**) [^{<1084>}1 Kings 8:4, 6, **σκήνωμα**] **τοῦ μαρτυρίου**; Philo, **ἱερὸν φορητὸν**, *Opp.* 2 146; Josephus, **μεταφερόμενος καὶ συμπερινοστών ναός**, *Ant.* 3, 6, 1). (In the discussion of this interesting subject we have availed ourselves of MS. contributions from Prof. T Paine, LL.D., author of *Solomon’s Temple*, etc., in addition to the suggestions in the book itself. For an exhaustive treatment we refer to the most recent Volume and charts, entitled *The Tabernacle of Israel in the Desert*, by Prof. James Strong, Providence, 1888.)

I. Terms and Synonyms. —

1. The first word thus used (^{<0250>}Exodus 25:9) is *Κυψινθησκη*, from *κίβη*; to lie down or dwell, and thus itself equivalent to *dwelling*. It connects itself with the Jewish, though not scriptural, word *Shechinah* (q.v.), as describing the dwelling place of the divine glory. It is noticeable, however, that it is not applied in prose to the common dwellings of men, the tents of the patriarchs in Genesis, or those of Israel in the wilderness. It seems to belong rather to the speech of poetry (^{<1870>}Psalms 87:2; ^{<2100>}Song of Solomon 1:8). The loftier character of the word may obviously have helped to determine its religious use, and justifies translators who have the choice of synonyms like “tabernacle” and “tent” in a like preference. In its application to the sacred building, it denotes (a) the ten tri-colored curtains; (b) the forty-eight planks supporting them; (c) the whole building, including the roof. *SEE DWELLING*.

2. Another word, however, is also used, more connected with the common life of men; *ἡσκη*, the *tent* of the patriarchal age, of Abraham and of Isaac and of Jacob (^{<0192>}Genesis 9:21, etc.). For the most part, as needing something to raise it, it is used, when applied to the sacred tent, with some distinguishing epithet. In one passage only (^{<1039>}1 Kings 1:39) does it appear with this meaning by itself. The Sept., not distinguishing between the two words, gives *σκηνή* for both. The original difference appears to have been that *ἡσκη* represented the uppermost covering, the black goats-hair roof, which was strictly a tent, in distinction from the lower upright house-like part built of boards. The two words are accordingly sometimes joined, as in ^{<0242>}Exodus 39:32; 40:2, 6:29 (A.V. “the tabernacle of the tent”). Even here, however, the Sept. gives *σκηνή* only, with the exception of the *var. lect.* of *ἡ σκηνὴ τῆς σκεπῆς* in ^{<0249>}Exodus 40:29. In its application to the tabernacle, the term *ohel* means (a) the tent-roof of goats-hair; (b) the whole building. *SEE TENT*.

3. *βαίθη* *bayith*, *house* (*οἶκος*, *domus*), is applied to the tabernacle in ^{<0239>}Exodus 23:19; 34:26; ^{<01624>}Joshua 6:24.; 9:23; ^{<0788>}Judges 18:31; 20:18, as it had been, apparently, to the tents of the patriarchs (^{<01317>}Genesis 33:17).

So far as it differs from the two preceding words, it expresses more definitely the idea of a fixed settled habitation. It was therefore fitter for the sanctuary of Israel after the people were settled in Canaan than during their wanderings. For us the chief interest of the word lies in its having descended from a yet older order, the first word ever applied in the Old

Test. to a local sanctuary, Bethel, “*the house of God*” (28, 17, 22), keeping its place, side by side, with other words — tent, tabernacle, palace, temple, synagogue—and at last outliving all of them; rising, in the Christian *Ecclesia*, to yet higher uses (^{<S1815>}1 Timothy 3:15). *SEE HOUSE*.

4. **vdqpk** *kódesh*, or **vdqjha** *mikdash* (ἁγίασμα, ἁγιαστήριον, τὸ ἅγιον, τὰ ἅγια, *sanctuarium*’), the *holy*, consecrated place, and therefore applied, according to the graduated scale of holiness of which the tabernacle bore witness, sometimes to the whole structure (^{<D278>}Exodus 25:8; ^{<R124>}Leviticus 12:4), sometimes to the court into which none but the priests might enter (^{<R046>}Leviticus 4:6; Numbers 3, 38; 4:12), sometimes to the innermost sanctuary of ail, the Holy of Hohes. (^{<R142>}Leviticus 16:2). Here also the word had an earlier starting-point and a far-reaching history. En-Mishpat, the city of judgment, the *seat* of some old oracle, had been also Kadesh, the sanctuary (^{<O147>}Genesis 14:7; *Ewald, Gesch. Isr.* 2, 307). The name *El-Kuds* still clings to the walls of Jerusalem. *SEE SANCTUARY*.

5. **I kyh** *heykal*, temple (**ναός**, *templum*), as meaning the stately building, or palace of Jehovah (^{<R201>}1 Chronicles 29:1, 19), is applied more commonly to the Temple (^{<D213>}2 Kings 24:13, etc.), but was used also (probably at the period when the thought of the Temple had affected the religious nomenclature of the time) of the tabernacle at Shiloh. (^{<R009>}1 Samuel 1:9; 3:3) and Jerusalem (^{<R077>}Psalms 5:7). In either case the thought which the word embodies is that the “tent,” the “house,” is royal, the dwelling-place of the great king. *SEE TEMPLE*.

The first two of the above words receive a new meaning in combination with **d[]** (*moed*), and with **tWd[]** (*ha-eduth*). To understand the full meaning of the distinctive titles thus formed is to possess the key to the significance of the whole tabernacle.

(a.) The primary force of **d[]** is “to meet by appointment,” and the phrase **d[] I had** has therefore the meaning of “a place of or for a fixed meeting.” Acting on the belief that the meeting in this case was that of the worshippers, the A.V. has uniformly rendered it by “tabernacle of the congregation” (so Seb. Schmidt, “tentorium conventus;” and Luther, “Stiftshutte” in which *Stift* = *Pfarrkirche*) while the Sept. and Vulg., confounding it with the other epithet, have rendered both by ἡ σκηνὴ τοῦ μαρτυρίου, and “tabernaculum testimonii.” None of these renderings,

however, bring out the real meaning of the word. This is to be found in what may be called the *locus classicus*, ὅς as the interpretation of all words connected with the tabernacle. “This shall be a continual burnt-offering at the door of the tabernacle of *meeting* (d[¹²³⁰]) where I will *meet* you (d[¹²³⁰] ἁρᾶν ὁσθήσομαι) to speak there unto thee. And there will I *meet* (γ[¹²³⁰] τῆς [ἱε]ράξομαι) with the children of Israel. And I will *sanctify* (γ[¹²³⁰] τῆς [ἱε]ράξομαι) the tabernacle of meeting... and I will *dwell* (γ[¹²³⁰] τῆς [ἱε]ράξομαι) among the children of Israel, and will be their God. And they shall know that I am the Lord their God” (¹²³⁰Exodus 29:42-46). The same central thought occurs in 25:22, “There I will *meet* with thee” (comp. also 30:6, 36; ¹²³⁰Numbers 17:4). It is clear, therefore, that “congregation” is inadequate. Not the gathering of the worshippers, but the meeting of God with his people, to commune with them, to make himself known to them, was what the name embodied. Ewald has accordingly suggested *Offenbarungszelt*= tent of revelation, as the best equivalent (*Alterthümer*, p. 130). This made the place a *sanctuary*. Thus it was that the *tent* was the *dwelling*, the *house* of God (Bahr, *Symb.* 1, 81). **SEE CONGREGATION.**

(b.) The other compound phrase, τῆς [ἱε]ράξομαι ἁρᾶς connected with d[¹²³⁰] (= to bear witness), is rightly rendered by ἡ σκηνὴ τοῦ μαρτυρίου, *tabernaculum testimonii, die Wohnung des Zeugnisses*, “the tent of the testimony” (¹²³⁰Numbers 9:15) “the tabernacle of witness” (¹²³⁰Numbers 17:7; 18:2). In this case the tent derives its name from that which is the center of its holiness. The two tables of stone within the ark are emphatically *the* testimony (¹²³⁰Exodus 25:16, 21; 31:18). They were to all Israel the abiding witness of the nature and will of God. The tent, by virtue of its relation to them, became the witness of its own significance as the meeting-place of God and man. The probable connection of the two distinct names, in sense as well as in sound (Bahr, *Symb.* 1, 83; Ewald, *Alt.* p. 230), gave, of course, a force to each which no translation can represent. **SEE TESTIMONY.**

II. History. —

1. We may distinguish in the Old Test. three sacred tabernacles:

(1.) The Ante-Sinaitic, which was probably the dwelling of Moses, and was placed by the camp of the Israelites in the desert, for the transaction of public business. ¹²³⁰Exodus 33:7-10, “Moses took the tabernacle, and pitched it without the camp, afar off from the camp, and called it the

Tabernacle of the Congregation. And it came to pass, that every one which sought the Lord went out unto the tabernacle of the congregation, which was without the camp. And it came to pass, when Moses went out unto the tabernacle, that all the people rose up, and stood every man at his tent-door, and looked after Moses until he was gone into the tabernacle. And it came to pass, as Moses entered into the tabernacle, the cloudy pillar descended, and stood at the door of the tabernacle, and the Lord talked with Moses. And all the people saw the cloudy pillar stand at the tabernacle-door: and all the people rose up and worshipped, every one in his tent-door.” This was neither the sanctuary of the tabernacle described in ch. 25 sq., which was not made till after the perfect restoration of the covenant (ch. 35 sq.), nor another sanctuary that had come down from their forefathers and was used before the tabernacle proper was built (as Le Clerc, J. D. Michaelis, and Rosenmüller supposed); but an ordinary tent used for the occasion and purpose (Keil, *Comment.* ad loc.).

(2.) The *Sinaitic* tabernacle superseded the tent which had served for the transaction of public business probably from the beginning of the Exode. This was constructed by Bezaleel and Aholiab as a portable mansion-house, guildhall, and cathedral, and set up on the first day of the first month in the second year after leaving Egypt. Of this alone we have accurate descriptions. It was the second of these sacred tents, which, as the most important, is called the tabernacle *par excellence*. Moses was commanded by Jehovah to have it erected in the Arabian desert, by voluntary contributions of the Israelites, who carried it about with them in their migrations until after the conquest of Canaan, when it remained stationary for longer periods in various towns of Palestine (as below).

(3.) The *Davidic* tabernacle was erected by David, in Jerusalem, for the reception of the ark (~~1062~~ 2 Samuel 6:12); while the old tabernacle remained to the days of Solomon at Gibeon, together with the brazen altar, as the place where sacrifices were offered (~~3163~~ 1 Chronicles 16:39; ~~4103~~ 2 Chronicles 1:3).

2. *Varied Fortunes of the Sinaitic Tabernacle.*

(1.) *In the Wilderness.* —The outward history of the tabernacle begins with Exodus 25. It comes after the first great group of laws (ch. 19-23), after the covenant with the people, after the vision of the divine glory (ch. 24). For forty days and nights Moses is in the mount. Before him there lay a problem, as measured by human judgment, of gigantic difficulty. In what fit

symbols was he to embody the great truths without which the nation would sink into brutality? In what way could those symbols be guarded against the evil which he had seen in Egypt, of idolatry the most degrading? He was not left to solve the problem for himself. There rose before him, not without points of contact with previous associations, yet in no degree formed out of them, the “pattern” of the tabernacle. The lower analogies of the painter and the architect seeing, with their inward eye, their completed work before the work itself begins, may help us to understand how it was that the vision on the mount included all details of form, measurement, materials, the order of the ritual, the apparel of the priests. He is directed in his choice of the two chief artists, Bezaleel of the tribe of Judah, Aholiab of the tribe of Dan (Daniel 31). The sin, of the golden calf apparently postpones the execution. For a moment it seems as if the people were to be left without the Divine Presence itself without any recognized symbol of it (Daniel 33:3). As in a transition period, the whole future depending on the patience of the people, on the intercession of their leader, a tent is pitched (probably that of Moses himself, which had hitherto been the headquarters of consultation), outside the camp, to be provisionally the tabernacle of meeting. There the mind of the lawgiver enters into ever-closer fellowship with the mind of God (Daniel 33:11), learns to think of him as “merciful and gracious” (Daniel 34:6); in the strength of that thought is led back to the fulfillment of the plan which had seemed likely to end, as it began, in vision. Of this provisional tabernacle it has to be noticed that there was as yet no ritual and no priesthood. The people went out to it as to an oracle (Daniel 33:7). Joshua, though of the tribe of Ephraim, had free access to it (Daniel 33:11).

Another outline law was, however, given; another period of solitude, like the first; followed. The work could now be resumed. The people offered the necessary materials in excess of what was wanted (Daniel 36:5, 6). Other workmen (Daniel 36:2) and workwomen (Daniel 35:25) placed themselves under the direction of Bezaleel and Aholiab. The parts were completed separately, and then, on the first day of the second year from the Exode, the tabernacle itself was erected and the ritual appointed for it begun (Daniel 40:2).

The position of the new tent was itself significant. It stood, not, like the provisional tabernacle, at a distance from the camp, but in its very center. The multitude of Israel, hitherto scattered with no fixed order, were now, within a month of its erection (⁴⁰¹¹Numbers 2:2), grouped round it, as

around the dwelling of the unseen Captain of the Host, in a fixed order, according to their tribal rank. The priests on the east, the other three families of the Levites on the other sides, were closest in attendance, the “body-guard” of the Great King. *SEE LEVITE*. In the wider square, Judah, Zebulun, Issachar, were on the east; Ephraim, Manasseh, Benjamin, on the west; the less conspicuous tribes, Dan, Asher, Naphtali, on the north; Reuben, Simeon, Gad, on the south side. When the army put itself in order of march, the position of the tabernacle, carried by the Levites, was still central, the tribes of the east and south in front, those of the north and west in the rear (ch. 2). Upon it there rested the symbolic cloud, dark by day and fiery-red by night (^{<0438>}Exodus 40:38). When the cloud removed, the host knew that it was the signal for them to go forward (^{<0436>}Exodus 40:36, 37; ^{<0437>}Numbers 9:17). As long as it remained — whether for a day, or month, or year they continued where they were (Exodus 40: 15-23). Each march, it must be remembered, involved the breaking up of the whole structure, all the parts being carried on wagons by the three Levitical families of Kohath, Gershon, and Merari, while the “sons of Aaron” prepared for the removal by covering everything in the Holy of Holies with a purple cloth (^{<0435>}Exodus 4:6-15). *SEE ENCAMPMENT*.

In all special facts connected with the tabernacle, the original thought reappears. It is the place where man *meets* with God. There the Spirit “comes upon” the seventy elders, and they prophesy (^{<0412>}Numbers 11:24, 25). Thither Aaron and Miriam are called out when they rebel against the servant of the Lord (^{<0413>}Numbers 12:4). There the “glory of the Lord” appears after the unfaithfulness of the twelve spies (^{<0410>}Numbers 14:10) and the rebellion of Korah and his company (^{<0409>}Numbers 16:19, 42) and the sin of Meribah (^{<0406>}Numbers 20:6). Thither, when there is no sin to punish, but a difficulty to be met, do the daughters of Zelophe had come to bring their cause “before the Lord” (^{<0427>}Numbers 27:2). There, when the death of Moses draws near, is the solemn “charge” given to his successor (^{<0314>}Deuteronomy 31:14).

(2.) *In Palestine*. — As long as Canaan remained unconquered and the people were still therefore an army, the tabernacle was probably moved from place to place, wherever the host of Israel was for the time encamped at Gilgal (^{<0419>}Joshua 4:19), in the valley between Ebal and Gerizim (^{<0430>}Joshua 8:30-35), again, at the headquarters of Gilgaal (^{<0406>}Joshua 9:6; 10:15, 43); and, finally, as at “the place which the Lord had chosen,” at Shiloh (^{<0427>}Joshua 9:27; 18:1). The reasons of this last

choice are not given. Partly, perhaps, its central position, partly its belonging to the powerful tribe of Ephraim, the tribe of the great captain of the host, may have determined the preference. There it continued during the whole period of the judges, the gathering-point for “the heads of the fathers” of the tribes (^{<0685>}Joshua 19:51), for councils of peace or war (^{<0622>}Joshua 22:12; ^{<0212>}Judges 21:12), for annual solemn dances, in which the women of Shiloh were conspicuous (ver. 21). There, too, as the religion of Israel sank towards the level of an orgiastic heathenism, troops of women assembled, shameless as those of Midian, worshippers of Jehovah, and, like the *ιερόδουλοι* of heathen temples, concubines of his priests (^{<0122>}1 Samuel 2:22). It was far, however, from being what it was intended to be, the one national sanctuary, the witness against a localized and divided worship. The old religion of the high places kept its ground. Altars were erected, at first under protest, and with reserve, as being not for sacrifice (^{<0225>}Joshua 22:26), afterwards freely and without scruple (^{<0063>}Judges 6:24; 13:19). Of the names by which the one special sanctuary was known at this period, those of the “house” and the “temple” of Jehovah (^{<0009>}1 Samuel 1:9, 24; 3:3, 15) are most prominent.

A state of things which was rapidly assimilating the worship of Jehovah to that of Ashtaroth or Mylitta needed to be broken up. The ark of God was taken, and the sanctuary lost its glory; and the tabernacle, though it did not perish, never again recovered it (^{<0022>}1 Samuel 4:22). Samuel, at once the Luther and the Alfred of Israel, who had grown up within its precincts, treats it as an abandoned shrine (so ^{<0780>}Psalms 78:60), and sacrifices elsewhere—at Mizpeh (^{<0009>}1 Samuel 7:9), at Ramah (^{<0012>}1 Samuel 9:12; 10:3), at Gilgal (^{<0008>}1 Samuel 10:8; 11:15). It probably became once again a movable sanctuary; less honored, as no longer possessing the symbol of the Divine Presence, yet cherished by the priesthood, and some portions at least of its ritual kept up. For a time it seems, under Saul, to have been settled at Nob (^{<0201>}1 Samuel 21:1-6), which thus became what it had not been before — a priestly city. The massacre of the priests and the flight of Abiathar must, however, have robbed it yet further of its glory. It had before lost the ark. It now lost the presence of the high-priest, and with it the oracular ephod, the Urim and Thummim (1 Samuel 22, 20, 23:6). What change of fortune then followed we do not know. The fact that all Israel was encamped, in the last days of Saul, at Gilboa, and that there Saul, though without success, inquired of the Lord by Urim (^{<0204>}1 Samuel 28:4-6), makes it probable that the tabernacle, as of old, was in the encampment,

and that Abiathar had returned to it. In some way or other it found its way to Gibeon (^{<1316B>}1 Chronicles 16:39). The anomalous separation of the two things which, in the original order, had been joined brought about yet greater anomalies, and while the ark remained at Kirjath-jearim, the tabernacle at Gibeon connected itself with the worship of the high-places (1 Kings 52:4). The capture of Jerusalem, and the erection there of a new tabernacle, with the ark, of which the old had been deprived (^{<10167>}2 Samuel 6:17; ^{<1315B>}1 Chronicles 15:1), left it little more than a traditional, historical sanctity. It retained only the old altar of burnt-offerings (^{<1312B>}1 Chronicles 21:29). Such as it was, however, neither king nor people could bring themselves to sweep it away. The double service went on; Zadok, as high-priest, officiated at Gibeon (^{<1316B>}1 Chronicles 16:39); the more recent, more prophetic service of psalms and hymns and music, under Asaph, gathered round the tabernacle at Jerusalem (ver. 4, 37). The divided worship continued all the days of David. The sanctity of both places was recognized by Solomon on his accession (1 Kings 3, 15; ^{<1401B>}2 Chronicles 1:3). But it was time that the anomaly should cease. As long as it was simply tent against tent, it was difficult to decide between them. The purpose of David, fulfilled by Solomon, was that the claims of both should merge in the higher glory of the Temple. Some, Abiathar probably among them, clung to the old order, in this as in other things; but the final day at last came, and the tabernacle of meeting was either taken down or left to perish and-be forgotten. So a page in the religious history of Israel was closed. Thus the disaster of Shiloh led to its natural consummation.

III. Description. — The written authorities four the restoration of the tabernacle are, first, the detailed account to be found in Exodus 26 and repeated in 36:8-38, without any variation beyond the slightest possible abridgment; secondly, the account given of the building by Josephus (*Ant.* 3, 6), which is so nearly a repetition of the account found in the Bible, that we may feel assured that he had no really important authority before him except the one which is equally accessible to us. Indeed, we might almost put his account on one side if it were not that, being a Jew, and so much nearer the time, he may have had access to some traditional accounts which may have enabled him to realize its appearance more readily than we can do, and his knowledge of Hebrew technical terms may have assisted him to understand what we might otherwise be unable to explain. The additional indications contained in the Talmud and in Philo are so few and indistinct,

and are, besides, of such doubtful authenticity, that they practically add nothing to our knowledge, and may safely be disregarded.

For a complicated architectural building, these written authorities probably would not suffice without some remains or other indications to supplement them; but the arrangements of the tabernacle were so simple that they are really all that are required. Every important dimension was either five cubits or a multiple of five cubits, and all the arrangements in plan were either squares or double squares, so that there is, in fact, no difficulty in putting the whole together, and none would ever have occurred, were it not that the dimensions of the sanctuary, as obtained from the “boards” that formed its walls, appear at first sight to be one thing, while those obtained from the dimensions of the curtains which covered it appear to give another. The apparent discrepancy is, however, easily explained, as we shall presently see, and never would have occurred to any one who had lived long under canvas or was familiar with the exigencies of tent architecture.

The following close translation of Exodus 26 will set the subject generally before the reader. We have indicated, by the use of *italics*, marked variations from the A.V.

1. And the tabernacle ([^] Kvjn) thou shalt make ten curtains; twisted linen, and violet and purple and crimson of cochineal: cherubs, work of (an) artificer, thou shalt
2. make them. (The) length of the one curtain (shall be) eight and twenty by the cubit, and (the breadth) four by the cubit, the one curtain: one measure (shall be)
3. to all the curtains. Five of the curtains shall be joining each to its fellow, and five of the curtains joining
4. each to its fellow. And thou shalt make loops (l Wl) of violet upon (the) edge of the one curtain from (the) end in the joining, and so shall thou make in (the) *edge*
5. *of the endmost curtain* in the *second joining*: fifty loops shalt thou. make in the one curtain, and fifty loops shalt thou make in (the) end of the curtain which is in the *second joining*, the *loops standing opposite* (t/ l Bqjñ)

- 6.** the one to its fellow. And thou shalt make fifty taches I (**srq**) of gold, and thou shalt join the curtains one to its fellow with the taches, and the tabernacle shall be one.
- 7.** And thou shalt make curtains of goats (hair) for *a tent* (**l ha**) upon the tabernacle, eleven curtains shalt
- 8.** thou make them. (The) length of the one curtain (shall be) thirty by the cubit, and (the) breadth four by the cubit, the one curtain: one measure (shall be) to
- 9.** (the) eleven curtains. And thou shalt join five of the curtains separately, and six of the curtains separately; and thou shalt double the sixth curtain *towards* (the)
- 10.** fore front of the *tent*. And thou shalt make fifty loops upon (the) edge of the one curtain-the endmost in the joining, and fifty loops upon (the) edge of the cur-
- 11.** *tain* — *the second joining*. And thou shalt make taches of copper-fifty; and shalt bring the taches in the loops, and thou shalt join the tent, and (it) shall be
- 12.** one. And (the) overplus *hang* in (the) curtains of the tent- *half of the* overplus curtain shall hang upon
- 13.** the back of the tabernacle; and *the* cubit from this (side) and *the* cubit from that (side) in the overplus in (the) length of (the) curtains of the tent shall be hung, upon (the) sides of the tabernacle from this (side) and from that (side), to cover it.
- 14.** And thou shalt make (a) covering to the tent, skins of rams reddened, and (a) covering of skins of *tach-ashes* from above.
- 15.** And thou shalt make *the* planks (**vrq**) for the tabernacle, trees [*wood*] of acacias (**uyf**) standing.
- 16.** Ten cubits (shall he the) length of the plank; and (a) cubit and (the) half of the cubit (the) breadth of the
- 17.** one plank. Two hands [*teons*] (shall there be) to the one plank, joined (**twbLv**) others *corresponding* [comp. 36:22] each to its fellow: so shalt thou

18. make [or *do*] for all (the) planks of the tabernacle. And thou shalt make the planks for the tabernacle, twenty planks for (the) Nogeb [*south*] quarter towards Tey-

19. man [*the south*]. And forty bases ($\tilde{d}a$) of silver shalt thou make under the twenty planks, two bases under the one plank four its two hands, and two bases under

20. the one [*next*] plank for its two hands., And for the second rib [*flank*] of the tabernacle to (the) Tsaphnm

21. [*north*] quarter (there shall be) twenty planks; and their forty bases of silver, two bases under the one plank, and two bases under the one [*next*] plank.

22. And for (the) thighs [*rear*] of the tabernacle seaward

23. [*west*] thou shalt make six planks. And two planks shalt thou make for (the) angles ($[w\alpha q]m\alpha$ cutting off)

24. of the tabernacle in the thighs [*rear*]: and (they) shall be twinned ($\mu ym\alpha$ perhaps *jointed, hinged, or bolted*) from below together, and shall be twins upon its head [*top*] towards the one ring: so shall (it) be too both of them; for the two angles shall (they) be.

25. And (there) shall be eight planks, and their bases of silver-sixteen bases, two bases under the one plank, and two bases under the one [*next*] plank.

26. And thou shalt make bars ($j yr\alpha$) of trees [*wood*] of acacias [*Shittim*]; five for (the) planks of the one rib

27. [*flank*] of the tabernacle, and five bars for (the) planks of the second rib [*flank*] of the tabernacle, and five bars for (the) planks of (the) rib [*flank*] of the taber-

28. nacle for the thighs [*rear*] seaward [*west*]. And the middle bar, in (the) middle of the planks (shall) bar ($j yr\alpha$) be *bolting* through) from the end to the end.

29. And the planks thou shalt overlay (with) gold, and the rings then shalt make (of) gold, (as) houses [*places*] for the bars; and thou shalt overlay the bars (with) gold.

30. And thou shalt rear the tabernacle like it — judgment [*style*] which I made thee see in the mountain.

Picture for Tabernacle 1

1. *The court* (רָצֶף) was a large rectangular enclosure, open to the sky, and with its entrance at the east end. Its dimensions are given more than once, being 100 cubits long and 50' broad. Its construction was very simple, being composed of a frame of four sides of distinct pillars, with curtains hung upon them. In other words, it was surrounded by canvas screens—in the East called *kannats*, and still universally used to enclose the private apartments of important personages. The pillars were probably of shittim-wood (that is, the desert acacia), a light, close-grained, imperishable wood, easily taking on a fine natural polish, though it is nowhere directly intimated of what material they were; they were five cubits in height (sufficient to prevent a person from looking over them into the enclosure), but their other dimensions are not given, so that we cannot be sure whether they were round (Ewald) or four-cornered (Bähr), probably the latter. At the bottom these pillars were protected or shod by sockets of brass (copper). It is not quite easy to say whether these sockets were merely for protection, and perhaps ornament, or if they also helped to give stability to the pillar. In the latter case, we may conceive the socket to have been of the shape of a hollow wedge or pointed funnel driven into the ground, and then the end of the pillar pushed down into its cavity; or they may have been simply plate laid on the ground, with a hole for the reception of the tenoned foot of the pillar, as in the case of the “boards” noticed below. Other appliances were used to give the structure firmness, viz. the common articles of tent architecture, ropes and pins (⁻¹²⁵¹⁸Exodus 35:18). At the top these pillars had a capital or head (⁻¹²³¹⁷Exodus 38:17, chapter), which was overlaid with silver; but whether the body of the pillar was plated with any metal is not said. Connected with the head of the pillar were two other articles, *hooks*, and things called מַצְבֵּי } *chashukim*, rendered “fillets,” i.e. ornamental chaplets in relief round the pillar (so Ewald, *Alterthümer*, p. 335, note 5), but most probably meaning *rods* (so Gesenius, Fürst, and others), joining one pillar to another. These rods were laid upon the hooks, and served to attach the hangings to and suspend them from. The hooks and rods were silver, though Knobel conjectures the latter must have been merely plated (*Exodus* p. 278). The mode of adjusting these hangings was similar to that of the doorway screens and “vail” described below. The

circumference of the enclosure thus formed was 300 cubits, and the number of pillars is said to have been $20 + 20 + 10 + 10 = 60$, which would give between every two pillars a space of $3-0 = 5$ cubits. There has been considerable difficulty in accurately conceiving the method adopted by the writer in calculating these pillars. This difficulty arises from the corner pillars, each of which, of course, belongs both to the side and to the end. It has been supposed by many, that the author calculated each one corner pillar twice; that is, considered it, though one in itself, as a pillar of the side and also as a pillar of the end. This would make in all 56 actual pillars, and, of course, as many spaces (Biahr, Knobel, etc.); that is, nineteen spaces on each side, and nine on the end. Now since the side was 100 cubits and the end 50, this would give for each side space $10^2 = 5$ and for each end space $54 = 5$ cubits, spaces artificial in themselves and unlike each other. It is certainly most probable that the spaces of side and end were of exactly the same size, and that each of them was some exact, and no fractional, number of cubits. The difficulty may be completely removed by assuming the distance of 5 cubits to each space, and counting as in the accompanying ground-plan. Thus, since each side was 100 cubits, this needs twenty spaces. But twenty spaces need twenty-one pillars. So that, supposing us to start from the south-east corner and go along the south side, we should have for 100 cubits twenty-one pillars and twenty spaces; but of these we should count twenty spaces and pillars for the south side, and call the south-west corner pillar, not the twenty-first pillar of the side, but the first of the end. Then going up the end, we should count ten pillars and spaces as end, but consider the north-west corner pillar not as eleventh of the end, but first of the north side; and so on. In this way we gain sixty pillars and as many spaces, and have each space exactly 5 cubits. The hangings- ((μϣ [~~beqak~~ *elaim* ') of the court were of twined *shesh*; that is, a fabric woven out of twisted yarn of the material called *shesh*. This word, which properly means *white*, is rendered by our version "fine linen," a rendering with which most concur, while some decide for *cotton*. At all events, the curtains were a strong fabric of this glancing white material, and were hung upon the pillars, most likely outside, though that is not known, being attached to the pillar at the top by the hooks and rods already described, while the whole was stayed by pins and cords, like a tent. The entrance, which was situated in the center of the east end and was twenty cubits in extent, was formed also of a hanging (technically Ēsm; *masak* of "blue, purple, and scarlet, and fine twined linen, work of the q̄w̄, *roken*" (A.V.

“needle-work”). The last word has usually been considered to mean *embroiderer* with the needle, and the curtain fancied to have had figures, flowers, etc., of the mentioned colors wrought into it. But such kinds of work have always a “wrong” side, and, most probably taking into account the meaning of the word in Arabic, and the fondness of the Arabs at this day for striped blankets, the word means “weaver of striped cloth,” and the hanging is to be conceived as woven with lines or stripes of blue, purple, and scarlet on the white ground of *shesh* (Knobel, Keil, etc.). In other words, the *warp*, or longitudinal threads, was of white linen, while the *woof* made cross-bars (which would hang vertically) of brilliantly dyed wool in a treble thread. They were merely spun and woven, without gold or embroidered figures. The furniture of the court consisted of the altar of burnt-offering and the laver. These are sufficiently described under their appropriate headings. *SEE ALTAR*; *SEE LAVER*. What concerns us is the position of them. In all probability, the tabernacle proper stood with its entrance exactly in the middle of the court, that is, fifty cubits from the entrance of the court; and very possibly the altar of burnt-offering stood, again, midway between the door of the court and that of the tabernacle, i.e. twenty-five cubits from each, and somewhere in the twenty-five cubits between the altar and the tabernacle stood the laver (Josephus, *Ant.* 3, 6, 2).

Picture for Tabernacle 2

Picture for Tabernacle 3

Picture for Tabernacle 4

Picture for Tabernacle 5

2. *The Tabernacle* itself – Following the method pursued with the outer court, we begin with the walls. These were built of boards, or, rather, planks (𐤀𐤎𐤁𐤏𐤍 *kerashim*), in close contact with each other. They were of shittim-wood, overlaid with gold on both sides, ten cubits high and one and a half cubit broad, their thickness being nowhere given. From the foot of each plank came out two “tenons” (𐤏𐤎𐤁𐤏𐤍; *yadoth-hands*), which must not be conceived as connecting the planks with each other laterally, as if there corresponded to a tenon in one plank a mortise in another; they were for connecting each particular plank with the ground, and must be conceived as two wedge-shaped or pointed pieces (probably of copper, or perhaps of

silver); projecting from the lower end of the plank. These tenons were thrust into silver sockets, of which two were prepared for each plank, each socket being the weight of a talent of silver. Whether these sockets were wedge shaped or pointed, and themselves went into the ground, or whether they were mere foot-plates for the plank, with holes for the tenons to pass through into the ground (the last more probable), is not intimated. Prof. Paine has ingeniously suggested the thickness of these sockets as one sixth of a cubit, *SEE METROLOGY*, and likewise their form (half a cubit square), as in the adjoining cut. He also calculates from this size of the sockets, or foot-plates, that the planks should be (as Josephus says) one third of a span, i.e. one sixth of a cubit thick (which is quite sufficient for strength), in order to turn the corners neatly as illustrated in the subjoined cut. This might indeed have been effected on the supposition that the planks were one cubit thick as the accompanying cut will show; but we can hardly suppose that the planks overhung the bases which supported them. These bases did not require to enter deeply into the ground, as there was no lateral strain upon them, and the whole weight of the building kept them firmly in their place. Their only object was to keep the bottom of the planks level and even. The upper ends of the planks, however, needed to be kept from separating, as they would certainly do under the traction of the stay-cords fore and aft. Hence the tenons mentioned in ^{<1237>}Exodus 26:17 are carefully distinguished from those (already described) referred to in ver. 19; and they are designated (without any sockets assigned to them) by a peculiar term, *twblymaneshullaboth*, which occurs here only. It is regarded by Gesenius as radically signifying *notched*, but he understands it here as meaning *joined*, a sense in which Furst and Milhau emphatically concur, to the exclusion of that adopted by the Sept. (ἀντιπίπτοντες) and the A.V. (“set in order”). Prof. Paine refers the term to the *top* of the planks, and renders it *clasp*, understanding a separate plate with holes corresponding to pins or tenons (probably all of copper) in the upper end of the planks likewise, as in the annexed cut. This is an essential provision for the stability of the structure, of which no one else seems to have thought. Nevertheless, as he privately informs us, he has since abandoned this distinction between the top and bottom tenons, and in his forthcoming second edition he will dispense with the clasps. The long middle bar, if pinned to each end plank, would subserve a similar purpose. Something of this sort is perhaps intimated by the *bolting* (jyrāhijrb) of ^{<1238>}Exodus 26:28; 36:33. The roof-curtains would likewise assist in holding the planks together.

Picture for Tabernacle 6

Picture for Tabernacle 7

Of these boards, which, being one and a half cubit, i.e. about two and a half feet broad, must have been formed of several smaller ones jointed together, there were twenty on the north and twenty on the south side, thus making each side the length of thirty cubits. For the west end were made six boards, yielding nine cubits, and in addition two boards for the corners (^{Q252}Exodus 26:22 sq.), making in all eight boards and twelve cubits; and as the end is thought (so Josephus, *Ant.* 3, 6, 3) to have been ten cubits (proportionate to that in Solomon's Temple, ^{Q188}1 Kings 6:2, 20), this would imply that each corner plank added half a cubit to the width, but nothing to the length, the measurements being taken inside. Were the planks supposed a cubit thick, which is the usual calculation (but an extravagant one on account of the weight), the remaining cubit of the corner plank would exactly cover the thickness of the side plank. The description given of the corners is exceedingly perplexing, and the diversity of opinion is naturally great. The difficulties all lie in ^{Q218}Exodus 24:24. It goes on, "they shall be coupled together;" rather, they shall be "twins," or "twinned" (^{Q188}טוּאָמִים *toamim*). "They" evidently refers to the corner planks; and, setting aside the idea that they make twins together, which cannot be, since they are at opposite corners, the expression may mean that each corner plank of itself makes twins, which it would do if it had two legs containing the angle between them. If the corner plank be two-legged, it adds necessarily something to the length, and thus destroys the measurement. One explanation is therefore to regard the end of the corner plank, *e*, as twin, i.e. corresponding to the side plank *a*. Further, each corner plank must be "entire" (^{Q188}טַמִּימִם *tammim*) at or on its head (A. V., with many others, considers *tammim* the same as *todnim*). Now if the "head" be not the top of the plank, but the edge or point of the corner; then the statement implies that the corner plank of the end wall, though prolonging the side wall outside, must not be cut away or sloped, for example, in the fashion indicated by the dotted lines *c d*. Once more, the words are added "unto one ring," accurately "unto the first ring." Keil (*Comment.* ad loc.) understands that "the two corner boards at the back were to consist of two pieces joined together at a right angle, so as to form, as double boards, one single whole from the top to the bottom," and that "one ring was placed half-way up the upright board in the corner or

angle, in such a manner that the central bolt, which stretched along the entire length of the walls, might fasten into it from both the side and back.” Murphy (*Comment. ad loc.*) suggests a form which we represent by the annexed figure. But Paine’s arrangement, as in the cut below, seems to us to meet all the requirements of the case in the simplest and most effectual manner. The ring and staples at the top and bottom of the corner planks formed a *hinge*, so that the adjoining planks were *twinned*, or carried together as one. That the end planks went in between the last side planks (as neatness and usage in such structures dictated), making the interior width of the tabernacle the full twelve cubits, is probable from the length of the roof-curtains presently described, if they were longitudinally arranged.

Picture for Tabernacle 8

Picture for Tabernacle 9

The walls or planks, in addition to the stability they may have derived from the sockets at the bottom (and perhaps the clasps at the top), were bound together by five bars or bolts, thrust into rings attached to each plank. These bars, in all probability, ran along the outside, though that is not intimated, and Ewald thinks otherwise. One bar is said to have gone in the middle (ÉwΦB): this is usually taken to mean half-way up the plank, and with two bars on each side of it, above and below; but some interpret “through the heart of the boards” (Riggenbach), and others understand it of the rear bar alone. Thus there seem to have been three rows of bars, the top and bottom one on each of the sides being in two pieces. Josephus’s account is somewhat different: “Every one,” he says (*Ant.* 3, 6, 3), “of the pillars or boards had a ring of gold affixed to its front outwards, into which were inserted bars gilt with gold, each of them five cubits long, and these bound together the boards; the head of one bar running into another after the manner of one tenon inserted into another. But for the wall behind there was only one bar that went through all the boards, into which one of the ends of the bars on both sides was inserted.” The whole edifice was doubtless further stayed by ropes attached to tent-pins in the ground from knobs on the outside of the planks. (See below.)

Picture for Tabernacle 10

Picture for Tabernacle 11

3. Drapery of the Tabernacle. —The wooden structure was completed as well as adorned by four kinds of hangings, each of which served a useful and even needful purpose.

Picture for Tabernacle 12

(1.) The Roof. — The first question that arises here is whether the roof was flat, like that of Oriental houses, or peaked and slanting, as in Occidental buildings. The old representations, such as Calmet's, take the former view; but to this it may be forcibly objected that it would in that case be impossible to stretch the roof covering sufficiently tight to prevent the rain and-snow from collecting in the middle, and either crushing the whole by its weight or flooding the apartments. Hence most later writers assume a peaked roof, although there is no mention of a ridge-pole, nor of supports to it; but the name "tent" given to the upper part of the edifice is itself conclusive of this form, and then these accessories would necessarily follow.

Picture for Tabernacle 13

The roofing material was a canvas of goats hair, the article still employed by the Bedawin for their tents. It consisted of eleven "curtains" (twelve i.e. breadths or pieces of (this camlet) cloth, each thirty cubits long and four cubits wide, which is as large, probably, as could well be woven in the loom at once. Ten of these were to-be "coupled" (two) i.e. sewed together, five in one sheet, and five in another, evidently by the selvage; thus making two large canvases of thirty cubits by twenty each. But as the building was only twelve cubits wide, one of them alone would more than suffice for a roof, even with a peak. Hence most interpreters understand that the surplus width was allowed to hang down the sides. But what is to be done with the other sheet? Fergusso (in Smith's *Dict. of the Bible*, s.v. "Temple") supposes (with interpreters in general) that the two sheets were thrown side by side across the ridgepole, the extra length (some fifteen cubits) being extended at the eaves into a kind of wings, and the surplus width (ten cubits) furled along the slope of the gable, or perhaps stretched out as a porch. But there is no authority whatever for this disposal; and if

the two pieces of canvas were intended to be thus adjoined, there appears no good reason why they should not have been *sewed* together at the first, like the individual breadths. Hence, Paine suggests that they were designed as a *double* roof, so as to more effectually to shed rain somewhat in the manner of a “fly” or extra roof to a modern tent. For this the size is exactly adequate. If the angle at the peak were a right angle, as it naturally would be, the gable, of course, being an isosceles triangle, eight and a half cubits would be required for each slope of the roof (these being the two legs of which twelve is the hypotenuse); thus leaving one cubit to cover each of the eaves (as specified in ver. 13), and lone cubit for seams, and perhaps hems. The seams, in order to be water-tight (especially since they ran parallel with the ridge and eaves) as well as smooth, would best be formed by overlapping the edges, in shingle style. The sixth “curtain,” or extra single piece, was to be “doubled in the fore-front of the tabernacle” (26:9, **I hab;ynE]I WmAl a, TI bkW**], which interpreters generally have understood as meant to close the gable. This, as Paine suggests, it would neatly do if folded in two thicknesses (like the rest of the goat’s hair cloth) across the lower part of the rear open space above the “boards,” as it is just long enough (twice fifteen cubits; the surplus three cubits being employed exactly as in the case of the other sheets), and sufficiently wide (four cubits up the six of the perpendicular; leaving only a small triangle at the peak for ventilation); the gores or corners probably being tucked in between the two thicknesses of the roof-sheets. This sixth curtain, of course, was sewed *endwise* to one of the outer pieces of the under canvas. These roof-curtains were joined by means of fifty “loops” (**tab] uluslsth**) of unspecified (probably the same strong) material, and as many taches (**μysæq] keraszin**) of “brass.” With most interpreters, Fergusson understands these to be intended for connecting the edges of the two sheets together so as to form one roof canvas. But besides the uselessness of this (as above pointed out), on this plan the rain would find an easy inlet at this imperfect suture. Hence Paine more reasonably concludes that they were designed for buttoning down the double canvas at the eaves so as to form “one tent” (26, 11, **dj a, I haqi**.i.e. the upper or tent part of the building). The taches, accordingly, were not *hooks* (as most understand: Fergusson thinks “S hooks”), but knobs in the planks on the outside, placed one cubit below the top (ver. 12). The number of the taches would thus exactly correspond to the requirements of the “boards,” i.e. twenty for each side and eight for the end, with one additional for each rear corner

(where a tache would be needed for both edges of the board. the others being in the front edge, as the first board would necessarily have it there; in the rear boards the knob would be in the middle). *SEE TACHE*.

Picture for Tabernacle 14

(2.) Another set of curtains was provided, consisting of ten pieces of stuff, each twenty-eight cubits long and four cubits wide, to be sewed into two large cloths of five “curtains” or breadths each. From the general similarity of the description, interpreters have naturally inferred that they were to be joined and used in like manner; but the necessity or practicability of employing them over head is far from obvious. Nor does the size in that case suit; for besides the difficulty of disposing of the surplusage in breadth (in length they would be scant if double), we naturally ask, Why were they different in number and size from the other roofing material? Prof. Paine therefore thinks that they were sewed *end to end* (the original is **Htj aAl a,hVaæone to the other**, 26:3; different from **dbl j** separately, ver, 9, of the roof-curtains) in two long pieces (they: would probably have been woven thus had it been possible), and’ then hung double in loose drapery around the interior of the tabernacle, being just high enough (four cubits) to cover the joints of the boards and prevent any one from looking through the cracks from without. These curtains were suspended on fifty knobs or taches of gold by means of fifty loops of the same material as the curtains themselves; these fastenings may be arranged as in the case of the roof canvas. It thus became “one tabernacle (ver. 6, **^Kvjnæha**, i.e. these curtains belonged to the upright [wooden] part of the structure, in distinction from the sloping [canvas] or “tent” part above it)., The material of these inner curtains was similar to that of the door of the outer court (27:16), but it was also to be embroidered with cherubim, like the interior “vail” (26:31), which will be considered below.

Picture for Tabernacle 15

(3.) A coat of “rams skins dyed red and tachash (A. V. “badgers’,” probably seal or some other fur) skins” was furnished as an additional covering (26:14, **hl j jnl jnæmillenalah, from upward**). This is usually regarded as a part of the roof; but to pile them there would have been sure to catch, the rain, and so prove worse than useless. Paine places them on the outside of the “boards” to hide the cracks and prevent the wind and rain from driving in. Hence the number of skins is not specified; they were

to form a blanket sufficiently large to cover the walls, and run up under the edge of the roof-canvas so as to catch the drip from the eaves. Doubtless the tachash fur was placed next the smooth gilding, and in its natural state, because hidden; and the rougher but more durable ram's-wool was exposed, the hair shingling downward to the weather, but dyed a brilliant color for effect. They would naturally be hung upon the copper taches, which served so many useful purposes in the "boards." They are called in ver. 14 "a covering (**hskim** ^{מִקְשֶׁה} *mikseh*, not necessarily a roof, for it is used only of this fur robe [or some similar one, ^{וְהָיָה} Numbers 4:8.12] and of the screen [whatever that may have been] of Noah's ark [Genesis 42, 13]) for the tent" (**l hab**), apparently as completing the canvas or tent-like part of the structure.

Picture for Tabernacle 16

Saalschiütz (*Archiol. der Hebraer*, 2, 321 sq.) represents the hangings of the tabernacle as suspended in the form of a tent, but in a peculiar form. He thinks the **kvim** was properly the space enclosed by the boards of acacia-wood; and that these formed the outer wall, so to speak, *within* which the tabernacle, the **l hab** properly so called, was reared in the form of a peaked tent. Of this the byssus curtains, he supposes, formed the internal drapery, while the goats'-hair curtains, covered with leather and tachash skins, formed the outer covering. The whole structure would thus present the appearance externally of a peaked tent, reared within a high palisade of wood, and open at the front. This representation has the advantage of allowing the ornamental curtain, and also the gilded boards with their golden rings and silver sockets, to be fully visible. There seems, however, at least one fatal objection to it, viz. that it does not fulfill the condition that the joining of the curtains shall be over the pillars that separate the holy from the most holy place—a condition of essential significance, as we shall see.

(4.) The *doorways* of the tabernacle were formed or rather closed in a manner altogether analogous to the entrance of the exterior court, namely, by a vertical screen or sheet of cloth made of heavy material, and (in one case) still further stiffened by embroidery, similar to the piece of tapestry that hangs at the portal of modern cathedrals in Italy, or (to speak more Orientally) like the flap at the opening of a modern tent and the carpet or camlet partition between the male and female apartments of a Bedawin

abode. Of these there were two, each of which is denoted by a distinctive term rarely varied.

(a.) The front opening (j tP, *pethach*; A.V. “door”) was closed sufficiently high to prevent a passer-by from looking in, by a “hanging” (Ēkm; *masak*, a *screen*, or covering from the sun [^{<1079>}Psalm 105:39] or from observation [^{<1079>}2 Samuel 7:19; ^{<2028>}Isaiah 22:8]) of materials exactly like that of the entrance to the court already described, suspended upon five copper-socketed and gilded pillars (μydwε []) of acacia-wood by means of golden hooks (μywe *pegs*, spoken only of these and those at the outer entrance), the whole being probably of the same height, proportions, and style in other respects as the exterior one just referred to. The number of these pillars is significant: as there were five of them, one must necessarily stand in the center, and this one was probably carried up, so as to support one end of the ridge-pole, which we have above seen is presumable. A corresponding pillar in the rear of the tent may be inferred to sustain the other end, and possibly one or more in the middle of the building. (b.) A “vail” (tkrē; *paroiketh*, *separatrix*, used only of this particular thing, sometimes [^{<1252>}Exodus 35:12; 39:34; 40, 21] with the addition of the previous term for emphasis) divided the interior into two apartments, called respectively the “holy place” and the “most holy.” This partition-cloth differed only from the exterior ones in being ornamented (perhaps on both sides; comp. ^{<1169>}1 Kings 6:29) with figures of cherubim stitched (probably with gold thread, i.e. strips of goldleaf rolled and twisted) upon it, apparently with the art of the embroiderer (bvε hcēni *the work of an artificer*; A.V. “cunning work”). It was suspended upon four pillars precisely like those of the door “hanging,” except that their sockets were of silver. A special statement of the text (^{<1253>}Exodus 26:33), “And thou shalt hang up the vail under the taches” (tkrēhAtachTtiwlysræhi t j i), evidently meaning that the pillars to which its ends were to be attached were to be placed directly beneath the golden knobs opposite in the walls, on which-likewise hung the side-curtains, shows both that these latter were thus completed by a drapery on the remaining side of each room (it will be remembered that the front knobs likewise correspond in position to that of the doorway screen), and likewise proves the character and situation of the taches themselves (not hooks in the roof, which at the eaves was at least five cubits above the top of the “vail”). As the vail,” like the two outer screens, was stretched tight across the space it occupied, it

was of course made exactly long enough for that purpose; thus, too, the embroidered figures (which, if of life-size, were of just the height to extend upright across the stuff-about four cubits) would show to the finest effect, not being it folds like the interior side-curtains.

It is not a little singular that the exact position of the "vail" is not otherwise prescribed than by the above requirement; nor is the length of either of the apartments which it separated given, although together they amounted) to thirty cubits. On the supposition (sustained by the analogy in the Temple) that the Most Holy was an exact square, i.e. (according to our determination above) twelve cubits each way, the knob or tache opposite which it would hang must have been that which stood in the forward edge of the eighth plank from the rear of the building. Whether it was in front of or behind the pillars is not certain; but the former is probable, as it would thus seem a more effectual barrier from without. The end pillars apparently stood in immediate contact with the side walls, both in order to sustain the ends of the vail, and to leave a wider space between them for ingress and egress. The vail was suspended directly upon golden pins (A.V. "hooks") inserted in the face of the pillars near their summit; and thus differed (as did likewise the screen of the door of the tabernacle) from the hangings of the outer court, which hung upon silver rods (A. V. "fillets") (doubtless by loops running on the rods) resting on similar pins or "hooks." The reason of this difference seems to have been that the greater space between the court pillars (so as to admit animals as well as men) would have caused too much sag in the hanging without intermediate support, which could only be furnished by the rods and attachments along the upper edge.

4. Supplementary Note. — Since the above was in type we have reconsidered a few points concerning the structure of this edifice which admit of further elucidation.

(1.) The "Corner-boards." — The fact that the dimensions of the courts and the building itself were in decimal proportions, and that in the temple subsequently erected for the same purpose, which maintained multiples of these dimensions, the holy and most holy were exactly twenty cubits wide (~~<K&P>~~ 1 Kings 6:2), leads so strongly to the presumption that in the tabernacle these rooms were ten cubits wide, that we are disposed to recall the arrangement adopted in the foregoing discussion, which gives these apartments a width of twelve cubits, leaving for the holy place the irregular dimensions of eighteen by twelve cubits. Adopting the suggestion of Keil

(*Commentary*, ad loc.) that the corner-boards were constructed of two-parts, forming a right angle with each other, we have only to take a plank one and a half cubits wide, like all the others, divide it lengthwise into two portions, one four sixths and the other five sixths of a cubit wide, and fasten these together in that manner, in order to obtain the needed half cubit necessary at each end of the rear, and allow one wing of the corner-board to lap around the end of the last side-board, and cover the joint neatly and symmetrically, as in the following figure. This last is the adjustment adopted by Brown (*The Tabernacle*, etc. [Lond. 1872], p. 23), who reviews and justly rejects the conjectures of Josephus (*Ant.* 3, 6, 3), Kalisck (*Commentary*, ad loc.), and Von Gerlach (*ibid.*). His complicated arrangement of the sockets, however, is unnecessary, as may be seen from the following diagram.

Picture for Tabernacle 17

The statement respecting these corner -planks in ~~Exodus~~ Exodus 26:24, “And they shall be *twinned* (μῦμαῖ) from below, and together they shall be *complete* (μῦμαῖ) upon its top to the first (or *same*) ring,” we may then understand to mean that they were to be in that, manner jointed throughout their length, and were to use the first or end ring of the side-plank in common for the topmost bar, thus holding the corner firm in both directions, as seen in the accompanying figure. The topmost rear bar may have been dowelled into the end of the side-bar for further security.

Picture for Tabernacle 18

(2.) *Position of the Curtains.* The use of these pieces of drapery will not be materially affected by this change in the width of the structure. We need only raise the peak into an acute instead of a right angle in order to dispose of the roof-canvas. The curtain across the rear gable may be wrapped a little farther along the side at each end, and it will at the same time cover the tops of the rear planks, and close the joint where the ends of the roof-curtains fall short of doing so.

On the supposition of a flat roof stretched directly across the tops of the planks, the dimensions of both sets of curtains may readily be made to correspond with the requirements of the building. The embroidered curtains may either be used around the walls, as previously, or they may be joined together into one large sheet to cover the ceiling and walls on the

inside. Their length (twenty-eight cubits) would in the latter case reach to within one cubit of the ground; and their combined breadth (forty cubits) would in like manner cover the end wall (ten cubits + thirty cubits of length of building). The suture, where the two canvases are ordinarily supposed to be joined by the loops, would thus also exactly fall over the “vail,” separating the holy from the most holy place.

The same would be true likewise of the goats'-hair curtains if similarly joined and spread over the roof and outside of the tabernacle, reaching to within one sixth cubit of the ground on each side and rear. The only difficulty would be as to the eleventh or extra goats hair curtain. If this were attached in the same manner as the other breadths, it would be wholly superfluous, unless used to close the entire front, as it might be if doubled (according to the usual interpretation of ~~Exodus~~ Exodus 26:9). But it seems agreed upon by all critics that it must be employed upon the *rear* of the building (as explicitly stated in ver. 12). Keil understands that it was divided between the back and the front equally; but this answers to neither passage, makes part of the rear *trebly* covered in fact, and brings (by his own confession) the suture one cubit behind the “vail” (contrary to ver. 33). Brown reviews and confutes the explanations of other interpreters (Kalisch, Von Gerlach, and Fergusson), but frankly admits his own inability to solve the problem (p. 43). Paine's interpretation is the only one that meets the case.

This last insuperable difficulty, together with the impossibility of shedding the rain and snow, seems to us a conclusive objection against the flat-roof theory of the building. Brown innocently remarks (p. 47), “Admitting that snow sometimes falls on the mountains of Sinai, it seldom, if ever, falls in the wadies or plains; and if slight showers ever do occur, they must be like angels visits, few and far between. None of the many authors I have followed across the desert of wandering seem ever to have witnessed snow, and very rarely even rain.” This last circumstance is probably owing to the fact that travelers almost invariably avoid the winter or rainy season. The writer of this article was overtaken, with his party, by a snow-storm in March, 1874, which covered the ground in the plains and bottoms of the wadies of Mount Sinai ankle-deep; and every traveler must have observed the unmistakable traces of terrific. floods or freshets along the valleys of the whole region. It often rains here in perfect torrents (see Palmer, *Desert of the Exodus*, p. 33,177). “A single thunder-storm, with a heavy shower of rain, falling on the naked granite mountains, will be sufficient to convert

a dry and level valley into a roaring river in a few short hours” (*ibid.* p. 129). It is essential to any reconstruction of the tabernacle that the roof be made water-tight, and this can only be done effectually by the true tent-form, with ridge and peak. *SEE TENT.*

5. Furniture of the Tabernacle. — The only piece of furniture within the inner or most holy place was the ark of the covenant; and the furniture of the outer room or holy place consisted of the altar of incense, the table of show-bread, and the “golden candlestick,” the position of each of which is given in ^(125b)Exodus 26:34, 35. They are all described in detail under their respective heads in this *Cyclopaedia*, but we subjoin the following particulars as supplementary to the article on the last-named piece. The *candelabrum*, as described in ^(125b)Exodus 25:31-37 (of which 37:17-23 is almost verbatim a copy), differs considerably from that in the account of Josephus (*Ant.* 3, 6, 7), and from the sculptured figure still extant upon the Arch of Titus (Reland, *De Spoliis Templi*, p. 6; in which work other representations, all slightly varying, are given from Rabbinical sources and coins). Hence it is probable that the “candlestick” as constructed for the tabernacle by Moses was not exactly the same in form as in the later models of Solomon’s and Herod’s temples; it would naturally be simpler and less ornamental in the earliest case, and the Herodian fabrication (if, indeed, this were other than that of the restoration from Babylon), to which all the later Jewish and profane statements apply (Solomon does not appear to have furnished his Temple with any other than the original candelabrum of the tabernacle), would of course depart most widely from the severity of the primitive type.

Picture for Tabernacle 19

(1.) In the original object, the following elements are clearly defined by the language (as above) employed: There was a main or central stem (**Ērḡ**, *yarek*, thigh, A.V. “shaft”), doubtless flaring or enlarged at the bottom, for a secure foot. From each side of this went off (apparently opposite each other, and at equal intervals), three arms (**μynḡ**, *kanimr*, reeds, “branches”), having each along their course three almond-shaped calyces (**μy[ḡ]**, *gebim*, cups, “bowls”), one crown (**ṛTḡk**, *kaphtor*, circlet, “knop”), and one blossom (**j ṛP**, *perach*, flower): the middle stem had four such calyces, and at least three crowns, placed each immediately beneath the several junctions of the arms with the main stem; also more

than one blossom. Finally, there were seven burners ($\mu\gamma\rho\alpha\epsilon$ nerzi, lights, “lamps”), evidently one for the extremity of each arm, and one for the top of the central stem.’ Every part of the candelabrum (including the burners, only so far as applicable to them) was a continuous rounded (hammered or turned) piece of refined gold ($\rho\omega\beta\epsilon; \beta\eta\zeta; \tau\eta \alpha\iota\eta\nu\alpha\iota\eta\alpha\epsilon$ “one beaten work of pure gold”). It has usually been assumed that the arms were all in the same plane with the main stem, and their summits all of equal height, and equidistant from each other, as is the case with the representation on the Arch of Titus.

(2.) The following are the principal points that remain uncertain: The relative position of the calyces, crowns, and blossoms on the arms; for although they are always enumerated in this order, there is nothing to show absolutely whether the enumeration begins at the intersection with the shaft or with the extremities. The former view, which is countenanced by the rest of the description (since this proceeds upward from the base), is adopted by Dr. Conant (in the Amer. ed. of Smith’s *Dict. of the Bible*, s.v. “Candlestick”); the latter, which is favored by the difficulty (or rather impossibility) of assigning more than one blossom to the summit of the central stem (as the text would then seem to require), is adopted by Prof. Paine (*Solomon’s Temple*, etc., p. 10). The signification of the terms is not decisive; for the *kaphtor*, or “knop,” may quite as well signify a little ornamental *ball* or globular enlargement in the necks of the arms and in the stem at their points of departure, as a *capital* or surmounting decoration (the three ranged along the main stem certainly were not such in strictness). The *perach*, or “flower,” is regarded by both the above writers (who thus agree in making these, after all, the extreme points of the chandelier) as the “receptacles” of the lamps themselves; these last being regarded by Paine as denoted by the *gebiim*, or “bowls,” having a triangular form in the case of the side arms, and a quaternary in that of the main stem a view which leads to great complexity in their construction and in the form of their sockets, and which, moreover, is incongruent with the number (seven only) assigned to the lights. Furthermore, in the comparison of the ornament in question with the shape of *almonds*, it is not clear whether the *flower* or *fruit* of that tree is referred to; we prefer the latter as being more properly designated by the simple word, and because the former is denoted by a different term in the same connection, the blossom shaped ornament. It must also be noted that the arms had each three of the first-named ornament, and but one of the other two; whereas the main stem had four

of' the first, and at least three of the second and two of the third: the three kinds, therefore, did not invariably go together, although they may have done so in the case of the central stem. Perhaps the whole may be best adjusted by assigning such a group or combination of the three kinds to each summit and to each intersection of the arms with the main stem, and merely two others of one kind (the *gebia*, or "bowl") to the side arms, probably at equidistant points; the group itself consisting simply of an ovate cup-like enlargement of the rod constituting the shaft, with a raised band just above the bulb, and the rim opening into petal-like lips, forming a cavity or socket for the lamp. *SEE LAMP.*

IV. *Relation of the Tabernacle to the Religious Life of Israel.* —1.

Whatever connection may be traced between other parts of the Mosaic ritual and that of the nations with which Israel had been brought into contact, the thought of the tabernacle meets us as entirely new. Spencer (*De Leg. Hebraeor.* 3, 3) labors hard, but not successfully, to prove that the tabernacles of Moloch of ^{<01026>}Amos 5:26 were the prototypes of the tent of meeting. It has to be remembered, however, (1) that the word used in Amos (*sikkuth*) is never used of the tabernacle, and means something very different; and (2) that the Moloch-worship represented a defection of the people *subsequent* to the erection of the tabernacle. The "house of God" *SEE BETHEL* of the patriarchs had been the large "pillar of stone" (^{<0238>}Genesis 28:18, 19), bearing record of some high spiritual experience, and tending to lead men upward to it (Bahr, *Symbol.* 1, 93), or the grove which, with its dim, doubtful light, attuned the souls of men to a divine awe (^{<0233>}Genesis 21:33). The temples of Egypt were magnificent and colossal, hewn in the solid rock, or built of huge blocks of stone as unlike as possible to the sacred tent of Israel. The command was one in which we can trace a special fitness. The stately temples belonged to the house of bondage which they were leaving. The sacred places of their fathers were in the land towards which they were journeying. In the meanwhile, they were to be wanderers in the wilderness. To have set up a bethel after the old pattern would have been to make that a resting-place, the object then or afterwards of devout pilgrimage; and the multiplication of such places at the different stages of their march would have led inevitably to polytheism. It would have failed utterly to lead them to the thought which they needed most of a Divine Presence never absent from them, protecting, ruling, judging. A sacred tent, a moving bethel, was the fit sanctuary for a people still nomadic. It was capable of being united afterwards, as it actually came

to be, with “the grove” of the older *cultus* (¹⁹²⁸Joshua 24:26). Analogies of like wants, met in a like way, with no ascertainable historical connection, are to be found among the Gaetulians and other tribes of Northern Africa (Sil. Ital. 3, 289), and in the sacred tent of the Carthaginian encampments (Diod. Sic. 20:65).

2. The structure of the tabernacle was obviously determined by a complex and profound symbolism, but its meaning remains one of the things at which we can but dimly guess. No interpretation is given in the law itself. The explanations of Jewish writers long afterwards are manifestly wide of the mark. That which meets us in the Epistle to the Hebrews, the application of *the types* of the tabernacle to the mysteries of redemption, was latent till those mysteries were made known. Yet we cannot but believe that, as each portion of the wonderful order rose before the inward eye of the lawgiver, it must have embodied distinctly manifold truths which he apprehended himself and sought to communicate to others. It entered, indeed, into the order of a divine education for Moses and for Israel, and an education by means of symbols, no less than by means of words presupposes an existing language. So far from shrinking, therefore, as men have timidly and unwisely shrunk. (Witsius, *Egyptiae*, in Ugolijo, *Thesaur.* vol. 1), from asking what thoughts the Egyptian education of Moses would lead him to connect with the symbols he was now taught to use, we may see in it a legitimate method of inquiry almost the only method possible. Where that fails, the gap may be filled up (as in Bahr, *Symbol.* passim) from the analogies of other nations, indicating, where they agree, a widespread primeval symbolism. So far from laboring to prove, at the price of ignoring or distorting facts, that everything was till then unknown, we shall as little expect to find it so, as to see in Hebrew a new and heaven-born language, spoken for the first time on Sinai, written for the first time on the two tables of the covenant.

3. The thought of a graduated sanctity, like that of the outer court, the holy place, the holy of holies, had its counterpart, often the same number of stages, in the structure of Egyptian temples (Bahr, *Symbol.* 1, 216). *SEE TEMPLE.*

(1.) The interior adytum (to proceed from the innermost recess outward) was small in proportion to the rest of the building, and commonly, as in the tabernacle (Josephus, *Ant.* 2, 6. 3), was at the western end (Spencer, *De Leg. Hebreor.* 3, 2), and was but little lighted. In the adytum, often at least,

was the sacred ark, the culminating point of holiness, containing the highest and most mysterious symbols-winged figures generally like those of the cherubim (Wilkinson, *Anc. Egypt.* 5, 275; Kenrick, *Egypt*, 1, 460), the emblems of stability and life. Here were outward points of resemblance. Of all elements of Egyptian worship this was old which could be transferred with least hazard, with most gain. No one could think that the ark itself was the likeness of the God he worshipped. When we ask what gave the ark its holiness, we are led on at once to the infinite difference, the great gulf between the two systems. That of Egypt was predominantly *cosmical*, starting from the productive powers of nature. The symbols of those powers, though not originally involving what we know as impurity, tended to it fatally and rapidly (Spencer) *Leg. Hebreor.* 3, 1; Warburton, *Divine Legation*, 2, 4, note). That of Israel was predominantly *ethical*. The nation was taught to think of God, not chiefly as revealed in nature, but as manifesting himself in and to the spirits of men. In the ark of the covenant, as the highest revelation then possible of the Divine nature, were the two tables of stone, on which were graven, by the teaching of the Divine Spirit, and therefore by the finger of God” (ⲁⲓⲚⲨ Matthew 12:28; ⲁⲓⲓⲓ Luke 11:20; see also Clement of Alexandria [*Strom.* 6:133] and ⲁⲓⲠⲔⲉ 1 Kings 18:46; ⲁⲓⲠⲓⲒⲒ 2 Kings 3:15; ⲁⲓⲠⲓⲒⲒ Ezekiel 1:3; 3:14; ⲁⲓⲠⲓⲒⲒ 1 Chronicles 28:19), the great unchanging laws of human duty which had been proclaimed on Sinai. Here the lesson taught was plain enough. The highest knowledge was as the simplest, the esoteric as the exoteric. In the depths of the holy of holies, and for the high-priest as for all Israel, there was the revelation of a righteous Will requiring righteousness in man (Saalschitz, *Archaöl.* c. 77).
SEE ARK.

Over the ark was the *kophereth* (“mercy-seat”), so called with a twofold reference to the root-meaning of the word. It *covered* the ark. It was the witness of a mercy *covering* sins. As the “footstool” of God, the “throne” of the Divine glory, it declared that over the law which seemed so rigid and unbending there rested the compassion of one forgiving “iniquity and transgression.” Ewald, however, giving to ϣⲡⲕ; the root of *kophereth*, the meaning of “to scrape,” “erase,” derives from that meaning. the idea implied in the Sept. ἱλαστήριον, and denies that the word ever signified ἐπίθεμα (*Alterth.* p. 128, 129). **SEE MERCY-SEAT.**

Over the mercy-seat were the cherubim, reproducing, in part, at least, the symbolism of the great Harnitic races, forms familiar to Moses and to Israel, needing no description for them, interpreted for us by the fuller

vision of the later prophets (~~3005~~ Ezekiel 1:5-13; 10:8-15; 41:19), or by the winged forms of the imagery of Egypt. Representing as they did the manifold powers of nature, created life in its highest form (Bihar, *De Leg. Hebreor.* 1, 341), their “overshadowing wings,” “meeting” as in token of perfect harmony, declared that nature as well as man found its highest glory in subjection to a divine law, that men might take refuge in that order, as under “the shadow of the wings” of God (Stanley, *Jewish Church*, p. 98). Placed where those and other like figures were, in the temples of Egypt, they might be hindrances and not helps, might sensualize instead of purifying the worship of the people. But it was part of the wisdom which we may reverently trace in the order of the tabernacle that while Egyptian symbols are retained, as in the ark, the cherubim, the urim, and the thummim, their place is changed. They remind the high-priest, the representative of the whole nation, of the truths in which the order rests. The people cannot bow down and worship that which they never see. **SEE *CHERUBIM.***

The material, not less than the forms, in the holy of holies was significant. The acacia or shittim-wood, least liable of woods then accessible to decay, might well represent the imperishableness of divine truth, of the laws of duty (Bahr, *Symbol.* 1, 286). Ark, mercy seat, cherubim, the very walls, were all overlaid with gold, the noblest of all metals, the symbol of light and purity-sunlight itself, as it were, fixed and embodied, the token of the incorruptible, of the glory of a great king (*ibid.* 1, 282). It was not without meaning that all this lavish expenditure of what was most costly was placed where none might gaze on it. The gold thus offered taught man that the noblest acts of beneficence and sacrifice are not those which are done that they may be seen of men, but those which are known only to him who “seeth in secret” (~~4005~~ Matthew 6:4).

Dimensions also had their meaning. Difficult as it may be to feel sure that we have the key to the enigma, there can be but little doubt that the older religious systems of the world did attach a mysterious significance to each separate number; that the training of Moses, as afterwards the far less complete initiation of Pythagoras in the symbolism of Egypt, must have made that transparently clear to him, which to us is almost impenetrably dark. A full discussion of the subject is obviously impossible here, but it may be useful to exhibit briefly the chief thoughts which have been connected with the numbers that are most prominent in the language of symbolism. Arbitrary as some of them may seem, a sufficient induction to

establish each will be found in Bahr's elaborate dissertation (*Symbol.* 1, 128-255) and other works (comp. Wilkinson, *Anc. Egypt.* 4:190-199; Leyrer, in Herzog's *Real-Encyklop.* s.v. "Stiftshüte").

ONE — The Godhead, eternity, life, creative force, the sun, man.

TWO — Matter, time, death, receptive capacity, the moon, woman.

THREE — (as a number or in the triangle) — The universe in connection with God, the absolute in itself, the unconditioned, God.

FOUR — (the number, or in the square or cube)-Conditioned existence, the world as created, divine order, revelation.

SEVEN — (as 3 + 4)-The union of the world and God, rest (as in the Sabbath), peace, blessing, purification.

TEN — (as = 1 + 2 + 3 + 4) — Completeness, moral and physical, perfection.

FIVE — Perfection half attained, incompleteness.

TWELVE — The sign of the zodiac, the cycle of the seasons; in Israel the ideal number of the people, of the covenant of God with them. To those who think over the words of two great teachers, one heathen (Plutarch, *De Is. et Os.* p. 411) and one Christian (Clem. Al. *Strom.* 6:84-87), who had at least studied as far as they could the mysteries of the religion of Egypt, and had inherited part of the old system, the precision of the numbers in the plan of the tabernacle will no longer seem unaccountable. If, in a cosmical system, a right-angled triangle, with the sides three, four, five, represented the triad of Osiris, Isis, Orus, creative force, receptive matter, the universe of creation (Plutarch, *loc. cit.*), the perfect cube of the holy of holies, the constant recurrence of the numbers 4 and 10, may well be accepted as symbolizing order, stability, perfection (Bahr, *Symbol.* 1, 225). The symbol reappears in the most startling form in the closing visions of the Apocalypse. There the heavenly Jerusalem is described, in words which absolutely exclude the literalism that has sometimes been blindly applied to it, as a city four-square-12,000 furlongs in length and breadth and height (⁶²¹⁶Revelation 21:16). *SEE NUMBER.*

Into the inner sanctuary neither people nor the priests as a body ever entered. Strange as it may seem, that in which everything represented light

and life was left in darkness and solitude. Once only in the year, on the day of atonement, might the high-priest enter. The strange contrast has, however, its parallel in the spiritual life. Death and life, light and darkness, are wonderfully united. Only through death can we truly live. Only by passing into the “thick darkness” where God is (^{<OR21>}Exodus 20:21; ^{<OR2>}1 Kings 8:12) can we enter at all into the “light inaccessible” in which he dwells everlastingly. The solemn annual entrance, like the withdrawal of symbolic forms from the gaze of the people, was itself part of a wise and divine order. Intercourse with Egypt had shown how easily the symbols of truth might become common and familiar things, yet without symbols the truths themselves might be forgotten. Both dangers were met. To enter once, and once only in the year, into the awful darkness—to stand before the law of duty, before the presence of the God who gave it, not in the stately robes that became the representative of God to man, but as representing man in his humiliation in the garb of the lowly priests, barefooted and in the linen ephod to confess his own sins and the sins of the people this was what connected the atonement-day (*kippur*) with the mercy-seat (*kophereth*). To come there with blood, the symbol of life, touching with that blood the mercy-seat with incense, the symbol of adoration (^{<OR62>}Leviticus 16:12-14), what did that express but the truth (1) that man must draw near to the righteous God with no lower offering than the pure worship of the heart, with the living sacrifice of body, soul, and spirit; (2) that could such a perfect sacrifice be found, it would have a mysterious power working beyond itself, in proportion to its perfection, to cover the multitude of sins?

From all others, from the high-priest at all other times, the holy of holies was shrouded by the heavy veil, bright with many colors and strange forms, even as curtains of golden tissue were to be seen hanging before the adytum of an Egyptian temple, a strange contrast often to the bestial form behind them (Clem. Al. *Peed.* 3, 4). In one memorable instance, indeed, the veil was the witness of higher and deeper thoughts. On the shrine of Isis at Sais, there were to be read words which, though pointing to a pantheistic rather than an ethical religion, were yet wonderful in their loftiness, “I am all that has been ($\pi\acute{\alpha}\nu \tau\acute{o} \gamma\epsilon\gamma\omicron\nu\acute{o}\varsigma$), and is, and shall be, and my veil no mortal hath withdrawn” ($\acute{\alpha}\pi\epsilon\kappa\acute{\alpha}\lambda\upsilon\psi\epsilon\nu$) (Plutarch, *De Is. et Osir.* p. 394). Like, and yet more unlike, the truth, we feel that no such words could have appeared on the veil of the tabernacle. In that identification of the world and God all idolatry was latent, as, in the faith of Israel, in the *I am all*

idolatry was excluded. In that despair of any withdrawal of the veil, of any revelation of the Divine will, there were latent' all the arts of an unbelieving priestcraft, substituting symbols, pomp, ritual, for such a revelation. But what, then, was the meaning of the veil which met the gaze of the priests as they did service in the sanctuary? Colors, in the art of Egypt, were not less significant than number, and the four bright colors, probably, after the fashion of that art, in parallel bands-blue, symbol of heaven, and purple of kingly glory, and crimson of life and joy, and white of light and purity (Bahr, *Symbol.* 1, 305-330)-formed in their combination no remote similitude of the rainbow, which of old had been a symbol of the Divine covenant with man, the pledge of peace and hope, the sign of the Divine Presence (^{<2028>}Ezekiel 1:28; Ewald, *Alterth.* p. 333). *SEE COLOR.* Within the veil, light and truth were seen in their unity. The veil itself represented the infinite variety, the *πολυποίκιλος σοφία* of the divine order in creation (^{<2029>}Ephesians 3:10). There, again, were seen copied upon the veil the mysterious forms of the cherubim; how many, or in what attitude, or of what size, or in what material, we are not told. The words "cunning work" in ^{<2035>}Exodus 36:35, applied elsewhere to combinations of embroidery and metal (^{<2035>}Exodus 28:15; 31:4), seem to justify the conjecture that here also they were of gold. In the absence of any other evidence, it would have been perhaps natural to think that they reproduced on a larger scale the number and the position of those that were over the mercy-seat. The visions of Ezekiel, however, reproducing, as they obviously do, the forms with which his priestly life had made him familiar, indicate not less than four (Ezekiel ch. 1 and 10), and those not all alike, having severally the faces of a man, a lion, an ox, and an eagle strange symbolic words, which elsewhere we should have identified with idolatry, but which here were bearing witness against it, emblems of the manifold variety of creation as at once manifesting and concealing God.

(2.) The outer sanctuary was one degree less awful in its holiness than the inner. Silver, the type of human purity, took the place of gold, the type of the Divine glory (Bahr, *Symbol.* 1, 284). It was to be trodden daily by the priests as by men who lived in the perpetual consciousness of the nearness of God, of the mystery behind the veil. Barefooted and in garments of white linen, like the priests of Isis, *SEE PRIEST*, they accomplished their ministrations. Here, too, there were other emblems of divine realities. It was specially illumined by the golden lamp with its seven lights, never all extinguished together, the perpetual symbol of all derived gifts of wisdom

and holiness in man, reaching their mystical perfection when they shine in God's sanctuary to his glory (^{<0253>}Exodus 25:31; 27:20; ^{<3001>}Zechariah 4:1-14). The shew-bread (the "bread of faces") of the Divine Presence, not unlike in outward form to the sacred cakes which the Egyptians placed before the shrines of their gods, served as a token that, though there was no form or likeness of the Godhead, he was yet there, accepting all offerings, recognizing in particular that special offering which represented the life of the nation at once in the distinctness of its tribes and in its unity as a people (Ewald, *Alterth.* p. 120). The meaning of the altar of incense was not less obvious. The cloud of fragrant smoke was the natural, almost the universal, emblem of the heart's adoration (^{<3902>}Psalms 141:2). The incense sprinkled on the shew-bread and the lamp taught men that all other offerings needed the intermingling of that adoration. Upon that altar no "strange fire" was to be kindled. When fresh fire was needed it was to be taken from the altar of burnt-offering in the outer court (^{<0124>}Leviticus 9:24; 10:1). (Very striking, as compared with what is to follow, are the sublimity and the purity of these symbols. It is as if the priestly order, already leading a consecrated life, were capable of understanding a higher language which had to be translated into a lower for those that were still without (Saalschütz. *Archaöl.* § 77).

(3.) Outside the tent, but still within the consecrated precincts, was the court fenced in by an enclosure, yet open to all the congregation as well as to the Levites, those only excepted who were ceremonially unclean. No Gentile might pass beyond the curtains of the entrance, but every member of the priestly nation might thus far "draw near" to the presence of Jehovah. Here, therefore, stood the altar of burnt-offerings, at which sacrifices in all their varieties were offered by penitent or thankful worshippers (^{<0271>}Exodus 27:1-8; 38:1), the brazen laver at which those worshippers purified themselves before they sacrificed, the priests before they entered into the sanctuary (^{<0207>}Exodus 30:17-21). Here the graduated scale of holiness ended. What Israel was to the world, fenced in and set apart, that the court of the tabernacle was to the surrounding wilderness, just as the distinction between it and the sanctuary answered to that between the sons of Aaron and other Israelites; just as the idea of holiness culminated personally in the high-priest, locally in the holy of holies.

V. *Theories of Later Times.* —

1. It is not probable that the elaborate symbolism of such a structure was understood by the rude and sensual multitude that came out of Egypt. In its fullness, perhaps, no mind but that of the lawgiver himself ever entered into it, and even for him, one half, and that the highest, of its meaning must have been altogether latent. Yet it was not the less, was perhaps the more fitted, on that account, to be an instrument for the education of the people. To the most ignorant and debased it was at least a witness of the nearness of the Divine King. It met the craving of the human heart, which prompts to worship, with an order that was neither idolatrous nor impure. It taught men that their fleshly nature was the hindrance to worship; that it rendered them unclean; that only by subduing it, killing it, as they killed the bullock and the goat, could they offer up an acceptable sacrifice; that such a sacrifice was the condition of forgiveness, a higher sacrifice than any they could offer as the ground of that forgiveness. The sins of the past were considered as belonging to the fleshly nature, which was slain and offered, not to the true inner self of the worshipper. More thoughtful minds were led inevitably to higher truths. They were not slow to see in the tabernacle the parable of God's presence manifested in creation. Darkness was as his pavilion (^{<1021>}2 Samuel 22:12). He has made a tabernacle for the sun (^{<1014>}Psalm 19:4). The heavens were spread out like its curtains. The beams of his chambers were in the mighty waters (^{<1041>}Psalm 104:2, 3; Isaiah 40, 22; Lowth, *De Sac. Poes.* 8). The majesty of God seen in the storm and tempest was as of one who rides upon a cherub (^{<1021>}2 Samuel 22:11). If the words "He that dwelleth between the cherubim" spoke on the one side of a special, localized manifestation of the Divine Presence, they spoke also on the other of that Presence as in the heaven of heavens, in the light of setting suns, in the blackness and the flashes of the thunder-clouds.

2. The thought thus uttered, essentially poetical in its nature, had its fit place in the psalms and hymns of Israel. It lost its beauty, it led men on a false track, when it was formalized into a system. At a time when Judaism and Greek philosophy were alike effete, when a feeble physical science which could read nothing but its own thoughts in the symbols of an older and deeper system was after its own fashion rationalizing the mythology of heathenism, there were found Jewish writers willing to apply the same principle of interpretation to the tabernacle and its order. In that way, it seemed to them, they would secure the respect even of the men of letters who could not bring themselves to be proselytes. The result appears in Josephus and in Philo, in part also in Clement of Alexandria and Origen.

Thus interpreted, the entire significance of the two tables of the covenant and their place within the ark disappeared, and the truths which the whole order represented became *cosmical* instead of ethical. If the special idiosyncrasy of one writer (Philo, *De Profug.*) led him to see in the holy of holies and the sanctuary that which answered to the Platonic distinction between the visible (ἀϊσθητά) and the spiritual (νοητά), the coarser, less intelligent Josephus goes still more completely into the new-system. The holy of holies is the visible firmament in which God dwells, the sanctuary is the earth and sea which men inhabit (*Ant.* 3, 6, 4, 7; 7, 7). The twelve loaves of the shew-bread represented the twelve months of the year, the twelve signs of the zodiac. The seven lamps were the seven planets. The four colors of the vail were the four elements (στοιχεῖα), air, fire, water, earth. Even the wings of the cherubim were, in the eyes of some, the two hemispheres of the universe, or the constellations of the greater and the lesser bears (*Clem. Alex. Strom.* 5, 35). The table of shew-bread and the altar of incense stood on the north, because north winds were most fruitful; the lamp on the south, because the motions of the planets were southward (*ibid.* § 34, 35). We need not follow such a system of interpretation further. It was not unnatural that the authority with which it started should secure for it considerable respect. We find it reappearing in some Christian writers—Chrysostom (*Hom. in Joann. Bampton.*) and Theodoret (*Quaest. in Exodus*); in some Jewish—Ben-Uzziel, Kimchi, Abarbanel (*Bahr, Symbol.* 1, 103 sq.). It was well for Christian thought that the Church had in the Epistle to the Hebrews and the Apocalypse of St. John that which helped to save it from the pedantic puerilities of this physico-theology. It is curious to note how in Clement of Alexandria the two systems of interpretation cross each other, leading sometimes to extravagances like those in the text, sometimes to thoughts at once lofty and true. Some of these have already been noticed. Others, not to be passed over, are that the seven lamps set forth the varied degrees and forms (πολυμερῶς καὶ πολυτρόπως) of God's revelation, the form and the attitude of the cherubim, the union of active ministry and grateful, ceaseless contemplation (*Strom.* 5, 36, 37).

3. It will have been clear from all that has been said that the Epistle to the Hebrews has not been looked on as designed to limit our inquiry into the meaning of the symbolism of the tabernacle, and that there is consequently no ground for adopting the system of interpreters who can see in it nothing but an aggregate of types of Christian mysteries. Such a system has, in fact,

to choose between two alternatives. Either the meaning was made clear, at least to the devout worshippers of old, and then it is no longer true that the mystery was hid “from ages and generations,” or else the mystery was concealed and then the whole order was voiceless and unmeaning as long as it lasted, then only beginning to be instructive when it was “ready to vanish away.” Rightly viewed, there is, it is believed, no antagonism between the interpretation which starts from the idea of *symbols* of great eternal truths, and that, which rests on the idea of *types* foreshadowing Christ and his Work and his Church. If the latter were the highest manifestation of the former (and this is the keynote of the Epistle to the Hebrews), then the two systems run parallel with each other. The type may help us to understand the symbol. The symbol may guard us against misinterpreting the type. That the same things were at once symbols and types may take its place among the proofs of an insight and a foresight more than human. Not the vail of nature only, but the vail of the flesh, the humanity of Christ, at once conceals and manifests the Eternals glory. The rending of that vail enabled all who had eyes to see and hearts to believe to enter into the holy of holies, into the Divine Presence, and to see, not less clearly than the high-priest, as he looked on the ark and the mercy-seat, that righteousness and love, truth and mercy, were as one. Blood had been shed, a life had been offered which, through the infinite power of its love, was able to atone, to satisfy, to purify.

The allusions to the tabernacle in the Apocalypse are, as might be expected, full of interest. As in a vision, which loses sight of all time limits, the temple of the tabernacle is seen in heaven (^(~~615~~) Revelation 15:5), and yet in the heavenly Jerusalem there is no temple seen (^(~~612~~) Revelation 21:22). In the heavenly temple there is no longer any vail; it is open, and the ark of the covenant is clearly seen (^(~~619~~) Revelation 11:19).

4. We cannot here follow out that strain of a higher mood, and it would not be profitable to enter into the speculations which later writers have engrafted on the first great thought. Those who wish to enter upon that line of inquiry may find materials enough in any of the greater commentaries on the Epistle to the Hebrews (Owen’s, Stuart’s, Bleek’s, Tholuck’s, Delitzsch’s, Alford’s), or in special treatises, such as those of Van Till (*De Tabernac.* in Ugolino, *Thesaurus*, 8), Bede (*Expositio Mystica et Moralis Hosaici Tabernaculi*), Witsils (*De Tabern. Levit. Mysteriis*, in the *Miscell. Sacr.*). Strange outlying hallucinations, like those of ancient rabbins, inferring from “the pattern showed to Moses in the

Mount” the permanent existence of a heavenly tabernacle, like in form, structure, proportions to that which stood in the wilderness (Leyrer, *loc. cit.*), or of later writers who have seen in it (not in the spiritual, but the anatomical sense of the word) a *type* of humanity, representing the outer bodily framework, the inner vital organs (Friederich, *Symb. der Mos. Stiftshütte*, in Leyrer, *loc. cit.*, and Ewald, *Alterth. p.* 338), may be dismissed with a single glance. The Judaic and patristic opinion in the main, though not in the details, was advocated by Bahr in his *Symbolik* (1837), in which he considered the tabernacle a symbol of the universe, the court representing earth, and the tabernacle, strictly so named, heaven, though not in a material sense, but as the place and instruments of God’s revelation of himself. In his work on the temple, ten years later, Bahr retracted much of his former theory, and advocated the opinion that the tabernacle symbolized the idea of the dwelling of God in the midst of Israel. Another view, which seems an exaggeration into unwarrantable detail of the true idea that each Christian is a temple of God, proceeds to adapt to the elements of human nature the divisions and materials of the tabernacle. Thus the court is the body, the holy place the soul, the holiest the spirit-true dwelling place of God. This might do very well as a general illustration, and was so used by Luther; but the idea has been fully developed and defended against the attack of Bahr by Friederich in his *Symb. der Mos. Stiftshütte* (Leips. 1841).

5. Nevertheless, as the central point of a great symbolical and typical institute, the tabernacle necessarily possessed, both as a whole and in its contents, a symbolical and typical significance, which has been recognized by all orthodox interpreters. On this head, as we see above, much fanciful and unregulated ingenuity has been indulged; but this must not induce us to neglect those conclusions to which a just application of the principles of typological interpretation conducts.

(1.) Under the Old-Test. economy, the primary idea of the tabernacle was that of a dwelling for Jehovah in the midst of his people and this was prominently kept in view in all the arrangements concerning the construction and location of the structure. “Let them,” said God to Moses, “make me a sanctuary that I may dwell among them” (⁽⁴²⁷⁸⁾Exodus 25:8; 29:45); when the structure was completed it was set up in the midst of the congregation, and there it always remained, whether the people rested or were on their march (Numbers 2); on it rested the cloud which indicated the Divine Presence, and which by its quiescence or removal indicated the

will of the Great Sovereign of Israel as to the resting or the removing of the camp (^{<0418>}Exodus 40:36-38); and to it the people repaired when they had sacrifice to offer to God, or counsel to ask of in (^{<0003>}Leviticus 1:3; ^{<0272>}Numbers 27:2; ^{<0314>}Deuteronomy 31:14, etc.). As Judaism was strictly monotheistic, it knew but *one* sacred place where Jehovah was to be found. The holy of holies, which the apostle calls “the second tabernacle” (Heb. 9:7), was the appropriate residence of Jehovah as the God of Israel. In this the principal thing was the ark, in which was placed “the testimony” (^{<0248>}1^{<0248>} and which was covered by “the mercy-seat” (^{<0248>}2^{<0248>}). The testimony was the book of the law, and it was put into the ark as a witness against the people because of their sinfulness (^{<0326>}Deuteronomy 31:26, 27).. This symbolized the great truth that the first relation into which Jehovah comes with the sinner is that of a ruler whose law testifies against the transgressor. But this testimony was *hid* by the mercy-seat, on which the blood of atonement was sprinkled by the high-priest when he entered within the veil, and on which the visible emblem of Jehovah’s presence the shechinah between the cherubim of glory-was enthroned; and in this there was an emblem of the fact that the condemning and accusing power of the law was taken away by the propitiatory covering which God had appointed. By all this was indicated the grand truth that the character in which Jehovah dwelt among his people was that of a justly offended but merciful and propitiated sovereign, who, having received atonement for their sins, had put these out of his sight, and would remember them no more at all against them (comp. Philo, *De Vit. Mosi*, bk. 3).

In the first or outer tabernacle, were the altar of incense, the table with the shew-bread, and the golden candlestick. The first was symbolical of the necessity and the acceptableness of prayer, of which the smoke of sweet incense that was to ascend from it morning and evening appears to be the appointed Biblical symbol (comp. ^{<0242>}Psalm 141:2; ^{<0110>}Luke 1:10; ^{<0118>}Revelation 5:8; 8:3, 4). The second was emblematical of the necessity of good works to accompany our devotions, the bread being the offering of the children of Israel to their Divine King (^{<0248>}Leviticus 24:8), and consecrated to him by the offering of incense along with it as emblematical of prayer. The third was the symbol of the Church, or people of God, the gold of which it was formed denoting the excellence of the Church, the seven lamps its completeness, and the oil by which they were fed being the appropriate symbol of the Divine Spirit dwelling in his people and causing

them to shine (comp. ^{<3002>}Zechariah 4:2,3; ^{<0154>}Matthew 5:14, 16; ^{<6012>}Revelation 1:12, 20).

In the fore-court of the tabernacle stood the altar of burnt-offering, on which were offered the sacrifices of the people, and the laver, in which the priests cleansed their hands and feet before entering the holy place. The symbolical significance of these is too well known to need illustration. *SEE OFFERING; SEE PURIFICATION.*

(2.) Under the new dispensation, if we view the tabernacle as a general symbol of Jehovah's dwelling in the midst of his people, then that to which it answers can be no other than the human nature of our Lord. He was "God manifest in the flesh," "Immanuel," God with us, and in him "dwelleth all the fullness of the Godhead bodily" (^{<5036>}1 Timothy 3:16; Matthew, 23; ^{<5019>}Colossians 2:9). Hence John (^{<6014>}John 1:14), in speaking of his incarnation, says, "The Word became flesh and *tabernacled* (ἐσκήνωσε) among us," where the language evidently points to the ancient tabernacle as the symbolical residence of Jehovah; and in the book of Revelation (^{<6025>}Revelation 21:5) the same apostle, in announcing the final presence of Christ in his glorified humanity with his Church, uses the expression, The *tabernacle* of God is with men." From these statements of the New Test. we may hold ourselves justified in concluding that the ancient tabernacle, viewed in its general aspect as the dwelling of Jehovah, found its antitype in the human nature of Christ, in whom God really dwelt. Viewed more particularly in its two great divisions, the tabernacle symbolized in its inner department the reign of Jehovah in his own majesty and glory, and in its outer department the service of God by propitiation and prayer. In keeping, with this, the writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews teaches (as above seen) us to regard the outer part of the tabernacle as more strictly typical of the person of Jesus Christ, and the inner of heaven, into which he has now entered. Thus he speaks of him (^{<3002>}Hebrews 8:2) as now, in the heavenly state, "a minister of the true [i.e. *real*, ἀληθινῆ, as distinguished from *symbolical*] tabernacle which the Lord pitched, and not man," where the allusion seems to be partly to the fact that Christ is in heaven, and partly to the fact that he ministers there in human nature. Still more explicit is the language used in 9:11, where the writer, after speaking of the sacerdotal services of the ancient economy as merely figurative and outward, adds, But Christ having appeared— as high-priest of the good things to come, by means of the greater and more perfect tabernacle not made with hands (that is, not of this creation), nor by means of blood of

goats and calves but by means of his own blood, entered once (for all) into the holy place, having obtained eternal redemption for us.” In interpreting this passage, we would follow those who take the whole as far as the words “his own blood” as the subject of the sentence, and consequently join the clauses depending from *διὰ* with *παραγεμόμενος*, and not with *εἰσήλθεν*; for it seems to be more natural to suppose that the writer should say that it was by means of a more perfect tabernacle and a holier sacrifice that Christ became the high-priest of spiritual blessings than that it was by these means that he entered into the holy place. The objection to this construction which dean Alford urges, that “*in* that case *οὐδέ* would be left without any preceding member of the negation to follow,” is of no weight, for it burdens the construction he adopts as much as that he rejects, and is to be obviated in either case by resolving *οὐδέ* into *καὶ οὐ* (see Meyer’s note on ver. 12). Assuming this to be the proper construction of the passage, it seems clearly to represent the human nature of our Lord — that in which he made his soul an offering for sin — as the antitype of the ancient tabernacle in which the high-priest offered sacrifice, while the heavenly world into which he had entered as a high-priest was typified by the holy place into which the Jewish high-priest entered to appear in the symbolical presence of Jehovah. For further confirmation of this may be adduced ^{<SCRIPT>}Hebrews 10:20, where the writer, speaking of the privilege enjoyed by believers under the new dispensation of approaching God through Christ, says we can do it “by a new and living way which he hath inaugurated (*ἐνεκαίνισεν*) for us through the vail (that is, his own flesh).” The allusion here is undoubtedly to the ancient tabernacle service, and the truth set forth is that as the high-priest of old went with sacrificial blood through the vail into the holy of holies, so we, as made priests unto God by Jesus Christ, may approach the immediate presence of Jehovah through that path which the Savior has inaugurated for us by his death in human nature—that path by which he himself has preceded us as our great intercessor, and which is ever fresh and living for us. There may be some rhetorical confusion in this passage, but the general idea seems plainly this, that the body of Christ, slain for us, affords us a passage, by means of sacrifice, into the presence of God, just as the first tabernacle with its services afforded an entrance to the high-priest of old into the holy of holies (see Hofmann, *Schribeweis*, II, 1, 405 sq.; *Weissag. u. Erfüllung*, 2, 189 sq.).

For the symbolism, in a New Test. sense, of the various parts and uses of the tabernacle, such as the altar (**θυσιαστήριον**, Heb. 13:10), the veil (**καταπέτασμα**, 10:20), the mercy-seat (**ἱλαστήριον**, Rom. 3, 25), etc., see each word in its place.

6. It is proper in this connection to refer to a speculative hypothesis which, though in itself unsubstantial enough, has been revived under circumstances that have given it prominence. It has been maintained by Von Bohlen and Vatke (Bühr, 1, 117,273) that the commands and the descriptions relating to the tabernacle in the books of Moses are altogether unhistorical, the result of the effort of some late compiler to ennoble the cradle of his people's history by transferring to a remote antiquity what he found actually existing in the Temple, modified only so far as was necessary to fit it into the theory of a migration and a wandering. The structure did not belong to the time of the Exodus, if indeed there ever was an Exodus. The tabernacle thus becomes the mythical after growth of the Temple, riot the Temple the historical sequel to the tabernacle. It has lately been urged as tending to the same conclusion that the circumstances connected with the tabernacle in the Pentateuch are manifestly unhistorical. The whole congregation of Israel are said to meet in a court which could not have contained more than a few hundred men (Colenso, *Pentateuch and Book of Joshua*, pt. 1, ch. 4:5). The number of priests was utterly inadequate for the services of the tabernacle (*ibid.* ch. 20). The narrative of the head-money collection, of the gifts of the people, is full of anachronisms (*ibid.* ch. 14).

Some of these objections those, e.g., as to the number of the first-born, and the disproportionate smallness of the priesthood, have been met by anticipation in remarks under PRIEST and LEVITE. Others bearing upon the general veracity of the Pentateuch history it is impossible to discuss here. **SEE PENTATEUCH.** It will be sufficient to notice such as bear immediately upon the subject of this article.

(1.) It may be said that this theory, like other similar theories as to the history of Christianity, adds to instead of diminishing difficulties and anomalies. It may be possible to make out plausibly that what purports to be the first period of an institution is, with all its documents, the creation of the second; but the question then comes, How are we to explain the existence of the second? The world rests upon an elephant, and the

elephant on a tortoise, but the footing of the tortoise is at least somewhat insecure.

(2.) Whatever may be the weight of the argument drawn from the alleged presence of the whole congregation at the door of the tabernacle tells with equal force against the historical existence of the Temple and the narrative of its dedication. There also, when the population numbered some seven or eight millions (^{<1049>}2 Samuel 24:9), “all the men of Israel” (^{<1100>}1 Kings 8:2), “all the congregation” (ver. 5), “all the children of Israel” (ver. 63) were assembled, and the king “blessed” all the congregation (ver. 14, 55).

(3.) There are, it is believed, undesigned touches indicating the nomadic life of the wilderness. “The wood employed for the tabernacle is not the sycamore of the valleys nor the cedar of Lebanon, as afterwards in the Temple, but the shittim of the Sinaitic peninsula. *SEE SHITTAH-TREE; SEE SHITTIM*. The abundance of fine linen points to Egypt, the seal or dolphin skins (“badgers” in the A.V., but see Gesenius; s.v. ^{<1100>}vj ן) to the shores of the Red Sea. *SEE BADGER*. The Levites are not to enter on their office till the age of thirty, as needing for their work as bearers a man’s full strength (^{<1023>}Numbers 4:23, 30). Afterwards, when their duties are chiefly those of singers and gatekeepers, they were to begin at twenty (^{<1212>}1 Chronicles 23:2) 1. Would a later history, again, have excluded the priestly tribe from all share in the structure of the tabernacle, and left it in the hands of mythical persons belonging to Judah, and to a tribe then so little prominent as that of Dan?

(4.) There remains the strong Egyptian stamp impressed upon well-nigh every part of the tabernacle and its ritual, and implied in other incidents. *SEE BRAZEN SERPENT; SEE LEVITE; SEE PRIEST; SEE URIM AND THUMMIM*. Whatever bearing this may have on our views of the things themselves, it points, beyond all doubt to a time when the two nations had been brought into close contact, when not jewels of silver and gold only, but treasures of wisdom, art, knowledge, were “borrowed” by one people from the other. To what other period in the history before Samuel than that of the Exodus of the Pentateuch can we refer that intercourse?

When was it likely that a wild tribe, with difficulty keeping its ground against neighboring nations, would have adopted such a complicated ritual from a system so alien to its own? The facts which, when urged by Spencer, with or without a hostile purpose, were denounced as daring and

dangerous and unsettling, are now seen to be witnesses to the antiquity of the religion of Israel, and so to the substantial truth of the Mosaic history. They are used as such by theologians who in various degrees enter their protest against the more destructive criticism of our own time (Hengstenberg, *Egypt and the Books of Moses*; Stanley, *Jewish Church*, lect. 4).

(5.) We may, for a moment, put an imaginary case. Let us suppose that the records of the Old Test. had given us in 1 and 2 Samuel a history like that which men now seek to substitute for what is actually given, had represented Samuel as the first great preacher of the worship of Elohim, Gad, or some later prophet, as introducing for the first time the name and worship of Jehovah, and that the Old Test. began with this (Colenso, pt. 2, ch. 21). Let us then suppose that some old papyrus, freshly discovered, slowly deciphered, gave us the whole or the greater part of what we now find in Exodus and Numbers, that there was thus given an explanation both of the actual condition of the people and of the Egyptian element so largely intermingled with their ritual. Can we not imagine with what jubilant zeal the books of Samuel would then have been "critically examined," what inconsistencies would have been detected in them, how eager men would have been to prove that Samuel had had credit given him for a work which was not his; that not he, but Moses, was the founder of the polity and creed of Israel; that the tabernacle on Zion, instead of coming fresh from David's creative mind, had been preceded by the humbler tabernacle in the wilderness?

The objection raised against the truthfulness of the narrative (Colenso, *ibid.* ch. 7) on the ground that the entire congregation of 600,000 is said to have been convened at the door of this small structure (Leviticus 8) is readily obviated by the natural interpretation that only the principal persons stood immediately near, while the multitude easily viewed the ceremonies from a convenient distance (Birks, *The Exodus of Israel*, p. 111).

VI. Literature. — Besides the commentaries on Exodus *ad loc.*, see Babhr, *Symbolik d. mos.* (ult. 1, 56 sq.; Lund, *Die jid. Heiligthümer dargestellt* (Hamb. 1695, 1738); Van Til, *Comment. de Tabernac. Mos.* (Dord. 1714; also in Ugolino, *Thesaur.* vol. 8); Conrad, *De Tabernaculi Mosis Structura et Figura* (Offenbach, 1712); Lamy, *De Tabernaculo Faederis* (Paris, 1720); Tympe, *Tabernaculi e Monumentis Descriptio* (Jena, 1731); Carpzov, *Appar.* p. 248 sq.; Reland, *Antiq. Sacr.* 1, 3-5;

Schacht, *Animadv. ad Iken. Antiq.* p. 267 sq.; D'Aquine [Phil.], *Du Tabernacle* (Paris, 1623-24); Benzeli *Dissertationes*, 2, 97 sq. Millii *Miscellanea Sacra* (Amit. 1754), p. 329 sq.; Ravius, *De iis quae ex Arabia in usum Tabernaculi fuerant Petita* (Ultraj. 1753, ed. J. M. Schröckh, Lips. 1755); Recchiti, (*KyMbi*) (Mantua, 1776); Vriemoet, *De Aulceo adyti Tabernaculi* (Franec. 1745); Meyer, *Bibeldeutung*, p. 262 sq.; Lanzi [Michelangelo], *La Sacra Scrittura Illustrata con Monum. Fenico A ssiri ed. Egiziani* (Roma, 1827, fol.); Neumann, *Die Stiftshütte* (Gotha, 1861); Friederich, *Symbol. d. mos. Stiftshütte* (Leips. 1841); Kurtz, in the *Stud. u. Krit.* 1844, 2, 305 sq.; Riggerbach, *Die mos. Stiftshütte* (Basel, 1862, 1867); Soltau, *Vessels of the Tabernacle* (Lond. 1865); Paine, *The Tabernacle, Temple, etc.* (Bost, 1861); Kitto, *The Tabernacle and its Furniture* (Lond. 1849); Simpson, *Typ. Character of the Tabernacle* (Edinb. 1852); Brown, *The Tabernacle, etc.* (ibid. 1s71, 1872, 8vo).

Tabernacle

Picture for Tabernacle

is a name given to certain chapels or meeting-houses in England erected by Mr. Whitefield, and to similar places of worship reared by Robert Haldane for the accommodation of a few large congregations in Scotland, out of which have chiefly been formed the present churches of Congregational dissenters in that country.

Tabernacle is also a term applied to certain interior portions of churches, etc.:

1. A niche or hovel for an image.
2. An ambry on the right side of the altar, or behind it, for the reservation of the host, chrism, and oil for the sick.
3. A throne carried like a litter on the shoulders of Spanish priests in the procession of *Corpus Christi*, and supporting the host.
4. A small temple over the central part of an altar for the reservation of the eucharist, contained in the pyx, and often decorated with a crown of three circlets.

Its earliest form was a coffer of wood, or a little arched receptacle; then it became a tower of gold, or of circular shape, being a casket for the chalice and paten, in fact a *ciborium*. In the 15th century the tabernacle became a magnificent piece of furniture over or on the left side of the high-altar, with statues, towers, foliage, buttresses, and superb work, as at Grenoble, St. John Maurienne, Leau, Tournay, and Nuremberg, the latter sixty-four feet high, and of white stone. *SEE CIBORIUM; SEE DOVE; SEE PYX.*

Tabernacles, the Feast of

the third of the three great annual festivals, the other two being the feasts of the Passover and Pentecost, on which' the whole male population were required to appear before the Lord in the national sanctuary. It was a celebration of the ingathering of all the fruits of the year, and in general import as well as time corresponded to the modern *Thanksgiving* season. *SEE FESTIVAL.*

I. Names and their Signification. — This festival is called —

1. *twkSbigj i Chag has-Sukkoth*; Sept. *ἑορτὴ σκηνῶν*, *the Festival of Tents*; Vulg. *feriae tabernaculorum*; A.V. *the Feast of Tabernacles* (^{<41813>}2 Chronicles 8:13; ^{<15704>}Ezra 3:4; ^{<38416>}Zechariah 14:16, 18,19); *σκηνοπηγία* (^{<41712>}John 7:2; Josephus, *Ant.* 8:4, 5); *σκηναί* (Philo, *De Sept.* § 24); *ἡ σκηνή* (Plutarch, *Sympos.* 4:6, 2); because every Israelite was commanded to live in tabernacles during its continuance (comp. ^{<12343>}Leviticus 23:43).

2. *āysæth;gj i ἑορτὴ συντελείας*, *the Feast of Ingathering* (^{<12216>}Exodus 23:16; 34:22), because it was celebrated at the end of the agricultural year, when the ingathering of the fruits and the harvest was completed.

3. It is *κατ' ἐξοχήν* denominated *h/hy]gj i the Festival of Jehovah* (^{<12339>}Leviticus 23:39), or simply *gj h;gj i the Festival* (^{<11012>}1 Kings 8:2; 2 Chronicles 5, 3; 7:8, 9; Mishna, *Shekalim*, 3, 1; *Sukkah*, 2, 6; *Rosh ha-Shana*, 1, 2; *Megillah*, 3, 5; *Taanith*, 1, 1, 2), because of its importance, and of its being the most joyful of all festivals. The assertion of Winer (*Bibl. Realwörterbuch*, s.v. "Laubhüttenfest"), repeated by Keil (*Archäologie*, vol. 1, § 85, note 3) and Bahr (*Symbolik*, 2, 660), that the rabbins call this festival *hbwrmh mwj*, *dies multiplicationis*, is incorrect. The Mishna, which Winer quotes in corroboration of this assertion, does not denominate this festival as such, but simply speaks of the many

sacrifices offered on the first day thereof: “If any one vows wine [for the Temple] he must not give less than three *logs*; if oil, not less than one *log*. If he says, I do not know how much I have set apart, he must give as much as is used on the day which requires most” (*Menachoth*, 13:5) — i.e. as is used on the first day of the festival [of Tabernacles] when it happens to be on a Sabbath, for on such a day there are more libations used than on any other day in the year, inasmuch as 140 *logs* of wine are required for the different sacrifices.

The following are the principal passages in the Pentateuch which refer to this festival: ^{<B236>}Exodus 23:16, where it is spoken of as the Feast of Ingathering, and is brought into connection with the other festivals under their agricultural designations, the Feast of Unleavened Bread and the Feast of Harvest; ^{<B234>}Leviticus 23:34-36, 39-43, where it is mentioned as commemorating the passage of the Israelites through the desert; ^{<B163>}Deuteronomy 16:13-15, in which there is no notice of the eighth day, and it is treated as a thanksgiving for the harvest; ^{<B292>}Numbers 29:12-38, where there is an enumeration of the sacrifices which belong to the festival; ^{<B510>}Deuteronomy 31:10-13, where the injunction is given for the public reading of the law in the Sabbatical year, at the Feast of Tabernacles. In Nehemiah 8 there is an account of the observance of the feast by Ezra, from which several additional particulars respecting it may be gathered.

II. *The Time at which this Festival was celebrated.* The time fixed for the celebration of this feast is from the 15th to the 22nd of Tishri when the season of the year is changing for winter (Josephus, *Ant.* 3, 10, 4); i.e. in the autumn, when the whole of the chief fruits of the ground — the corn, the wine, and the oil — were gathered in (Exodus 23,16; ^{<B239>}Leviticus 23:39; ^{<B163>}Deuteronomy 16:13-15). Hence it is spoken of as occurring “in the end of the year, when thou hast gathered in thy labors out of the field.” There were thus only four days intervening between this festival and the Great Day of Atonement. But though its duration, strictly speaking, was only seven days (^{<B163>}Deuteronomy 16:13; ^{<B252>}Ezekiel 45:25), yet, as it was followed by a day of holy convocation, this festival is sometimes described as lasting eight days (^{<B236>}Leviticus 23:36; ^{<B188>}Nehemiah 8:18).

III. *The Manner in which this Festival was celebrated.* As it is most essential, in describing the mode in which this feast was and still is celebrated, to distinguish between the Pentateuchal enactments and those

rites, ceremonies, and practices, which gradually obtained in the course of time, we shall divide our description into three periods.

1. The Period from the Institution of this Festival to the Babylonian Captivity. — The Mosaic enactments about the manner in which this festival is to be celebrated are as follows: The Israelites are to live in tabernacles during the seven days of this festival, “that your generations may know that I made the children of Israel to dwell in tabernacles when I brought them out of the land of Egypt” (^{<R232>}Leviticus 23:42,43). The first day alone, however, is to be a holy convocation (^{<Vdq; arg qj>}and a Sabbath or day of perfect cessation of business, on which no manner of secular work is to be done (^{<R235>}Leviticus 23:35, 39); and all the able-bodied male members of the congregation, who are not legally precluded from it, are to appear in the place of the national sanctuary, as on the Passover and Pentecost (^{<R234>}Exodus 23:14,17; 34:23). On this day the Israelites are to take “the fruit of goodly trees, with branches of palm-trees, boughs of thick trees, and willows of the brook” (^{<R230>}Leviticus 23:40), most probably to symbolize the varied vegetation which grew in the different localities of their journey, through the wilderness—viz. the palm-tree of the plain where the Israelites encamped, the willow at the mountain stream, from which God gave his people water to drink; and the designedly indefinite thick bush on the mountain heights over which they had to travel; while the fruits of the goodly trees represent the produce of the beautiful land which they ultimately obtained after their pilgrimages in the wilderness (Pressel, in Herzog’s *Real-Encyklopädie*, s.v. “Laubhüttenfest”). As this, festival, however, though symbolizing by the several practices thereof the pilgrimage through the wilderness, was nevertheless more especially designed to celebrate the completion of the harvest in the Promised Land, as typified by the fruit of the goodly trees in contrast to the plants of the wilderness, the Israelites are enjoined “not to appear before the Lord empty, but every one shall give as he is able, according to the blessing of the, Lord thy God which he hath given thee” (^{<R235>}Exodus 23:15; ^{<R166>}Deuteronomy 16:16,17). Hence they are to offer burnt offerings, meat-offerings, drink-offerings, and other sacrifices as follows: On the first day, the burnt-offering is to consist of thirteen bullocks, two rams, fourteen lambs, and one kid of the goats for a sin-offering, with the appropriate meat and drink-offerings; the meat-offerings being three tenths of an ephah of flour mingled with one half of a hin of oil to each bullock, two tenths of an ephah of flour mingled with one third of a hin of oil to each ram, and

one tenth of an ephah of flour mingled with one quarter of a hin of oil to each lamb; the drink offering consisting of one half of a hin of wine to each bullock, one third of a hin of wine to each ram, and one quarter of a hin of wine to each lamb (^{<0452>}Numbers 15:2-11; 28:12-14). The same number of rams and lambs, and one kid, are to be offered on the following days; the number of bullocks alone is to be reduced by one each day, so that on the seventh day only seven are to be offered (^{<0492>}Numbers 29:12-38). There are accordingly to be offered during the seven days in all seventy bullocks, fourteen rams, ninety-eight lambs, and seven goats, with thirty-three and three-fifths ephahs of flour, sixty four and one-sixth bins of oil, and sixty-four and one, sixth hins of wine. Moreover, the law is to be read publicly in the sanctuary on the first day of the festival every Sabbatical year (^{<0510>}Deuteronomy 31:10-13). The six following days, i.e. 15th-22nd of Tishri-are to be half festivals; they were most probably devoted to social enjoyments and friendly gatherings, when every head of the family was to enjoy the feasts from the second or festival tithe with his son, daughter, man-servant, maidservant, the Levite, the stranger, the fatherless, and the widow (16:14). *SEE TITHE.*

At the conclusion of the seventh day another festival is to be celebrated, denominated *the concluding day* (μῆρας τῆς []), *the eighth concluding day* (τῆς [] ἡμέρας Sept. ἑξῶδίου). Like the first day, it is to be a holy convocation, and no manner of work is to be done on it. As it is not only the finishing of the Feast of Tabernacles, but the conclusion of the whole cycle of festivals, the dwelling in the tabernacle is to cease on it, and the sacrifices to be offered thereon are to be distinct, and unlike those offered on the preceding days of Tabernacles. The burnt-sacrifice is to consist of one bullock, one ram, and seven lambs one year old, with the appropriate meat and drink-offerings, and one goat for a sin-offering (^{<0235>}Numbers 29:36-38). The sacrifices, therefore, were it to be like those of the seventh new moon and the Great Day of Atonement. Being, however, attached as an octave to the Feast of Tabernacles, the Sabbatical rest and the holy convocation, which properly belong to the seventh day of the Feast of Tabernacles, are transferred to it, and hence the two festivals are frequently joined together and spoken of as one composed of eight days. There is only one instance on record of this festival being celebrated between the entrance into the Promised Land and the Babylonian captivity (^{<1082>}1 Kings 8:2; ^{<1008>}2 Chronicles 7:8-10 with ^{<1687>}Nehemiah 8:17). No trace of any

exposition of the Pentateuchal enactments with regard to this festival is to be found until we come to the postexilic period.

2. The Period from the Return from Babylon to the Destruction of the Temple. —In the account of the first celebration of this festival after the return of the Jews from the Babylonian captivity, the concise Pentateuchal injunction is expanded. Not only are the localities specified in which these booths are to be erected, but additional plants are mentioned, and the use to be made of these plants is stated. The Jews, according to the command of Ezra, made themselves booths upon the roofs of houses in the courts of their dwellings, in the courts of the sanctuary, in the street of the watergate, and in the street of the gate of Ephraim, from the olive-branches, the pine-branches, the myrtle-branches, the palm-branches, and the branches of the thick trees, which they were told to gather, and dwell in these booths seven days (^{<1685>}Nehemiah 8:15-18). The Sadducees of old, who are followed by the Karaites, took these boughs and the fruits to be identical with those mentioned in ^{<1639>}Leviticus 23:39, 40, and maintained that these were to be used for the construction and adornment of the booths or tabernacles. The Pharisees and the orthodox Jewish tradition, however, as we shall see hereafter, interpreted this precept differently.

When the Feast of Tabernacles, like all other festivals and precepts of the Mosaic law, began to be strictly and generally kept after the Babylonian captivity, under the spiritual guidance of the Great Synagogue, the Sanhedrim, and the doctors of the law— scribes, more minute definitions and more expanded applications of the concise Pentateuchal injunction were imperatively demanded, in order to secure uniformity of practice, as well as to infuse devotion and joy into the celebration thereof, both in the Temple and in the booths. Hence it was ordained that the tabernacle or booth (^{hK}*susukkah*) must be a detached and temporary habitation, constructed for the sole purpose of living in it during this festival, and must not be used as a permanent dwelling. The interior of it must neither be higher than twenty cubits, nor lower than ten palms; it must not have less than three walls; it must not be completely roofed in. or covered with any solid material but must be thatched in such a manner as to admit the view of the sky and the stars; and the part open to the rays of the sun must not exceed in extent the part shaded by the cover. It must not be under a tree; neither must it be covered with a cloth, nor with anything which contracts defilement or does not derive its growth from the ground (*Mishna, Sukkah*, 1, 1-2, 7). The furniture of the huts was to be, according to most

authorities, of the plainest description. There was to be nothing which was not fairly necessary. It would seem, however, that there was no strict rule on this point, and that there was a considerable difference according: to the habits or circumstances of the occupant (Carpzov, p. 415; Buxtorf, *Syn. Jud.* p. 451). (See curious figures of different forms of huts, and of the great lights of the Feast of Tabernacles, in Surenhusius, *Mischnar*, vol. 2; also a lively description of some of the huts used by the Jews in modern times in *La Vie Juive en Alsdae*, p. 170, etc.) Every Israelite is to constitute the *sukkah* his regular domicile during the whole of the seven days of the festival, while his house is only to be his occasional abode, and he is only to quit the booth when it rains very heavily. Even a child, as soon as he ceases to be dependent upon his mother, must dwell in the booth; and the only persons exempt from this duty are those deputed on pious missions, invalids, nurses, women, and infants (Mishna, *Sukkah*, 2, 8,9). The orthodox rabbins in the time of Christ would not eat any food which exceeded in quantity the size of an egg out of the booth (*ibid.* 2, 5).

The four species of vegetable productions to be used during prayer (^(R23)Leviticus 23:39, 40) are the next distinctive feature of this festival, to which the ancient doctors of the law before the time of Christ devoted much attention. These are-

(1.) “The fruits of the goodly tree” (**rdh**;/[**grp**]). As the phrase *goodly or splendid tree* (**rdh**;/[**is**] is too indefinite, and the fruit of such a tree may simply denote the fruit of any choice fruit-tree, thus leaving it very vague, the Hebrew canons, based upon one of the significations of **rdh**;(to dwell, to rest; see Rashi on ^(R24)Leviticus 23:40), decreed that it means *the fruits which permanently rest upon the tree—i.e. the citron, the paradise-apple* (**gwot** **tā**, *ethrog*). Hence the rendering of Onkelos, the so-called Jerusalem Targum, and the Syriac version of **rdh**; by *ethrog* (= **κίτριον**, Josephus, *Ant.* 13:13, 5), *citron*. Josephus elsewhere (*ibid.* 3, 10, 4) says that it was the fruit of the *persea*, a tree said by Pliny to have been conveyed from Persia to Egypt (*Hist. Nat.* 15:13), and which some have identified with the peach (*Malus persica*). The *ethrog* must not be from an uncircumcised tree (^(R23)Leviticus 19:23), nor from the unclean heave-offering (comp. ^(R81)Numbers 18:11,12); it must not have a stain on the crown, nor be without the crown, peeled of its rind, perforated, or defective, else it is illegal (Mishna, *Sukkah*, 3, 5, 6).

(2.) “*Branches of palm-trees*” (ⲡⲓⲣⲁⲉⲓⲧⲡⲕⲓ). According to the Hebrew canons, it is the shoot of the palm-tree when budding, before the leaves are spread abroad, and while it is yet like a rod, and this is called *luláb* (ⲃⲓ Ⲡⲓ), which is the technical expression given in the Chaldee versions and in the Jewish writings for the Biblical phrase in question (Buxtorf, *Lex. Talm.* col. 1143; Carpzov, *App. Crit.* p. 416; Drusius, *Not. Maj.* in Leviticus 23). The *luláb* must at least be three hands tall, and must be tied together with its own kind (Mishna. *Sukkah*, 3, 1, 8; Maimonides, *lad Ha-Chezaka*, *Rilchoth Luláb*, 7:1).

(3.) “*The bough of a thick tree*” (ⲧⲃⲫⲓ; / [ⲉⲁⲛⲓ]). This ambiguous phrase is interpreted by the ancient canons to denote “the myrtle-branch (*sdh*) whose leaves thickly cover the wood thereof: it must have three or more shoots around the stem on the same level of the stem, but if it has two shoots opposite each other on the same level, and the third shoot is above them, it is not *thick*, but is called (*hf̄wç twb* []) a *thin myrtle*” (Mishna, *Sukkah*, 32 b; Maimonides, *ibid.* 7. 2). This explanation accounts for the rendering of the Chaldee paraphrases of this phrase by *hadds* (*sdh*), *myrtle-branch*. If the point of this myrtle-branch is broken off, or if its leaves are torn off, or if it has more berries on it than leaves, it is illegal (Mishna, *Sukkah*, 3, 2).

(4.) “*The willows of the brook*” (Ⲉⲓⲛⲓⲃⲉⲓ = *salix helix*) must be of that species the distinguishing marks of which are dark wood, and long leaves with smooth margin. If any one of these four kinds has been obtained by theft, or comes from a grove devoted to idolatry, or from a town which has been enticed to idolatry (comp. ^{<B32>}Deuteronomy 13:12, etc.), it is illegal (*ibid.* 3, 1-5). Their legality having been ascertained, the palm, the myrtle, and the willow are bound up together into one bundle, denominated *luláb*.

It has already been remarked that the Sadducees in and before the time of Christ maintained that the boughs and fruit here mentioned (viz. ^{<B34>}Leviticus 23:40) are to be used for the construction and adornment of the booths, and that they appeal to ^{<B35>}Nehemiah 8:15, 16 in support of this view. This view has not only been espoused by the Karaite Jews, the successors of: the Sadducees, **SEE SADDUCEE**, but is defended by bishop Patrick Keil, and most modern Christian interpreters. Against this, however, is to be urged that—

- (1.) The obvious sense of the injunction (^(RE34)Leviticus 23:40) is that these boughs are to be carried as symbols during the rejoicing, and that we should expect something more explicit than the single and simple word $\mu\tau\epsilon\chi\eta\ \omega\iota$ and *ye shall take*, had it been designed that these boughs should be employed for the construction of the booths.
- (2.) *The fruit* ($\gamma\rho\epsilon\alpha$) as the margin of the A.V. rightly has it, and not *boughs*, as it is in the text with which this injunction commences—could surely not be among the materials for the construction of the booths.
- (3.) The law about the booths is entirely separated from the ordering of the fruit and boughs, as may be seen from a comparison of ^(RE34)Leviticus 23:40 with ver. 42.
- (4.) The first day of this festival, as we have seen, was a holy convocation, on which all manner of work was interdicted. It is therefore against the sanctity of the day to suppose that the command to take the fruit and the boughs on the first-day meant that the Israelites are to construct with these plants the booths on this holy day.
- (5.) The appeal to Nehemiah 8 is beside the mark, inasmuch as different materials are there mentioned — e.g. olive branches and pine-branches, which were actually used for making the booths, while the hadâr fruit and the willow specified in the Pentateuchal injunction, are omitted. With the regulations about the tabernacles and the boughs or *luláb* before us, we can now continue the description of the mode in which this festival was celebrated in the Temple.

14th of Tishri was the *Preparation Day* ($\mu\gamma\ br\] , b/f = \text{παρασκευή}$). The pilgrim's came up to Jerusalem on the day previous to the commencement of the festival, when they prepared everything necessary for its solemn observance. The priests proclaimed the approach of the holy convocation on the eve of this day by the blasts of trumpets. As on the Feasts of the Passover and Pentecost, the altar of the burnt-sacrifice was cleansed in the first night-watch (Mishna, *Yoma*. 1, 8), and the gates of the Temple, as well as those of the inner court, were opened immediately after midnight for the convenience of the priests who resided in the city, and for the people who filled the court before the cock crew to have their sacrifices and offerings duly examined by the priests (*ibid.* 1, 8). When the first day of Tabernacles happened on the Sabbath the people brought their palm-branches or *luláb*'s on the 14th of Tishri to the synagogue on the Temple

mount, where the servants of the synagogue (μϣνζj) deposited them in a gallery, while the *luláb's* of the elders of the synagogue (μϣνqz) were placed in a separate chamber, as it was against the Sabbatical laws to carry the palms on the Sabbath from the booths of the respective pilgrims to the Temple.

15th of Tishri. —At daybreak of the first day of the festival a priest, accompanied by a jubilant procession and by a band of music, descended with a golden pitcher holding three *logs* to the pool of Siloam, and, having filled it with water from the brook, he endeavored to reach the Temple in time to join his brother priests who carried the morning sacrifice to the altar (*Tosiphtha Sukkah*, c. 3). Following in their steps, he entered from the south through the water-gate into the inner court (Mishna, *Middoth*, 2, 6; Gemara, *Sukketh*, 48 a). On reaching the water-gate, he was welcomed by three blasts of the trumpet. He then ascended the steps of the altar with another priest who carried a pitcher of wine for the drink-offering. The two priests turned to the left of the altar where two silver basins were fixed with holes at the bottom; the basin for the water was to the west and had a narrower hole, while the one for the wine was to the east and had a wider hole, so that both might get empty at the same time. Into these respective basins they simultaneously and slowly poured the water and the wine in such a manner that both were emptied at the same time upon the base of the altar. To the priest who poured out the water the people called out, Raise thy hand! The reason for this is that when Alexander Jannai, who officiated as priest, was charged with this duty, being a Sadducee and rejecting the ordinances of the scribes, he poured the water over his feet and not into the basin, whereupon the people pelted him with their *ethrôgs*, or citrons. At this catastrophe, which nearly cost the life of the Maccabean king, Alexander Jannai called for the assistance of the soldiers, when nearly six thousand Jews perished in the Temple, and the altar was damaged, a corner of it being broken off in the struggle which ensued (Josephus, *Ant.* 13:13, 5; Mishna, *Sukkah*, 4:9; Gemara, *ibid.* 48 a; 51 a; Gratz, *Geschichte der Juden* [2nd ed. Leips. 1863], 3, 112, 473 sq.). See Scribes. The ceremony of drawing the water-was repeated every morning during the seven days of the festival.

At the same time that the priests went in procession to the pool of Siloam, another jubilant multitude of people went to a place outside Jerusalem called *Motsâ* (axivw), which abounded in willows. These willows they

gathered with great rejoicing, carried them into the Temple amid the blasts of trumpets, and placed them at the altar in such a manner that their tops overhung and formed a sort of canopy (Mishna, *Sukkah*, 4:5). The decorating process of the altar being finished, the daily morning-sacrifice was first offered, *Musaph* (אָפּוּר); then the additional or special sacrifice for this festival prescribed in Numbers 29:12-38, which, on the first day, consisted of a burnt-offering of thirteen bullocks, two rams, and fourteen lambs, with the appropriate meat- and drink-offering, and a goat for a sin-offering, and then the peace-offerings, the vows, and the free-will offerings, which constituted the repast of the people (Jerusalem, *Sukkah*, v). While these sacrifices were offered the Levites chanted *the Great Hallel*, as on the feasts of the Passover and Pentecost. On this occasion, however, each of the pilgrims held in his right hand the *luláb*, or palm, to which were tied the twigs of myrtle and willow as described above, and the *ethrôg*, or citron, in his left, while these psalms were chanted; and, during the chanting of Psalm 118, the pilgrims shook their palms three times—viz. at the singing of ver. 1, 25, and 29 (אָפּוּר Psalm 118:1, 118:25, 118:29) (Mishna, *Sukkah*, 3, 9). When the *Musâph* chant was finished the priests in procession went round the altar once, exclaiming: Hosanna, O Jehovah; give us help, O Jehovah, give prosperity! (אָפּוּר Psalm 118:25). Thereupon the solemn benediction was pronounced by the priests and the people dispersed, amid the repeated exclamations, “How beautiful art thou, O altar!” or “To Jehovah and thee, O altar, we give thanks!” (Mishna, *Sukkah*, 4:5; Gemara, *ibid.* 44 b, 45). Each one of the pilgrims then betook himself to his respective booth, there to enjoy his repast with the Levite, the stranger, the poor, and the fatherless who shared his hospitality. This practice explains the remarks of the evangelists (אָפּוּר Matthew 21:8, 9, 15; אָפּוּר John 12:12,13). It is to be remarked that on the first day of the festival every Israelite carried about his *luláb*, or palm, all day; he carried it into the synagogue, held it in his hand while praying, and only laid it down when called to the reading of the law, as he then had to hold the scroll, **SEE SYNAGOGUE**; carried it with him when he went to visit the sick and comfort the mourners (Mishna, *Sukkah*, 41 a; Maimonides, *clad Ha-Chezaka*, *lilchoth Luláb*, 7:24).

16th-20th of Tishri. —These days were *half-holydays*; they were called *the middle days of the festival* (אָפּוּר אָפּוּר = μεσοόσης τῆς ἑορτῆς, אָפּוּר John 7:14), or *the lesser festival* (אָפּוּר אָפּוּר). Any articles of food or raiment required for immediate use were allowed to be ‘purchased privately during

these days, and work demanded by the emergencies of the public service or required for the festival, the omission of which entailed loss or injury; was permitted to be done. *SEE PASSOVER.*

On the night of the 15th, and on the five succeeding nights, *the rejoicing of the drawing of water* (tj mç hbawçh tyb) was celebrated in the court of the Temple in the following manner: The people assembled in large masses in the court of ‘the women at night, after the expiration of the first day of the festival. The women occupied the galleries which were permanent fixtures in the court (*Mishna, Middoth, 2, 15*), while the men occupied the space below. Four huge golden candelabra were placed in the center of the court; each of these candelabra had four-golden basins and four ladders, on which stood four lads from the rising youths of the priests with jars of oil wherewith they fed the basins, while the cast-off garments of the- priests were used as wicks. The lights of these candelabra illuminated the whole city. Around these lights pious and distinguished men danced before the people with lighted flambeaux in their hands, singing hymns and songs of praise; while the Levites, who were stationed on the fifteen steps which led into the woman’s court, and corresponded to the fifteen psalms of degrees=steps (Psalm 120-134), accompanied the songs with harps, psalteries, cymbals, and numberless musical instruments. The dancing, as well as the vocal and instrumental music, continued till daybreak. Some of these pious men performed dexterous movements with their flambeaux while dancing for the amusement of the people. Thus it is related that R. Simon II (A.D. 30-50), son of Gamaliel I, the teacher of the apostle Paul *SEE EDUCATION*, used to dance with eight torches in his hands, which he alternately threw up in the air and caught again without their touching each other or falling to the ground (*Tosiphta Sikkah, c. 4; Jerusalem, Sikkah, 5, 4; Babylon, ibid. 53 a*). It is supposed that it was the splendid light of this grand illumination, which suggested the remark of our Savior— “I am the light of the world” (~~John~~ John 8:12). Towards the approach of day two priests stationed themselves, with trumpets in their hands, at the upper gate leading from the court of the Israelites to the court of the women, and awaited the announcement of daybreak by the crowing of the cock. As soon as the cock crew, they blew the trumpets three times and marched out the people of the Temple in such a manner that they had to descend the ten steps, where the two priests again blew the trumpets three times, and when they reached the lowest step in the outer court they for the third time blew the trumpets three times. They continued to blow as

they were marching across the court till they reached the eastern gate. Here they turned their faces westward towards the Temple and said, “Our fathers once turned their back to the sanctuary in this place, and their faces to the east, and worshipped the sun towards the east (comp. ²¹⁸⁵Ezekiel 8:15, 16); but we lift up our eyes to Jehovah.” Thereupon they returned to the Temple, while the people who were thus marched out went to their respective booths. Some, however, formed themselves into a procession, and went with the priests to the pool of Siloam to fetch the water; while others returned to the Temple, to be present at the morning sacrifice (Mishna, *Sukkah*, 5, 2-4; Maimonides, *Iad Ha-Chezaka, Hilchoth Sukkah*, 8:12-15). The Talmud maintains that the ceremony of the drawing of water is anterior to the Babylonian captivity, and that ^{2312B}Isaiah 12:3 refers to it (*Sukkah*, 48 b). Indeed, it is only on this supposition that the imagery in ^{2312B}Isaiah 12:3 obtains its full force and- significance. As to the import of this ceremony, ancient tradition furnishes two explanations of it.

(1.) Since the Feast of Tabernacles was the time of the latter rain (^{2122B}Joel 2:23), the drawing and pouring out of the water was regarded as symbolical of the forthcoming rain which it was ardently desired might be blessed to the people. Hence the remark that he who will not come up to the Feast of Tabernacles shall have no rain (*Sukkah*, 48, 51; *Rosh ha-Shanah*, 16; *Taanith*, 2 a).

(2.) The Jews seem to have regarded the rite as symbolical of the water miraculously supplied to their fathers from the rock at Meribah. But they also gave to it a more strictly spiritual signification. It was regarded as typical of the outpouring of the Holy Spirit. Hence the remark: “It is called the house of drawing the water, because from thence the Holy Spirit is drawn in accordance with what is said in ^{2312B}Isaiah 12:3, With joy shall ye draw water out of the wells of salvation” (Jerusalem *Sukkah*; 1). It is upon this explanation that our Savior’s remark is based (⁴⁰³⁵John 7:37-39) in allusion to this ceremony on this last day of the festival when it was performed for the last time. The two meanings are, of course, perfectly harmonious, as is shown by the use which Paul makes of the historical fact— (1 Corinthians 10, 4) “they drank of that spiritual rock that followed them: and that rock was Christ.”

The mode in which the sacrifices were offered in the middle days of the festival, the use of the palm and the citron, the procession round the altar, etc., were simply a repetition of the first day of the festival, with this

exception, however, that the number of animals diminished daily, according to ‘the prescription in ^{<04912>}Numbers 29:12-38, and that *the Lesser Hallel* was chanted by Levites instead of *the Great Hallel* (q.v.). A peculiarity connected with the sacrificial service of this festival must here be noticed. On all other festivals only those of the twenty-four orders of the priests officiated upon whom the lot fell (comp. ^{<13417>}1 Chronicles 24:7-19), but on the seven days of Tabernacles the whole of the twenty-four orders officiated. On the-first day the thirteen bullocks, two rams, and-one goat were offered by sixteen orders, while the fourteen sheep were offered by the other eight. As there was one bullock less offered each of the seven days, one order of priests left each day the sixteen orders who offered these bullocks and joined those who offered the fourteen lambs. Hence, “on the first day six of these orders offered two lambs each, and the two other orders one lamb each. On the second day five orders of the priests offered two lambs each, and the four other orders one lamb each. On the third day four orders offered two lambs each, and six orders one lamb each. On the fourth day three orders offered two lambs each, and eight orders one lamb each. On the fifth day two orders offered two lambs each, and ten orders one lamb each. On the sixth day one order offered two lambs each, and twelve orders one lamb each; while on the seventh day, when the orders of priests who sacrificed the bullocks had diminished to eight, fourteen orders offered one lamb each” (Mishna, *Sukkah*, 5, 6).

21st of Tishri. —The seventh day, which was denominated *the last day of the Feast of Tabernacles* (**bwf** **μwy gj l ç `wrhah**, Mishna, *Sukkah*, 4:8), was especially distinguished in the following manner from the other six days. After the *Musâph*, or special festival sacrifice of the day, the priests in procession made seven circuits round the altar (*ibid.* 4:5), whereas on the preceding days of the festival only one circuit was made. The willows (**hbr** []) which surrounded the altar were then so thoroughly shaken by the people that the leaves lay thickly on the ground. The people also fetched palm-branches and beat them to pieces at the side of the altar (*ibid.* 4:6). It is from this fact that the last day of the festival obtained the names of *the Day of Willows* (**hbr** [**μwy**, *ibid.* 4:1), *the Great Hosanna Day* (**hbr an h[yçwh μwy**), and *the Branch-thrashing Day* (**twyrj fwbj μwy**, *ibid.* 4, 6). Herzfeld suggests that the thrashing of the willows and palms may have been to symbolize that after the last verdure of the year had served for the adornment of the altar the trees might now go on to

cast off their leaves (*Gesch. des Volkes Israel*, 2, 125). As soon as the thrashing process was over, the children who were present, and who also carried about the festive nosegays, threw away their palms and ate up their *ethrôgs*, or citrons (Mishna, *Sukkah*; 4, 7); while the pilgrims, “in the afternoon of this day, began to remove the furniture from the Tabernacles in honor of the last day of the festival” (*ibid.* 4:8) as the obligation to live or eat in the booths ceased in the afternoon of the seventh day, inasmuch as the Feast of Tabernacles itself had now terminated. The eighth day, as we shall presently see, was a holy convocation, whereon no manner of work was allowed to be done, and the Hebrews could no more dismantle their huts on this day without desecrating it than on the Sabbath. It must also be remarked that this last day of the festival, this Great Hosanna day, was regarded as one of the four days whereon God judges the world (Mishna, *Rosh ha-Shanah*, 1, 2; Gemara, *ibid.*). There can, therefore, be but little doubt that when John records the memorable words uttered by Christ (ἐν τῇ ἔσχατῇ ἡμέρᾳ τῇ μεγάλῃ τῆς ἑορτῆς), in the last great day of the festival (John 7:37), he meant this distinguished day.

22nd of *Tishri*. —The eighth day, which, as we have seen; was a separate festival—was a day of holy convocation whereon no manner of work was allowed to be done. After the daily morning sacrifice and the private offerings of the people, the sacrifices prescribed in Numbers 29:36-38 were offered, during which *the Great Hallel* was chanted by the Levites. At the sacrifices, however the twenty-four orders of priests were no longer present, but lots were cast as on other festivals, and that order upon whom the lot fell offered the sacrifices (Mishna, *Sukkah*, 5, 6). The Israelites dwelt no longer in the booths on this day, the joyful procession for the drawing of water was discontinued, the grand illumination in the court of the women ceased, and the palms and willows were not used any more.

It only remains to be added, that when the Feast of Tabernacles fell on a Sabbatical year (q.v.) the reading of portions of the law (Deuteronomy 31:10-13) was afterwards confined to one book of the Pentateuch. This arose from the multiplication of synagogues, in which the law was read every week, thus rendering it less needful to read extensive portions in the Temple during this festival, inasmuch as the people had now ample opportunities of listening in their respective places of worship to the reading of the law and the prophets. Hence also the reading of the law, which in olden days took place in the last hours of the forenoon of every

day of this festival, was afterwards restricted to one day. It was at last assigned to the high-priest, and ultimately to the king.

It is said that the altar was adorned throughout the seven days with sprigs of willows, one of which each Israelite who came into the court brought with him. The great number of the sacrifices has already been noticed. The number of public victims offered on the first day exceeded those of any day in the year (*Menach.* 13:5). But besides these, the Chagigahs or private peace-offerings were more abundant than at any other time; and there is reason to believe that the whole of the sacrifices nearly outnumbered all those offered at the other festivals put together. It belongs to the character of the feast that on each day the trumpets of the Temple are said to have sounded twenty-one times. Though all the Hebrew annual festivals were seasons of rejoicing, the Feast of Tabernacles was, in this respect, distinguished above them all. The huts and the *luláb's* must have made a gay and striking spectacle over the city by day, and the lamps, the flambeaux, the music, and the joyous gatherings in the court of the Temple must have given a still more festive character to the night. Hence it was called by the rabbins גג , *the festival*, κατ' ἐξοχήν. There is a proverb in *Sukkah* (5, 1), "He who has never seen the rejoicing at the pouring-out of the water of Siloam has never seen rejoicing in his life." Maimonides says that he who failed at the Feast of Tabernacles in contributing to the public joy according to his means incurred especial-guilt (Carpzov, p. 4-19). The feast is designated by Josephus (*Ant.* 8:4, 1) ἑορτὴ ἀγιωτάτη καὶ μεγίστη, and by Philo ἑορτῶν μεγίστη. Its thoroughly festive nature is shown in the accounts of its observance in Josephus (*ibid.* 8:4, 1; 15:33), as well as in the accounts of its celebration by Solomon, Ezra, and Judas Maccabaeus. From this fact, and its connection with the ingathering of the fruits of the year, especially the vintage, it is not wonderful that Plutarch should have likened it to the Dionysiac festivals, calling it θυρσοφορία and κρατηροφορία (*Sympos.* 4).

3. From the Dispersion of the Jews to the Present Time. —Excepting the ordinances which were local and belonged to the Temple and its sacrificial service, and bating the exposition and more rigid explanation of some of the rites so as to adapt them to the altered condition of the nation, the Jews to the present day continue to celebrate the Feast of Tabernacles as in the days of the second Temple. As soon as the Day of Atonement is over, every orthodox Israelite, according to the ancient canons, begins to erect his booth in which he and his family take up their temporary abode during

this festival. Each paterfamilias also provides himself with a *luláb*=palm, and *ethrôg* citron, as defined by the ancient canons. On the eve of the 14th of Tishri, or of the Preparation Day (**twks br []**), the festival commences. All the Jews, attired in their festive garments, resort to the synagogue, where, after the evening prayer” (**byr [m]**) appointed in the liturgy for this occasion, the hallowed nature of the festival is proclaimed by the cantor (**zj**) in the blessing pronounced over the cup of wine (**çwdq**). After the evening service, every family resorts to its respective booth, which is illuminated and adorned with foliage and diverse fruit, and in which the first festive meal is taken. Before, however, anything is eaten, the head of the family pronounces the sanctity of the festival over a cup of wine. This sanctification or *Kiddush* (**vWDq**) was ordained by the men of the Great Synagogue (q.v.), and as there is no doubt that our Savior and his apostles recited it, we shall give it in English. It is as follows: “Blessed art thou, O Lord our God, King of the universe, who hast created the fruit of the vine! Blessed art thou, O Lord our God, King of the universe, who hast chosen us from among all nations, hast exalted us above all tongues, and hast sanctified us with thy commandments. In love, O Lord, thou hast given us appointed times for joy, festivals, and seasons for rejoicing; and this Feast of Tabernacles, this time of our gladness, the holy convocation, in memory of the: exodus from Egypt; for thou hast chosen us, and hast sanctified us above all nations, and hast caused us to inherit thy holy festivals with joy and rejoicing. Blessed art thou, O Lord, who hast sanctified Israel and the seasons! Blessed art thou, O Lord our God, King of the universe, who hast sanctified us with thy commandments, and hast enjoined us to dwell in booths! Blessed art thou, O Lord our God, King of the universe, who hast preserved us alive, sustained us, and brought us to the beginning of this season!” Thereupon each member of the family washes his hands, pronouncing the prescribed benediction while drying them, and all enjoy the repast. The orthodox Jews sleep in the booths all night. The following morning, which is the first day of the festival, they again resort to the synagogue, holding the palms and citrons in their hands. They lay them down during the former part of the prayer, but take them up after the eighteen benedictions, when they are about to recite the Hallel. Holding the palm in the right hand and the citron in the left, they recite, the following prayer: “Blessed art thou, O Lord our God, King of the universe, who hast sanctified us with thy commandments, and hast enjoined us to take the palm-branch! Thereupon each one turns his citron upside-down and waves

his palm-branch three times towards the east, three times towards the west, three times towards the south, and three times towards the north. The legate of the congregation pronounces the following benediction: “Blessed art thou, O Lord our God, King of the universe, who hast sanctified us with thy commandments, and hast enjoined us to recite the *Hallel!*” and the *Hallel* is chanted; when they come to Psalm 118, the waving of the palm-branch is repeated at the first, tenth, and twenty-fifth verses, just as it was done in the Temple. Two scrolls of the law are then taken out of the ark (*ḥwra*, *hbyt*) and brought on the platform (*hmyb*), when the lessons for the first day of the festival are read out from the law-^{<1025>} Leviticus 22:26-23, 44; and ^{<1092>} Numbers 29:12-16, as *Maphtâr*; and from the prophets, ^{<840>} Zechariah 14:1-21. *SEE HAPHTARAH*. After this the *Musâph* prayer is recited, which corresponds to the *Musâph* or *additional* sacrifices in the Temple for this special festival. When the legate of the congregation in reciting the *Musâph* come to the passage where the expression *priests* (*ḥynhk*) occurs, the Aaronites and the Levites arise, and, after the latter have washed the hands of the former, the priests, with uplifted hands, pronounce the sacerdotal benediction (^{<1063>} Numbers 6:24-27) upon the congregation, who have their faces veiled with the *Talîth*. *SEE FRINGE*. The ark of the Lord is then placed in the center of the synagogue, when the elders form themselves into a procession headed by the legate, who carries the scroll of the law, and all the rest carry the palm-branches in their hands and walk round the ark once, repeating the *Hosanna*, and waving the palms in commemoration of the procession round the altar in the Temple (Maimonides, *lad Ha-Chezaka*, *Hilchoth Lulâb*, 7:23). When the morning service is concluded the people betake themselves to their respective booths to partake of the festive repast with the poor and the stranger; In the afternoon, about five or six o’clock, they again resort to the synagogue to recite the *Minchâh* (*hj nm*) prayer, answering to the daily evening sacrifice in the Temple. As soon as darkness sets in or the stars appear, the second day of the festival commences, the Jews having doubled the days of holy convocation. The evening prayer as well as the practices for this evening resemble those of the first evening.

The ritual for the second day in the morning, as well as the rites, with very few variations, is like that of the first day. The lesson, however, from the prophets is different, for on this day ^{<1082>} 1 Kings 8:2-21 is read. After the afternoon service of this day the middle days of the festival begin, which last four days, when the ritual is like that of ordinary days, except that a

few prayers, bearing on this festival are occasionally inserted in the regular formulae, lessons from the law are read on each day as specified in the article HAPHTARAH *SEE HAPHTARAH* , and the above-named procession goes round the ark. The seventh day, which is *the Great Hosanna* (an[çwh hbr]), is celebrated with peculiar solemnity, inasmuch as it is believed that on this day God decrees the weather, or rather the rain, for the future harvest (Mishna, *Rosh ha-Shanah*, 1, 2; Gemara, *ibid.*). On the evening preceding this day every Israelite prepares for himself a small bunch of willows tied up with the bark of the palm; some of the pious Jews assemble either 'in the synagogue or in the booths to read the book of Deuteronomy, the Psalms, the Mishna, etc., all night, and are immersed before the morning prayer. When the time of morning service arrives, numerous candles are lighted in the synagogue, and after the *Shachrîth* (tyrj ç) = morning prayer, which is similar to that of the previous day, seven scrolls of the law are taken out of the ark, and from one of them the lesson is read. The *Musâph* or additional prayer is then recited; thereupon a procession is formed, headed by the rabbi and the legate with the palms in their hands, and followed by those who carry the seven scrolls of the law. This procession goes seven times round the ark, which is placed in the middle of the synagogue, or round the reading-desk, reciting the Hosannas, in accordance with the seven circuits around the altar which were performed in the Temple on this day, and waving their palms at certain expressions. The palms are then laid down, and every one takes up his bunch of willows and beats off its leaves at a certain part of the liturgy, in accordance with the beating off the leaves from the willows around the altar in the Temple, which took place on this day. On the evening of the seventh day the festival commences which concludes the whole cycle of festival (ynwmç trx[). It is a day of holy convocation, on which no manner of work is done, and is introduced by the *Kiddush* (çwdq) = proclamation of its sanctity, given in the former part of this, section. On the following morning the Jews resort to the synagogue, recite the morning prayer (tyrj ç), as is the first two days of the Feast of Tabernacles, inserting, however, some prayers appropriate for this occasion. Thereupon the special lesson for the day is read, the *Musâph* or additional prayer is offered, and the priests pronounce the benediction in the manner already described. The people no longer take their meals in the booths on this day. On the evening of this day again another festival commences, called *the Rejoicing of the Law* (hrwt tj mç). After the reciting of the Eighteen

Benedictions, all the scrolls of the law are taken out of the ark, into which a lighted candle is placed. A procession is then formed of the distinguished members, who are headed by the legate; they hold the scrolls in their hands, and go around the reading-desk; the scrolls are then put back into the ark, and only one is placed upon the desk, out of which is read the last chapter of Deuteronomy, and to the reading of which all persons present in the synagogue are called, including children. When the evening service is over the children leave the synagogue in procession, carrying banners with sundry Hebrew inscriptions.

On the following morning the Jews again resort to the synagogue, recite the *Hallel* after the Eighteen Benedictions, empty the ark of all its scrolls, put a lighted candle into it, form themselves into a procession, and with the scrolls in their hands, and amid jubilant songs, go round the reading-desk. This being over, the scrolls of the law are put back into the ark, and from one of the two which are retained is read Deuteronomy 33:whereunto four persons are at first called, then all the little children are called as on the previous evening, and then again several grown-people are called. The first of these is called *the Bridegroom of the Law* (hrwt ^tj) and after the cantor who calls him up has addressed him in a somewhat lengthy Hebrew formula, the last verses of the Pentateuch are read; and when the reading of the law is thus finished all the people exclaim, qzj , *be strong!* which expression is printed at the end of every book in the Hebrew Bible as well as of every non-inspired Hebrew work. After reading the last chapter of the law the beginning of Genesis (^{<000E>}Genesis 1:1-2, 3) is read, to which another one is called who is denominated *the Bridegrooms of Genesis* (tyçarb ^tj), and to whom again the cantor delivers a somewhat lengthy Hebrew formula; the *Maphtîr*, consisting of ^{<0025>}Numbers 29:35-30, 1, is then read from another scroll; and with the recitation of the *Musâph*, or additional special prayer for the festival, the service is concluded. The rest of the day is spent in rejoicing and feasting. The design of this festival is to celebrate the annual completion of the perusal of the Pentateuch, inasmuch as on this day the last section of the law is read. "Hence the name of the festival, *the Rejoicing of Finishing the Law*.

IV. *Origin and Import of this Festival.* — Like Pentecost, the Feast of Tabernacles owes its origin to the harvest, which terminated at this time, and which the Jews in common with other nations of antiquity celebrated as a season of joy and thankfulness for the kindly fruit of the earth. This is

undoubtedly implied in its very name, *the Feast of Ingathering*, and is distinctly declared in ⁽¹²³¹⁶⁾Exodus 23:16: “Thou shalt keep the feast of ingathering in the end of the year when thou hast gathered in thy labors out of the field” (comp. also. ⁽¹²³¹⁹⁾Leviticus 23:39; ⁽¹⁵¹⁶³⁾Deuteronomy 16:13). With this agricultural origin, however, is associated a great historical event, which the Jews are enjoined to remember during the celebration of this festival, and which imparted a second name to this feast — viz. “Ye shall dwell in booths seven days, that your generations may know that I made the children of Israel to dwell in booths, when I brought them out of the land of Egypt” (⁽¹²³⁴²⁾Leviticus 23:42, 43), whence its name, *the Feast of Booths* or *Tabernacles*. The Feast of Tabernacles, therefore, like the Passover, has a twofold significance—viz. it has a reference both to the annual course of nature and to a great national event. As to the reason for connecting this pre-eminently joyous festival of ingathering with the homeless dwelling of the Israelites in booths in the wilderness, we prefer the one given by the ancient Jews to theories advanced by modern commentators. In the midst of their great joy, when their houses are full of corn, new wine, oil, and all good things, and their hearts overflow with rejoicing—the Israelites might forget the Lord their God, and say that it is their power and the strength of their arm which have gotten them this prosperity (⁽¹¹⁸¹²⁾Deuteronomy 8:12, etc.). To guard against this the Hebrews were commanded to quit their permanent and sheltered house and sojourn in booths at the time of harvest and in the midst of general abundance, to be reminded thereby that they were once homeless and wanderers in the wilderness, and that they are now in the enjoyment of blessings through the goodness and faithfulness of their heavenly Father, who fulfilled the promises made to Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob. This idea was still more developed after the Babylonian captivity, when the canons about the building of the booths were enacted. The booths, as we have seen, were to be covered in such a manner as to admit the view of the sky and the stars, in order that the sojourners therein might be reminded of their Creator, and remember that, however great and prosperous the harvest, the things of earth are perishable and vanity of vanities. This is the reason why the scribes also ordained that the book of Ecclesiastes should be read on this joyous festival.

The origin of the Feast of Tabernacles is by some connected with Sukkoth, the first halting-place of the Israelites on their march out of Egypt; and the huts are taken, not to commemorate the tents in the wilderness, but the

leafy booths (*succhoth*) in which they lodged for the last time before they entered the desert. The feast would thus call to mind the transition from settled to nomadic life (Stanley, *Sinai and Palestine*, Appendix, § 89).

Philo saw in this feast a witness for the original equality of all the members of the chosen race. All, during the week; poor and rich, the inhabitant alike of the palace and the hovel, lived in huts, which, in strictness, were to be of the plainest and most ordinary materials and construction. From this point of view the Israelite would be reminded with still greater edification of the perilous and toilsome march of his forefathers through the desert, when the nation seemed to be more immediately dependent on God for food, shelter, and protection, while the completed harvest stored up for the coming winter set before him the benefits he had derived from the possession of the land flowing with milk and honey which had been of old promised to his race. But the culminating-point of this blessing was the establishment of the central spot of the national worship in the Temple at Jerusalem. Hence it was evidently fitting that the Feast of Tabernacles should be kept with an unwonted degree of observance at the dedication of Solomon's Temple (^{<K&P>}1 Kings 8:2, 65; Josephus, *Ant.* 8:4, 5), again after the rebuilding of the Temple by Ezra (^{<K&P>}Nehemiah 8:13-18), and a third time by Judas Maccabaeus, when he had driven out the Syrians and restored the Temple to the worship of Jehovah (2 Macc. 10:5-8).

V. Literature. —Maimonides, *Iad-Chezaka, Hilchoth Luláb*; Meyer, *De Temp. et Festis Diebus Hebraeorum* (Utrecht, 1755), p. 317, etc.; Bahr, *Symbolik des Mosaischen Cultus* (Heidelberg, 1839), 2, 624 sq., 652 sq.; Herzfeld, *Geschichte des Volkes Israel* (Nordhausen, 1857), 2, 120 sq., 177 sq.; *The Jewish Ritual*, entitled *Dereka Ha-Chajim* (Vienna, 1859)p., 2-14 b sq., 295 sq.; Keil, *Handbuch der biblischen Archäologie* (2nd ed. Frankforton-the-Main, 1859), p. 412 sq.; Carpzov, *App. Crit.* p.414; Buxtorf, *Syn. Jud.* c. 21; Reland, *Ant.* 4:5; Lightfoot, *Temple Service*, 16:and *Exercit. in Joan.* 7:2,37; Otho, *Lex. Rab.* 230; the treatise *Sukkah*, in the Mishna, with Surenhusius's *Notes*; Hupfeld, *De Fest. hebr.* pt; 2; comp. the monographs *De Libatione Aquae in Fest. Tab.* by Iken (in the *Symbol.* etc. [Bremen, 1744], 1, 160), Biel (Vitemb. 1716), and Tresenreuter (Alt. 1743), Groddek, *De Ceremonia Palmarum in Fest. Tab.* (Lips. 1694-95, also in Ugolino, vol. 18); Dachs, on *Sukkah*, in the *Jerusalem Gemara* (Utrecht, 1726); Tirsch, *De Tabernac. Feriis* (Prag. s. Let an.).

Tab'itha

(**Ταβιθά**; Vulg. *Tabitha*), also called, *Dorcas* (**Δορκάς**), a female disciple of Joppa, “full of good works,” among which that of making clothes for the poor is specifically mentioned (^{<4085>}Acts 9:36-42). A.D. 32. While Peter was at the neighboring town of Lydda, Tabitha died, upon which the disciples at Joppa sent an urgent message to the apostle, begging him to come to them without delay. It is not quite evident from the narrative whether they looked for any exercise of miraculous power on his part, or whether they simply wished for Christian consolation under what they regarded as the common calamity of their Church; but the miracle recently performed on Aeneas (ver. —34), and the expression in ver. 38 (**διελθεῖν ἕως ἡμῶν**), lead to the former supposition. Upon his arrival Peter found the deceased already prepared^ῥ for burial, and laid out in an upper chamber, where she was surrounded by the recipients and the tokens of her charity. After the example of our Savior in the house of Jairus (^{<4025>}Matthew 9:25; ^{<4054>}Mark 5:40), “Peter put them all forth,” prayed for the divine assistance, and then commanded Tabitha to arise (comp. ^{<4054>}Mark 5:41; ^{<4054>}Luke 8:54). She opened her eyes and sat up, and then, assisted by the apostle, rose from her couch. This great miracle, as we are further told, produced an extraordinary effect in Joppa, and was the occasion of many conversions there (^{<4092>}Acts 9:42). *SEE PETER*.

The name of “Tabitha” (**atybā**) is the Aramaic form answering to the Hebrew **תביא** *tebiyāh*, a “female gazelle,” the gazelle being regarded in the East, among both Jews and Arabs, as a standard of beauty indeed, the word **יבא** properly means “beauty.” Luke gives “Dorcas” as the Greek equivalent of the name.

Similarly we find **δορκάς** as the Sept. rendering of **יבא** in ^{<5125>}Deuteronomy 12:15, 22; 2 Samuel 2, 18; ^{<2065>}Proverbs 6:5. It has been inferred from the occurrence of the two names that Tabitha was a Hellenist (see Whitby, *ad loc.*). This, however; does not follow, even if we suppose that the two names were actually borne by her, as it would seem to have been the practice even of the Hebrew Jews at this period to have a Gentile name in addition to their Jewish name. But it is by no means clear from the language of Luke that Tabitha actually bore the name of Dorcas. All he tells us is that the name of Tabitha means gazelle” (**δορκάς**), and for the benefit of his Gentile readers he afterwards speaks of her by the Greek

equivalent. At the same time it is very possible that she may have been known by both names; and we learn from Josephus (*War*, 4:3, 5) that the name of Dorcas was not unknown in Palestine. Among the Greeks also, as we gather from Lucretius (4, 1154), it was a term of endearment. Other examples, of the use of the name will be found in Wettstein, *ad lo.*, **SEE DORCAS**.

Table

Picture for Table 1

is the rendering in the A.V. usually of **ⲓ ⲓⲩⲩ** *ushulchân* (New Test. **ⲧⲣⲱⲡⲉⲗⲁ**, likewise invariably so translated, except ^{<0193>}Luke 19:23 ["bank"]); ^{<4164>}Acts 16:34 ["meat"]), so called from being *extended* (**ⲓ ⲓⲩⲩ**; comp. Homer, *Od.* 10:37; and see ^{<4923>}Psalms 69:23), and denoting especially a table spread with food (^{<0107>}Judges 1:7; ^{<0219>}1 Samuel 20:29, 34; ^{<1137>}1 Kings 5:7; 10:5; ^{<4316>}Job 36:16; ^{<4457>}Nehemiah 5:17); but spoken likewise of the *table of shew-bread* (see below), and likewise of the *lectisternia* prepared before idols (^{<2351>}Isaiah 45:11; see. Schumann, *De Lectisterniis in Sacro Cod.* [Lips. 1739]). For the "tables" of stone on which the Decalogue was engraved, see below. The word. **bsæmesâb**, a *divan* (q.v.), is once rendered "at table" (Song of Solomon 1, 12). **SEE SITTING**.

Picture for Table 2

Little is known as to the form of tables among the Hebrews; but, as in other Oriental nations, they were probably not high. In ^{<0253>}Exodus 25:23, indeed, the table for the shew-bread is described as a cubit and a half in height; but the table of Herod's temple, as depicted on the arch of Titus at Rome, is only half a cubit high. Probably the table of the ancient Hebrews differed little from that of the modern Arabs, namely, a piece of skin or leather spread upon the ground (hence the figure of entanglement in it, ^{<4923>}Psalms 69:23). In Palestine, at the present day, the general custom, even of the better classes, is to bring a polygonal stool (*kursi*), about fourteen inches high, into the common sitting-room for meals. Upon this is placed a tray (*seniyeh*) of basketwork or of metal, generally copper, on which the food is arranged. 'These two pieces of furniture together compose the table (*sûfrah*). The bread lies upon the mat beneath the tray, and a cruse of water stands near by, from which all drink as they have need. On formal

occasions, this is held in the hand by a servant, who waits upon the guests. Around this stool and tray the guests gather, sitting on the floor (Thomson, *Land and Book*, 1, 180). **SEE EATING.**

Picture for Table 3

Among the ancient Egyptians, the table was much the same as that of the present day in Egypt, a small stool, supporting a round tray, on which the dishes are placed (see Lane, *Mod. Eg.* 1, 190); but it differed from this in having its circular summit fixed on a pillar, or leg, which was often in the form of a man, generally a captive, who supported the slab upon his head, the whole being of stone or some hard wood. On this the dishes were placed together with loaves of bread, some of which were not unlike those of the present day in Egypt, flat and round, as our crumpets. Others had the form of rolls or cakes, sprinkled with seeds. The table was not generally covered with any linen, but, like the Greek table, was washed with a sponge, or napkin, after the dishes were removed, and polished by the servants, when the company had retired; though an instance sometimes occurs of a napkin spread on it, at least on those which bore offerings in honor of the dead. One or two guests generally sat at a table, though, from the mention of persons seated in rows according to rank, it has been supposed the tables were occasionally of a long shape; as may have been the case when the brethren of Joseph “sat before him, the first-born according to his birthright, and the youngest according to his youth,” Joseph eating alone at another table where “they set on for him by himself.” But even if round, they might still sit according to rank, one place being always the post of honor, even at the present day, at the round table of Egypt (Wilkinson, *Anc. Egypt.* 1. 179). **SEE DINE.**

The tables of the ancient Assyrians, as delineated upon the monuments, were often of a highly ornamental character (Layard, *Nineveh*, 2, 236; Botta, *Nineveh*, p. 188). **SEE BANQUET.**

For the *triclinium* of the Roman period, **SEE ACCUBATION; SEE SUP.**

Other Greek words than **τράπεζα** above (which likewise denotes occasionally a broker’s counter, **SEE MONEY-CHANGER**, not to mention **ἀνακείμεαι** etc., often rendered ‘sit’ at table), which are translated “table” in the A. V. in a different sense, are: **κλίνη** (^{<4004>}Mark 7:4), a *bed* (as elsewhere rendered), or couch used for eating, i.e. the *triclinium* above noticed; and **πλάξ** (^{<4003>}2 Corinthians 3:3; ^{<8004>}Hebrews 9:4), a *tablet* for

inscription; more fully **πινακίδιον**, a *writing-table* (^{<016>}Luke 1:63). *SEE TABLE OF THE LAW.*

Table

(**j** **W** , *luach*, a *tablet*, whether of stone [as below], wood [“board,” ^{<02708>}Exodus 27:8, etc.], or for writing on [^{<23018>}Isaiah 40:8; Habakkuk 8:9; ^{<018B>}Proverbs 3:3]) **OF THE LAW** (only plur. in the phrases “tables of stone” [^{<0242>}**ba, tj l u** ^{<0242>}Exodus 24:12; 31:18; or **μυνηαει** , 34:1, 4], and “tables of the covenant” [^{<0900>}Deuteronomy 9:9, 15] or “of the testimony” [^{<0318>}Exodus 31:18]), such as those that were given to Moses upon Mount Sinai, being written by the finger of God, and containing the Decalogue, or Ten Commandments of the law, as they are rehearsed in Exodus 20. Many idle questions have been started about these tables; about their matter, their form, their number, who wrote them, and what they contained. The words which intimate that the tables were written by the finger of God, some understand simply and literally; others, of the ministry of an angel; and others explain merely to signify an order of God to Moses to write them. The expression, however, in Scripture always signifies the immediate Divine agency. See Walther, *De Duabus Taculis Lapideis* (Regiom. 1679); Michaelis, *De Tab. Faed. Prioribus* (Vitemb. 1719).

Table,

the name given to the supreme ecclesiastical court of the Waldensian Church (q.v.):

Table, Credence

a small side-table, commonly placed on the south side of the altar, for the altar breads, cruets of wine and water, offertory dish, service-books, lavabo dish, and other things necessary for the solemn or low celebration of the holy eucharist. *SEE CREDENCE-TABLE.*

Table, Holy

1. The Lord’s table or altar.
2. A frontal to an altar; e.g. one given to Glastonbury in 1071, made of gold, silver, and ivory, and one at St. Alban’s in the 12th century.
3. The mensa, the upper stone altar-slab.

4. Pensilis, containing the names of benefactors, registers of miracles, a list of indulgences, and the course of officiants, officiating clergy at the hours, and celebrants of masses.

Table Of Commandments

a representation of the two tables of stone on which the Commandments were graven, ordered by a post-Reformation canon to be placed on the east wall of the church or chancel.

Table Of Degrees

a formal list of relationships, both by blood and affinity, within which degrees the Church of England authoritatively prohibits marriage. This table, usually printed at the end of the Anglican Prayer-book is ordered to be hung up in a prominent place in the nave of every church or chapel, by the authority of various visitation articles, especially those of archbishop Parker in 1563. *SEE AFFINITY.*

Table Of (Movable) Feasts,

a list of movable festivals prefixed to the Book of Common Prayer for the guidance and instruction of both clergy and laity.

Table Of Lessons.

A tabular arrangement of Scripture lections for matins and evensong, daily arranged throughout the year. This table was first drawn up in 1549, altered in the revision of 1661, and again amended by Convocation in 1870.

Table Of The Lord

a phrase taken from Scripture, used to designate the holy table, or altar, of the Christian Church (⁴⁶⁰²1 Corinthians 10:21). In the Old Test. the words table and altar appear to have been applied indifferently to the same thing (³⁴⁴²Ezekiel 41:22). Among other terms which have been used to designate the Lord's table, it is obvious to mention the word "altar" as having been so employed; it is a term, however, which, though it may easily be borrowed in a figurative sense from the ancient Scriptures, is neither found in the New Test. in the sense now referred to, nor has it the sanction of the Church. In the first Prayer-book of king Edward VI, published in 1549,

which may be considered as a connecting link between the Missal and our present Prayer book, the word “altar” occurs in the Communion Service at least three times: but in the service of 1552 (the second Prayer-book of Edward VI) it is in every instance struck out; and if another expression is used in place of it, that expression is *The Lord’s Table*. This circumstance is the more worthy of remark, because wherever in the older of these books the phrase “God’s Board” was adopted as descriptive of “the Lord’s Table” it was allowed to remain. *SEE ALTAR*.

Table Of Prothesis.

SEE CREDENCE-TABLE;

Table Of Secrets

a piece of paper placed at the foot of the cross on the altar, and containing the part of the service the priest is to say while turned to the altar, so that he need not turn to look on his book. This is placed upon pasteboard or thin wood, and richly framed. Migne, *Encyclop. Theologique*, s.v.

Table Of Shew-Bread

Picture for Table

($\mu\eta\theta\eta\iota\ \dot{\iota}\ \dot{\iota}\mu\alpha$ *table of the faces*, ^{<0007>}Numbers 4:7; $\tau\kappa\rho\epsilon\mu\eta\iota\ \dot{\iota}\ \dot{\iota}\mu\alpha$ *table of the arrangement*, ^{<1316>}1 Chronicles 28:16; $\rho\eta\theta\eta\iota\ \dot{\iota}\ \dot{\iota}\mu\alpha$ *the pure table*, ^{<1316>}Leviticus 24:6; ^{<1431>}2 Chronicles 13:11; Sept. $\eta\ \tau\rho\acute{\alpha}\pi\epsilon\zeta\alpha\ \tau\eta\varsigma\ \pi\rho\theta\acute{\epsilon}\sigma\epsilon\omega\varsigma$), one of the pieces of furniture in the Mosaic tabernacle (^{<1253>}Exodus 25:23 sq.; 37:10 sq.), in Solomon’s Temple (^{<1174>}1 Kings 7:48; comp; ^{<1428>}2 Chronicles 29:18), in its restoration by Zerubbabel (1 Macc. 1, 22), and in Herod’s reconstruction of that edifice (Josephus, *War*, 7:5, 5). It stood in the outer apartment or holy place, on the right hand or north side, and was made of acacia (shittim) wood, two cubits long, one broad, and one and a half high, and covered with laminate of gold. According to the Mishna (*Menach. 11:5*), it was ten handbreadths long and five wide; other traditions make it twelve handbreadths long and six wide. The top of the leaf of this table was encircled by a border or rim ($\rho\zeta\epsilon\alpha$ *crown or wreath*) of gold. The frame of the table, immediately below the leaf, was encircled with a piece of wood of about four inches in breadth, around the edge of which was a rim or border ($\tau\rho\varsigma\iota\mu\alpha$ *margin*) similar to that around the leaf. A little lower down, but at equal distances from the top of

the table, there were four rings of gold fastened to the legs, through which staves covered with gold were inserted for the purpose of carrying it (^{<1223>}Exodus 25:23-28; 37:10-16). The description of Josephus, which is quite minute, varies in several particulars (*Ant.* 3, 6,6). These rings were not found in the table which was afterwards made for the Temple, nor indeed in any of the sacred furniture, where they had previously been, except in the ark of the covenant. Twelve unleavened loaves were placed upon this table, which were sprinkled with frankincense (the Sept. adds salt; ^{<1247>}Leviticus 24:7). The number twelve represented the twelve tribes, and was not diminished after the defection of ten of the tribes from the worship of God in his sanctuary, because the covenant with the sons of Abraham was not formally abrogated, and because there were still many true Israelites among the apostatizing tribes. The twelve loaves were also a constant record against them, and served as a standing testimonial that their proper place was before the forsaken altar of Jehovah (see Philo, *Opp.* 2, 151; Clem. Alex. *Strom.* 6:279).

Wine also was placed upon the table of shew-bread in bowls, some larger, **tʷo [q]** and some smaller, **t nθK**; also in vessels that were covered, **t/wcq** and in cups, **tʷoQan** which were probably employed in pouring in and taking out the wine from the other vessels, or in making libations. Gesenius calls them “paterse libatoria;” and they appear in the A. V. as “spoons.” Some of them were perhaps for incense (**hnwbl ykyzb**, Mishna, *Yoma*, 5, 1). See generally ^{<1253>}Exodus 25:29, 30; 37:10-16; 40, 4, 24; ^{<1245>}Leviticus 24:5-9; ^{<1246>}Numbers 4:7.

The fate of the original table of shew-bread is unknown. It was probably transferred by David (if it then still existed) to his temporary sanctuary on Mt. Zion, and thence by Solomon to his sumptuous Temple, With the other articles of sacred furniture, it was carried away by the Babylonians and possibly in like manner restored after the Captivity. Antiochus Epiphanes despoiled the second Temple of this as well as of its other treasures (1 Macc. 1, 23), and hence on the Maccabean restoration a new one was made (4, 49). According to ‘Josephus, it was reconstructed in a most elaborate and costly manner at the expense of Ptolemy Philadelphus (*Ant.* 12:2,9, where the description is very detailed). The same historian again describes more briefly the Herodian shew-bread table, which was carried away by the Romans (*War*, 7:5, 5), and was deposited by Vespasian in his newly erected Temple of Peabe at Rome (*ibid.* 7:5, 7). where it survived

the burning of that building under Commodus (Herodian, 1, 14), and in the middle of the 5th century, was taken by the Vandals under Genseric to Africa (Cedren. *Compend.* 1, 346). It is said to have been rescued by Belisarius (A.D. 520), and sent to Constantinople, whence it was finally remitted to Jerusalem (Propius, *Vandal.* 11:9). The only authentic representation of this interesting article extant is that upon the arch of Titus at Rome, *SEE SHEW-BREAD*, which was carefully delineated and described by Reland (*De Spoliis Templi* [Fr. ad Rh. 1716], c. 6-9) when it seems to have been in a better state of preservation than at present. See, generally, Schlichter, *De Mensa Facierum* (Hal. 1738; also in Ugolino, *Thesaur.* 10); Witsius, *Miscell. Sacr.* 1, 336; Carpzov, *Appar7. Crit. p.* 278; Bahr, *Symbol. d. mos. Cultus*, 1, 435; Friederich, *Symbol. d. mos. Stiftshütte*, p. 170; Keil, *Tempel Sal.* p. 109; Paine, *The Tabernacle and the Temple* (Bost. 1861), p. 11; Neumann, *Die Stiftshütte*, etc. (Leips. 1861), p. 135; Riggenbach, *Die mos. Stiftshütte* (Basel, 1867), p. 37; Soltau, *Vessels of the Tabernacle* (Lond. 1873), p. 17-28. *SEE TABERNACLE; SEE TEMPLE.*

Table Of Succession.

A list of the successors of St. Peter made by Eusebius. He acknowledged that there was great difficulty in procuring information, and his account appears to have been compiled chiefly from reports or traditions. Of his fidelity he has given proof, by leaving vacancies in his conjectural list, when he had no light to guide him. These vacancies were subsequently filled up by Nicephorus, Callistus, and Simon the Metaphrast (see Elliott, *Delineation of Romanism*, p. 498). *SEE SUCCESSION.*

Table-tomb

a tomb shaped like a table or altar erected over a grave or place of interment. *SEE TOMB.*

Table-turning

SEE SPIRITUALISM.

Tablet

is the inaccurate rendering in the A.V. of two Heb. words designating some kind of female ornament.

1. **zmWki** *kumâz* (so called, according to Gesen., from the *globular* form; but, according to Fürst, *a locket* or clasp; Sept. ἐμπλόκια καὶ περιδέξια, Vulg. *dextralia*, in ^{<0282>}Exodus 35:22; ἐμπλόκιον, *muraenulae*, in ^{<0485>}Numbers 31:50), probably *drops* hung like beads in a string around the neck or arm, as described by ancient authors on Arabia (Diod. Sic. 3, 44, 50; Strabo, 16:277).

2. **vḡWaiyTB**; *bottey hanne'phesh, houses of the soul* (^{<2181>}Isaiah 3:20, Sept. δακτύλιοι, Vulg. *olfactoriola*), i.e. *perfume-bottles* of essences or smelling-salts kept in lockets suspended about the person. **SEE ORNAMENT.**

Tablet, Memorial.

A tablet placed on the floor of a church or cloister, inscribed with a legend in memory of some person deceased.

Tablet, Mural.

A tablet on which an inscription has been placed, affixed to the wall of a church or cloister.

Ta'bor

(Heb. *Tabor'*, **r/bT**; a *mound*), the name of three spots in Palestine, all closely related to each other, if not indeed actually identical. **SEE AZNOTHITABOR; SEE CHISLOTH-TABOR.**

I. MOUNT TABOR (Sept. Γαιθβώρ [v.r. Ταφώθ], ὄρος Θαβώρ, Θαβώρ, but τὸ Ἰταβύριον in Jeremiah and Hosea, and in Josephus [Ant. 5, 5, 3; War, 4:1,1, etc.], who has also Ἄταρβύριον, as in Polybius, 5, 70,6; Vulg. *Thabor*), a mountain (**rhi** ^{<0046>}Judges 4:6,12, 14, elsewhere without this epithet, ^{<0692>}Joshua 19:22, ^{<0088>}Judges 8:18; ^{<3792>}Psalms 79:12; ^{<2468>}Jeremiah 46:18 ^{<3801>}Hosea 5:1), one of the most interesting and remarkable of the single mountains in Palestine. It was a Rabbinic saying (and shows the Jewish estimate of the attractions of the locality) that the Temple ought of right to have been built here, but was required by an express revelation to be erected on Mount Moriah.

Picture for Tabor

1. Description. —*Mount Tabor* rises abruptly from the north-eastern arm of the plain of Esdraelon and stands entirely; insulated, except on the west, where a narrow ridge connects it with the hills of Nazareth. It presents to the eye, as seen from a distance, a beautiful appearance, being so symmetrical in its proportions, and rounded off like a hemisphere or the segment of a circle, yet varying somewhat as viewed from different directions, being more conical when seen from the east or west. The body of the mountain consists of the peculiar limestone of the country. It is studded with a comparatively dense forest of oaks, pistacias, and other trees and bushes, with the exception of an occasional opening on the sides and a small uneven tract on the summit. The coverts afford at present a shelter for wolves, wild boars, lynxes, and various reptiles. Its height is estimated at 1300 feet from the base, and 1865 from the sea-level (Tristram, *Land of Israel*, p. 498). Its ancient name, as already suggested, indicates its elevation, though it does not rise much, if at all, above some of the other summits in the vicinity. It is now called *ebel et-Tu*; a name which some have tried to identify with Tabor, as if it were a contraction. But *Jebel et Tur* means simply the “fort-hill,” and is used to designate the Mount of Olives and Gerizim, as well as Tabor. It lies about six or eight miles almost due east from Nazareth. The ascent is usually made on the west side, near the little village of Debirieh, probably the ancient Daberath (^{<ref>Joshua 19:12</ref>}), though it can be made with entire ease in other places. It requires three quarters of an hour or an hour to reach the top. The path is circuitous and at times steep, but not so-much so as to render it difficult to ride the entire way. The trees and bushes are generally so thick as to intercept the prospect; but now and then the traveler as he ascends comes to an open spot which reveals to him a magnificent view of the plain. One of the most pleasing aspects of the landscape, as seen from such points, in the season of the early harvest, is that presented in the diversified appearance of the fields. The different plots of ground exhibit various colors, according to the state of cultivation at the time. Some of them are red, where the land has been newly ploughed up, owing to the natural properties of the soil; others yellow or white, where the harvest is beginning to ripen or is already ripe; and others green being covered with grass or springing grain. As they are contiguous to each other, or intermixed, these part-colored plots present, as looked down upon from above, an appearance of gay checkered work which is singularly beautiful.

The top of Tabor consists of an irregular platform half a mile long by three quarters wide, embracing a circuit of half an hour's walk and commanding wide views of the subjacent plain from end to end. A copious dew falls here during the warm months. Travelers who have spent the night there have found their tents as wet in the morning as if they had been drenched with rain.

It is the universal judgment of those who have stood on the spot, that the panorama spread before them as they look from Tabor includes as great a variety of objects of natural beauty and of sacred and historic interest as any one to be seen from any position in the Holy Land. On the east the waters of the Sea of Tiberias, not less, than fifteen miles distant, are seen glittering through the clear atmosphere in the deep bed where they repose so quietly. Though but a small portion of the surface of the lake can be distinguished, the entire outline of its basin can be traced on every side. In the same direction the eye follows the course of the Jordan for many miles, while still farther east it rests upon a boundless perspective of hills and valleys, embracing the modern Hauran, and farther south the mountains of the ancient Gilead and Bashan. The dark line which skirts the horizon on the west is the Mediterranean the rich plains of Galilee fill up the intermediate space as far as the foot of Tabor. The ridge of Carmel lifts its head in the north-west, though the portion which lies directly on the sea is not distinctly visible. On the north and north-east we behold the last ranges of Lebanon as they rise into the hills about Safed, overtopped in the rear by the snow-capped Hermon, and still nearer to us the Horns of Hattin, the reputed Mount of the Beatitudes. On the south are seen, first the summits of Gilboa, which David's touching elegy on Saul and Jonathan has fixed forever in the memory of mankind, and farther onward a confused view of the mountains and valleys which occupy the central part of Palestine. Over the heads of Dûhy and Gilboa the spectator looks into the valley of the Jordan in the neighborhood of Beisan (itself not within sight), the ancient Bethshean, on whose walls the Philistines hung up the headless trunk of Saul, after their victory over Israel. Looking across a branch of the plain of Esdraelon, we behold Endor, the abode of the sorceress whom the king consulted on the night before his fatal battle. Another little village clings to the hill-side of another ridge, on which we gaze with still deeper interest. It is Nain, the village of that name in the New Test., where the Savior touched the bier and restored to life the widow's son. The Savior must have often passed at the foot of this mount in the course of his

journeys in different parts of Galilee. It is not surprising that the Hebrews looked up with so much admiration to this glorious work of the Creator's hand. The same beauty rests upon its brow today, the same richness of verdure refreshes the eye, in contrast with the bald aspect of so many of the adjacent mountains. The Christian traveler yields spontaneously to the impression of wonder and devotion, and appropriates as his own the language of the psalmist (¹³⁹¹Psalm 89:11, 12)—

“The heavens are thine, the earth also is thine; The world and the fullness thereof, thou hast founded them. The north and the south thou hast created them; Tabor and Hermon shall rejoice in thy name.”

2. History. —Tabor is not expressly mentioned in the New Test., but makes a prominent figure in the Old. The book of Joshua (19:22) names it as the boundary between Issachar and Zebulon (see ver. 12). Barak, at the command of Deborah, assembled his forces on Tabor, and, on the arrival of the opportune moment, descended thence with “ten thousand men after him” into the plain, and conquered Sisera on the banks of the Kishon (¹⁰⁰⁶Judges 4:6-15). The brothers of Gideon, each of whom resembled the children of a king, were murdered here by Zebah and Zalmunna (8, 18, 19). Some writers, after Herder and others, think that Tabor is intended when it is said of Issachar and Zebulon in (¹³³⁹Deuteronomy 33:19, that “they shall call the people unto. *the mountain*; there they shall offer sacrifices of righteousness.” Stanley, who holds this view (*Sinai and Palestine*, p. 351), remarks that he was struck with the aspect of the open glades on the summit as specially fitted for the convocation of festive assemblies, and could well believe that in some remote age it may have been a sanctuary of the northern tribes, if not of the whole nation. The prophet in (³⁸⁰Hosea 5:1 reproaches the priests and royal family with having “been a snare on Mizpah and a net spread upon Tabor.” The charge against them probably is that they had set up idols and practiced heathenish rites on the high places which were usually selected for such worship. The comparison in (²⁴⁶⁸Jeremiah 46:18, “As Tabor is among the mountains and Carmel, by the sea,” imports apparently that those heights were proverbial for their conspicuousness, beauty, and strength.

After the close of Old-Test. history, Tabor continued to be a strong fortress. In the year B.C. 218, Antiochus the Great got possession of it by stratagem and strengthened its fortifications. The town existed on the

summit in New-Test. times; but the defenses had fallen into decay, and Josephus caused them to be rebuilt (*War*, 4. 1, 8).

3. Present Condition. —Dr. Robinson (*Bibl. Res.* 2, 353) has thus described the ruins which are to be seen at present on the summit of Tabor: “All around the top are the foundations of a thick wall built of large stones, some of which are beveled, showing that the entire wall was perhaps originally of that character. In several parts are the remains of towers and bastions. The chief remains are upon the ledge of rocks on the south of the little basin, and especially towards its eastern end; here are in indiscriminate confusion, walls and arches and foundations, apparently of dwelling-houses, as well as other buildings, some of hewn, and some of, large beveled stones. The walls and traces of a fortress are seen here, and farther west along the southern brow, of which one tall pointed arch of a Saracenic gateway is still standing, and bears the name of Bab el-Hawa, Gate of the Wind. Connected with it: are loopholes, and others are seen near by. These latter fortifications belong to the sera of the Crusades; but the large beveled stones we refer to a style of architecture not later than the times of the Romans, before which period, indeed, a town and fortress already existed on Mount Tabor. In the days of the Crusaders, too, and earlier, there were here churches and monasteries. The summit has many cisterns, now mostly dry.” The same writer found the thermometer here, 10 A.M. (June 18), at 98° Fahr., at sunrise at 64°, and at sunset at 740. The Latin Christians have now an altar here, at which their priests from Nazareth perform an annual mass. The Greeks also have a chapel, where, on certain festivals, they assemble for the celebration of religious rites. Stanley, in his *Notices of Localities Visited with the Prince of Wales*, remarks, “The fortress, of which the ruins crown the summit, had evidently four gateways, like those by which the great Roman camps of our own country were entered. By one of these gateways my attention was called to an Arabic inscription, said to be the only one on the mountain.” It records the building or rebuilding of “this blessed fortress” by the order of the sultan Abu-Bekr on his return from the East A.H. 607. In 1873 the monks began the construction of a convent on the north-east brow of the mountain.

4. Traditional Importance. — In the monastic ages, Tabor, in consequence partly of a belief that it was the scene of the Savior’s transfiguration, was crowded with hermits. It was one of the shrines from the earliest period - which pilgrims to the Holy Land regarded as a sacred duty to honor with

their presence and their prayers. Jerome, in his *Itinerary of Paula*, writes, “Scandebat montem Tabor, in quo transfiguratus est Dominus; aspiciebat procul Hermon et Hermonim et campos latissimos Galilneae (Jesreel), in quibus Sisara prostratus est. Torrens Cison qui mediam planitiem dividebat, et oppidum juxta, Naim, monstrabantur.” This idea that our Savior was transfigured on Tabor prevailed extensively among the early Christians (see Robinson, *Bibl. Res.* 2,358 sq.), who adopted legends of this nature, and often reappears still in popular religious works. — If one might choose a place which he would deem peculiarly fitting for so sublime a transaction, there is certainly none which would so entirely satisfy our feelings in this respect as the lofty majestic, beautiful Tabor. It has been thought difficult, however, to acquiesce in the correctness of this opinion. The summit of Tabor appears to have been occupied by a town as early as the time when the Israelites took possession of the country (^{<1692>}Joshua 19:22). Indeed, such a strong position would scarcely be left unoccupied in those stormy times of Syria’s history. Accordingly, as above seen, it is susceptible of proof from the Old Test., and from later history, that a fortress or town existed on Tabor from very early times down to B.C. 50 or 53; and, as Josephus says that he strengthened the fortifications of a city there, about A.D. 60, it is certain that Tabor must have been inhabited during the intervening period, that is, in the days of Christ (comp. Polybius, 5, 70, 6; Josephus, *Ant.* 14:6, 3; *War*, 2, 20, 1; 4:1. 8; *Life*, § 37). But as in the account of the transfiguration it is said that Jesus took his disciples “up into a high mountain apart and was transfigured before them” (^{<170>}Matthew 17:1, 2), we must understand that he brought them to the summit of the mountain, where they were alone by themselves (κατ’ ἰδίαν). Yet it is not probable that the whole mountain was occupied by edifices, and it is quite possible that a solitary spot might have been found amid its groves, where the scene could have taken place, unobserved. The event has, indeed, been referred by many to Mount Hermon, on the ground that our Lord’s miracle immediately preceding was at Caesarea Philippi; but the interval of a whole week (“six days,” ^{<171>}Matthew 17:1, ^{<172>}Mark 9:2, “eight days,” ^{<173>}Luke 9:28) decidedly favors the idea of a considerable journey in the interval.

SEE TRANSFIGURATION.

Some Church traditions have given also to Tabor the honor of being Melchizedek’s hill, from which he came forth to greet Abraham, so that here is another king’s dale, rivaling that at Gerizim, if tradition is to be followed. The whole legend will be found at full length in Athanasius (*Opp.*

2, 7 [Colon. 1686]). That father tells us that Salem, the mother of Melchizedek, ordered him to go to Tabor. He went, and remained seven years in the wood naked, till his back became like a snail's shell.

The mountain has been visited and described by multitudes, of travelers, especially (in addition to those named above) Russegger (*Reis.* 3, 258), Hasselquist (*Voyage*, p. 179), Volney (*Voyage*, 2, 272), Schubert (*Morgenl.* 3, 175), Burckhardt (*Syria*, p. 332), Stephens (*Travels*, 2, 317), Nugent [lord] (*Lands*, etc., 2, 198); see also Reland, *Palaest.* p. 334; Hackett, *Illustr. of Script.* p. 304; Thomson, *Land and Book*, 2, 136; Porter, *Handb.* p. 401; Badeker, *Palest.* p. 364; Ridgaway, *The Lord's Land*, p. 371.

II. The PLAIN (or rather OAK) OF TABOR (/I aetwbT; Sept. ἡ δρῶς Θαβώρ; Vulg. *Quercus Thabor*) is mentioned only in ^{<0101>}1 Samuel 10:3 as one of the points in the homeward journey of Saul after his anointing by Samuel. It was the next stage in the journey after "Rachel's sepulcher at Zelzah." But, unfortunately, like so many of the other spots named in this interesting passage, the position of the Oak of Tabor has not yet been fixed. *SEE SAUL.* Ewald seems to consider it certain (*gewiss*) that Tabor and Deborah are merely different modes of pronouncing the same name, and he accordingly identifies the oak of Tabor with the tree under which Deborah, Rachel's nurse, was buried (^{<0138>}Genesis 35:8) and that again with the palm under which Deborah the prophetess delivered her oracles (*Gesch.* 1, 390; 2, 489; 3, 29), and this again with the Oak of the old Prophet near Bethel (*ibid.* 3, 444). But this, though most ingenious, can only be received as a conjecture, and the position on which it would land us "between Ramah and Bethel" (^{<0105>}Judges 4:5)— is too far from Rachel's sepulcher to fall in with the conditions of the narrative of Saul's journey, so long as we hold that to be the traditional sepulcher near Bethlehem. We can only determine that it lay somewhere between Bethlehem and Bethel, but why it received the epithet "Tabor" it is impossible to discover. Yet we see from the names Chisloth-Tabor and Aznoth-Tabor that the mountain gave adjunct titles to places at a considerable distance. *SEE ZELZAH.*

III. The CITY OF TABOR (Sept. Θαβώρ v.r. Θαχχεία; Vulg. *Thabor*) is mentioned in the lists of 1 Chronicles 6 as a city of the Merarite Levites, in the tribe of Zebulun (ver. 77). The catalogue of Levitical cities in Joshua 21 does not contain any name answering to this (comp. ver. 34, 35). But

the list of the towns of Zebulun (ch. 19) contains the name of CHISLOTH-TABOR (ver; 12). It is therefore possible either that this last name is abbreviated into Tabor by the chronicler, or (which is less likely) that by the time these later lists were compiled the Merarites had established themselves on the sacred mountain, and that the place in question is Mount Tabor.

Taborites

a section of the Hussites, the other being known as the Calixtines. The Taborites were so called from the fortified city of Tabor, erected on a mountain, in the circle of Bechin, in Bohemia, which had been consecrated by the field-preaching of Huss. The gentle and pious mind of that martyr never could have anticipated, far less approved, the terrible revenge which his Bohemian adherents took upon the emperor, the empire, and the clergy, in one of the most dreadful and bloody wars ever known. The Hussites commenced their vengeance after the death of king Wenceslaus, Aug. 16, 1419, by the destruction of the convents and churches, on which occasions many of the priests and monks were murdered. John Ziska, a Bohemian knight, formed a numerous, well-mounted, and disciplined army, which built Tabor, as above described, and rendered it an impregnable depot and place of defense. He was called *Ziska of the Cup*, because one great point for which the Hussites contended was the use of the cup by the laity in the sacrament. At his death, in 1424, the immense mass of people whom he had collected fell to pieces; but under Procopius, who succeeded Ziska as general, the Hussites again rallied, and gained decisive victories over the imperial armies in 1427 and 1431.. After this, as all parties were desirous of coming to terms of peace, the Council of Basle interposed, and a compromise was made; but hostilities again broke out in 1434, when the Taborites gained a complete victory. Owing, however, to the treachery of Sigismund, whom they had aided in ascending the throne, they were much weakened; and from this time they abstained from warfare, and maintained their disputes with the Catholics only in the deliberations of the diet and in theological controversial writings, by means of which their creed acquired a purity and completeness that made it similar in many respects to the Protestant confessions of the 16th century. Encroachments were gradually made on their religious freedom, and they continued to suffer until they gradually merged into the BOHEMIAN BRETHERN (q.). See Bezezyia, in Ludwig, *Reliq. MSS.* 6:142, 186; Eneas Sylvius, *Hist. Bohem.* epist. 130.

Tabret

Picture for Tabret 1

Picture for Tabret 2

(a contraction of *taboret*, for “taboring”, *SEE TABER*) is the rendering in the A. V. of the two kindred words *ἄΤοτόφ* (Genesis 31; 27;- ^{<1016>}1 Samuel 10:5; 18:6; Isaiah 5, 12; 24:8; 30:32; ^{<2810>}Jeremiah 31:4; ^{<2813>}Ezekiel 28:13; elsewhere “timbrel”) and *τῖΤαόφθηθ* (Job 17; 6), which both mean a musical instrument of the *drum* kind (from *ἄπτ*; *to beat*). This sort of music has always been in great request, both in classical and sacred scenes, especially on festive occasions. *SEE MUSICAL INSTRUMENTS*. Especially has that form of the drum known as the *tambourine* been in vogue, particularly for female performers. *SEE TIMBREL*.

Tab’rimon

(Heb. *Tabrimmon*, ^Ἰ*Μοβῖ*; *good is Rimmon*; Sept. *Ταβερεμό* v.r. *Ταβενρομή*; Vulg. *Tabrenon*), the father of Benhadad I, king of Syria in the reign of Asa (^{<1158>}1 Kings 15:18). B.C. ante 928. The name is in honor of the Syrian god (comp. the analogous forms Tobiel, Tobiah, and the Phoenician Tabaram [Gesenius, *Mon. Phoen.* p. 456]). *SEE RIMMON*.

Tabula Clericorum

the catalogue of the clergy so called by Augustine.

Tabula

Dei, a Latin term for the *SEE TABLE OF THE LORD* (q.v.).

Tabula Eucharistiae

the Christian altar.

Tabula Pacis

Picture for Tabula

(*tablet of peace*), a term applied to the OSCULATORIUM *SEE OSCULATORIUM* (q.v.), an ornament by which the kiss of peace was given to the faithful’ in mediaeval times.

Tachash

SEE BADGER.

Tache

(**מִרְק**, *keres*; Sept. **κρίκος**; Vulg. *circulus, fibula*). The word thus rendered occurs only in the description of the structure of the tabernacle and its fittings (¹²³¹⁶Exodus 26:6, 11, 33; 35:11; 36:13; 39:33), and has usually been thought to indicate the small hooks by which a curtain is suspended to the rings whereon it hangs, or connected vertically, as in the case of the vail of the Holy of Holies, with the loops of another curtain. The history of the English word is philologically interesting, as presenting points of contact with many different languages. The Gaelic and Breton branches of the Celtic family give *tac*, or *tackh* in the sense of a nail or hook; The latter meaning appears in the *attaccare, staccare*, of Italian; in the *attacher, detacher*, of French. On the other hand, in the *tak* of Dutch, and the *Zacke* of German, we have a word of like sound and kindred meaning. Our Anglo-Saxon *taccan* and English *take* (*to seize as with a hook* are probably connected with it. In later use the word has slightly altered both its form and meaning, and the *tack* is no longer a hook, but a small flat-headed' nail (comp. Diez, *Roman. Wörterb.* s v. "Tacco").

The philological relations. of the Hebrew word are likewise interesting. It comes from the obscure root **srq**; *kards*, which occurs only in ²³⁶¹¹Isaiah 46:1 ("stoopeth," Sept. **συνεπίβη**; Vulg. *contritus est*) as a synonym of **[rk]** ("boweth down") in the parallel hemistich, and is therefore understood by Gesenius and Fürst to signify *to bend*, or by Miuhlau *to be round* (like **rrq**). The only derivatives, besides the proper name *Kiros* (**s/rq**, ¹⁶⁷⁴⁷Nehemiah 7:47) or *Keros* (**srqe** ¹⁵²⁴⁴Ezra 2:44), are the term in question and **l sōḥi** *karsol*, the *ankle* (occurring only in the dual, "feet," ¹²²⁵⁷2 Samuel 22:37; ⁹¹⁸³⁶Psalms 18:36 [37]). Prof. Paine (author of *The Tabernacle*, etc.), in a private note, ingeniously traces the connection between these two objects, which a diagram will clearly illustrate.

Picture for Tache 1

As the loops are explicitly stated to have been in the *selvage* of the curtains, the "taches," if meant as hooks to join them edgewise, would present the appearance in the annexed cut, which is substantially the

representation of those interpreters who have adopted this idea. Now, to say nothing for the present of the gap thus left in the roof, we find that these “taches,” being exactly fifty for each set of “curtains,” bear no special numerical relation to the general size of the curtains themselves, the edges so joined being in one case thirty and in the other twenty-eight cubits long; whereas all the other numbers and dimensions about the building have definite proportions to each other. Nor, if the sixth or extra breadth of the goats-hair cloth was sewed in the ordinary way like the other five, can we divine any good reason for resorting to this singular method of joining the remaining selvages.

There are other and still graver difficulties in the ordinary plan of connecting these sheets, which would immediately be revealed in the actual attempt at reconstruction, and will be anticipated by any one familiar with tent architecture.

Picture for Tache 2

(a.) The “vail” hung exactly under the “taches” (⁴²³³Exodus 26:33). But as the colored sheets (which of course must have been innermost) were each twenty cubits wide and twenty-eight cubits long, if they were spread thus combined over the ridge-pole, the suture between them which these “hooks” formed could in no case have well tallied with this position: had they been stretched lengthwise of the building (as their close correspondence in length would indicate), the joint also would have been the same direction, i.e. at right angles with the line of the vail; if crosswise of the building (as both Riegenbach and Fergusson suppose), then the line of the suture and that of the “vail” could only have coincided on the supposition that the entire extra ten cubits breadth of the embroidered “curtains” was thrown outside the rear of the edifice, where it would be utterly useless and exposed to the weather. Nor could the requirements of the text cited be met by using these colored sheets singly in this manner: not longitudinally for the same reason as before; not transversely, for then their breadth would not cover both the apartments.

(b.) The goats-hair sheets, if combined by such a contrivance as an S hook, would be equally impracticable: placed longitudinally on the ridge (as their length would emphatically indicate by this second repetition of the thirty cubits), they would certainly leak intolerably at the joint, unless this were brought exactly at the peak, which the odd number of the “curtains” in this

the article **h** at the beginning having been corrupted into a **t**; for the word **ḥb** in Chronicles is regularly supplied in Samuel by that article" (*Dissert.* p. 82). Therefore he concludes "Jashobeam the Hachmonite" to have been the true reading. Josephus (*Ant.* 7:12, 4) calls him **Ἰέσσαμος υἱὸς Ἀχεμαίου**, which favors Kennicott's emendation. In these corrections Keil (*Comment.* ad loc.) concurs. *SEE HACHMONI; SEE JASHOBEAM.*

Tackling

is the rendering in the A. V. — of **σκευή**, which occurs only in ^{<4071>}Acts 27:19, meaning the spars, ropes, chains, etc., of a vessel's furniture (as in Diod. Sic. 14:79; so of household movables, Polyb. 2, 6, 6; equipage, Xenoph. *Anab.* 4:7, 27; Herodian, 6:4,11; warlike apparatus, Diod. Sic. 11:71). *SEE SHIP.*

Tacquet, Andrew

a Jesuit of Antwerp, known for his skill in the mathematical sciences, died in 1660. He published, among other things, a good treatise on astronomy, an edition of Euclid, etc. The prejudices of the times seem to have prevented him from more effectually defending the system of Copernicus. His collected works were published at Antwerp (1669, 1707, fol.).

Tad'mor

(Heb. *Tadmor*, **רמֹבִיִּי**; prob. city of palms [see below]; Sept. **Θεδμόρ** v.r. **Θοεδμόρ**; Vulg. *Palmira*), a city "in the wilderness" which Solomon is said to have built (^{<1084>}1 Chronicles 8:4). In the nearly parallel passage (^{<1085>}1 Kings 9:18), where the phrase "in the land" is added to the description, indicating that this, like the associated cities, was within Solomon's legitimate jurisdiction, the reading "Tadmor" is adopted in the A. V. from the *Keri*, or margin; the *Kethib*, or text, has **רמֹת**, *Tamár* (Sept. **Θερμάθ** v.r. **Θαμμώρ**; Vulg. *Polmirai*), which should probably be pointed **רמֹתִי** by contraction for **רמֹבִיִּי** or imitation of the original **רמֹתִי**; the palm-tree (see Keil, *Comment.* ad loc.). *SEE PALM.* The name would seem to indicate an abundance of date-palms anciently in that vicinity, although they are scarce in its present neglected state.

1. Classical Identification. — There is no reasonable doubt that this city is the same as the one known to the Greeks and Romans and to modern

Europe by the name, in some form or other, of *Palmyra* (Παλμυρά, Παλμιρά, Palmira). The identity of the two cities results from the following circumstances:

- (1.) The same city is specially mentioned by Josephus (*Ant.* 8:6, 1) as bearing in his time the name of Tadmor among the Syrians, and Palmyra among the Greeks; and Jerome, in his Latin translation of the Old Test., translates Tadmor by Palmira (~~480~~2 Chronicles 8:4).
- (2.) The modern Arabic name of Palmyra is substantially the same as the Hebrew word, being *Tadmur*, or *Tathur*.
- (3.) The word Tadmor has nearly the same meaning as Palmyra, signifying probably the “City of Palms,” from Tamar, a palm; and this is confirmed by the Arabic word for Palma, a Spanish town on the Guadalquivir, which is said to be called Tadmir (see Gesenius, in his *Thesaurus*. p. 345).
- (4.) The name Tadmor, or Tadmor, actually occurs as the name of the city Aramaic and Greek inscriptions which have been found there.
- (5.) In the Chronicles, the city is mentioned as having been built by Solomon after his conquest of Hamath-Zobah, and it is named in conjunction with “all the store-cities which he built in Hamath.” This accords fully with the situation of Palmyra, *SEE HAMATIT*; and there is no other known city, either in the desert or not in the desert, which can lay claim to the name of Tadmor.

2. History. — As above stated, Tadmor was built by Solomon, probably with the view of securing an interest in and command over the great caravan traffic from the East, similar to that which he had established in respect of the trade between Syria and Egypt. See this idea developed in Kitto’s *Pictorial Bible* (not in ~~480~~2 Chronicles 8:4), where it is shown at some length that the presence of water in this small oasis must-early have made this a station for caravans coming west through the desert; and this circumstance probably dictated to Solomon the importance of founding here a garrison town, which would entitle him — in return for the protection he could give from the depredations of the Arabs, and for offering an intermediate station where the factors of the West might meet the merchants of the East to a certain regulating power, and perhaps to some dues, to which they would find it more convenient to submit than to change the line of route.. It is even possible that the Phoenicians, who took

much interest in this important trade, pointed out to Solomon the advantage which he and his subjects might derive from the regulation and protection of it by building a fortified town in the quarter where it was exposed to the greatest danger. A most important indication in favor of these conjectures is found in the fact that all our information concerning Palmyra from heathen writers describes it as a city of merchants, who sold to the Western nations the products of India and Arabia, and who were so enriched by the traffic that the place became proverbial for luxury and wealth and for the expensive habits of its citizens.

We do not again read of Tadmor in Scripture, nor is it likely that the Hebrews retained possession of it long after the death of Solomon. No other source acquaints us with the subsequent history of the place, till it reappears in the account of Pliny (*Hist. Nat.* 5, 24) as a considerable town, which, along with its territory, formed an independent state between the Roman and Parthian empires. Afterwards it was mentioned by Appian (*De Bell. Civ.* 5, 9), in reference to a still earlier period of time, in connection with a design of Mark Antony to let his cavalry plunder it. The inhabitants are said to have withdrawn themselves and their effects to a strong position on the Euphrates, and the cavalry entered an empty city. In the 2nd century it seems to have been beautified by the emperor. Hadrian, as may be inferred from a statement of Stephanus of Byzantium as to the name of the city having been changed to *Hadrianopolis* (s.v. Παλμυρά). In the beginning of the 3rd century it became a Roman colony under Caracalla (A.D. 211-217), and received the *jus Italicum*. From this period the influence and wealth of Palmyra rapidly increased. Though nominally subject to Rome, it had a government of its own, and was ruled by its own laws. The public affairs were directed by a senate chosen by the people; and most of its public monuments were built, as the inscriptions show, by “the senate and people.” For nearly a century and a half this prosperity continued, and it was only checked at length by the pride it generated.

The story of the unfortunate Valerian is well known. Being captured by the Persians, his unworthy son did not use a single effort to release him from the hands of his conquerors. Odenathus, one of the citizens of Palmyra, revenged the wrongs of the fallen emperor, and vindicated the majesty of Rome. He marched against the Persians, took the province of Mesopotamia, and fled Sapor beneath the walls of Ctesiphon (A.D. 260). The services thus rendered to Rome were so great that Odenathus was associated in the sovereignty with Gallienus (A.D. 264). He enjoyed his

dignity but a short period, being murdered by his nephew at a banquet in the city of Emesa only three years afterwards. His reign was brief, but brilliant. Not only was Sapor conquered and Valerian revenged, but Syrian rebels and the northern barbarians, who now began their incursions into the Roman empire, felt the force of his arms.

Odenathus bequeathed his power to a worthy successor Zenobia, his widow; and the names of Zenobia and Palmyra will always be associated so long as history remains. The virtue, the wisdom, and the heroic spirit of this extraordinary woman have seldom been equaled. At first she was content with the title of regent during the minority of her son Vaballatus, but unfortunately ambition prompted her to adopt the high sounding title of "Queen of the East." She soon added Egypt to her possessions in Syria, Asia Minor, and Mesopotamia, and ruled over it during a period of five years. In A.D. 271 the emperor Aurelian turned his arms against her, and having defeated her in a pitched battle near Antioch and in another at Emesa, he drove her back upon her desert home. He then marched his veterans across the parched plain and invested Palmyra, which capitulated after a brief struggle. Zenobia attempted to escape, but was captured on the banks of the Euphrates, and brought back to the presence of the conqueror. She was taken to Rome, and there, covered with her jewels and bound by fetters of gold, she was led along in front-of the triumphant Aurelian. Zenobia deserved a better fate. If common humanity did not prevent the Roman citizens from exulting over an honorable, though fallen, foe, the memory of her husband's victories and of his services rendered to the State might have saved her from the indignity of appearing before a mob in chains.

Picture for Tadmor 1

Aurelian took Palmyra in A.D. 272, and left in it a small garrison, but soon after his departure the people rose and massacred them. On hearing of this the emperor returned, pillaged the city, and put the inhabitants to the sword.. It was soon repaired by the orders of the conqueror, and the Temple of the Sun rebuilt; but it never recovered its former opulence. Twenty years later, under the reign of Diocletian, the walls of th3 city were rebuilt. It appears from an inscription to have assisted the emperor Alexander Severus in his wars against the Persians; and there are proofs of its having continued to be inhabited until the downfall of the Roman empire. There is a fragment of a building with a Latin inscription bearing

the name of Diocletian; and there are existing walls of the city of the age of the emperor Justinian, together with the remains of a costly aqueduct which he built. It eventually became the seat of a bishop, but never recovered any importance. When the successors of Mohammed extended their conquests beyond the confines of Arabia, Palmyra was one of the first places which became subject to the caliphs. In the year 659 a battle was here fought between the caliphs Ali and Moawiyah, and won by the former. In 744 it was still so strongly fortified that it took the caliph Merwan seven months to reduce it, the rebel Solyman having shut himself up in it.

From this period, Palmyra seems to have gradually fallen into decay. Benljamin of Tudela, who was there towards the end of the 12th century, speaks of it as "Thadmor in the desert, built by Solomon of equally large stones [with Baalbec]. This city is surrounded by a wall, and stands in the desert, far from any inhabited place. It is four days' journey from Baalath [Baalbec], and contains 2000 warlike Jews, who are at war with the Christians and with the Arabian subjects of Nouredin, and aid their neighbors the Mohammedans." In connection with this statement, it may be remarked that the existing inscriptions of Palmyra attest the presence of Jews there in its most flourishing period, and that they, in common with its other citizens, shared in the general trade, and were even objects of public honor. One inscription intimates the erection of a statue to Julius Schalmalat, a Jew, for having at his own expense conducted a caravan to Palmyra. This was in A.D. 258, not long before the time of Zenobia, who, according to some writers, was of Jewish extraction. Irby and Mangles (*Travels*, p. 273) also noticed a Hebrew inscription on the architrave of the great colonnade, but give no copy of it, nor say what it expressed. The latest historical notice of Tadmor which we have been able to find is, that it was plundered in 1400 by the army of Timur Beg (Tamerlane), when 200,000 sheep were taken (Rankin, *Wars of the Mongols*). Abulfeda, at the beginning of the 14th century (*Descript. Arab.* p. 98), speaks of Tadmor as merely a village, but celebrated for its ruins of old and magnificent edifices. These relics of ancient art and magnificence were scarcely known in Europe till towards the close of the 17th century. In the year 1678 some English merchants at Aleppo resolved to verify by actual inspection the reports concerning these ruins which existed in that place. The expedition was unfortunate, for they were plundered of everything by the Arabs, and returned with their object unaccomplished. A second expedition, in 1691, had better success; but the accounts which were

brought back received little credit, as it seemed unlikely that a city which, according to their report, must have been so magnificent, should have been erected in the midst of deserts. When, however, in the year 1753, Robert Wood published the views and plans which had been taken with great accuracy on the spot two years before by Dawkins, the truth of the earlier accounts could no longer be doubted; and it appeared that neither Greece nor Italy could exhibit antiquities which, in point of splendor, could rival those of Palmyra. From that time it has frequently been visited by travelers, and it is now readily accessible by an excursion on camels from Damascus. Its ruins have often been described and delineated.

Picture for Tadmor 2

3. Present Remains. — Tadmor was situated between the Euphrates and Hamath, to the south-east of that city, in a fertile tract or oasis of the desert. Palm trees are still found in the gardens around the town, “but not in such numbers as would warrant, as they once did, the imposition of the name. The present Tadmor consists of numbers of peasants mud-huts, clustered together around the relics of the great Temple of the Sun.

The ruins cover a sandy plain stretching along the bases of a range of mountains called Jebel Belaes, running nearly north and south, dividing the great desert from the desert plains extending westward towards Damascus and the north of Syria. The lower eminences of these mountains, bordering the ruins, are covered with numerous solitary square towers, the tombs of the ancient Palmyrenes, in which are found memorials similar to those of Egypt. They are seen to a great distance, and have a striking effect in this desert solitude. Beyond the valley which leads through these hills the ruined city first opens upon the view. The thousands of Corinthian columns of white marble, erect and fallen, and covering an extent of about a mile and a half, present an appearance, which travelers compare to that of a forest. The site on which the city stands is slightly elevated above the level of the surrounding desert for a circumference of about ten miles, which the Arabs believe to coincide with the extent of the ancient city, as they find ancient remains whenever they dig within this space. There are, indeed, traces of an old wall, not more than three miles in circumference; but this was probably built by Justinian, at a time when Palmyra had lost its ancient importance and become a desolate place, and when it was consequently desirable to contract its bounds, so as to include only the more valuable portion. Volney well describes the general aspect which these ruins

present: “In the space covered by these ruins we sometimes find a palace of which nothing remains but the court and walls; sometimes a temple whose peristyle is half thrown down; and now a portico, a gallery, or triumphal arch. Here stand groups of columns, whose symmetry is destroyed by the fall of many of them; there we see them ranged in rows of such length that, similar to rows of trees, they deceive the sight, and assume the appearance of continued walls. If from this striking scene we cast our eyes upon the ground, another, almost as varied, presents itself—on all sides we behold nothing but subverted shafts; some whole, others shattered to pieces or dislocated in their joints; and on which side soever we look, the earth is strewn with vast stones, half buried; with broken entablatures, mutilated friezes, disfigured reliefs, effaced sculptures, violated tombs, and altars defiled by dust.” The colonnade and individual temples are inferior in beauty and majesty to those which may be seen elsewhere—such, for example, as the Parthenon and the remains of the temple of Jupiter at Athens; and there is evidently no one temple equal to the Temple of the Sun at Baalbec, which, as built both at about the same period of time and in the same order of architecture, suggests itself most naturally as an object of comparison. But the long lines of Corinthian columns at Palmyra, as seen at a distance, are peculiarly imposing; and in their general effect and apparent vastness, they seem to surpass all other ruins of the same kind. The examinations of travelers show that the ruins are of two kinds. The one class must have originated in very remote times, and consists of rude, unshapen hillocks of ruin and rubbish, covered with soil and herbage, such as now alone mark the site of the most ancient cities of Mesopotamia and Babylonia, and among which it would be reasonable to seek some traces of the more ancient city of Solomon. The other, to which the most gorgeous monuments belong, bears the impress of later ages. It is clear from the style of architecture that the later buildings belong to the three centuries preceding Diocletian, in which the Corinthian order of pillars was preferred to any other. All the buildings to which three columns belonged were probably erected in the 2nd and 3rd centuries of our sera. Many inscriptions are of later date; but no inscription earlier than the 2nd century seems yet to have been discovered.

The Temple of the Sun is the most remarkable and magnificent ruin of Palmyra. The court by which it was enclosed was 179 feet square, within which a double row of columns was continued all round. They were 390 in number, of which about sixty still remain standing. In the middle of the

court stood the temple, an oblong quadrangular building surrounded with columns, of which about twenty still exist, though without capitals, of which they have been plundered, probably because they were composed of metal. In the interior, at the south end, is now the humble mosque of the village. A little beyond the temple begins the great colonnade, which runs nearly from east to west; it is of great length, and very beautiful. The columns are in good proportion and excellent preservation; each shaft consisting of three courses of stone admirably jointed, with a bracket for a bust or statue interposed between the second and third. In their present naked condition, these brackets are unsightly; yet when they were surmounted by statues the effect must have been extremely grand.

The necropolis of Palmyra lies half an hour northwest of the Temple of the Sun, in the Wady el-Kebur, the ravine through which we made our approach to the city. The tombs, which are very numerous and extremely interesting, are almost all of them towers, two, three, four, and in one instance five stories high. The tomb of Jamblichus, mentioned by Wood, is now dreadfully dilapidated, its stairs crumbled away, and the floor of the fourth story entirely gone. It is five stories high, and was built in the third year of the Christian sera. That of Manaius is peculiarly interesting, and in some respects, indeed, the most curious building at Palmyra. It is in wonderful preservation, and its description will afford some idea of the others, as they are almost all built on the same plan, though far less beautiful. It is a lofty square tower, about fifteen feet in the side, lessening by three courses of stone like steps at about a third of its height. An inscription in honor of the deceased is engraved on a tablet over the doorway. The principal apartment is lined with four Corinthian pilasters on each side, with recesses between them for mummies; each recess divided into five tiers by shelves, only one of which retains its position. The ancient Palmyrenes buried their dead in the Egyptian manner, and Wood found in one of the tombs a mummy in all respects similar to those in the land of the Pharaohs.

Picture for Tadmor 3

4. Authorities. — The original sources for the history of Palmyra may be seen in the *Scriptores Historiae Augustae, Triginta Tyranni*, vol. 14; *Divus Aurelianus*, vol. 26; *Eutropius*, 9:10, 11, 12. In A.D. 1696; Abraham Seller published a most instructive work, entitled *The Antiquities of Palmyra, containing the History of the City and its Emperors*, which

contains several Greek inscriptions, with translations and explanations. Gesenius published an account of the Palmyrene inscriptions at Rome and Oxford in *his Monumenta Scripturae Linguaeque Phoenicæ*, § 53. The best work on the ruins of Palmyra is still Robert Wood's splendid folio, entitled *The Ruins of Palmyra*, etc. (Lond. 1753) Very good accounts of them may also be seen in Irby and Mangles, *Travels*; Richter, *Walfahrten*; Addison, *Damascus and Palmyra*. The last work contains a good history of the place; for which, see also Rosenmüller's *Bibl. Geog.*, translated by the Rev. N. Morren; and, in particular, Cellarius, *Dissert. de Inp. Palmyreno* (1693). Gibbon, in ch. 11 of the *Decline and Fall*. has given an account of Palmyra with his usual vigor and accuracy. For an interesting account of the present state of the ruins, see Porter, *Handbook for Syria and' Palestine*, p. 543-549; Beaufort, *Egyptian Sepulchers*, etc., vol. 1; and Badeker, *Syria*, p. 523. Besides Wood's great work, excellent views of the place have been published by Cassas in his *Voyage Pittoresque de la Syrie*; and later by Laborde in his *Voyage en Orient*. Recently photographs have been taken by various artists, and an accurate knowledge of the remains of this renowned and remarkable place is thus made accessible to the whole world.

Taft, George, D.D.

an Episcopal minister, was born at Mendon, Mass., Aug. 27, 1791, and was a graduate of Brown University, in the class of 1815. He pursued his theological studies under the direction of the Rev. Dr. Crocker, rector of St. John's Church, Providence, R. I., and was ordained a deacon by bishop Griswold, March 7, 1818, and a presbyter, Sept. 2, 1819. He became rector of St. Paul's Church in Pawtucket, R. I., in October, 1820, continuing for a time to teach in a school in Providence with which he had been connected for several years. Such double service not being altogether satisfactory to his bishop, he gave a gentle hint to the parish of St. Paul's that "he had not ordained their minister to keep school;" and he thenceforth devoted himself with great zeal and success to his work as a minister of the Gospel until his death, which occurred at Pawtucket, Dec. 11, 1869. His ministry was a little over fifty years in duration. (J.C.S.)

Taggart, Samuel

a Presbyterian minister, was born at Londonderry, N.H., March 24, 1754. He graduated at Dartmouth College in 1774, was licensed to preach by the

Presbytery of Boston June 1, 1776, and was ordained and installed pastor of the Church at Coleraine, Hampshire Co., Mass., Feb. 19, 1777. He was a member of Congress from 1803 to 1817. He died April 25, 1825. Mr. Taggart possessed a mind of great strength and vigor. He published several theological treatises, sermons, orations, political speeches, etc. (1800-19). See Sprague, *Annals of the Amer. Pulpit*, 3, 377; Allibone, *Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors*, s.v.; Packard, *Hist. of the Churches and Ministers in Franklin County*.

Taggart, William, D.D.

a Presbyterian divine, was born in 1783, educated privately, graduated at the Theological Seminary of the Associate Reformed Church, New York, in 1813; was licensed to preach by the Monongahela Associate Reformed Presbytery in the same year, and ordained by the same presbytery and installed pastor of the united congregations at Upper Wheeling and Cadiz in 1814, where he continued to labor until old age. He died Sept. 11, 1865. Dr. Taggart was a man of strong thought." His moral and intellectual attributes were perhaps rarely, if ever, excelled." See Wilson, *Presb. Hist. Almanac*, 1866, p. 279.

Ta'han

(Heb. *Tach'an*, תַּחַן camp [Gesenius], or *graciousness* [Furst]), the name of two descendants of Ephraim.

1. (Sept. **Τανόχ** v.r. **Τανάϊ**; Vulg. *Thehen*.) The head of one of the families of the Ephraimites at the end of the Exode (^{<0465>}Numbers 26:35). B.C. ante 1618. *SEE TAHANITE*.

2. (Sept. **Θάέν** v.r. **Θαάν**; Vulg. *Thaan*.) Son of Telah and father of Laadan in the Palestinian lineage of Ephraim (^{<1375>}1 Chronicles 7:25). B.C. post 1618.

Ta'hanite

(Heb. *Tachani'*, תַּחַנִּי patronymic from *Tahan*; Sept. **Ταναχί** v.r. **Ταναί**; Vulg. *Thehenita*), the family name (Numbers, 26, 35) of the descendants of TAHAN *SEE TAHAN* (q.v.).

Tahap'anes

(^{<2126>}Jeremiah 2:16). *SEE TAHPANHES.*

Taharoth

SEE TALMUD.

Ta'hath

(Heb. *Tdchath*, תַּי חַיִּי in pause *Tachath*, תַּי חַיִּי; *station*, i.e. *beneath*, as often), the name of a place and of three men.

1. (Sept. Καταάθ v.r. Θάαθ; Vulg. *Thahath*.) One of the stations of the Israelites in' the desert between Makheloth and Tarah (^{<0835>}Numbers 33:26); situated apparently not far beyond the western edge of the Arabah nearly opposite Mount Hor. *SEE EXODE.* —
2. (Sept. θαάθ v.r. Κοάθ; Vulg. *Thahath*.) A Kohathite Levite, son of Assir and father of Uriel, or Zephaniah, in the ancestry of Samuel and Heman (^{<1375>}1 Chronicles 6:24, 37 [Heb. 9 and 22]). B.C. cir. 1585.
3. (Sept. Θαάθ v.r. Θαάδ; Vulg. *Thahath*.) Son of Bered, and father of Eladah, among the immediate descendants of Ephraim in Palestine (^{<1372>}1 Chronicles 7:20). B.C. — post 1618. Burrington (*General*. 1, 273) regards him as the same with Tahan (q.v.) the son of Ephraim; but against the text.
4. (Sept. Σαάθ v.r. Νομέε; Vulg. *Tahath*.) Grandson of the preceding (with whom some confound him), being son of Eladah and father of Zabad (^{<1372>}1 Chronicles 7:20). B.C. post 1618.

Tahitian Version

The extensive assemblage of islands in which the Tahitian dialect is spoken includes the Society, or Leeward, and the Georgian, or Windward, Isles, with the Low Islands, and the "Paumotu," or Dangerous Archipelago. The largest of the islands is Otaheite, or, more properly, Tahiti, where the Tahitian language, generally considered as the most perfect type of all the Polynesian dialects, remained in its primitive simplicity. To account for this, it seems as if Tahiti had been peopled before any other island of Polynesia, properly so called; that from thence, as from a center, emigrants went to settle on the islands of the surrounding archipelago as far as New Zealand, and that while the Polynesian language became more or less

modified by the mode of life called for by the nature of the soil or of the climate, it remained, as stated already, in its primitive simplicity at Tahiti. The Tahitian version was made from the English Bible, with constant reference to the sacred originals. The first portion published was the Gospel of Luke, which appeared in 1818, while in 1838 the entire Bible was published in London under the superintendence of the Rev. Henry Nott. Other editions followed, of which the most important, consisting of a revised edition of the entire Scriptures, was completed in London in 1848. In 1877 the annual report of the British and Foreign Bible Society announced that the committee were bringing out a revised edition with maps, which, according to the report in 1879, had left the press, the edition, consisting of 5000, having been edited by the Rev. A. T. Saville. Up to March 31, 1889, the sum total of Bibles distributed, either as a whole or in parts, was 57,579. See, besides *The Bible of Every Land*, the annual reports of the British and Foreign Bible Society since 1860, which are the only source of information. (B. P.)

Tah'panhes

(Heb. *Tachpanches'*, sj ꞑꞑ ꞑꞑ ꞑꞑ; Jeremiah 2, 16 [marg.]; 43:7, 8, 9; 44:1; 46:14), Ta-hap'anes (Heb. *Tachpanes'*, ꞑꞑꞑꞑ ꞑꞑ; 2, 16 [text]), or Tehaph'nehes (Heb. *Techaphneches'*, sj ꞑꞑ ꞑꞑ) ^{<3308>}Ezekiel 30:18; all of Egyptian origin [see below]; Sept. Τάφνας or Τάφνας; Vulg. *Taphne* or *Taphnis*), a city of Egypt, of importance in the time of the prophets Jeremiah and Ezekiel. The name is clearly Egyptian, and closely resembles that of the Egyptian queen TAHPENES SEE TAHPENES (q.v.), which, however, throws no light upon it. The Coptic name of this place, *Taphnas* (Quatremere, *Mem. Geog. et Hist.* 1, 297, 298), is obviously derived from the Sept. form: the Gr. and Lat. forms, Τάφνας, Herod., Τάφνη, Steph. Byz., *Dafno*, *Itin. Ant.*, are perhaps nearer to the Egyptian original (see Parthey, *Zur Erdkunde des alten Aegyptens*, p. 528). Can the name be of Greek origin? If the HANES mentioned by Isaiah (^{<3304>}Isaiah 30:4) be the same as Tahpanhes, as we have suggested (s.v.), this conjecture must be dismissed. No satisfactory Egyptian etymology of this name has been suggested, Jablonski's *Taphenes*, "the head" or "beginning of the age" (*Opusc.* 1, 343), being quite untenable; nor has any Egyptian name resembling it been discovered. Dr. Brugsch (*Geogr. Inschr.* 1, 300, 301, Taf. lvi, No. 1728), following Mr. Heath (*Exodus Papyri*, p. 174), identifies the fort *Tebenet* with Tahpanhes; but it is doubtless the present

Tell Defenneh (described in the 4th Report of Egyptian Expl. Fund, Lond. 1888).

Tahpanhes was evidently a town of Lower Egypt near or on the eastern border. When Johanan and the other captains went into Egypt “they came to Tahpanhes” (²⁴⁰⁷Jeremiah 43:7). Here Jeremiah prophesied the conquest of the country by Nebuchadnezzar (²⁴⁰⁸Jeremiah 43:8-13). Ezekiel foretells a battle to be there fought apparently by the king of Babylon just mentioned (²⁴⁰⁸Ezekiel 30:18). The Jews in Jeremiah’s time remained here (²⁴⁰⁸Jeremiah 46:1). It was an important town, being twice mentioned by the latter prophet with Noph or Memphis (²⁴⁰⁶Jeremiah 2:16; 46:14), as well as in the passage last cited. Here stood a house of Pharaoh. Hophra before which Jeremiah hid great stones, where the throne of Nebuchadnezzar would afterwards be set, and his pavilion spread (²⁴⁰⁸Jeremiah 43:8-10). It is mentioned with “Ramesse and all the land of Gesen” in Judith 1, 9. Herodotus calls this place *Daphnae* of Pelusium (Δάφναι αὐτὴ Πηλουσίαι), and relates that Psammetichus I had here a garrison against the Arabians and Syrians, as at Elephantine against the Ethiopians, and at Marea against Libya, adding that in his own time the Persians had garrisons at Daphne and Elephantine (2:30). Daphne was therefore a very important post under the twenty-sixth dynasty. According to Stephanus, it was near Pelusium (s.v.). In the *Itinerary of Antoninus* this town, called *Dafno*, is placed sixteen Roman miles to the south-west of Pelusium (ap. Parthey, Map 6 where observe that the name of Pelusium is omitted). This position seems to agree with that of *Tel-Defenneh*, which Sir Gardner Wilkinson supposes to mark the site of Daphnae (*Modern Egypt and Thebes*, 1, 447, 448). This identification favors the inland position of the site of Pelusium, if we may trust to the distance stated in the *Itinerary*. **SEE SIN**. Sir Gardner Wilkinson (*loc. cit.*) thinks it was an outpost of Pelusium.

It may be observed that the Camps, τὰ Στρατόπεδα, the fixed garrison of Ionians and Carians established by Psammetichus I, may possibly have been at Daphnae.

Tah’pen’s

(Heb. *Tachpeney’s*, **synEJ** **Ti**; evidently of Egyptian origin, but uncertain in its signification, **SEE TAHPANHES**; Sept. Θεκεφένης v.r. Θεκεμίνα; Vulg. *Taphnes*), a proper name of an Egyptian queen. She was wife of the

Pharaoh who received Hadad the Edomite, and who gave him her sister in marriage (^{<11118>}1 Kings 11:18-20). B.C. cir. 1000. In the Sept. the latter is called the elder sister of Thekemina, and in the addition to ch. 12 Shishak (Susakim) is said to have given Ano, the elder sister of Thekemina his wife, to Jeroboam. It is obvious that this and the earlier statement are irreconcilable, even if the evidence from the probable repetition of an elder sister be set aside, and it is scarcely necessary to add that the name of Shishak's chief or only wife, Karaamat, does not support the Sept. addition. **SEE SHISHAK**. There is therefore but one Tahpenes or Thekemina. At the time to which the narrative refers there were probably two, if not three, lines ruling in Egypt—the Tanites of the twenty-first dynasty in the lower country; the high-priest kings at Thebes, but possibly they were of the same line; and perhaps one of the *last faineants* of the Rameses family. To the Tanitic line, as apparently then the most powerful, and as holding the territory nearest Palestine, the Pharaoh in question, as well as the father-in-law of Solomon, probably belonged. If Manetho's list be correct, he may be conjectured to have been Psusennes. **SEE PHARAOH**, 9. No name that has any near resemblance to either Tahpenes or Thekemina has yet been found among those of the period (see *Lepsius, Konigsbuch*).

Tah'reä

(Heb. *Tachrie'd*, [רַחֵף], *cunning* [Gesenius], or *flight* [Fürst]; Sept. **Θαρά** v.r. **Θαράχ**; Vulg. *Tharaa*), *third* named of the four sons of Micah, Jonathan's grandson (^{<1394>}1 Chronicles 9:41); called in the parallel passage (8, 35) TAREA **SEE TAREA** (q.v.). B.C. post 1037. Tah'tim-Hod'shi (Heb. *Tachtim' Chodshi'*, **מַחְתִּים חֹדְשִׁי**; lit. *lowlands my month*; Sept. **Θαβασῶν ἢ ἐστὶν Ναβασαί** v.r. **ἑθαὼν ἄδασαί**; Vulg. *inferiora Hodsi*), a region (*/ra*, “land”) mentioned as one of the places visited by Joab during his census of the land of Israel, between Gilead and Dan-jaan (^{<1245>}2 Samuel 24:6). Furst (*Handwörterb.* 1, 380) proposes to separate the “Land of the Tachtim” from “Hodshi.” and to read the latter as *Haishi*—the people of Harosheth (comp. ^{<1042>}Judges 4:2). Thenius restores the text of the Sept. to read “the Land of Bashan, which is Edrei.” This in itself is feasible, although it is certainly very difficult to connect it with the Hebrew. Ewald (*Gesch.* 3, 207) proposes to read *Hermon* for Hodshi; and Gesenius (*Thesaur.* p. 450 a) dismisses the passage with a *vix pro sano habendum*. There is a district called the *Ard et-Tahta*, to the east-northeast of

Damascus, which recalls the old name-but there is nothing to show that any Israelite was living so far from the Holy Land in the time of David. It seems probable from the connection that the whole, is a proper name, descriptive, however, of the physical aspect of the region to which it was given. The route taken by the king's messengers was first eastward to Moab; then northward through Gilead; then from Gilead to "the land of Tahtim-Hodshi," to Danjaan and Zidon. "The land of Tahtim-Hodshi" was thus manifestly a section of the upper valley of the Jordan, probably that now called *Ard el-Hluleh*, lying deep down at the western base of Hermon.

Taitazak or Taytazak, Joseph

a Spanish Jew, belonged to those 300,000 exiles who had to leave their country in 1492. With his father and brothers, he settled at Salonica, where he wrote *ãswy trwp*, "the fruitful bough of Joseph" (after ^{<1422>}Genesis 49:22), a commentary on Ecclesiastes, in a homiletico-philosophical style (Venice, 1599): — *µyl t çwrp txq*, i.e. excerpts from his commentary on the Psalms, published with Penini's work, *bhzh ^/çl*, "the tongues of gold" (ibid. 1599). The MS. of his complete commentary on the Psalms is to be found in the libraries of Paris and Oxford: — *µyrts µj l*, "the bread of sacredness," in allusion to ^{<1017>}Proverbs 9:17; a commentary on Daniel and the five Megilloth, viz. the Song of Songs, Ruth, Lamentations, Ecclesiastes, and Esther (ibid. 1608). In its present form this work only contains fragments of Taitazak's commentaries on three books, and MSS. of the entire commentaries are still extant: — *bwya rwab*, a commentary on Job, extant: — *t wçw µyqsp*, i.e. questions and decisions (ibid. 1622). See Furst, *Bibl. Jud.* 3, 412; De Rossi, *Dizionario Storico*, p. 314 (Germ. transl.); Steinschneider, *Catalogus Libr. Hebr. in Bibl. Bodl.* col. 1533; Kitto, *Cyclop.* s.v.; Finn, *Sephardim*, p. 413. (B. P.)

Tajus, Samuel

bishop of Saragossa, lived in the 7th century. In the year 646 he went to Rome at the command of king Chindaswinth, and with the sanction of the seventh Council of Toledo, for the sake of bringing back the long-missed *Expositio in Hiobum s. Moralium*, lib. 35 of Gregory I. According to tradition, he was shown in a vision the place where it was hidden. Tajus was also present at the eighth and ninth councils of Toledo. Besides an

Epistola ad Eugenium Toletanum episcopum, he also wrote *Sententiarum* lib. 5 (Migne, *Patrol.* vol. 80), containing extracts from Gregory's work on

- (a) God, creation, creature, government of the world;
- (b) incarnation, Church, Church government;
- (c) moral life, virtues;
- (d) sins and vices;
- (e) sinners, prince of this world, Antichrist, judgment, condemnation.

Wherever Gregory failed him, he supplied his work from Augustine's writings. The work is preceded by a *Praefatio ad Quiricum Barcinonensem Episcopum*, to whom the work is dedicated, together with the *Responsio Quirici*. See *Regensburger Conversations Lexikon*, s.v.; *Theologisches Universal-Lexikon*, s.v. (B.P.)

Talapoins

priests or friars of the Siamese and other Indian nations. They reside in monasteries under the superintendence of a superior, whom they call a *Sanerat*. Celibacy is obligatory upon them, and a breach of chastity in the case of any one of them is punished with death. They perform penance for such of the people as pay them for it; are very hospitable to strangers, and strict in their rules of chastity. There are also female Talapoins, who live according to rules similar to those of the men. The residences of the Talapoins are much superior to those of the priests in Ceylon and Burmah, having richly carved entrances and ornamental roofs.

Talbot, Peter

a Roman Catholic divine, was the son of sir William Talbot, and was born in the county of Dublin in 1620. He entered the society of Jesuits in Portugal in 1635; and after studying philosophy and divinity, went into holy orders at Rome, whence he returned to Portugal, and afterwards to Antwerp, where he read lectures on moral theology. He is supposed to be the person who, in 1656, reconciled Charles II, then at Cologne, to the popish religion; and Charles is reported to have sent him to Madrid in the interest of the Romish Church, he paid court to Cromwell, whose funeral he attended as a mourner. In 1669 pope Clement IX dispensed with his vows as Jesuit, and advanced him to the titular archbishopric of Dublin. He immediately began to persecute those, of his order who had signified their

loyalty to the king, quarreled with Plunket, the titular primate; and when the popish plot was discovered in England in 1678, he was imprisoned in Dublin Castle on suspicion of being concerned in it, and died there in 1680. He was a man of ability and learning, but vain, ambitious, and turbulent. Among his publications are, *De Natura- Fidei et. ficeresis, Tractatus de Religione*: — *A Treatise of Religion and Government* (1670, 4to): — *Letters to the Roman Catholics in Ireland* (Paris, 1674, 4to). See Allibone, *Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors*, s.v.; Chalmers, *Biog. Dict.* s.v.

Talbot, Robert, D.D.

an English divine and antiquarian, was born at Thorp, Northamptonshire, and was admitted to New College, Oxford, in 1525. He left the university in 1530; in 1541 was made prebendary of Wells; and treasurer of the cathedral church of Norwich, April 9, 1547, which position he retained until his death, Aug. 27, 1558. He was a diligent searcher into the antiquities of his country, and his collections proved of great service to Leland, Bale, Caius, Camden, and others. He also furnished archbishop Parker with many Saxon books. He was the first Englishman who illustrated Antoninus's *Itinerary* with various readings and notes, but his notes reach only to the sixth journey. Talbot, Samson, D.D., a Baptist minister, was born near Urbana, O., June 28, 1828, and was a graduate of Granville College, now Denison University. O., in 1852, and of Newton Theological Institute in 1855. He was ordained in 1856, and was pastor of the Baptist Church in Dayton, O., eight years, 1856-64, and was then appointed president of Denison University, which position he held until his death, which occurred at Newton Center, Mass., June 29, 1873. President Talbot was an accomplished scholar, a profound thinker, and bade fair to stand in the very front rank of scholars in this country. (J.C.S.)

Talbot, William, D.D.

an English prelate, was born at Stourton Castle in 1659, and in 1674 entered as a gentleman commoner of Oriel College, Oxford. After graduation he entered holy orders, and in the reign of king James II preached and acted with great zeal against popery. In April, 1691, he was nominated to the deanery of Worcester, and Sept. 24, 1699, was advanced to the bishopric of Oxford. He was translated to the bishopric of Sarum, April 23, 1715; and in September, 1722, was translated to that of Durham, of which county he was made lord-lieutenant and custos rotulorum. He

died Oct. 10, 1730. There are in print two speeches of his in the House of Lords, and a volume of *Sermons* (8vo).

Talent

representing the Greek *τάλαντον*, Lat. *talentum*, is the rendering of the Heb. and Chald. *kikkar*, כִּקָּא *circle*, the coin being no doubt of that form. It was the largest weight among the Hebrews, being used for metals, whether gold (^{<1094>}1 Kings 9:14; 10:10, etc.), silver (^{<1162>}2 Kings 5:22), lead (^{<3817>}Zechariah 5:7), bronze (^{<1289>}Exodus 38:29), or iron (^{<1397>}1 Chronicles 29:7). A hill sufficient for the site of a city was sold for two talents of silver (^{<1164>}1 Kings 16:24); and for 1000 talents of silver the friendship of the Assyrian king was purchased (^{<1259>}2 Kings 15:19); another Assyrian king laid the kingdom of Judah under a tribute of 300 talents of silver and 30 of gold (^{<1284>}2 Kings 18:14); a similar tribute imposed by an Egyptian king consisted of 100 talents of silver and one talent of gold (23, 33); the crown of an Ammonitish king weighed one talent of gold (^{<1020>}2 Samuel 12:30). The sacred utensils of the Tabernacle and the Temple amounted to many talents of silver and gold (^{<1259>}Exodus 25:39; 38:24, 25, 27; ^{<1094>}1 Kings 9:14, etc.). But there must be some error in the numbers at 1 Chronicles 29 (see Kitto, *Pict. Bible*, note ad loc.). **SEE NUMBER**. In the post-exilian period, likewise, talents were a mode of estimation (1 Macc. 11:28; 13:16, 19; 15:31; 2 Macc. 3, 4, 8, etc.). In the New Test. the talent only occurs in a parable (^{<1255>}Matthew 25:15 sq.), and as an estimate of a stone's weight (^{<1662>}Revelation 16:21). From ^{<1285>}Exodus 38:25, 26, it appears that one talent was equivalent to 3000 shekels of the sanctuary (Schmidt, *Biblatem*. p. 183; Bockh, *Metrol. Unters.* p. 55). **SEE SHEKEL**. As the mina (q.v.) consisted of 50 sacred shekels, it follows that the talent was equal to 60 mine, just as the Attic talent had 60 minae. **SEE METROLOGY**.

TALENT figuratively signifies any gift or opportunity God gives to men for the promotion of his glory. "Everything almost," says Mr. Scott, "that we are, or possess, or meet with, may be considered as a *talent*; for a good or a bad use may be made of every natural endowment, or providential appointment, or they may remain unoccupied through inactivity and selfishness. Time, health, vigor of body, and the power of exertion and enduring fatigue — the natural and acquired abilities of the mind, skill in any lawful art or science, and the capacity for close mental application—the gift of speech, and that of speaking with fluency and propriety, and in a

convincing, attractive, or persuasive manner — wealth, influence, or authority — a man's situation in the Church, the community, or relative life-and the various occurrences which make way for him to attempt anything of a beneficial tendency; these, and many others that can scarcely be enumerated, are talents which the consistent Christian will improve to the glory of God and the benefit of mankind. Nay, this improvement procures an increase of talents, and gives a man an accession of influence and an accumulating power of doing good; because it tends to establish his reputation for prudence, piety, integrity, sincerity, and disinterested benevolence: it gradually forms him to an habitual readiness to engage in beneficent designs, and to conduct them in a gentle, unobtrusive, and unassuming manner, it disposes others to regard him with increasing confidence and affection, and to approach him with satisfaction; and it procures for him the countenance of many persons whose assistance he can employ in accomplishing his own salutary purposes.”

Talionis, Lex

(*law of retaliation*). This was a Roman law to the effect “That if any one called another man's credit, or fortune, or life, or blood into question in judgment, and could not make out the crime alleged against him, he should suffer the same penalty that he intended to bring upon the other.” Although the ecclesiastical law could not inflict the punishment of retaliation for false witness against any man's life, yet such false testimony was early reputed by the Church as the highest species both of calumny and murder, and consequently brought such witnesses under all the ecclesiastical penalties due to those crimes. Bingham, *Christ. Antiq.* bk. 16:ch. 10:§ 9.

Talith

SEE FRINGE.

Tal'itha Cu'mi

(*ταλιθα κουμι*; Aram. *atyl ʿajymēq*, *telitha Mimi*), two Syriac words (Mark 5, 41) signifying “Damsel, arise.” The word *atyl f* occurs in the Chald. paraphrase of ²⁰⁰⁸Proverbs 9:3, where it signifies *a girl*; and Lightfoot (*Horae Heb.* Mark 5, 41) gives an instance of its use in the same sense by a rabbinical writer. Gesenius (*Thesaur.* p. 550) derives it from the Hebrew *hl f*, *a lamb*. The word *ymwq* is both Hebrew and Syriac (2 p. fem. imperative, Kal, and Peal), signifying *stand, arise*. As might be

expected, the last clause of this verse, after Cumi, is not found in the Syriac version. Jerome (*Ep. 57 ad Pammachium, Opp. 1, 308* [ed. Vallars]) records that Mark was blamed for a false translation on account of the insertion of the words "I say unto thee;" but Jerome points to this as an instance of the superiority of a free over a literal translation, inasmuch as the words inserted serve to show the emphasis of our Lord's manner in giving this command on his own personal authority.

Tallents, Francis

an eminent Nonconformist divine, was born at Palsley, near Chesterfield, England, November, 1619, and was educated at the public-schools of Mansfield and Newark. He entered Peterhouse, Cambridge, but being chosen subtutor to the sons of the earl of Suffolk, removed to Magdalen College, of which he afterwards became fellow senior fellow, and president. In 1648 he was ordained at London in the Presbyterian form, and in 1652 became minister of St. Mary's, Shrewsbury. At the Restoration, not wishing to be re-ordained, he was ejected, and in 1673 returned to Shrewsbury, and became pastor of a Dissenting congregation there. He died April 11, 1708, and was buried in St. Mary's, Shrewsbury. He published, *View of Universal History to 1700* (Lond. 1700, fol.): — *Short History of Schism* (1705, 8vo): — *Considerations on S. Garscome's Answer*. See Chalmers, *Biog. Dict. s.v.*; Allibone, *Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors, s.v.*

Talleyrand (De Perigord) Alexandre Angelique,

a noted French prelate, was born in Paris, Oct. 16, 1736, and after a course of education at the College de la Fleche, the Seminary of St. Sulpice, and under the direction of abbé Bourlier, became one of the almoners of the king, later vicar-general of Verdun, and (in 1762) abbot of Gard (diocese of Amiens). Having been chosen coadjutor of the archbishop of Rheims, he was consecrated at Rome, Sept. 26, 1766, under the title of archbishop of Troyanople *impartibus*. He succeeded to the archbishopric of Rheims Oct. 27, 1777, and was very active in improving his diocese, as well as in public and ecclesiastical functions, sharing the varied fortunes of the Church and State during the stormy period of the French Revolution. After having been a refugee at Aix-la-Chapelle, Brussels, and other places, he was recalled in 1803, and on July 28 was made cardinal, and on Aug. 8

following bishop of Paris, where he died, Oct. 20, 1821. See Hoefler, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, s.v.

Talleyrand (De Perigord), Elie

a French prelate, was born at Perigueux in 1301, and was educated for the priesthood at the school of St. Front in that town. He became successively archdeacon of Perigueux, dean of Richmond (diocese of York), abbot of Chancelas, and (Oct. 10, 1324) bishop of Limoges, although he' was not consecrated because of his youth; and in 1328 he was translated to the see of Auxerre, though he continued to reside at Oudan, engaged in literary studies. He was created cardinal May 22, 1331, and thenceforth became active in public affairs, in which he experienced many remarkable adventures. He died at Avignon, Jan. 17, 1364, leaving a vast fortune. See Hoefler, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, s.v.

Tallis, Thomas

a celebrated English musician, flourished about the middle of the 16th century. Under queen Elizabeth he became gentleman of the royal chapel and organist. Although he was a diligent collector of musical antiquities, and a careful peruser of the works of other men, his compositions are so truly original that he may justly be said to be the father of the cathedral style. Notwithstanding his supposed attachment to the Romish religion, it seems that Tallis accommodated himself and his studies to the alterations introduced at the Reformation. With this view, he set to music those parts of the English liturgy which at that time were deemed most proper to be sung, viz. the two morning services-the one comprehending the *Venite a Exultemus*, *Te Deum*, and *Benedictus*; and the other, which is part of the communion office, consisting of the *Kyrie Eleison*, *Nicene Creed*, and *Sanctus*; as also the evening service, containing the *Magnificat* and *Nunc Dimittis*. He also set musical notes to the preces and responses, and composed that litany which for its excellence is sung on solemn services in all places where the choral service is performed. The services of Tallis contain also chants for the *Venite Exultemus* and the *Creed of St. Athanasius*, two of which are published in Dr. Boyce's *Cathedral Music*; vol. 1. Besides the offices above mentioned, constituting what are now termed the morning, communion, and evening services, in four parts, with the preces, responses, and litany. Tallis composed many anthems. He died Nov. 23, 1585, and was buried in the parish church of Greenwich, in Kent.

Talmage, Samuel Kennedy, D.D.

a Presbyterian divine, was born at Somerville, N. J., Dec. 11, 1798. He graduated at the College of New Jersey in 1820; taught in an academy for two years; was tutor in the College of New Jersey for three years, employing his leisure hours in studying theology privately; was licensed and ordained an evangelist in 1825 by the Newton Presbytery; labored as a missionary at Hamburg and other points in Edgefield District, S. C., for one year; in 1827 was a colleague with the Rev. S. S. Davis, D.D., in supplying the First Presbyterian Church at Augusta, Ga.; in 1828 became pastor of the Augusta Church; in 1836 was elected professor of languages in Oglethorpe University, which chair he held until 1840, when he was elected president of the institution, where he continued to labor until 1862, when his health failed. He died Sept. 2, 1865; Dr. Talmage was an able minister, a fine scholar, and a successful instructor. See Wilson, *Presb. Hist. Almanac*, 1866, p. 363.

Tal'mai

Picture for Talmai

(Heb. *Talmay'*, **ymi** **י****י** *furrowed* [Gesenius] or *bold* [Fuirst, who comp. **Θολομαῖος**, Josephus, *A nt.* 14:8,1; **Βαρ-θολομαῖος**, ^{<01018>}Matthew 10:3]; Sept. **Θολμαί**, **Θολμί**, **Θελαμείν**, **Θολομαί**, etc.; Vulg. *Tholmai* or *Tholomai'*), the name of two men.

1. Last named of the three gigantic" sons of Anak" in Hebron (^{<0132>}Numbers 13:22), who were expelled by Ca leb (^{<01514>}Joshua 15:14) and slain by the Judahites (Judges 1, 10). B.C. 1618. It has been thought that these people are depicted on the Egyptian monuments as a tall, light complexioned race. In the hieroglyphic inscription they are named *Tanmahu*, which may be the Egyptian rendering of the Hebrew word Talmai, allowing for the interchange of the liquid *I* for *n*, so constant in all languages. The figure is from a picture on a wall of the tomb of Aimenepthah I, supposed to represent a man of the tribe of Talmai, one of the sons of Anak (Burton, *Excerpta Hieroiqspnica*).

2. Son of Ammihud and king of Geshur (2 Samuel 3, 3; 13:37; 1 Chronicles 3, 2). B.C. 1045. His daughter Maachah was one of the wives of David and mother of Absalom. He was probably a petty chieftain

dependent on David, and his wild retreat in Bashan afforded a shelter to his grandson after the assassination of Amnon. *SEE DAVID*.

Tal'mon

(Heb. *Talmonn'*; $\tilde{m}l \text{ } \text{f}i$ *oppressor*; Sept. **Τελμών** and **Τελαμίν** v.r. **Τελμάν**, **Τολμών**, **Τελαμείν**; Vulg. *Telmon*), the head of a family of door-keepers in the Temple, “the porters for the camps of the sons of Levi” ($\langle 1997 \rangle$ 1 Chronicles 9:17 $\langle 6119 \rangle$ Nehemiah 11:19). B.C. 1013. Some of his descendants returned with Zerubbabel ($\langle 1892 \rangle$ Ezra 2:42; $\langle 1075 \rangle$ Nehemiah 7:45), and were employed in their hereditary office in the days of Nehemiah and Ezra ($\langle 6225 \rangle$ Nehemiah 12:25), for the proper names in this passage must be considered as the names of families.

Talmud

($dWml \text{ } \text{T}i$ *talmud, doctrine*; from dml ; “to teach”). :The Talmud-, “that wonderful monument of human industry, human wisdom, and human folly” (Milman), is the work- which embodies the canonical and civil laws of the Jews. It consists of a Mishna (q.v.) as text, and a voluminous collection of commentaries and illustrations, called in the more modern Hebrew *Horaa*, and in Aramaic *Gemara*, “the complement” or “completion,” from $r\text{m}6j$ “to make perfect.” Thence the men who delivered these decisive commentaries are called Gemarists, sometimes Horaim, but more commonly Amoraim.

1. History and Composition. —The Jews divided their law into the written and unwritten. The former contained the Pentateuch, **πεντάτευχος**, **hçymj** , **yçmwj** , **hrwt**, or the **btkbç hrwt**, *verbum Dei scriptum*, **ἔγγραφος**; the latter was handed down orally, the **hp l [bç hrwt**, **παράδοσις**, *verbum Dei non scriptum*, **ἄγραφος**. Some Jews have assigned the same antiquity to both, alleging that Moses received them **ῥον** Mount Sinai, and that Joshua received the oral law from Moses, who transmitted it to the seventy elders; and these again transmitted it to the men of the Great Synagogue, the last of whom was Simon the Just (q.v.). From the men of the Great Synagogue it came into the possession of the rabbins till Judah the Holy (q. v), who embodied in the celebrated code, of traditional Jaw, or Mishna, all the authorized interpretations of the Mosaic law, the traditions and decisions of the learned, and the precedents of the courts or schools; or, as Moses Maimonides (q.v.) states, in his preface to

the Mishna (*Seder. Zeraim*), “From Moses our teacher to our holy rabbi no one has united in a single body of doctrine what was publicly taught as the oral law; but an every generation the chief of the tribunal, or the prophet of his day, made memoranda of what he had heard from his predecessors and instructors, and communicated it orally to the people. In like manner, each individual committed to writing for his own use, and according to the degree of his ability, the oral laws and the information he had received respecting the interpretation of the Bible, with the various decisions that had been pronounced in every age and sanctified by the authority of the great tribunal. Such was the form of proceeding until our rabbi the holy, who first collected all the traditions, the judgments, the sentences, and the expositions of the law, heard by Moses our master, and taught in each generation.” There is, no doubt, some truth in this as to a few elementary principles of Hebrew usage and practice, both civil and religious; but the whole of the unwritten law cannot have this primordial majesty, for, without referring to the trivial and foolish character of many of its appointments, we know that Midrashim, or explanations and amplifications of Biblical topics, were of gradual growth. Their commencement dates prior to the chronicle writer, because he refers to works of that nature (^{<4132>}2 Chronicles 13:22; 24:27). The system of interpretation which they exemplify and embody existed in the age of the so called *Sopherim*, or scribes, who took the place of the prophets. — The men of the Great Synagogue promoted it. It prevailed from the Asmonsean period till that of Hadrian, i.e. about 300 years. The Midrash was naturally simple at first, but it soon grew more comprehensive and complicated under a variety of influences, of which controversy was not the least powerful. When secret meanings, hidden wisdom, deep knowledge, were sought in the letter of Scripture, the Midrashim shaped themselves accordingly, and a distinction in their contents could be made. Thus they have been divided into the *Halakah*, **hkl h**, “the rule,” and *Hagadâh*, **hdgh**, “what is said.” Legal prescriptions formed the Halakah, free interpretations the Hagadah. The one, as a rule of conduct, *must be attended to*; the other merely passed for *something said*. The one was permanent and proceeded from authoritative sources, from schools, the teachers of the law, etc.; the other was the product of individual minds, consisting of ideas which had often no other object than of being expressed at the moment. The oldest collection of Halakoth that is, the oldest Mishna-proceeded from the school of Hillel. Rabbi Akiba, who was slain in the Hadrianic war, is said to have composed Mishnic regulations. The school of R. Simon ben-Gamaliel (q.v.), A.D.

166, who was a descendant of Hillel, collected and sifted the existing materials of the oral law. The present Mishna proceeded from the hands of R. Judah the Holy (q.v.), son and successor of R. Simon ben-Gamaliel. The title of Judah's work is simply *Mishnah*, **הנצמ**, **δευτέρωσις** (from **הנצ**, “to repeat”), “repetition,” like the Arabic *Mathani* (Koran, 15:87; 39:34), that is, either (considering the divine law as twofold, written and traditional) the second branch of the twofold law, or else the law given in a second form, as an explicative and practical development of it (comp. Gratz, *Gesch. d. Juden*, 4:419).

The work itself is composed of the following elements:

1. *Pure Mishnah* (**הנצמ**), the elucidation of the fundamental text of the Mosaic laws, and their application to an endless variety of particular cases and circumstances not mentioned in them.
2. *Haldkâh* (**הכל ה**), the usages and customs of Judaism, as sanctioned and confirmed by time and general acquiescence.
3. *Dibreî Chakalnim* (**μυmkj yrbd**), law principles of the wise men or sages, i.e. the ancient, and at that time the more recent, teachers, to whose decisions the people's respect for them gave a greater or less weight.
4. *Maassiyath* (**twyç[m]**), practical facts, conclusions arrived at by the course of events.
5. *Gezirôth* (**twryzq**), extemporaneous decisions demanded by emergencies.
6. *Tekanôth* (**twnqt**), modifications of usages to meet existing circumstances; and
7. *Kelalîm* (**μyl l k**), universal principles, under which a multitude of particular cases may be provided for.

According to Maimonides, there were five classes into which the traditional law is divided, viz.:

1. *Pirushm* (**μyçwryp**), “interpretations” given to Moses by God, the authority of which has never been disputed (**μynp μwçb μhb tqwl j m ^ya**).

2. *Halakâth le-Mosheh mis-Sindy* (ynysm hçml hkl h), “precepts delivered to Moses on Mount Sinai,” a distinction which gained the applause of all the classical rabbins, because it belongs to the class of undisputed decisions.

3. Those which have admitted of discussion, and the value and weight of which have been mainly determined by an extensive consent among the authorities.

4. *Gezarâth* (twrzg), “decisions” which have been made by the wise men regarding some of the written laws, and which decisions are designed to insure more fully the observance of such laws (or to make a fence about the law, hrwtl gys twç[l ydk).

5. *Tekanâth* (twnqt), “experimental suggestions,” referring to things recommended or enjoined by particular masters, which though they may not possess the stringent force of laws, nevertheless exert a great influence in the formation of social and religious habits and usages.

In constructing his work, Jehudah, or Judah, arranged these manifold materials under six general classes, called *Sedarzim* (pyrds), or orders. The first is called *Zeraim* (py[rz), or “seeds,” and treats of agricultural laws; the second, *Moed* (d[wm), or “festivals,” or “solemnity,” treats of the Sabbath and the annual festivals and holydays, the duties of their observance, and the various enactments and prohibitions thereunto pertaining; the third, *Nashizm* (pyçn), or “women,” treats of the intercourse between the sexes, of husband and wife, the duties of a brother-in-law towards his widowed and childless sister-in-law, the right of untying the shoe (^{<DE>}Deuteronomy 25:5), of dowry and marriage settlements, of espousals, divorces, and of all the laws to these subjects respectively appertaining; the fourth, *Nezikin* (yqyzn, or “injuries,” treats of the laws of property (movable as well as immovable) and of commerce; the tithe, *Kodashim* (pyçdq), or “consecrations,” treats of sacrifices and their laws; the sixth, *Taharôth* [or rather *Tohoroth* (twrhf), or “purifications,” treats ‘of the laws of pureness, legal cleanness, and that both positively and negatively. The initial letters of these titles combined, for the sake of memory, give the technical word *Zemàn nekêt* (fqn ^mz), “a time accepted.”

The regulations thus generally classified are further arranged under a multitude of subsidiary topics, each *Seder*, or order, being divided into a number of tracts or treatises, called *Massiktoth* (twtksm), and these were again subdivided into *Perakîm* (pyqrp), chapters. The latter again are divided or broken up into paragraphs. Altogether there are 63 *Massiktoth*, with 525 chapters and 4187 paragraphs, in the Mishna. The whole is called *Shas* (s ç), after the initials of hçç yrds, i.e. the six orders. Since a general analysis of the contents of the Mishna has already been given under the art. MISHNA *SEE MISHNA* (q.v.), we must refer the reader to it, while a more minute analysis will be given farther on.

R. Judah's Mishna, however, did not contain all Midrashim. Many others existed, which are contained in part in the *Siphra* on Leviticus, *Siphre* on Numbers and Deuteronomy, *Mechilta* on Exodus, *SEE MIDRASH*, the Mishnas made by individual teachers for the use of their pupils, with the addition to the official Mishna collected by R. Chiya and his contemporaries. All the Halakoth of this sort, which were extra-Mishnaic, were called *Boraitas*. (twtyyrb; Heb. twnwxyj) or *Tosiphtas* (twtpswt). As has been stated, R. Judah the Holy collected the great mass of traditions in the work called Mishna; but even this copious work could not satisfy, for the length of time, the zeal of the rabbins for the law, for all casuistry is endless in its details. There were a great multitude of all kinds of possibilities which were treated in the Mishna, and yet, again, each single sentence left open divers possibilities, divers doubts, and considerations not yet finished. Thus it was an inner necessity of the matter that the text of the Mishna should again become the point of learned discussion. Partly by means of logic (that is, Rabbinical), partly with the help of the traditional matter, which had not yet been included in the Mishna, all open questions were now discussed. This task was carried out by the Amoraim, or Gemarical doctors, whose *very singular* illustrations, opinions, and doctrines were subsequently to form the Gemaras, i.e. the Palestinian and Babylonian: a body of men charged with being the most learned and elaborate triflers that ever brought discredit upon the republic of letters—

*“For mystic learning, wondrous able
In magic, talisman, and cabal
Deep-sighted in intelligences
Ideas, atoms, influences.”*

With unexampled assiduity did they seek after or invent obscurities and ambiguities, which continually furnished pretexts for new expositions and illustrations, the art of clouding texts in themselves clear having proved ever less difficult than that of elucidating passages the words or the sense of which might be really involved in obscurity.

*“Hence comment after comment, spun as fine
As bloated spiders draw the flimsy line!”*

The two main schools where this casuistic treatment of the Mishnic text was exercised were that at Tiberias, in Palestine, and that at Sora (q.v.), in Babylonia, whither Abba Areka, called “Rab” (q.v.), a pupil of R. Judah, had brought the Mishna. In these and other schools (as Nahardea, Sipporis, Pumbaditha [q.v.], and Jabne or Jamnia), the thread of casuistry was twisted over and over again, and the matter-of traditions of the law thus took greater and greater dimensions. Abandoning the Scripture’ text, to illustrate and to explain which the doctors and wise men of the schools had hitherto labored, successive generations of *Genzarici* now devoted& their whole attention to the exposition of the text of the Mishna; and the industry and cavillation were such that expositions, illustrations, and commentaries multiplied with amazing rapidity and to so portentous a degree that they eventually swelled into a monstrous chaotic mass, which was dignified by the name of Gemara, [armg\]\(supplement or complement\)](#), and this, together with the Mishna, was called “Talmud.” Notwithstanding the uncertain paternity of this incongruous body of opinions, there were not wanting those who gave a preference to the Gemara over the Mishna, and even over the “written law.” It was said by some that the “written law” was like water, the Mishna like wine, and the Gemara like hippocras, or spiced wine. The “words of the scribes,” said those supporters of the Gemara, are lovely above the “words of the law,” for the words of the law” are *weighty and light*, but the “words of the scribes” are all weighty.

It was by R. Jochanan, rector of the Academy of Tiberias, that the minor chaos of comments and facetiae began to be collected; and these, being added to the Mishna, were termed the *Palestinian Talmud*, or *Talmud Jeushali*, i.e. Jerusalem Talmud. This Talmud, which was completed at Tiberias about A.D. 350, only contains four orders, viz., *Zeraim*, *Môed*, *Nashuim*, and *Nezikin*, together with the treatise *Niddah* and some other fragmentary portions. From the schools of Babylonia, also, a similar collection was in after-times made; but, as, upon the desolation of

Palestine, the study of the law was chiefly prosecuted in Babylon, the college there were far more numerous, and far more ingenious and prolific were the imaginations of the Babylonian professors. To collect and methodize all the disputations, interpretations, elucidations, commentaries, and conceits of the Babylonian Gemarici was consequently a labor neither of one man nor of a single age. The first attempt was made (A.D. 367) by R. Ashi, elected at the age of fourteen to be rector of the school of Soras (q.v.), a teacher described as eminently pious and learned. R. Ashe labored during sixty years upon the rank, unwieldy work, and, after arranging thirty-five books, died in 427, leaving the completion to his successors. For 100 years longer did rabbi after rabbi, with undiminished zeal, successively continue this un-profitable application, until at length, after the lapse of 123 years (about A.D. 550), rabbi Abina, the sixth in succession to Ashb, gave the finishing stroke to this *second* Talmud. Denominated, from the name of the province in which it was first compiled, the *Babylonian Talmud*, this second Talmud is as unmanageable to the student on account of its style and composition as on account of its prodigious bulk. Composed in a dialect neither Chaldaic nor Hebrew, but a barbarous commixture of both of these and of other dialects, jumbled together in defiance of all the rules of composition or of grammar, it affords a *second* specimen of a *Babylonian confusion of languages*.

*“It was a parti-colored dress
Of patched and piebald languages,
Which made some think, when it did gabble,
They’d heard three laborers of Babel,
Or Cerberus himself pronounce A leash of languages at once.”*

Abounding, moreover, in fantastic trifles and Rabbinical reveries, it must appear almost incredible that any sane man could exhibit such acumen and such ardor in the invention of those unintelligible comments, in those nice scrupulosities, and those ludicrous chimeras which, the rabbins have solemnly published to the world, and of which we will speak further on.

II. Form and Style. — In general, the Gemara takes the shape of scholastic discussions, more or less prolonged, on the consecutive portions of the Mishna. On a cursory view, it is true, these discussions have the air of a desultory and confused wrangle; but, when studied more carefully, they resolve themselves into a system governed by a methodology of its own. “Non vero sterilis in Mishnicam commentarius Gemara est; quae illius tantum modo verba explicet. *Sed prolixas in ear instituit disputationes,*

questiones proponendas et ad eas respondendo dubia movendo, eaque solvendo, excipiendo et replicando” (Wahner, *Antiq. Hebr.* 1, 339).

The language of the Talmud is partly Hebrew and partly Aramaic. The best Hebrew of the work is in the text of the Mishna, that in the Gemara being largely debased with exotic words of various tongues, such as Latin, Greek, Arabic, Coptic, and Persian (comp. A. Brull, *Fremdsprachliche Redensarten in den Talmuden und Midrashim* [Leips. 1869]), barbarous spelling, and uncouth grammatical, or rather ungrammatical, forms. The same remark will apply to the Aramaic portions, which, in general, are those containing popular narrative, or legendary illustration, while the law principles and the discussions relating to them are embodied in Hebrew. Many forms of the Talmudic dialect are so peculiar as to tender a grammar adapted to the work itself greatly to be desired. Ordinary Hebrew grammar will not take a man through a page of it. *SEE RABBINICAL DIALECT.*

In style the Mishna is remarkable for its extreme conciseness, and the Gemara is written upon the same model, though not so frequently obscure. The prevailing principle of the composition seems to have been the employment of the fewest words, thus rendering the work a constant brachylogy. A phrase becomes a focus of many thoughts, a solitary word an anagram, a cipher for a whole subject of reflection. To employ an appropriate expression of Delitzsch,” What Jean Paul says of the style of Haman applies exactly to that of the Talmud: “It is a firmament of telescopic stars, containing many a cluster of light which no unaided eye has ever resolved” (*Zur Geschichte der jüdischen Poesie* [Leips. 1836], p. 31). But without regard to grammatical and linguistic difficulties and numberless abbreviations which crowd the pages of the Talmud, there are a number of so-called *termini technici*, which were current only in the Rabbinical schools, but have been incorporated in the Gemara, like joints and ligaments in its organization, so as to make the knowledge of them indispensable to the student. Such *termini* were—

1. The *explication*, or *ḥwryp*, which is introduced by the formulae *k yam*, “What is this?” *rmaq yam*, “What does he say?” *nymqya yamb*, “How is this to be understood?” *nyqs [yamb*, “What is the matter here?” *hmq rkd am*, “Who could think of such a thing?” *ymd ykyh*, “How have we to interpret this?”

2. *The question*, or **hl aç**. If a question is offered by one school to another, it is introduced by the formula **whl ay[bya**, “They propose to them;” if from several persons to one, the formula is **hynym w[b**, “They ask of him;” or if the demand is made of one person to another, it is **hynym a[b**, “I ask of him.”
3. The *response*, or **hbwçt**, which may consist either in strong reasons (**afçp** or **/wryt**) or in strong objections (**akryp** or **ayçwq**), is introduced by the formula **l anm**, “Whence have you this?” or **hl [ywh yam**, “You wish to know the decision in this case.”
4. *Tosiphta*, or **atpswt**, an appendix to the Mishna. We have seen that R. Chiya, or, as some have it, R. Nehemya under his direction, composed a work of this description in Palestine, the substance of which is diffused in citations throughout the Talmud. They are indicated by the sign-word *Tana*, **anat**, “He teaches,” or *Vetanialey*, **yl [yntw**, “It is taught hereupon,” prefixed to the sentence.
5. *Boraztha*, or **atyrb**, another kind of supplement to the Mishna. Such are the books *Siphra*, *Siphre*, and *Mechilta*, mentioned above. When a citation is adduced from a Boraita in the Talmud, it is introduced by one of these forms: *Tanu rabbandn*, **nbr wnt**, “Our rabbins have taught;” *Tani chada*, **adj ynt**, “A certain (rabbi) has taught,” etc.
6. The *suspense*, or **wqyt**, is used when a case cannot be decided either *pro* or *con*, and thus this formula is used, which according to some contains the initials of **ybçt twy[byaw twyçwq /rty**, i.e. “the Tishbite (viz., Elijah, at his coming) will explain all objections and inquiries.” Others, however, pretend that it is an abbreviation of **unqyt**, “It remains *in state quo*.”
7. The *objection*, or **ayçwq**, a question not of a fixed Halakah, which is irrefragable, but of some position of the Amoraim or perhaps Tanaim, which is lawfully debatable, and is introduced by the formulae **[mç at**, “Come and hear;” **hnym [mç**, “Hear of this;” **ykh ya**, “If so;” **aml a**, “Therefore;” **hzb tqwl j m**, “There is a controversy in this case;” **ygl pym aq yamb**, “What is the ground of the controversy?” **!t [d aql s**, “Thou couldst suppose.”

- 8.** The *refutation*, or **atbwyt**, is used in order to uphold the authority of the Bible (**qwsph ʿm**) against a Tanaite, and to oppose the authority of a Tanaite against that of one of the Amolraim, and is introduced by the formula **atbwyt, atbwyt**, “This objection is truly of great weight.”
- 9.** The *contradiction*, or **hymr**, an objection thrown against a sentiment or opinion by the allegation of a contrary authority, and is introduced by the formula **yhnymrw**, “But I oppose this.”
- 10.** The *argumentation*, or **atpqth**, “an assailing or seizing upon,” is a kind of objection in use only among the later Amoraim, and is introduced by **hl ʿyqtm ynwł p r**, “Rabbi N. objects to this.” If this objection is not refuted, it takes the value of Halakah.
- 11.** The *solution*, or **qwryp**, is the explanatory answer to the objection (see *supra* 7).
- 12.** The *infirmation*, or **ywnç**, “disowning or shifting off,” when a sage, sorely pressed in debate, shifts off his thesis upon another, introducing this by the formula **ah ynm**, “But whose is this sentence.”
- 13.** The *appui*, or **[wys**, “support,” is a corroborative evidence for a doctrine or principle, introduced by the formula **hyl [yy sm amył**, “It can be said,” “There is support for it.”
- 14.** The *necessity*, or **hkrxh**, This term is used in order to justify a sentence or a word, or even a single letter, which seems superfluous in the Bible or in the Mishna, and is introduced by the formula **yl hml wz ah**, “What is this for?” To which is answered, **akyrx**, “It is absolutely necessary.”
- 15.** The *accord*, or **hfwç**, “series,” a catena or line of Talmudic teachers, cited against a given proposition.
- 16.** *Sugia*, **aygws**, means the proper nature of a thing. By this word the Gemara refers to itself with regard to its own properties and characteristics.
- 17.** *Hilkatha*, **atkl h**, is the ultimate conclusion on a matter debated, henceforth constituting a rule of conduct. Much of the Gemara consists of

discussions by which they are verified, confirmed, and designated. When the advocates of two opposing theses have brought the debate to an issue, they say, “The Halacta is with such a one” $\hat{k}w \hat{k} atkl h$.

18. *Maasah*, or $h\check{c}[m$, *factum*, the establishment of a Halacta by cases of actual experience or practice.

19. *Shematetha*, $att[m\check{c}$, “to hear,” describes a judgment or principle which, being founded on Holy Writ, or being of self-evident authority, must be hearkened to as incontestable.

20. *Horaah*, $harwh$, “demonstration,” doctrine, legitimate and authoritative.

21. *Hagadah*, $hdgh$, “a saying,” incident related, anecdote or legend employed in the way of elucidation. Hagadah is not law, but it serves to illustrate law.

III. *Literary and Moral Character of the Book.* Since the Gemara is in general only a more complete development of the Mishna, it also comprises all the primary elements of the Mishna mentioned above, which are, however, intermixed with an endless variety of *Hagadoth*, i.e. anecdotes and illustrations, historical and legendary, poetical allegories, charming parables, with epithalamiums, etc., and thus making the Talmud contain *all* and *everything*, or as Buxtorf (in *Praefat. Lex. Chald. et Talmud.*) says:

“Sunt enim in Talmud adhuc multa quoque Theologica sana, quamvis plurimis inutilibus corticibus, ut Majemon, licubi loquitur, involuta. Sunt in eo) multa fida antiquitatis Judaee collapsae veluti rudela et-vestigia, ad convincendam posterorum Judaeorum perfidiam, ad illustrandam utriusque Testamenti historiam, ad recte explicandos ritus, leges, consuetudines populi Hebraei prisci, plurimum conducentia. Sunt in eo multa Juridica, Medica, Physica, Ethica, Politica, Astronomica et aliarum scientiarum praeclara documenta, quae istius gentis et temporis historiam mirifice commendant. Sunt in eo illustria ex antiquitate proverbia, insignes sententiae, acuta apophthegmata, scite prudenterque dicta innumera, quae lectorem vel meliorem, vel sapienterem, vel doctorem reddere possunt, et ceu rutilantes gemmas non minus Hebraeam linguam exornant, quam omnes Latini et Graecae flosculi

suas linguas condecorant. Sunt in eo multae vocum myriades, quae vel voces in Scripturæ Sacrae usu raras illustrent, et native explicant, vel totius linguae Hebraicae et Chaldaicae usum insigniter complent et perficiunt, qui alioqui in defectu maximo mutilus et mancus jaceret.”

In order to illustrate this, we will give a few specimens of such Hagadoth for the benefit of the reader:

God is represented as praying. R. Jochaana says, in the name of R. Josi, How is it proved that the Holy One, blessed be he, does pray? From ^{<230>}Isaiah 56:7, “I will bring them to my holy mountain and make them joyful in my house of prayer.” Mark, it is not said, their prayer, but my prayer; therefore it is conclusively proved that he prays. And what does he pray? R. Zutra, the son of Tobia, said, in the name of Rav, the following is the divine prayer: “May it please me that my mercies shall prevail over mine anger, that the bowels of my compassion may be extended, that I may mercifully deal with my children and keep justice in abeyance.” In corroboration of this, the following story is given. It is told by R. Ismael, the son of Elisha. Once I went into the Holy of Holies for the purpose of burning incense, and I saw Acathriel Jah, the Lord, sitting upon the high and exalted throne. And he said to me, Ismael, my son, bless me! and I *addressed to him* the above prayer, and he shook his head (*Berakoth*, p. 7, col. 1).

But if God prays, then he must, also put on phylacteries. Even upon this point the rabbins do not leave us in ignorance. Where is it proved that God puts on phylacteries? In ^{<231>}Isaiah 62:8, where we read, “The Lord hath sworn by his right hand, and by the arm of his strength.” By the term right hand is meant the law, as it is written, “From his right hand went a fiery law for them” (^{<232>}Deuteronomy 33:2); and by the term arm of his strength is meant phylacteries, as it is written, “The Lord will give strength to his people,” etc. (*Berakoth*, p. 6, col. 1). Moreover, God has actually shown his phylacteries to Moses. It is written, “And I will take away mine hands, and thou shalt see my back parts” (^{<233>}Exodus 33:23). R. Chana, the son of Bisna, says, in the name of R. Shimeon Chasida, “From this passage we learn’ that the Holy One, blessed be he, has shown to Moses the tie of the phylacteries, which lies on the back part of his head” (*Berakoth*, p. 7, col. 1).

If God prays, then, in the language of the rabbins, he is conscious of some personal feeling. They are not silent on this point. For example, the school of Ishmael have taught that peace is a very important matter, and that for its sake even God prevaricated. For it is written in Genesis 18: first that Sarah said, "My Lord is old;" but afterwards it is written she said, "And I am old" (*Yebamoth*, p. 65, col. 2; see as 7 *Baba Metsia*, p. 87, col. 1).

God is represented as needing a sacrifice to atone for himself. R. Shimeon, the son of Pazi, asked, It is written, "And God made two great lights;" and again, the greater light and the lesser light; how does this agree? *Ans.* The moon said to the Holy One, blessed be he-Lord of the universe, is it possible for two kings to use one crown?

He said to her, Go and make thyself smaller. She said to him again, Lord of the universe, because I spoke to thee reasonably, should I make myself smaller? He said, in order to comfort her, Go and rule day and night. She said to him, What advantage will this be to me? Of what use is a candle in the middle of the day? He replied, Go and let Israel number the days of the year by thee. She said, It is impossible even for the sun that the calendar should be reckoned after him only, for it is written, "Let *them* be for signs, and for seasons, and for days and years?" He said to her, Go, and the righteous will be called by thy name; such as Jacob the little, Samuel the little, David the little, etc. But when God saw that the moon was not quite comforted with these promises, he said, Bring ye a sacrifice to atone for me, because I lessened the size of the moon. And this corresponds with the saying of R. Shimeou, the son of Lakish: Why is the monthly sacrifice distinguished from others, inasmuch as it is written concerning it, "And one kid of the goats for a sin-offering unto the Lord?" (⁰⁴⁸¹⁵Numbers 28:15). Because God said, This kid shall be an atonement for that I have lessened the size of the moon (*Chulin*, p. 60, col. 2). Raba barbar Chana, in telling a long story, says, "I heard a Bath-kol crying, Woe to me that I have sworn! And now since I have sworn, who will absolve me from my oath? (*Baba Bathra*, p. 74, col. 1).

Occupation of God. On one occasion Abyathon found Elijah, and asked him. What does the Holy One, blessed be he, do? He answered, He is studying the case of the concubine of Gibeon. [We do not give this excerpt in full.] And what is his opinion, about it? He says that Abyathon, my Son, is right; and Jonathan, my son, is also right. Is there, their, a doubt in

heaven about it? No, not in-the least, rejoined Elijah; but both opinions are the words of the living God (*Götting* p. 6, col. 2).

Rabba, the son of Shila, met Elijah, and asked him, "What does; the Holy One, blessed be he, do?" Elijah replied, "He recites the lessons he hears from the lips of all the rabbins, with the exception of rabbi Meir. But why does he not want to learn from rabbi Meir?" Elijah answered, "Because rabbi Meir learned from one with the name of Acher." Rabba said, "But rabbi Meir found a pomegranate, and has eaten the inside, but thrown away the husks of it, i.e. he only learned from Acher, but did not practice his deeds." Elijah answered, "Now God says, Meir, my son" (*Chagigah*, p. 15, col. 2).

R. Abhu says, If there had not been a passage of Scripture for it, it would be impossible to make such a statement; but it is written, "In the same day shall the Lord shave with a razor that is hired, namely, by them beyond the river, by the king of Assyria, the head, and the hair of the feet: and it shall also consume the beard" (²⁰⁷²Isaiah 7:20). God appeared to Sennacherib in the form of an old man. Sennacherib said to him, If thou shouldst go to the kings of the east and the west, whose children I have taken away and killed, what wouldst thou say to them? He answered, I would say to them that this man, i.e. Sennacherib, sits also in fear. Sennacherib said, What then shall I do? God said, Go and disguise thyself, that they should not recognize thee. How shall I disguise myself? God said, Go and bring me a razor, and I will shave thee. Sennacherib replied, From where shall I bring thee a razor? God said, Go to that house, and bring it me. He went there and found ole. Then angels came, and appeared to, him in the form of men; and were grinding olive-seeds. He said to them, Give me a razor. They replied, Crush one measure of olive-seeds, and we will give the sazers He did so and they gave it to him. Before he returned to God it became dark. God said to him, Bring a light. And he brought coals of fire to make a light and while he was blowing them, the, flame took hold of his beard; and thus God shaved his head and beard (*Sanhedrin*, p. 96, col. 1).

The schools of Hillel and of Shammai were disputing for three years about a certain point in the law; each side maintained that it was infallibly right. At last a Bath-kol came down from heaven and said, The opinions of both are the words of the living God, but the law is as the school of Hillel (*Erubin*, p. 13, col. 2).

R. Joshua, the son of Levi, says, When Moses came down from the presence of God, Satan appeared before him and said, Lord of the universe, where is the law? God replied, I have given it to the earth. He went to the earth and asked, Where is the law? The earth answered, God understandeth the way thereof (^{<1823>}Job 28:23). He went to the sea and asked, Where is the law? The sea, said, It is not in me. He went to the depth, and asked the same question. The depth said, It is not in me; Destruction and death said, We have heard the fame thereof with our ears (ibid.). So he returned to God and said, Lord of the universe, I have searched for it all over the earth, and have not found it. God said to him, Go to the son of Amram. He came to Moses, and said to him, The law which God gave thee, where is it? Moses replied to Satan, Who am I, that God should give me a law! Thereupon of God said to Moses, Art thou a liar? Moses answered, "Lord of the universe, thou hast a precious treasure, which is thy daily delight, and should I claim it for my own advantage? God said to him, Because thou didst think little of thyself, the law shall be called after thy name. As it is written, "Remember ye the law of Moses my servant" (^{<3004>}Malachi 4:4). Rabbi Joshua continues to narrate: When Moses went up to heaven, he found God *occupied in twisting wreaths* for the letters- (of the law). And he called, Moses! is there no peace in thy city? i.e. that thou didst not salute me with a salaam? Moses answered, Is it customary that a servant should salute his master? God said, Thou oughtest to have helped me; i.e. thou shouldst have wished me success in my work. Immediately Moses said to him, "And now, I beseech thee, let the power of my Lord is great, according as thou hast spoken" (^{<0447>}Numbers 14:17) (*Sabbath*, p. 89, col. 1).

These are only a few of the many examples which crowd the pages of the Talmud. That these stories are extravagant, and often, when taken literally, absurd, no one can deny. But they must be merely regarded as to their meaning and intention. Much has been said against the Talmud on account of the preposterous character of some of these legends. But we should give the Hebrew *literati* the benefit of their own explanations. They tell us that in the Talmud the Hagadah has no absolute authority, nor any value except in the way of elucidation. It often-but not always-enwraps a philosophic meaning under the veil of allegory, mythic folk-lore, ethical story, Oriental romance, parable, and aphorism and fable. They deny that the authors of these fancy pieces intended either to add to the law of God or to detract from it by them, but only to explain and enforce it in terms best suited to

the popular capacity. They caution us against receiving these things according to the letter, and admonish us to understand them-according to their spiritual or moral import. "Beware," says Maimonides, "that you take not the words of the wise men literally, for this would be degrading to the sacred doctrine, and sometimes contradict it. Seek rather the hidden sense; and if you cannot find the kernel, let the shell alone, and confess, 'I cannot understand this.'" But the impartial reader must at once admit that these suggestions are merely the after-thoughts of tender apologists, for some of these stories have no hidden sense at all, but must be taken literally, because meant so, as the following will prove. In the treatise *Gittin*, fol. 69, col. 1, we read the following prescription: "For the bleeding at the nose, let a man be brought who is a priest, and whose name is Levi, and let him write the word Levi backwards. If this cannot be done, get a layman, and let him write the following words backwards: 'Ana pipi Shila bar Sumki;' or let him write these words: 'Taam dli bemi keseph, taam li bemi paggan.'" Or let him take a root of grass, and the cord of an old bed, and paper and saffron and the red part of the inside of a palm-tree, and let him burn them together; and let him take some wool and twist two threads, and let him dip them in vinegar, and then roll them in the ashes and put them into his nose. Or let him look out for a small stream of: water that flows from east to west, and let him go and stand with one leg on each side of it, and let him take with his right hand some mud from under his left foot, and with his left hand from under his right foot, and let him twist two threads of wool, and dip them in the mud, and put them into his nostrils. Or let him be placed under a spout, and let water be brought and poured upon him, and let them say, 'As this water ceases to flow, so let the blood of M., the son of the woman N., also cease.'" A commentary on this wisdom or folly is superfluous. That this direction to stop a bleeding at the nose is not a rare case in the Talmud, the following mode of treatment for the scratch, or bite of a mad dog will prove. In the treatise *Yoma*, fol. 83, col. 1, we read: "The rabbins have handed down the tradition that there are five things to be observed of a mad dog; his mouth is open, his saliva flows, his ears hang down, his tail is between his legs, and he goes by the sides of the ways. Some say, also, that he barks, but his voice is not heard. What is the cause of his madness? Ray says it proceeds from this, that the witches are making their sport with him. Samuel says it is an evil spirit that rests upon him. What is the difference? The difference is this, that in the latter case he is to be killed by some missile weapon. The tradition agrees with Samuel, for it says in killing him no other mode is to be used but the casting of some

missile weapon. If a mad dog scratch any one, he is in danger; but if he bite him he will die. In case of scratch there is danger; what, then, is the remedy? Let the man cast off his clothes and run away. Rab Huna, the son of Rab Joshua, was once scratched in the street by one of them; he immediately cast off his clothes and ran away. He also says, I fulfilled in myself these words: ‘Wisdom -gives life to them that have it’ (²⁰⁶²Ecclesiastes 6:12). In case of a bite the man will die; what, then, is the remedy? Abai says he must take the skin of a male adder and write upon it these words I, M., the son of the woman N., upon the skin of a male adder, I write against thee, *Kanti, Kanti, Klirus*.

Some say, ‘*Kandi, Kandi, Klurus, Jah, Jah*, Lord of hosts, Amen, Amen, Selah.’ Let him also cast off his clothes and bury them in the graveyard for twelve months of the year; then let him take them up and burn them in an oven, and let him scatter the ashes at the parting of the roads. But during these twelve months of the year, when he drinks water, let him drink out of nothing but a brass tube, lest he should see the phantom-form of the daemon and be endangered. This was tried by Abba the son of Martha, who is the same as Abba the son of Manjumi. His mother made a golden tube for him.”

In the face of such extravagancies, we are not surprised at the following statement made by a modern Jewish writer, H. Hurwitz, in an essay preceding his *Hebrew Tales* (Lond. 1826), p. 34 sq.

“The Talmud contains many things which every enlightened Jew must sincerely wish had either never appeared there, or should, at least, long ago have been expunged from its pages... Some of these sayings are objectionable *per se*; others are, indeed, susceptible of explanations, but without them are calculated to produce false and erroneous impressions. Of the former description are all those extravagancies relating to the extent of Paradise, the dimensions of Gehinnom, the size of Leviathan, and the *shor habor*, the freaks of Ashmbdai, etc., idle tales borrowed most probably from the Parthians and Arabians, to whom the Jews were subject before the promulgation of the Talmud. How these objectionable passages came at all to be inserted, can only be accounted for from the great reverence with which the Israelites of those days used to regard their wise men, and which made them look upon every word and expression that dropped from the mouth of their instructors as so

many precious sayings well worthy of being preserved. These they wrote down for their own private information, together with more important matters, and when, in aftertimes, these writings were collected in order to be embodied in one entire work, the collectors, either from want of proper discrimination or from some pious motive, suffered them to remain, and thus they were handed down to posterity. That the wiser portion of the nation never approved of them is well known. Nay, that some of the Talmudists themselves regard them with no favorable eye is plain from the bitter terms in which they spoke against them [for example, Jehoshua ben Levi, who exclaims: "He who writes them down will have no portion in the world to come; he who explains them will be scorched"]... I admit, also, that there are many and various contradictions in the Talmud, and, indeed, it would be a miracle if there were none. For the work contains not the opinions of only a few individuals living in the same society, under precisely similar circumstances, but of hundreds, nay, thousands, of learned men of various talents, living in a long series of ages, in different countries, and under the most diversified conditions... To believe that its multifarious contents are all dictates of unerring wisdom is as extravagant as to suppose that all it contains is founded in error. Like all other productions of unaided humanity, it is not free from mistakes and prejudices, to remind us that the writers were fallible men, and that unqualified admiration must, be reserved for the works of divine inspiration, which we ought to study, the better to adore and obey the all-perfect Author. But while I should be among the first to protest against any confusion of the Talmudic rills with the ever-flowing stream of Holy Writ, I do not hesitate to avow my doubts whether there exists any uninspired work of equal antiquity that contains more interesting, more various and valuable information than that of the still-existing remains of the ancient Hebrew sages."

But while we admire the candor of this Jewish writer, we must confess that not all of his coreligionists act oil the same principle, as the sequel will prove. An article in the *Quarterly Review* for October, 1867, with the heading "What is the Talmud?" has taken the world by surprise. Such a panegyric the Talmud most likely never had. Written so learnedly, and in a style so attractive, about a subject utterly unknown to the world at large,

the stir it has created is not to be wondered at, and the more: so because this article contained sentences which could not have emanated from a Jew. But the writer was a Jew, Mr. E. Deutsch (since deceased), and what Isaac said to Jacob, “The voice is Jacob’s voice, but the hands are the hands of Esau,” must be applied to the author of “What is the Talmud?” We cannot pass over this article by merely alluding to it; it deserves our full attention, on account of the mischief it has already wrought, and must work, in the minds of those who are not able to correct the erroneous statements contained in it.

The writer accuses (p. 4 of the American reprint, contained in the *Literary Remains* [N. Y. 1874]) the investigators of the Talmud of mistaking the grimy stone caricatures over our cathedrals for the gleaming statues of the saints within. But, entering into the cathedrals of the Talmud and beholding these saints, we hear, in the treatise *Aboda Sara*, fol. 17, col. 1, of rabbi Elieser, **hyl [ab al ç µl w[b tj a hnwz j ynh al ç** (we dare not translate this sentence into English, but we give it in Latin: “Non erat meretrix in terra quacum non fornicatus esset”). When rabbi Nachman (we read Tr. *Yona*, fol. 12, col. 2) went to Shanuzib, he proclaimed **amwyl aywh ^am zyrkm çyçrtl [l qm yk br** (this also we dare not translate into English, but we give it in Latin: “Rab quum Tarsum intraret proclamabat quam vellet luxorem in diem”). Of rabbi Abuha we read (Tr. *Berakoth*, fol. 44, cl. 1) that he was such a strong eater that a fly could not rest upon his forehead; and (*ibid.*) of rabbi Ami and rabbi Assi that they ate so much that the hair fell from their heads; and of rabbi Simeon, the son of Lakesh, that he ate so much that he lost his senses. In Tr. *Baba Metsia*, fol. 84, col. 1, we read that rabbi Ismael, the son of rabbi Jose, and rabbi Eleazar, the son of rabbi Simeon, were so corpulent that when they stood face to face a pair of oxen could pass under them without touching them. Of the honesty of rabbi Samuel and rabbi Cahauna we read a nice story in Tr. *Baba Kamma*, fol. 113, col. 2, which we had better pass over, for enough has been said of some of the Talmudical saints.

The writer in the *Quarterly* is astonished at the fact that the Talmud has so often been burned. But it is an old saying, “Habent sua fata libelli.” The followers of the Arabian prophet burned the great library at Alexandria, and they still do the same with every book which they believe is written against their religion. The Jews have burned and excommunicated the books of their own great Maimonides (q.v.), and considered him a heretic.

They have burned, and still burn, the Hebrew Old Test. because of the Latin headings and crosses, to say nothing of the New Test. The Roman Catholics burn the Protestant Bible. Why should the Talmud have escaped? Besides, ignorance and fanaticism, in all ages and countries, have burned the books which they supposed were against their system. This was especially the case with the Talmud, A.D. 1240, when a conference was held in Paris between Nicolaus Donin and some Jewish rabbins concerning certain blasphemies contained in the Talmud and written against Jesus and Mary. R. Jehiel, the most prominent of the Jewish rabbins at that conference, would not admit that the Jesus spoken of in the Talmud was Jesus of Nazareth, but another Jesus, a discovery which was copied by later writers. But modern Jews acknowledge the failure of this argument, for, says Dr. Levin, in his prize-essay *Die Religions disputation des R. Jehiel von Paris*, etc., published in Gratz's *Monatsschrift* (1869), p. 193, "We must regard the attempt of R. Jehiel to ascertain that there were two by the name of Jesus as unfortunate, original as the idea may be." The result of this conference was that the Talmud in wagon-loads was burned at Paris in 1242. This was the first attack. When, however, the writer in the *Quarterly* states that Justinian in A.D. 553 already honored the Talmud by a special interdictory *novella* (146 Περὶ Ἑβραίων), we must regard such a statement as erroneous and superficial, for, as Dr. Gratz, in his *Gesch. der Juden*, 5, 392, shows, this *novella* has no reference to the Talmud at all (comp. also vol. 7 [1873], p. 441 sq.). In our days, such accusations against the Talmud as that preferred by Donin were impossible, because all these offensive passages have been removed not so much by the hands of the censor, as by the Jews themselves, as the following document or circular letter, addressed by a council of elders, convened in Poland in the Jewish year 5391 (i.e. A.D. 1631), to their coreligionists, which at the same time contains the clue why in later editions of the Talmud certain passages are wanting, will show. The circular runs thus in the translation of Ch. Leslie (in *A Short and Easy Method with the Jews* p. 2 sq. [Lond. 1812], where the original Hebrew is also found):

"Great peace to our beloved brethren of the house of Israel.

"Having received information that many Christians have applied themselves with great care to acquire the knowledge of the language in which our books are written, we therefore enjoin you, under the penalty of the great ban (to be inflicted upon such of you as shall transgress this our statute), that you do not, in any new

edition either of the Mishna or Gemara, publish anything relative to Jesus of Nazareth; and you take special care not to write anything concerning him, either good or bad, so that neither ourselves nor our religion may be exposed to any injury. For we know what those men of Belial, the Munirim, have done to us, when they became Christians and how their representations against us have obtained credit. Therefore, let this make you cautious. If you should not pay strict attention to this our letter, but act contrary thereto, and continue to publish our books in the same manner as before, you may occasion, both to us and yourselves, greater afflictions than we have hitherto experienced, and be the means of our being compelled to embrace the Christian religion, as we were formerly; and thus our latter troubles might be worse than the former. For these reasons we command you that, if you publish any new edition of those books, let the places relating to Jesus the Nazarene be left in blank, and fill up the space with a circle like this, O. But the rabbins and teachers of children will know how to instruct the youth by word of mouth. Then Christians will no longer have anything to show against us upon this subject, and we may expect deliverance from the afflictions we have formerly labored under, and reasonably hope to live in peace.”

The writer in the *Quarterly*, while loudly praising the humane spirit which, as he tells us, pervades the “system and institutions set forth in the Talmud,” endeavors at the same time to apologize for those parts of the Talmud which contain, as he admits (p. 12), “gross offences against modern taste,” by telling us that, when compared with other ancient systems of jurisprudence, “the Talmud will then stand out rather favorably than otherwise.” It is not necessary to say much on this painful and disgusting part of the subject; but we will say this, that it is one thing to point to the existence of mire, that we may warn the unwary, and another to wallow with delight in it. We heartily wish that some of the rabbins who wrote the Talmud had been content with discharging that which may be considered a duty, and not laid themselves open to the charge justly brought against them, of doing injury to the morals and minds of those who study their writings, by their unnecessary and improper statements and details, of which the treatise *Nidda*, which we have here especially in view, and which treats of the “menstruating woman,” is so full. When, in 1843, Messrs. De Sola and Raphall published a translation of a portion of the

Mishna, they excused the omission of this treatise by saying, in the preface to their work, "The treatise *Nidda*, not being suited to the refined notions of the English reader, has not been printed." They did well and wisely to omit it in the list of portions selected for translation. It may be said, But this treatise, bad as it is, is only a commentary on some portions of the laws of Moses. To this we may reply, it was manifestly necessary that Infinite Wisdom should solemnly prohibit many atrocities then prevent among the heathen nations. In order to prohibit them, they must of necessity be mentioned. No doubt, the proper feeling which leads us to turn with disgust from the very thought of the crimes thus forbidden is very much owing to those very laws which were given that the children of Israel should be distinguished from other nations, and thus, being ceremonially clean, should be fit to enter the tabernacle of God. But is there any proper excuse for writing or printing one hundred and seventy-eight folio pages in order to define all the forms in which imagination can suggest that only one of these crimes could be committed. Let us, as the subject is so important, for a moment consider a parallel case. Murder is forbidden. This law is of inexpressible importance. It is impossible to dwell too largely on the enormity of this crime, or to speak too earnestly of the necessity of watching against anger, hatred, cruelty, and every possible form in which we can in any way participate in the guilt of this dreadful sin. Just so we cannot say too much about the necessity of personal purity and holiness, for God will be "sanctified in them that draw near him." But what would we say of a man who should write a large volume merely to describe all the various modes in which a 'murder can be carried out, and the symptoms of decay and dissolution which would follow the deed?

On page 26 of the article alluded to we are told: "There are many more vital points of contact between the New Test. and the Talmud than divines yet seem fully to realize, for such terms as 'redemption,' 'baptism,' 'grace,' 'faith,' 'salvation,' 'regeneration,' 'Son of man,' 'Son of God,' 'kingdom of heaven,' were not, as we are apt to think invented by Christianity, but were household words of Talmudical Judaism, to which Christianity gave a higher and purer meaning." It requires, however, a very slender acquaintance with the Bible to enable any one to reply to this statement that many of these terms were familiar to the Jews long before the Talmud was in existence, for they are found in the Old Test. And not only so, but the New Test. itself is a much older book than the Talmud. Our author tells us that the Mishna was compiled about A.D. 200. The Gemara is of still

later date. It seems strange, indeed, that it did not occur to the learned author that it is impossible to suppose that the New Test. had no influence upon the rabbins, who rejected its authority. Unquestionably the reasonings of Paul and the writings of the other apostles greatly affected the whole tone of thought and manner of expression which prevailed among those who, nevertheless, refused to acknowledge their own Messiah. This is a common mistake among even learned Jews. Because *some parts* of the Talmud are unquestionably very ancient, they speak of *the whole* as a work of very great antiquity. They cannot altogether divest themselves of the fabulous notion that God gave the *oral* as well as the written law to Moses himself. Thus they habitually claim for the Talmud, as to antiquity, a degree of respect to which it is by no means entitled.

The most serious error, however, and that against which we must most distinctly protest, is this. We are told that “the Pentateuch remains in all cases the background and latent source of the Mishna” (p. 17). And again, “Either the scriptural verse forms the terminus *a quo*, or the terminus *ad quem*. It is either the starting-point for a discussion which ends in the production of some new enactment or one never before investigated is traced back to the divine source by an outward ‘hint,’ however insignificant” (p. 19). Now, although this is literally true as to many of the *civil laws* contained in the Pentateuch, it is by no means a correct representation of the actual state of the case as to the *religious principles* which form the substance and the foundation of the laws of Moses. If those men who wrote the Talmud really understood and followed out the teaching of Moses, why do they almost entirely ignore the teaching of the other prophets? It is astonishing to see how very little mention is made in the Jerusalem Talmud and in the 5894 pages of the Babylonian Talmud of a great part of the Old Test.; and a perusal of the book called *ʿrha tdl wt rps*, compiled by R. Aaron Pisarenis, or Pesaro (q.v.), which contains an index of all the passages of Holy Writ quoted in the Talmud, will make good our assertion. Passing over some minor points, such as on astronomy or mathematics or the science of interpretation of dreams (a filthy specimen of the latter is especially given in *Tr. Berakoth*, fol. 57, col. 1), we will only touch another point, the Talmudical praise of women. Thus, we read on p. 56, among other moral sayings, “Love your wife like yourself, honor her more than yourself.” Without arguing the question from what we know of the position of Jewish females in the countries where the Talmud is studied and its precepts obeyed — a position which proves the very contrary to the

saying alluded to-it is well known to every student of the Talmud that the doctors of the Talmud in general do not hold in high estimation the female sex. They put them in the category with slaves and children. Again and again we read, "Women, slaves, and children are exempted." "You shall teach the law to your sons, and not to your daughters." "He who teaches his daughter the law is like as if he teaches her to sin." "The mind of woman is weak." "The world cannot exist without males and females, but blessed is he whose children are sons; woe to him whose children are daughters." We also remember the teaching of the Talmudical sages, that a man may consider his wife like a piece of butcher's meat. We also remember that in the morning prayer the husband thanks God "that he hath not made him a woman." As to the precept which the writer in the *Quarterly Review* quotes as one of the moral sayings of the Talmud, we must believe him on his word, or search over the 2947 pages of that stupendous work, since the writer has thought proper to conceal the treatise and the page of the Talmud from which he has translated the above sentence. We are inclined to believe that the reviewer had the following passage (Tr. *Sanhedrin*, fol. 76, col. 2) before him: "Rabbi Judah has said that Rab has said, He who marries his daughter to an old man, and he who gives a wife to his son when too young, and he who returns to the Goi (Gentile) the things the Gentile has lost, concerning him the Scripture says. In order to add drunkenness to thirst, the Lord will not forgive him" (⁻¹⁸²⁹⁸Deuteronomy 29:18, 19). They replied, He who loves his wife like himself, and he who honors her more than himself, and he who directs his sons and daughters in the right way, and gives them into marriage at the proper ages, concerning him the Scripture says, 'And thou shalt know that thy tabernacle shall be in peace; and thou shalt visit thy habitation, and shalt not sin' (Job 5, 24)." This, however, is not a command, but optional according to the Talmud and the following, as given in Tr. *Yebamoth*, fol. 62, col. 2:

"Rabbi Tanchuma said that rabbi Hanilai had said, Every man who is without a wife is without joy, without blessing, without goodness. Without joy because it is written, 'Thou shalt rejoice, thou and thine household' (Deat. 14:26); without a blessing, for it is written, 'That he may cause the blessing to rest in thine house' (⁻³⁴⁴⁰Ezekiel 44:30); without goodness, for it is written, 'It is not good that the man should be alone.' In the west they add that the man who is without a wife is also without a law and with it a wall.

Without a law, for it is written Is not my help in me? and is wisdom driven quite from me? (^{<RB13>}Job 6:13); without a wall, because it is written 'A woman shall compass a man' (^{<RB12>}Jeremiah 31:22).

Rabba, the son of Olah, says, also without peace, as it is written, And thou shalt know that thy tabernacle shall be in peace, and shalt visit thy habitation, and shalt not sin. He who loves his wife like himself, and he who honors her more than himself, and he who directs his sons and his daughters in the right way, and gives them into marriage at the proper ages, concerning him the Scripture says, 'And thou shalt know that thy tabernacle shall be in peace, and thou shalt visit thy habitation, and shalt not sin.'

We venture to think that these are the passages of the Talmud which the reviewer has picked out. We must, however, be allowed to observe that it is not the imperative, "Love your wife," but the participle with the article, "*He* who loves." It will be seen that we have not translated the whole paragraph; *we dare not*. We will leave that to the reviewer and his admirers, for what we have left out, and much of the following, belongs to the defiled and defiling portions of the work, in which the Talmud is so rich. From another, such foul page (*Sanhedrin*, fol. 22, col. —1) the reviewer has copied, "He who forsakes the love of his youth, God's altar weeps for him." "He who sees his wife die before him has, as it were, been present at the destruction of the sanctuary itself. Around him the world grows dark." The sentences are badly rendered; and, even if they were not, seeing in what connection they stand and through what a quagmire the reviewer was obliged to wade to fish them out, they are worthless. Another such moral saying runs thus: "When the thief has no opportunity for stealing, he considers himself an honest man." Who of the Talmudical sages has said this? The Talmud relates that when Abishag the Shunammite was brought to king David she said to him, "Marry me;" the king replied, "It is not lawful for me to marry you." As a reproach to the king, the Talmud makes the Shunammite say, *fyqn aml çl çpn abngl hysj* (*Sanhedrin*, *ibid.*), which the reviewer translated as above. After all, it would be strange, indeed, if we could not gather from a work of 2947 pages some good sayings and sentences. But, unless the whole work be translated, it will never be known what the Talmud really is. For instance, in one of the treatises of the Talmud called *Challah* we find, almost verbatim, what our Lord says in ^{<RB3>}Matthew 5:28; and yet that portion of the Talmud is written in language so obscene and immoral that it would be

difficult to meet its equal among the most licentious publications of ancient or modern times. We challenge any admirer of the Talmud to translate the treatise and publish it, and then every one will be able to give the right reply to the query so often raised by the reviewer, “What is the Talmud?”

The article in question thus concludes: “When the masters of the law entered and left the academy, they used to offer up a short but fervent prayer; a prayer of thanks that they had been able to carry out their’ task thus far, and a prayer, further, that no evil might-rise at their hands, that they might not have fallen into error, that they might not declare pure that which was impure, and impure that which was pure” (p. 58). Against this we offset the following:

“The wise men have informed us that when the teacher entered the house of learning, he said, ‘May it please thee, O Lord my God, that I may not be the cause of any offence, nor err in anything as regards the *Halakah*, that my companions may rejoice over me, and that I may not say of things unclean they are clean, and things clean that they are unclean, and that my companions may not err in anything as regards the *Halakah*, and that I may rejoice over them.’ And when the teacher left the house of learning he said, ‘I thank thee, my God, that thou hast given me my portion among those who sit in the house of learning and not among those who sit at the corners of the streets. For I rise up early, and they rise up early; I rise up early to occupy myself in things concerning the law, they rise up early to occupy themselves in things which are useless. I work and they work; I work and receive a reward, they work and receive no reward. I run and they run; I run to everlasting life, and they run to the pit of destruction.’”

Is not this prayer like that of the Pharisee in the gospel? (☞ Luke 18:11.)

After having touched upon the most vital points of the Talmud—which, as we believe, has been done *sine ira et studio*, but in accordance with the old saying, *Amicus Plato, amicus Aristoteles, sed magis amica veritas*—we will now subjoin some of the opinions on the Talmud by different authors. D’Israeli, in his *Genius of Judaism* (p. 88), says:

“The Mishna, at first considered as the perfection of human skill and industry, at length was discovered to be a vast, indigested heap of contradictory decisions. It was a supplement of the law of Moses

which itself required a supplement. Composed in curt, unconnected sentences, such as would occur in conversation, designed to be got by rote by the students from the lips of their oracles, the whole was at length declared to be not even intelligible, and served only to perplex or terrify the scrupulous Hebrew. Such is the nature of traditions when they are fairly brought together and submitted to the eye.

“The Mishna now only served as a text (the law of Moses being slightly regarded) to call forth interminable expositions. The very sons of the founder of the Mishna set the example by pretending that they understood what their father meant. The work once begun, it was found difficult to get rid of the workmen. The sons of the Holy were succeeded by a long line of other rulers of their divinity schools, under the title, aptly descriptive, of the Amoraim, or *dictators*. These were the founders of the new despotism; afterwards, wanderers in the labyrinth they had themselves constructed, roved the *Seburatim*, or *opinionists*, no longer dictating, but inferring, opinions by keen speculations. As in the decline of empire mere florid titles delight, rose the *Geonim*, or *sublime* doctors, till at length, in the dissolution of this dynasty of theologians, they sank into the familiar, titular honor of *Rabbi*, or master.

“The Jews had incurred the solemn reproach in the days of Jesus of having annihilated the word of God by the load of their *traditions*. The calamity became more fearful when, two centuries after, they received the fatal gift of their collected traditions, called *Mishna*, and still more fatal when, in the lapse of three subsequent centuries, the epoch of the final compilation, was produced the commentary graced with the title of the *Gemara*, ‘completeness,’ or ‘perfection.’ It was imagined that the human intellect had here touched its meridian. The national mind was completely rabbinized. It became uniform, stable, and peculiar.

“The Talmud, or the Doctrinal, as the whole is called, was the work of nearly five hundred years. Here, then, we find a prodigious mass of contradictory opinions, an infinite number of casuistical cases, a logic of scholastic theology, some recondite wisdom, and much rambling dotage; many puerile tales and Oriental fancies; ethics and

sophisms, reasonings and unreasonings, subtle solutions, and maxims, and riddles; nothing in human life seems to have happened which these doctors have not perplexed or provided against, for their observations are as minute as Swift exhausted in his *Directions to Servants*. The children of Israel, always children, were delighted as their Talmud increased its volume and their hardships. The Gemara was a kind of a third law to elucidate the Mishna, which was a second law, and which had thrown the first law, the law of Moses, into obscurity.”

Dr. Isaac Da Costa, in his *Israel and the Gentiles* (N. Y. 1855, p. 116); says:

“The Talmud is a most curious monument, raised with astonishing labor, yet made up of puerilities. Like the present position of the Jew, away from his country, far from his Messiah, and in disobedience to his God, the Talmud itself is a chaos in which the most opposite elements are found in juxtaposition. It is a book which seems in some parts entirely devoid of common sense and in others filled with deep meaning, abounding with absurd subtleties and legal *finesse*, full of foolish tales and wild imaginations; but also containing aphorisms and parables which, except in their lack of the simple and sublime character of the Holy Writ, resemble in a degree the parables and sentences of the New Test. The Talmud is an immense heap of rubbish, at the bottom of which a few bright pearls of Eastern wisdom are to be found. No book has ever expressed more faithfully the spirit of its authors. This we notice the more when comparing the Talmud with the Bible, that Book of books, given to, and *by* means of, the Israel of God; the Talmud, the book composed by Israel *without* their God, in the time of their dispersion, their misery, and their degeneracy.”

Dr. Milman, in his *History of the Jews* (3, 13), says:

“The reader, at each successive extract from this extraordinary compilation (i.e. the Talmud), hesitates whether to admire the vein of profound allegorical truth and the pleasing moral apologue, to smile at the monstrous extravagance, or to shudder at the daring blasphemy. The influence of the Talmud on European superstitions, opinions, and even literature remains to be traced. To the Jew the Talmud became the magic circle within which the national mind

patiently labored for ages in performing the bidding of the ancient and mighty enchanters who drew the sacred line beyond which it might not venture to pass.”

Mr. Farrar, in his *Life of Christ* (2, 485), says:

“Anything more utterly unhistorical than the Talmud cannot be conceived. It is probable that no human writings ever confounded names, dates, and facts with a more absolute indifference. The genius of the Jews is the reverse of what, in these days, we should call historical...”

Some excellent maxims even some close parallels to the utterances of Christ may be quoted, of course, from the Talmud, where they lie imbedded like pearls in ‘a sea’ of obscurity and mud. It seems to me indispensable and a matter which every one can now verify for himself—that these are amazingly few, considering the vast bulk of national literature from which they are drawn. And, after all, who shall prove to us that these sayings were always uttered by the rabbins to whom they were attributed? Who will supply us with the faintest approach to a proof that (when not founded on the Old Test.) they were not directly or indirectly due to Christian influence or Christian thought? ‘Prof. Delitzsch,’ in his lectures on *Jüdisches Handwerkerleben zur Zeit-Jesu*. (3rd ed. Erlangen, 1879, p; 35), says:

“Those who have not in some degree accomplished the extremely difficult task of reading this work for themselves will hardly be able to form a clear idea of this polynomial colossus. It is a vast debating club, in which there hum confusedly the myriad voices of at least five centuries. As we all know by experience, a law, though very minutely and exactly defined, may yet be susceptible of various interpretations, and question on question is sure to arise when it comes to be applied to the ever varying circumstances of actual life. Suppose, then, you have about ten thousand legal definitions all relating to Jewish life and classified under different heads, and add to these ten thousand definitions about five hundred doctors and lawyers, ‘belonging’ mostly to Palestine or Babylonia, who make these definitions, one after the other, the subject of examination and debate, and who, with hair-splitting acuteness, exhaust not only every possible sense the words will bear, but every possible practical occurrence arising out of them. Suppose that these fine

spun threads of these legal disquisitions frequently lose themselves in digressions, and that, when one has waded through a long tract of this sandy desert, one lights, here and there, on some green oasis consisting of stories and sayings of universal interest. This done, you will have some tolerable idea of this enormous and, in its way, unique code of laws, in comparison with which, in point of comprehensiveness, the law-books of all other nations are but Lilliputian, and, when compared with the hum of its kaleidoscopic Babel, they resemble, indeed, calm and studious retreats.”

Mr. Alexander, in his book on *The Jews: their Past, Present, and Future* (Lond. 1870), p. 80 sq., says:

The Talmud, as it now stands, is almost the whole literature of the Jews during a thousand years. Commentator followed upon commentator, till at last the whole became an immense bulk, the original Babylonian Talmud alone consisting of 2947 folio pages. Out of such a literature it is easy to make quotations which may throw an odium over the whole. But fancy, if the productions of a thousand years of English literature, say from the *History* of the Venerable Bede to Milton’s *Paradise Lost*, “were thrown together into a number of uniform folios, and judged in like manner; if, because some superstitious monk should write silly ‘Lives of Saints,’ therefore, the works of John Bunyan should also be considered worthless. The absurdity is too obvious to require another word. Such, however, is the continual treatment the Talmud receives, both at the hands of its friends and of its enemies. Both will find it easy to quote in behalf of their preconceived notions; but the earnest student will rather try to weigh the matter impartially, retain the good he can find even in the Talmud, and reject what will not stand the test of God’s Word.”

In conclusion, while we acknowledge the fact that this great encyclopedia of Hebrew wisdom teems with error, and that in almost every department in science, in natural history, in chronology, genealogy, logic, and morals, falsehood and mistake are mixed up with truth upon its pages, we nevertheless confess that, notwithstanding, with all its imperfections, it is a useful book, an attestation of the past, a criterion of progress already attained, and a prophecy of the future. “It is a witness, too, of the length of folly to which the mind of man may drift when he disdains the wisdom of

God as revealed in the Gospel; and in these respects it will always have a claim on the attention of the wise. When Talmudism, as a religious system, shall, in a generation or two, have passed away, the Talmud itself will be still resorted to as a treasury of things amazing and things profitable; a deep cavern of antiquity, where he who carries the necessary torch will not fail to find, amid whole labyrinths of the rubbish of times gone by, those inestimable lessons that will be true for all times to come, and gems of ethical and poetic thought which retain their brightness forever” (Etheridge, *Introduction to Jewish Literature*).

IV. Contents. — The six *Sedarim*, or orders, of which the Mishna is composed are also found in the Talmud, and the following is an analysis of the contents of each tractate of the six orders:

(I.) **µy[rz rds**, *Seder Zeraim* (Seeds). This *Seder* contains the following eleven tractates:

1. twkrb, *Berakoth*, or the treatise of *blessings*, and speaks in nine chapters of the daily prayers and thanksgivings, etc.

a. ytmyam (so called from the first word of the chapter) treats of the time when the Shema is to be said in the morning and evening, of the position of the body at prayers, and the benedictions to be said ‘respectively (5 sections).

b. arwq hwh speaks of the sections and order of the Shema, of how the voice is to be used in saying the prayer, and of the occasions which exempt from prayer” (8 sections).

c. wtmç ym points out such as are exempted from prayer (6 sections).

d. rj çh tl pt treats of the time during which prayers may be said, whether the Shemoneh Esreh (q.v.) are to be said in an abbreviated manner, of prayer as an *opus operatum*, of praying in dangerous places, and of the additional prayer (7 sections).

e. ydmw[ya refers to the outer and inner position at prayer; of prayer for rain; of the prayer on Sabbath evening; of the minister of the congregation; and mistakes in prayer (5 sections).

f. ḥykrbm dxyk recites the different blessings to be said for fruits of the tree and the earth, wine and bread ; for wine before and after meals;’ of the sitting and lying at the table; of blessings for the main meals and water (8 sections).

g. wl kaç hçl ç expatiates on blessings pronounced conjointly; with whom a union for such a purpose may be entered upon; the form of prayer to be used in accordance with the number of persons, of different companies (5 sections).

h. ḥyrbd wl a ḥybç shows the differences between the schools of Hillel and Shammai concerning the washing of hands and the blessing at meals (8 sections).

i. hawrh names the prayer to be said at beholding signs and wonders, at the building of a new house; and treats of prayers offered in vain, of prayers at the leaving and going into a city; of the praising of God for the good as well as for the evil; how to approach the Temple mountain; of the using of the name of God at salutations (5 sections).

2. hap, Peah, or the *corner of the field*, treats, in eight chapters, of the field corners, gleanings, etc., to be left to the poor, etc.:

a. ḥyrbd wl a, of the measure of the Peah, where, of what, and how large it must be given, and how long the fruit is exempted from tithe (6 sections).

b. ḥyqyspm wl aw, how fields and trees as to the Peah may be separated from each other (8 sections).

c. twnbm m, how large a field must be of which Peah must be given (8 sections).

d. haph, how the Peah must be given (11 sections).

e. çydg, what belongs to the poor, and on the bunch left through forgetfulness (8 sections).

f. tyb yamç, what may be regarded as a bunch left through forgetfulness, and what not (11 sections).

g. tyzl k, the same concerning olive-trees; on the right of the poor in the vineyard (8 sections).

- h.** **l k ytmyam**, how long the right of the poor lasts; what constitutes the poor, and who is not entitled to the right of the poor (9 sections).
- 3.** **yamd**, *Demai*, or *doubtful*, treats, in seven chapters, of fruits about which some doubts may be raised whether tithes should be paid for them or not, viz—
- a.** **ˆyl qh**, which fruits are exempted from the rights of Demai; how the Demai tithe differs from other tithes, and as to the rights of Demai fruits (4 sections).
- b.** **ˆyrç[tm p̄yrbd wl aw**, who may be regarded a strict Israelite, and to whom the performance of the Demai law belongs at buying and selling.
- c.** **ˆyl ykam**, who may receive Demai for eating, and that nothing should be given away untithed (6 sections).
- d.** **j qwl h**, how a man may be believed concerning the tithes (7 sections).
- e.** **ˆm j qwl h**, how the tithe is to be given from Demai (11 sections).
- f.** **wntfr̄m** company, and of the fruits in Syria (12 sections).
- g.** **ˆymz mh**, how to act with such as are not believed concerning the tithes; how to separate the tithes in diverse cases; and what must be taken into account when tithed and untithed fruits are mixed up (8 sections).
- 4.** **p̄yal k**, *Kilayim*, or *mixtures, treats*, in nine chapters, of the prohibited mingling of fruit and grain crops on the same field, etc., viz.
- a.** **p̄yfj h**, which kinds of fruits, trees, and animals are. Kilayim, and how to graft and plant (9 sections).
- b.** **has l k**, what to do when two kinds of seed are mixed, or in case of sowing another kind on a field already sown, or in case of making beds of different corn in one field (11 sections).
- c.** **hgwr [**, of beds, their division: of cabbage and its distance (7 sections).
- d** and **e.** **p̄rk** and **tj rq**, of vineyards and their Kilayim (9 and 8 sections).

- f. whzya**, of the rights of a vine raised on an espalier (9 sections).
- g. yrbmh**, of the layering of vines, spreading of vines, etc. (8 sections).
- h. yal k**, in how far Kilayim are forbidden among—animals, in yoking together as well as in copulating, and what to do with bastards and some other animals (6 sections).
- i. rwsa ʿya**, of Kilayim in garments, especially of the mixture of wool and flax; of clothing-merchants and tailors; of felt and woven letters, etc. (10 sections).
- 5. ty[ybç**, *Shebiith*, or the *Sabbatical year*, in ten chapters:
- a. ʿl yah hdçb ʿyçrwj ytmya d[**, of fields with trees, and how long they may be cultivated in the sixth year (8 sections).
- b. ʿbl h hdçb j a [**, of open fields, and what may be done in them till the beginning of the seventh year (10 sections).
- c. ʿyayxwm ytmyam**, of manuring the field: of breaking stones and pulling down walls (10 sections).
- d. hnwçarb**, of cutting and pruning trees; from what time on it is permitted to eat of the fruits of the seventh year which have grown by themselves (10 sections).
- e. j wç twnb**, concerning the white fig and summer-onions; which farm utensils cannot be sold and lent (9 sections).
- f. twxra çwl ç**, of the difference of countries concerning the seventh year, and what fruits cannot be taken outside of the country (6 sections).
- g. l wdg l l k**, what things are subject to the right of the seventh year (7 sections).
- h. l wdg l l k**, what use may be made of fruits which have grown by themselves; what must be observed at their sale and the proceeds thereof; how they-are to be gathered (11 sections).
- i. µgyph**, of the fruits which may be bought, and of storing away the preserved- fruits (9 sections).

j. **ty[ybç**, of the remittance of debts (9 sections).

6. **twmwrt**, *Terumoth*, or *oblations*, relates, in eleven chapters, to the heave-offering:

a. **hçmj** , what persons can give the Terumoth, and of which fruits; and of giving the Terumoth not according to number; measure, and weight (10 sections).

b. **ymrwt ya**, the Terumoth cannot be given from the pure for the impure; of distinguishing whether something was done purposely or by mistake; and that one kind of fruit can supply the Terumoth of another (6 sections).

c. **prwth**, in which cases the Terumoth must be given a second time; how to determine the Terumah; of the Terumah of a Gentile (9 sections).

d and **e.** **has** and **çyrpmh**, of the quantity of the large Terumah; in which cases common fruit becomes not medumma (i.e. is to be given entirely as Terumah), in spite of having been mixed with Terumah (13 and 9 sections).

f. **l kwah**, of the restitution of the Terumah, when a person has eaten thereof by mistake (5 sections).

g. **l kwah**, when a person eats thereof with intention (7 sections).

h. **hçyah**, of the care that a Terumah get neither unclean nor poisoned (12 sections).

i. **[rwzh**, what is to be done in case Terumah has been sown (7 sections).

j. **l xb**, how common fruits by the mere taste can become Terumah fruit (12 sections).

k. **yntwn ya**, how the oil of a Terumah cannot be burned, when the priest cannot enjoy its light (10 sections).

7. **twrç[m**, *Maseroth*, or *tithes*, due to the Levites, in five chapters:

a. **wrma l l k**, of the kinds of fruits subject to tithes, and from what time on they are due (8 sections).

b. rbw[hyh, of exceptions (8 sections).

c. ryb[mh, where fruits become tithable (10 sections).

d. çbwkh, of preserving, picking out, and other cases exempted from tithes (6 sections).

e. rqw[h, of removing of plants; of buying and selling; of wine and seed that cannot be tithed (8 sections).

8. ynç rç[m, *Maas-esheni*, or *second tithe*, which the Levites had to pay: out of their tenth to the priests, in five chapters:

a. ynç rç[m, that this tenth cannot be disposed of in any way (7 sections).

b. ^tyn ynç rç[m, only things necessary for eating, drinking, and anointing: can be bought for the money of the tenth; what to do when tenth-money and common money are mixed together, or when tenth-money must be exchanged- (10 sections).

c. rmay al , fruits of the second tenth, when once in Jerusalem, cannot be taken out again (13 sections).

d. yl wmh, what must be observed at the price of the tenth, and how money and that which is found must be regarded (12 sections).

e. y[br µrk, of a vineyard in its fourth year, the fruits of which are equally regarded as the fruits of the second tenth; and how the *biur*, or taking-away of the tenth, is performed in a solemn manner according to ^{<63>}Deuteronomy 26:13 sq. (15 sections).

9. hl j , *Challah*, or *dough*, refers to the cake which the women were required to bring of kneaded dough to the priest, in four chapters:

a. µyrbd hçmj , which fruits are subject to Challah (9 sections).

b. and **c.** twryp and ^yl kya, of special cases which need a more precise definition concerning Challah, and of the quantity of meal and its Challah (8 and 10 sections).

d. **μϣη ytç**, of counting together of different fruits, and the different rights of countries concerning Challah (11 sections).

10. **hl r[**, *Orlah, lit. foreskin*, of the forbidden fruits of the trees in Palestine during the first three years of their growth, in three chapters:

a. **[fwnh**, which trees are subject to the law of Orlah and which not (9 sections).

b. **hmwrth**, what to do in case of fruits of Orlah or Kilayim being mixed with other fruits; of the law concerning leaven, spices, and meat; what to do in case of holy and unholy, or Chollin, having been mixed up (17 sections).

c. **dgb**, how the same law also concerns colors for dyeing purposes, and the fire used for cooking; and what is to be observed concerning the difference of countries (9 sections).

11. **μϣrwkb**, *Bikkurin, or first-fruits*, in four chapters:

a. **ˆyaybm çy**, who is not entitled to offer the first-fruits, or who can offer them without observing the formula prescribed (^{<TRM>}Deuteronomy 26:3); of what and when they are to be offered or repaid (11 sections).

b. **μϣrwkbhw hmwrth**, of the difference of the first-fruits of the Terumah and the second tenth, especially of the pomegranate at the Feast of Tabernacles; of blood of men and of the animal Coi (probably a bastard of buck and roe), which must be distinguished from all animals (11 sections).

c. **dxyk ˆyçyrpm**, of the ceremonies to be observed at bringing the first-fruits to Jerusalem, and their rights (12 sections).

d. **swnygwrdna**, of the hermaphrodite (5 sections). (This chapter is Boraitha, or addition to the second chapter, and is wanting where *only* the Mishna is printed.)

(II.) d[wm rds, *Seder Môëd* (Festive Solemnity). This *Seder*, one of the most interesting, consists of twelve tractates:

12. **tbç**, *Shabbath*, containing twenty-four chapters, treats of the laws relating to the Sabbath, with respect to lights and oil used on that day, ovens in which articles of food were warmed on the Sabbath, and the dress

of men and women used on the same day. It also enumerates thirty-nine kinds of work, by each of which, separately, the guilt of Sabbath-breaking may be incurred, viz.:

- 1, to sow;
- 2, to plough;
- 3, to mow;
- 4, to gather into sheaves;
- 5, to thresh;
- 6, to winnow;
- 7, to sort corn;
- 8, to grind;
- 9, to sieve;
- 10, to knead;
- 11, to bake;
- 12, to shear wool;
- 13, to wash wool;
- 14, to card;
- 15, to dye;
- 16, to spin;
- 17, to warp;
- 18, to shoot two threads;
- 19, to weave two threads;
- 20, to cut and tie two threads;
- 21, to tie;
- 22, to unite;
- 23, to sew two stitches;
- 24, to tear two threads with intent to sew;
- 25, to catch game;
- 26, to slaughter;
- 27, to skin;
- 28, to salt a hide;
- 29, to singe;
- 30, to tan;
- 31, to cut up a skin;
- 32, to write two letters;
- 33, to erase two(letters with intent to write;
- 34, to build;
- 35, to demolish;

36, to extinguish fire;

37, to kindle fire;

38, to strike with. a hammer;

39, to carry out of one property into another. It treats of the differences between the schools of Hillel and Shammai, etc., viz.

- a.** **tbçh twaxy**, of removals on the Sabbath day; work to be avoided; discussion between tile schools of Hillel and *Shanmmai* as to what constitutes work: work allowed (11 sections).
- b.** **hmb ^yqyl dm**, of the lighting of a lamp; eve of the Sabbath (7 sections).
- c.** **hryk**, of different ovens, and preparing and warming the meat on Sabbath; of pails for retention of the dripping oil or sparks of the lamps (6 sections).
- d.** **^ynmwf hmb**, of things to cover up pots to retain the heat, and of things not to cover up the pots (2 sections).
- e.** **hmhb hmb**, with what a beast is led forth or covered, especially a camel (4 sections).
- f.** **hça hmb**, with what women and men may go out or not go out on the Sabbath of *various* styles; of pinning the veil; of ribbons, etc. (10 sections).
- g.** **l wdg l l k**, of how many sin-offerings a man may be responsible for under certain circumstances for ignorantly trespassing against the Sabbath; the thirty-nine kinds of forbidden work; rule and measure for things the carrying of which makes liable to a sin-offering (4 sections).
- h.** **^yy ayxwmh**, of the measure of fluids; of cords, bulrushes paper, and all possible portable things (7 sections).
- i.** **[ra**, of things the carrying of which makes unclean, and of the measure of the portable things on the Sabbath day (7 sections).
- j.** **[ynxmh**, of different kinds of portable things; of carrying living or dead men, and of many other things (6 sections).

- k.** **qrwzh**, of throwing over the street, ditch, and rock, river and land; of the distance how far it *can* be thrown, and the presumable error (6 sections).
- l.** **hnwbh**, of building, hammering, planing, boring, ploughing, gathering wood, pruning, picking up, writing (6 sections).
- m.** **rz[yl a ybr**, of weaving, sewing, cutting, washing, beating, catching game, etc. (7 sections).
- n.** **hnwmc**, of catching game; of making salt-water; of forbidden medicines, toothache and pains in the loins.
- o.** **μyrçq wl a**, of tying and untying of knots; of folding garments, and making the beds (3 sections).
- p.** **ybt k l k**, of saving things out of a conflagration; of extinguishing and covering, etc. (8 sections).
- q.** **μyl kh l k**, of vessels which may be moved on *the* Sabbath S sections).
- r.** **ˆynpm**, what things may be moved for making room; of hens, calves, asses; of leading the child; of an animal that calves; a woman that is to be delivered, and of a child (3 sections).
- s.** **rz[yl a ybr**, of circumcision on the Sabbath, and what belongs to it (6 sections).
- t.** **rmwa rz[yl a r ˆyl wt**, of straining the wine; of fodder; of cleansing the crib; of straw on the beds and clothes-press (5 sections).
- u.** **l fwn**, of things permitted to be carried; of cleaning a pillow; the table, of picking up the crumbs; and of sponges (3 sections).
- v.** **tybj**, of casks, cisterns, bathing-clothes, salves, etc.; of emetics; of setting a limb or a rupture (6 sections).
- w.** **μda l awç**, of borrowing; of counting from a book, drawing lots, hiring laborers; of waiting at the end of a Sabbath-way; of mourning-pipes, coffin, and grave which a heathen has dug; what may be done to the dead (5 sections).

x. *ḡḡj ḡḡ ym*, of one who is overtaken by the dusk on the road; of feeding the animals; of pumpkins and carrion; of several things permitted on the Sabbath (5 sections).

13. *ḡbwr [*, *Erubin*, or *mingling*, in ten chapters, deals with those ceremonies by which the Sabbath boundary was extended; “mingling” a whole town into one fictitious yard, so that carrying within it should not be unlawful:

a. *ywbm*, concerning the entry to an alley (10 sections).

b. *ḡsp ḡḡw [*, concerning enclosures (6 sections).

c. *l kb ḡbr [m*, concerning a holyday or a Friday (9 sections).

d. *whwayxwhḡ ym*, concerning the stepping beyond the Sabbath limit (11 sections).

e. *ḡbr [m dxyk*, concerning the enlarging the bounds of a city (9 sections).

f. and **g.** *ḡl j*, etc., *rdh*, concerning the neighborhood (10 and 11 sections).

h. *ḡpttḡm dxyk*, concerning what may be done in a yard (11 sections).

i. *twgg l k*, concerning roofs, etc. (4 sections).

j. *ḡl ypt hxwmh*, concerning some different Sabbath laws (15 sections).

14. *ḡyj sp*, *Pesachim*, in ten chapters, treats of the paschal festival and things- connected with its celebration:

a and

b. *h[ḡ l k* and *h[bral rwa*, of searching for leaven; how to put it away; of the Easter-cake, and the herbs for the bitter herbs (7 and 8 sections).

c. *ḡrbw [wl a*, of the care to avoid leaven (8 sections),

d. *wghnḡ ḡwqm*, of the works on the day before Easter, and what kinds of work are permitted (9 sections).

e. *fj çn dymt*, when and: how to kill the paschal lamb; of cleaning and skinning the same, and how it becomes disallowed (10 sections).

f. *j spb µyrbd wl a*, how the Passover abrogates the command against *work* on the Sabbath; of the offering of festival sacrifices; of a sacrifice having been changed with another (6 sections).

g. *ˆyl wx dxyb*, .of roasting: the lamb; how it becomes unclean; what to do with the remaining parts (13 sections).

h. *ˆmzb hçah*, what persons are allowed to eat it and what are not; of companies (8 sections),

i. *ayhç ym*, of the second Easter; of the Easter in Egypt, and of divers cases when paschal lambs have been exchanged (11 sections).

j. *ybr[yj sp*, of the order at the Easter-meal after the four cups of wine which are necessary for it (9 sections).

15. *µyl qç*, *Shekalim*, or *shekels*, in eight chapters, contains laws relating to the half-shekel which was paid for the support of public worship:

a. *rdab dj ab*, how the money-changers take their seat at the money-tables, on the 15th of Adar, where the people exchange their money (7 sections).

b. *ˆyprxM*, of changing, and of coins used *ins* former times; of the remaining money (5 sections).

c. *yqrp hçl çb*, how the paid shekels may be taken again from the treasury (4 sections).

d. *hmwrth*, how they are to be spent, and what to do with the balance (9 sections),

e. *ˆynymmh ˆh wl a*, of the offices in the sanctuary, and of the seals (6 sections).

f. *rç[hçl ç*, how often the number thirteen occurred in the sanctuary(6 sections).

g. **waxmnç tw[m**, of money and other things which are found, when it is doubtful to whom they belong (7 sections).

h. **wyqwrh lk**, of other dubious things; resolution that the shekel and firstlings have ceased with the Temple (8 sections).

16. **amwy**, *Yoma*, or the *Day of Atonement*, in eight chapters:

a. **µymy t[bç**, of the preparations of the highpriest (8 sections),

b. **hnwçarb**, of casting lots, and of the offerings (7 sections).

c. **µhl rma**, of the beginning of the Day of Atonement; of bathing, washing, and dressing the high-priest, and of presenting the bullocks and goats. (11 sections).

d. **ypl qb ārf**, of casting the lots upon the goats, and the confession (6 sections),

e. **wl wayxwh**, what was to be done in the Holy of Holies (7 sections).

f. **yry[ç ynç**, of sending forth the goat (8 sections).

g. **wl ab**, what the high-priest was meanwhile to do, and until the end of his service at night (5 sections).

h. **µwy yrwpkh**, of the privileges of fasting; how man is forgiven, and how he is not forgiven (9 sections).

17. **hkws**, *Sukkah*, or the *Feast of Tabernacles*, in five chapters:

a. **ayhç hkws**, of the size and covering of the Sukkah (11 sections).

b. **çyh,l** how often meals should be eaten in it; exemptions (9 sections).

c. **bl wl** , of the palm-branches, myrtle-boughs, willows, Citrons; what constitutes their fitness, and what not; how to tie and stake them (15 sections).

d. **hbr[w bl wl** , how many days these ceremonies last; of the pouring-out of the water (10 sections).

e. **l y l j h**, of the rejoicings; how to divide the offerings and shew-bread on this festival among the orders of the priests (8 sections).

18. **bwř μwy**, *Yom Tob*, i.e. *good day*, or, as it is generally called, **hxyb**, *Betzah*, i.e. *the egg*, from the word with which it commences, containing five chapters:

a. **hxyb hdl wnc**, whether an egg laid on the festival may be eaten thereon. On this question the schools of Shalmai and Hillel are divided; the former decide in the affirmative, the latter in the negative (10 sections),

b. **bwř μwy**, or **ˆyl yçbt bwr [**, i.e. of connecting the meals on the Sabbath and other subsequent holydays.. Maimonides gives the following account, which will enable the reader to understand this expression: “The rabbins, in order to prevent cooking or preparation of food on the festival for the following working-days, have prohibit it even for the Sabbath immediately following. They are ordered, however, that some article of food should be prepared on the day before the festival, to which more may be cooked, in addition, on the festival; which has-been ordered with the intention of reminding the general mass that it is not lawful to prepare any food on the festival which is not eaten thereon. It is called **bwr [**, or mixture, because it mixes *or* combines the preparation of food necessary for the festival with that required from the family’s use on the Sabbath” (*Hilchoth omn Tob*, ch. 6.)”

c. **ˆyd[ˆya**, of catching and killing animals; how to buy the necessary things, without mentioning the money (S sections).

d. **aybmh**, of carrying, especially wood not required for burning (7 sections).

e. **ˆyl yçm**, enumeration and precise definition of classes of things which cannot be done on a feast *day*, still less on a Sabbath day (7 sections).

19. **hnç çar**, *Rosh Hash-shanah*, or *New-year*, in four chapters:

a. **μynç yçar h[bra**, of the four New-years (9 sections).

b. **ˆnya μa**, of examining witnesses who witnessed the new moon, and of announcing it on the top of the mountains by fire (9 sections).

c. **whwar**, of announcing the new moon and new year with cornets (8 sections).

d. **l ç bwf μwy**, what to do in case the New year falls on the Sabbath, and of the order of service on the New-year (9 sections).

20. **tyn[t**, *Taanith, or fasting*, in four chapters:

a. **ymyam**, of prayer for *rain*, and proclamations of fasting in case the rain does not come in due season (7 sections).

b. **twyn[t rds**, of the ceremonies and prayers on the great fast-days (10 sections).

c. **wl a twyn[t rds**, of other occasions of fasting; of not blowing alarms; when to cease fasting, in-case it rains (9 sections).

d. **hçl çb yqrp**, of the twenty-four stations or delegates; their fastings, lessons ; of bringing wood for the altar; of the 17th of Tammuz and of the 9th and 15th of Ab (8 sections). The Mishna tells us the following concerning these dates: “On the 17th of Tammuz the stone tables *were* broken and: the daily offering ceased, and the city was broken up, and Apostemus (i.e. Antiochus Epiphaales) burned the law, and he set up an image in the Temple. On the 9th of Ab it was proclaimed to our fathers that they should not enter the land, and the house was ruined for the first and second time, and Bither was *taken*, and the city was ploughed up.” Rabban Simon, the son of Gamaliel, said, “There were no holydays in Israel like the 15th of Ab, or like the Day of Atonement, because in them the daughters of Jerusalem promenaded in white garments, borrowed, that no one might be ashamed of her poverty. All these garments must be baptized. And the daughters of Jerusalem promenaded and danced in the vineyards. And what did they say? Look here, young man, and see whom you choose; look out for beauty, look for family. ‘Favor is deceitful, and beauty is vain; but a woman that feareth the Lord, she shall be praised;’ and it is said, ‘Give her of the fruit of her hands, and let her own works praise her in the gates’ (^{אריב}Proverbs 31:30, 31). And it is also said: ‘Go forth, O ye daughters of Zion, and behold king Solomon with the crown wherewith his mother crowned him in the day of his espousals, and in the day of the gladness of his heart’” (^{אריב}Song of Solomon 3:11).

21. **hl ygm**, *Megillah*, or the *roll* of the book of Esther, in four chapters:

a. hl ygm, of the days on which the Megillah is read (11 sections). The Gemara, on the fourth section of this Mishna (fol. 7, col. 2), tells us that the Jews are directed to get so drunk on the Feast of Purim that they cannot discern the difference “between” “Blessed be Mordecai and cursed be Haman” and “Cursed be Mordecai and blessed be Haman.” On the same page we read, “Rabba and rabbi Zira made their Purim entertainment together. When Rabba got drunk, he arose and killed rabbi Zira. On the following day he prayed for mercy, and restored him to life. The following year Rabba proposed to him again to make their Purim entertainment together; but he answered, “Miracles don’t happen every day.”

b. arwqh, how to read the Megillah; what can only be done by day, and what can be done by night (6 sections).

c. ry[h ynb, of the sale of holy things;’ of the lessons for the Sabbath during the month of Adar, and for other festivals (6 sections).

d. dmw[hl ygmh ta arwqh, of the persons required for the lessons; how many verses each person may read; who must be silenced in public prayer; of the passages which at the public reading are to be omitted, or at least not to be interpreted (10 sections). For these passages; see the following article, *SEE TALMUD, THE, IN THE TIME OF THE OLD TESTAMENT*.

22. ^wfq d[wm, *M5ed Eaton, or small holyday*, in three chapters, treats of the half-holydays between the first and the last day of the Passover, and of the Feast of Tabernacles:

a. ^yqçm, of working in the field; of graves, and of making coffins; and what pertains to a building (10 sections).

b. phç ym, of the work done on fruits: what may be carried and bought (5 sections).

c. ^yj l gm wl aw, of shaving, washing, writing, and mourning (9 sections).

23. hgygj, *Chagigah, or feasting*, in three chapters, speaks of the voluntary sacrifices-other than the paschal lamb offered by individual Jews on the great feasts:

a. **l kh ʿybyj** , of the persons who. are obliged to appear at the feasts (8 sections).

b. **ʿyçrwd ʿya**, of sundry ordinances having no direct connection with the subject indicated by the title of the treatise: thus the first section of this second chapter opens with “Men must not lecture on matters of incest (or adultery) before three persons, nor on matters of the creation before two, nor on the chariot before one, unless he be wise and intelligent by his own knowledge,” etc.; of laying-on of hands (7 sections).

c. **çdq b rmwj** , in how far the rules for holy things are more weighty than for the heave-offering; in how far certain persons may be credited; how the vessels of the sanctuary were cleaned again after the feast (8 sections).

(III.) **µyçn rds**, *Seder Nashim* (Women). This *Seder* is composed of seven treatises, viz.

24. **twmby**, *Yebamoth*, enters into the minutest details as to the peculiar Jewish precept of *yibbûm*, or the obligation of marrying the childless widow of a brother, with the alternative disgrace of the performance of the *chalitsah*, or removal of the shoe of the recalcitrant, referred to in the book of Ruth. It contains sixteen chapters, in 123 sections.

a. The opening section of this treatise will give a good idea of the subject treated there. “Fifteen women free their rival wives and their rival’s rivals from the *chalitsah* and *yibbûm ad infinitum*, viz. his daughter (the dead brother’s wife being the daughter of a surviving brother), son’s daughter, or daughter’s daughter; his wife’s daughter, wife’s son’s daughter, or wife’s daughter’s daughter; his mother-in-law, mother of his mother-in-law, the mother of his father-in-law; his maternal sister, his mother’s sister, or his wife’s sister; the widow of his maternal brother, or the widow of a brother who *was* not alive at the same time with him, and his daughter-in-law. All these free their rival wives and their rival’s rivals from the *chalitsah* and *yibbûm*. If, however, any of these had died, or refused her consent, or had been divorced, or is unfit for procreation, their rivals may be married by *yibbûm*; yet refusal of consent or unfitness [to procreate] cannot be applied in respect to his mother-in-law, or the mother of his father-in-law.” This Mishna is called **µyçn hrç [çmj** (4 sections).

- b.** *tça dxk*, of cases where a brother was born after the married brother's death; of cases where a brother is to be freed either according to the command or for the sacredness of the person; of the equal right of brothers and sons; of betrothing to persons who cannot be distinguished from each other; of wives who cannot be married (10 sections).
- c.** *ˆyj a h[bra*, of hypothetical cases e.g. when brothers married sisters, etc. (10 sections).
- d.** *l wj h*, of the sister-in-law who was found to be pregnant; when she gets the heritage; of her marriage contract; of her relatives; how long she must wait; what constitutes a mamzer, i.e. an illegitimate child; that the sister of the deceased wife may be married (13 sections).
- e.** *l ayl mg ˆbr*, of the rights of a marriage contract and divorce (6 sections).
- f.** *l [abh*, whom the high-priest cannot marry; what constitutes a barren woman, or a prostitute; of the duty of begetting children (6 sections).
- g.** *hml a*, who is entitled, under these circumstances, to eat of the heave-offering or not (6 sections).
- h.** *l r[h*, of one that is wounded in the stones, and of one that has his privy member cut off; of the Ammonites and Moabites; of the hermaphrodite, etc. (6 sections).
- i.** *ˆwrtwm çy*, of women, or brothers-in-law, who, on account of their relationship, can neither marry nor be married, and of the prohibited degrees (6 sections).
- j.** *hçah l hç*, of false news that one or the other died; of the carnal intercourse of one who is not yet marriageable (9 sections).
- k.** *ˆyaçwn*, of violated women, proselytes, and interchanged children (7 sections).
- l.** *twxmh*, of the ceremonies of the chalitsah (6 sections),
- m.** *µyrmwa ç b*, and

n. çrj , of the refusal of one who is not of age to marry a man; of the right of deaf persons (13 and 4 sections).

o. hkl hç hçah, and

p. l hç hçah hl [b, how-the evidence that one is dead receives credence, and its validity as to the right of the wife marrying again; and the Levirate (q.v.) (10 and 7 sections). Several portions of this treatise are so offensive to all feelings of delicacy that they have been left untranslated by the English translators, and are either printed in Hebrew or represented by asterisks alone.

25. twbwtk, *Kethuboth*, in thirteen chapters, contains the laws relating to marriage contracts:

a. hl wtb, of such as are regarded as virgins, and of the sum promised by the bridegroom to the bride (10 sections).

b. hçah, whether a person may testify of himself, and of the credibility of the witnesses (10 sections).

c. twr [n wl a, of the penalty for violating a virgin (9 sections).

d. hr [n, to whom the fine belongs; of the rights of a father over his daughter; of a husband over his wife; what the husband owes the wife; of the heritage of sons and daughters (12 sections).

e. ypl [ãa, of the addition to the kethubah or the sum stipulated in the marriage contract); of the duties belonging to the wife; of conjugal duties; to how much a wife is entitled for her living (9 sections).

f. tayxm, what the wife owes to her husband, and what belongs to him; of assigning against the sum which the wife has brought in, and of the dowry of a daughter (7 sections).

g. rydmh, of the vows of a woman, and of the defects which cause a divorce (10 sections);

h. wl pñç hçah, of the rights of the husband to the property which fell to his wife during her marriage, and *vice versa* (S sections).

i. btwkh, of the privileges at the meeting of creditors, and before whom the wife has to swear that she has received nothing of her kethubah (9 sections),

j. ywçn hyhç ym of cases where a man has more than one wife (6 sections).

k. tnwzyn hnml a, of the rights of widows, and of the sale of the kethubah which is invested in immovable property (6 sections).

l. hçah ta açwnh, of the right of a daughter of a former husband, and of the right of a widow to remain in her husband's house (4 sections).

m. ynyyd ynç, different opinions of two judges of Jerusalem; how a wife may not be taken from, one place to another.; of the privileges in living in the land of Israel and at Jerusalem; as to the money in which the kethubah must be paid (11 sections).

26. µyrdn, *Nedarim*, or *vows*, in eleven chapters:

a. yywnk l k, of the expressions for vows, since a person is obliged to keep them, even if the words were wrongly and not correctly pronounced (4 sections).

b. ^yrtwm wl aw, what words do not constitute a vow; how they are to be distinguished from an oath; what restrictions and ambiguities may occur (5 sections).

c. µyrdn h[bra, of four kinds of vows which are regarded as void; of the vows made to robbers, publicans, etc. (11 sections).

d. rdwmh ^yb ^ya, and

e. yrdnç ^yptwçh, of the case where a person has consented to derive no advantage from another or to be to him of no use, and how one can make something prohibited to the other (8 and 6 sections).

f. l çwbmh ^m rdwnh, and

g. qryh ^m rdwnh, of different kinds of eatables, in case they have been renounced, etc. (10 and 9 sections).

- h.** $\hat{y}y snwq$, concerning the time over which the vow extends (7 sections).
- i.** $rz[yl a ybr$, of diverse causes for which a vow may be made (9 sections).
- j.** $hr[n$, who has the right of making the vow of a wife' or daughter void (8 sections),
- k.** $\mu yrdn wl aw$, what, vows can be made void by the husband or father, and what in case of ignorance or error.(12 sections).
- 27.** $ryzn$, *Nazir*, in nine chapters, relating to vows of abstinence:
- a.** $twryzn yywnk l k$, of the form in which such a vow can be made; of the difference of Samson's' vow of abstinence from others (7 sections).
- b.** $yny rh ryzn$, what vows are binding *and* what not (10 sections).
- c.** $rmaç ym$, of the time of shaving (7 sections).
- d.** $ym rmaç$, of the remission and removing the same (7 sections)
- e.** $yamç tyb$, what is to be done in cases of error, and other dubious cases (7 sections).
- f.** $hçl ç \hat{y}rwsa$, of things prohibited to a Nazarite (11 sections).
- g.** $l wdg \hat{h}k$, for what uncleanness he must shave himself (4 sections).
- h.** $\mu yryzn ynç$, of some doubtful cases (2 sections).
- i.** $\mu wk[h$, of the power which, in divers cases, leads to the supposition that he is unclean; whether Samuel was a Nazarite (5 sections).
- 28.** $hfws$, *Sotah*, or the *erring woman*, in nine chapters:
- a.** $anqmh$, what constitutes *an* erring woman; who must drink the bitter water; how she is to be presented in public, etc. (9 sections).
- b.** $aybm hyh$, of writing the curses, and the ceremonies connected with it (6 sections).

c. *hyh l fwn*, of the offering of the sotah, and the fate of the woman found guilty (8 sections).

d. *hswra*, where the bitter water is not to be used (5 sections).

e. *µymhç µçk*, that the bitter water should also be taken by the adulterer (5 sections).

f. *anyqç ym*, of the required testimony (4 sections).

g. *ˆyrman wl a*, of formulas to be spoken in the holy tongue, and of such not to be spoken in that tongue (8 sections),

h. *j wçm*, of the address of the priest anointed as king (7 sections).

i. *hl g[*, of killing the heifer for expiation of an uncertain murder; of different things which have been abolished, and what will be at the time of the Messiah (11 sections). The last sections of this Mishna are very interesting because they foretell the signs of the approaching Messiah, and wind up with the following remarkable words: "In the time of the Messiah the people will be impudent and be given to drinking; public-houses will flourish and the vine will be dear; none will care for punishment, and the learned will be driven from one place to the other, and no one will have compassion on them; the wisdom of the scribes will be stinking; fear of God will be despised; truth will be oppressed, and the wise will become less. The young men will shame the old, the old will rise against the young; the son will despise the father; the daughter will rise against the mother, the daughter-in-law against the mother-in-law, and a man's foes shall be they of his own household. The face of that generation is as the face of a dog; the son shall not reverence the father!"

29. *ˆyfg*, *Gittin*, or *divorce bills*, in nine chapters, treats of divorce, and the writing given to the wife on that occasion; how it must be written, etc.

a. *fg aybmh*, of sending a divorce, and what must be observed in case the husband sends one to his wife (6 sections).

b. *fg aybmh tnydmm*, when, how, and on what it must be written (7 sections).

c. *fg l k*, that it must be written in the name of the wife (8 sections).

d. **fg hl wçh**, sundry enactments, made for the better existence of the world (9 sections).

e. **˘yqyznh**, enactments for the sake of peace (9 sections).

f. **rmwah**, sundry cases of the bill of divorce (7 sections).

g. **wwj aç ym**, of additional conditions (9 sections).

h. **fg qrwzh**, of throwing the divorce bill, its different effects; what constitutes a bald bill of divorce (i.e. one which according to the Mishna has more folds than subscribing witnesses) (10 sections).

i. **çrgmh**, of the signature of witnesses, and of the cause that constitutes a divorce, of which the school of Shammai says, “No man may divorce his wife, unless he find in her scandalous behavior, for it is said (⁽¹²¹⁾Deuteronomy 24:1), Because he found in her some uncleanness; but the school of Hillel says, ‘Even if she spoiled his food, because it is said some uncleanness.’ Akiba says, Even if he found one handsomer than she, for it is said, if it happen that she found no favor in his eyes.’

30. **˘yçwdq**, *Kiddushin*, or *betrothals*, in four chapters:

a. **tynqn hçah**, of the different ways in which a wife is acquired, and how she regains her liberty; of the difference of prayers which are incumbent upon the man and wife, in and outside of the land of Israel (10 sections).

b. **çyah çdqm**, of valid and invalid betrothals (10 sections).

c. **wrbj l rmwah**, of betrothals made under certain conditions; of children of different marriages (13 sections).

d. **˘ysj wy hrç[**, of the different kinds of families which may intermarry and which cannot; of the evidence of a known or unknown lineage; rules according to which a man ought not to be in a secluded place alone with women; counsels as to the trade or profession in which an Israelite should bring up his son; occupations which an unmarried man should not follow, on account of the great facilities they offer for unchaste practices. It also states that all ass-drivers are wicked, camel-drivers are honest, sailors are pious, physicians are destined for hell, and butchers are company for Amalek (14 sections).

(IV.) $\hat{y}qyzn rds$, *Seder Nezikin* (Damages). This *Seder* contains ten tractates:

31. amq abb, *Baba Kamma*, or the *first gate*, so called because in the East law is often administered in the gateway of a city. It treats, in ten chapters, of damages:

a. twba h[bra, of four kinds of damages, restitution and its amount (4 sections).

b. l grh dxyk, how an animal can cause damage, and of the owner who is obliged to make restitution (6 sections).

c. j ynmh, of damage caused by men; of goring oxen (11 sections).

d. and e. rWÇ, continuation, and of damage caused by an open pit (<9 and 7 sections).

f. snwkh, of damage caused by negligent feeding of cattle and by fire (6 sections).

g. hbwrm, of restitution, when it is double, twofold or fivefold (7 sections).

h. l bwj h, of restitution for hurting or wounding (7 sections).

i. l zwgh, what to do, in case some change happens with something robbed; of the fifth part above the usual restitution, in case of perjury (12 sections).

j. l ykamw l zwgh, of sundry cases, applicable to the restitution of stolen goods (10 sections).

32. h[yxm abb, *Baba Metsiah*, or the *middle gate*, in ten chapters, treats of claims resulting from trusts:

a. μynÇ $\hat{y}zj wa$, and

b. twayxm wl a, what to do with goods which were found (8 and 11 sections).

c. dyqpmh, of deposits (12 sections).

d. bhzh, of buying, and different kinds of cheating (12 sections).

e. whzya, of different kinds of usury and overtaking (11 sections).

f. rkwçh, of the rights of hiring (8 sections).

g. yl [wph ta rkwçh, of the rights of laborers concerning their eating, and what they may eat of the eatables they work on; of the four kinds of keeping, and what is meant by *ones*, *i.e. casus fortuitus* (11 sections).

h. l awçh, continuation, and again of hiring (9 sections).

i. l bqmh, of the rights among farmers; of wages, and taking a pledge (13 sections).

j. tybh, of diverse cases when something belonging to two has fallen in; of the rights of public places (6 sections).

33. artb abb, *Baba Bathra*, or the *last gate*, in ten chapters, treats of the partition of immovables, laws of tenantry, joint occupation, and rights of common:

a. ^yptwçh, of the partition of such things as are in common; what each has to contribute, and how one can be obliged to make a partition (6 sections).

b. rwpj y al, of divers kinds of servitude; what and how far something must be removed from the neighbor's premises for different causes (14 sections).

c. tqzj, of superannuation of things, and its rights (12 sections).

d. tybh ta rkwmh, what: is sold along with the sale (9 sections).

e. rkwmh hnysh ta, continuation) and how a sale may be made void (11 sections).

f. twryp rkwmh, for what a person must be good; of the required size of different places and the right of passing through (8 sections).

g. rmwah, of becoming security for a sold acre and of other things pertaining to it (4 sections).

h. ^yl j wn çy, of inheritances (8 sections).

i. **tmç ym**, of the division of property (10 sections).

j. **fwçp fg**, what is required in order to make a contract legal (8 sections).

34. **ˆyrdhns**, *Sanhedrin*, or *courts of justice*, in eleven chapters:

a. **twnwmm ynw d**, of the difference of the three tribunals of, **α**, at least three persons; **β**, the small Sanhedrin of twenty-three persons; and, **γ**, the great Sanhedrin of seventy-one persons (6 sections).

b. **l wdg ˆhk**, of the privileges of the high-priest and king (5 sections).

c. **ynyd twnwmm**, of appointing judges; unfitness for being judge and witness; of hearing the witnesses and publishing the sentence (8 sections).

d. **dj a**, of judgments in money and judgments in souls; a description how they sat in judgment (5 sections).

e. **ˆyqdw b wyh**, again of examining witnesses, and what must be observed in capital, punishments (5 sections).

f. **rmgn**, of stoning in special (6 sections).

g. **twwym [bra**, of the other capital punishments; those that were to be stoned (11 sections).

h. **rrws ˆb**, of stubborn sons and their punishments, with, so many restrictions, however, that this case hardly could ever have occurred (7 sections).

i. **ˆh wl aw**, of criminals who were burned or beheaded (6 sections).

j. **l arçy l k**, of those who have part in the world to come, viz. “all Israel” (6 sections). But the following have no share: he who says that the resurrection of the dead is not found in the law, or that there is no revealed law from heaven, and the Epicurean. Besides, there are excluded from the world to come, Jeroboam, Ahab, Manasseh, Balaam, Doeg, Ahitophel, and Gehazi. So, likewise, the generation of the Deluge; that of the Dispersion (⁻⁰¹⁰⁸Genesis 11:8): the men of Sodom, the spies, the generation of the wilderness, the congregation of Korah, and the men of a city given to idolatry. In the Gemara a good deal is spoken, of the Messiah.

k. $\hat{y}q\eta j\ nh\ \hat{h}\ w\ l\ a$, of those that are strangled, especially rebellious elders and their punishment (6 sections).

35. $t\ w\ k\ m$, *Makkoth*, or *stripes*, in three chapters, treats of corporal punishments:

a. $\mu yd\ [h\ dxyk$, in what cases false witnesses are inflicted with the stripes, and of the mode of procedure against false witnesses in general' (10 sections).

b. $\hat{h}\ w\ l\ a$, of unintentional murders, and the cities of refuge (8 sections).

c. $\hat{h}\ w\ l\ aw$, of criminals deserving the stripes; how they should be inflicted; why forty save one (?); of stopping in case the delinquent is regarded as too weak; that such as have suffered this penalty are free from the punishment of extermination; of the reward of those who keep the law; why so many laws were given to Israel (16 sections).

36. $t\ w\ [w\ b\ \zeta$, *Shebuoth*, or *oaths*, in eight chapters:

a. $y\ t\ \zeta\ t\ w\ [w\ b\ \zeta$, of different kinds wherein a person is conscious or unconscious of having touched anything unclean (because it is treated under the head of oaths, ^{<RRB>}Leviticus 5:2); of the atonement through sacrifices; what sins were atoned by the different kinds of sacrifices (7 sections).

b. $t\ w\ [y\ d\ y$, how far the sanctity of the court of the Temple reaches (5 sections).

c. $t\ w\ [w\ b\ \zeta$, of forswearing, its kinds and degrees (11 sections).

d. $t\ w\ d\ [h\ t\ [w\ b\ \zeta$, of the oath of witnesses; of blasphemy and cursing (13 sections).

e. $\hat{w}d\ q\ p\ h\ t\ w\ [w\ b\ \zeta$, of the oath mentioned in ^{<RRB>}Leviticus 6:3, and of the perjurer (5 sections).

f. $\hat{y}\ n\ y\ y\ d\ h\ t\ [w\ b\ \zeta$, of the oath demanded by the court, when it must be taken or not, and what ought to be testified (7 sections).

g. $\hat{y}\ [b\ \zeta\ \eta\ h\ l\ k$, of such oaths as are for the benefit of him that swears (8 sections).

h. *ʿyrmwç h[bra*, of the different watchmen who must be security for goods; how far it goes; in what cases they must replace it or swear; what in case they lied (6 sections).

37. *twyd[*, *Edayoth*, or *testimonies*, in eight chapters. It is so called because it consists of laws which tried and trustworthy teachers attested to have been adopted by the elder teachers, in Sanhedrim assembled:

a. *yamç*, enactments in which the other sages deviate from the schools of Shammai and Hillel, or wherein the school of Hillel is followed, or wherein the school of Hillel has given way to that of Shammai (14 sections).

b. *anynj ybr*, enactments of different rabbins, especially of R. Ishmael and R. Akiba on mostly unimportant things (10 sections).

c. *Amh l k ʿyamf*, enactments of R. Dosa on divers defilements (12 sections).

d. *µyrbd wl a*, laws in which the school of Shammai is more lenient than that of Hillel (12 sections).

e. *hdwhy ybr*, laws which R. Akiba would not take back (7 sections).

f. *ʿb hdwhy ybr*, of different kinds of defilement on which disputes have taken place with R. Eliezer (3 sections). *g* and

h. *[çwhy r dy[h*; of some minor points which cannot be brought under one common nomenclature; at the end we read that Elijah the Prophet will finally determine all disputed points of the sages and ill bring peace (9 and 7 sections).

38. *hrz hdwb[*, *Abodah Zarah*, or *idolatry*, in five chapters. This treatise is wanting in the Basle edition of 1578, because severe reflections upon Jesus Christ and his followers were found therein by the censor:

a. *ʿhydya ynpl*, what must be observed concerning idolatrous feasts, and of things not to be sold to idolaters (9 sections).

b. *ʿya ʿydy[m*, of divers forbidden occasions which tend towards a near relation with idolaters; of the use that can be made of their goods, especially eatables (7 sections).

c. **μyml xh l k**, of idols, temples, altars, and groves (10 sections).

d. **l a[mçy ybr**, of what belongs to an idol, and of desecrating an idol; prohibition of wine of libation, and of every wine which was only touched by a heathen, because even the slightest libation could have made it sacrificial wine (12 sections).

e. **rkwçh**, continuation of things with which wine could have been mixed and; how to cleanse utensils bought of a heathen for eating purposes (12 sections).

39. **twba**, *Aboth*, or **twba yqrp**, *Pirkey Aboth*, contains the ethical maxims of the fathers of the Mishna. It is impossible to give an analysis of the six chapters, because they all contain maxims without any chronological order. This treatise speaks of the oral law, its transmission, names of the “receivers,” and contains maxims, apothegms, and the wisdom of the wise. The first chapter has 18, the second 16, the third 18, the fourth 22, the fifth 23, and the sixth 10 sections. A more detailed account of it has been given in the art. **PIKEABOTH** *SEE PIKEABOTH* (q.v.).

40. **twyrwh**, *Horayoth*, or *decisions*, in three chapters, treats of the manner of pronouncing sentences and other matters relating to judges and their functions, but which, though erroneous, still were observed, and for which a sin-offering was to be brought according to ^{
}Leviticus 4:13:

a. **wrwh**, in what cases and under what circumstances such offerings were to be brought by the congregation or not (5 sections).

b. **ˆhk hrwh**, of the sin-offering of an anointed priest and prince (7 sections).

c. **j yçm ˆhk**, who is meant by an anointed priest and prince; of the difference between *an* anointed priest and one only invested with the priesthood: of the prerogatives of a high-priest before a common priest; of the male sex before the female; finally, of the order of precedence among those who profess the Jewish religion, that a learned precedes an unlearned (8 sections).

(V.) **μyçdq rds**, *Seder Kodashim* (Consecrations). This *Seder* contains eleven tractates:

41. $\mu y j$ bz, *Zebachim*, or *sacrifices*, in nineteen chapters:

a. $\mu y h b z h$ I k, in how far-every sacrifice must be regarded with the intention that it shall be such a sacrifice (4 sections).

b. I b q ç $\mu y j$ b z h I k, and

c. $\hat{y} l$ w s p h I k, how it becomes unfit or an abomination (5 and 6 sections).

d. $y a m ç$ t y b, of sprinkling the blood (6 sections).

e. $\hat{m} w q m$ w h z y a, of the difference between the most holy sacrifices and those of less holiness (8 sections)

f. $y ç d q$ $y ç d q$, of the place of the altar where every sacrifice has to be offered (7 sections).

g. $\bar{a} w [h$ t a f j , of the sacrifice of birds (6 sections).

h. $w b r [t n ç$ $\mu y j$ b z h I k, Of cases where something of the sanctified has been ech;mlecl with the other parts (12 sections).

i. j b z m h, how the altar sanctifies the offered part (7 sections).

j. r y d t h I k, of the order in which sacrifices must be brought; which precedes the other (S sections).

k. μd t a f j , of washing the dress, etc., on which the blood of a sin-offering has come (S sections).

l. $\mu w y$ I w b f, to whom the skins belong and where they go (6 sections).

m. f j w ç h, of divers trespasses, when trespass has been committed unconsciously during the sacrificial service (8 sections).

n. t a f j t r p, of the different places of sacrificial service during different periods (Gilgal, Shiloh, Noli, Gibeon, Jerusalem), and of the difference between the altar and the heights (10 sections).

42. $t w j$ n m, *Menachoth*, or *meat-offerings*, in eighteen chapters:

- a.** **twj nmh l k**, of taking a handful; what corresponds in sacrifices to the act of sacrificing, when it becomes unfit or an abomination (4 sections).
- b.** and **c.** **mwqh**, and **d.** **tl kth**, according to the different kinds of meat-offerings (5, 7, and 5 sections).
- e.** **twj nmh l k twab**, and
- f.** **twj nm wl a**, of these different kinds and their treatment (9 and 7 sections).
- g.** **hdwth**, of the thank-offering and of the Nazarite's offering (6 sections).
- h.** **twnbrq l k**, whence the necessary good things were taken (7 sections).
- i.** **twdm ytç**, of the measures in the sanctuary; of the drink-offerings and the laying-on of hands (9 sections).
- j.** **l a[mçy ybr**, of the wave-loaf (9 sections).
- k.** **µj l h ytç**, of the Pentecostal and shewbreads (9 sections).
- l.** **twj nmh**, of changes in the offering (5 sections).
- m.** **yl [yrh**, of indefinite vows; of the Onias temple in Egypt; a correct exposition of the words "a sweet savor" (11 sections).
- 43.** **ˆyl wj**, *Cholin*, or *unconsecrated things*, in seventeen chapters:
- a.** **ˆyfy yç l kh**, who may slaughter; wherewith and where it can be slaughtered (7 sections).
- b.** **dj a fj wçh**, of cutting through the windpipe and (esophagus, in front or at the side, and how the slaughtering becomes unfit (10 sections).
- c.** **twpyrf wl a**, what animals are no more *kashdr*, i.e. lawful, but *trephsh*, i.e. unlawful: the signs of clean fowls, grasshoppers, and fishes (7 sections).
- d.** **hçqmh hmhb**, enactments concerning an animal fetus (7 sections).
- e.** **wnb taw wtwa**, of the prohibition against slaughtering an animal and the young on the same day (5 sections).

f. *μdh ywsyk*, the precept of covering the blood of wild animals and fowl (7 sections).

g. *hçnh dyg*, the precept concerning the prohibition of eating the sinew which shrank (6 sections).

h. *rçbh l k*, the prohibition to boil any kind of flesh in milk (6 sections).

i. *bfwrhw rw[j* , pollution communicated by a carcass or trephah (5 sections).

j. *[wrzh*, of the oblations due to the priest from the slaughtered animal (4 sections).

k. *zgh tyçar*, of the firstlings of the fleece (2 sections).

l. *wqh j wl ç*, the precept of letting the parent bird, found in the nest, fly away (5 sections).

44. *twrwkb*, *Bekoroth*, or *first-born*, in nine chapters:

a. *rbw[j qwl h*, of the redemption of the first-born of an ass; how to redeem it (7 sections)

b. *rbw[j qwl h wtrp*, when the first-born of an animal is not to be given; of some defects of a sanctified animal; of sundry dubious cases as to what Constitutes the first-born (9 sections).

c. *hmhb j qwl h*, of the sign of the birth of the first-born; of the wool of a first-born (4 sections).

d. *d[hmk*, how long the first-born must be raised up before it is given to the priest; what must be paid for the inspection (10 sections).

e. *yl wsp l k*,

f. *ymwm wl a l [*, and

g. *wl a ymwm*, of the defects which make a first-born unfit for sacrifice or service in the sanctuary (6,12, and 7 sections).

h. rwbk çy, of the rights of the first-born concerning a heritage; in what cases he forfeits such a right or the priest forfeits the right on the first-born, and of what property he has to receive his heritage (10 sections).

i. hmhb rç[m, concerning the tithe of the herd; of what, when, and how the tithe has to be given; what to do in dubious cases (8 sections).

45. ^ykr[, *Erakin, or estimates*, in nine chapters:

a. ^ykyr[m l kh, who has to make this estimate and on what (4 sections).

b. ^ykr[b ^ya, what constitutes herein the minimum and maximum (6 sections).

c. ^ykr[b çy, how such a valuation may be more difficult to the one than to the other (5 sections).

d. dy gçh, how the valuation has to be made according to the means, age, etc. (4 sections).

e. yl qçm rmwah, valuation according to weight, and how the treasurer takes a forfeit (6 sections).

f. µymwtyh µwç, of proclaiming and redeeming (5 sections).

g. ^çydqm ^ya, and

h. çydqmh, of the banished (5 and . sections).

i. whdç ta rkwmh, of redeeming a sold field; of houses in a city surrounded with a wall (⁴⁸¹⁰Leviticus 20:29); of the privilege of the houses and cities of the Levites (8 sections).

46. hrwmt, *Temunarah, or exchanges* (⁴⁸⁷⁰Leviticus 27:10, 33), in seven chapters, treats of the way exchanges are to be effected between sacred things:

a. ^yrymm l kh, to what persons and things this right may be applied or not (6 sections).

b. twnbrqb çy, of the difference between the sacrifice of an individual and a congregation (3 sections).

c. **μϣ̣dq wl a**, of the exchange of the young of a sacred animal (5 sections).

d. **tafj dl w**, of sin-offerings which were starved, or which were lost and found again (4 sections).

e. **ˆymyr [m dxyk**, of the means to cheat the priest out of the first-born ; how young and old can be sanctified at the same time or separately (6 sections).

f. **ˆyrwsah l k**, what is prohibited to be brought upon the altar (5 sections).

g. **ỵdq̣b cy**, of the different rights of things sanctified for the altar and for the Temple; what may be buried or burned of the sanctified (6 sections).

47. **twtyrk**, *Kerithoth*, or *cutting off*, in seven chapters, treats of offenders being cut off from the Lord, provided the offences were wantonly committed; but if inadvertently committed, entail the obligation to bring sin-offerings:

a. **ççw μϣ̣l ç**, of the sacrifice of a woman in childbed, after the birth is certain or uncertain (2 sections).

b. **yrswj m h[bra**, and **c.** **tl ka wl /rma**, of cases where one or more sin-offerings were to be brought (6 and 10 sections).

d. **l ka qps**, of a doubtful sin-offering (3 sections).

e. **hfyj ç μd l ka**, of eating blood and divers doubtful eatings, and what they cause (8 sections).**f.** **μça aybmh**, of cases where the secret sin became known; of the efficacy of the *day* of expiation; of shekels which were used separately and for other purposes (9 sections).

48. **hl y[m**, *Meailah*, or *trespass* (⁻⁰¹⁸⁶Numbers 5:6, 8), in six chapters, treats of things partaking of the name of sacrilege:

a. **μϣ̣dq ỵdq̣**, what sacrifice causes a trespass (4 sections).

b. **āw[h tafj** , from what time it is possible according to the nature of the sanctified (9 sections).

c. tafh dl w, of things which were given from such trespass (8 sections).

d. j bzm yçdq, how far the addition of different things takes place (6 sections).

e. ˆm hnhnhçdqhh, in how far the wear and tear, by spoiling something of it, or the use thereof, is to be considered (5 sections).

f. hç[ç j yl çh, in how far a man may trespass by means of a third person (6 sections).

49. dymt, *Tamid*, or *daily sacrifices*, in seven chapters, treats of the morning and evening offerings:

a. hçl çb twmwqm, of the night-watch and of the arrival of the captain, when the gate was opened and the priests went in (4 sections).

b. wyj a whwar, of the first work, how the altar was cleared from the ashes, the fagots were brought and the great and the small fire were arranged; the former for the members and the coals of the sacrifices, the latter for the coals of the incense (5 sections).

c. hnwmh µhl rma, allotting services for the offering of the lamb; of finding out whether “it brightens;” of fetching the lamb and the vessels; of the lamb-chamber, opening the Temple and cleansing the inner altar and candlestick (9 sections).

d. ˆytpwk wyh al, of slaughtering and sprinkling the blood; of skinning, cutting, and dividing the parts (3 sections).

e. hnwmh µhl rma, of the morning prayer of the priests; of offering the incense (6 sections).

f. wl j h yl w[, again of cleansing the inner altar and the candlestick; of putting on the coals and of lighting the incense (3 sections).

g. ˆhkç ˆmzb, of the entering of the high priest and of the other, priests; of the blessing of the priests; when, *the* high-priest offered the sacrifices; of the chant which the Levites intoned in the sanctuary (4 sections).

50. twdm, *Middoth*, or *measurements*, in five chapters, treats of the measurements of the Temple, its different parts and courts:

- a.** *twmwqm hçl çb*, of the nightwatches in the Temple, the gates and chambers (9 sections).
- b.** *tybh rh*, the mountain of the Temple, *its* walls and courts (6 sections).
- c.** *j bzmh*, of the altar and the other space of the inner court to the *hall* of the Temple (8 sections).
- d.** *wj tp*, computation of the measures of the Temple (7 sections).
- e.** *hrz[h l k*, of the measure of the court and its chambers (4 sections). This tractate has no Gemara or commentary.

51. *µynq*, *Kinnim*, or *bird's-nests*, in three chapters, treats of the mistakes about doves and beasts brought; into the Temple for sacrifice:

- a.** *āw[h tafj* , how the blood of these birds was sprinkled in different manner that of the sacrifice above the altar, that of the trespass offering below the red line which stretched around the altar (4 sections).
- b.** *hmwts ^q*, of the so-called indefinite nest (5 sections);
- c.** *µyrbd hmb*, of possible mistakes of the priests and the offering women (6 sections).

(VI.) *twrhf rds*, *Seder Taharoth* (Purifications). This order has twelve tractates.

52. *µyl k*, *Kelim*, or *vessels*, in, thirty chapters, treats of those which convey uncleanness (^{<OR13>}Leviticus 11:33):

- a.** *twba twamwfh*, of the main kinds of uncleanness according to their ten degrees, as well as of other ten degrees of un-cleanness as well as of holiness (9 sections).
- b.** *[yl k*, **c.** *yl k rw[yç*, and **d.** *srj h*, of earthen vessels, which *are* the least capable of uncleanness, but which become clean as soon as they break wholly or partly (8, 8, and 4 sections).

e. *rwnt*, **f.** *hçw[hµ g. twtl qh*, **h.** *wxxj ç wrnt*, and

i. **fj m**, of the divers kinds of ovens made of earth (11, 4, 6, 11, and 5 sections).

j. **μyl k wl a**, of vessels which by cover and binding are protected against uncleanness (8 sections).

k. **twktm yl k**, **l.** **μda t [bf**, **m.** **āyysh**, and

n. **hmk twktm yl k**, of metal vessels which become unclean, and how they get clean (9, 8, 8, and 8 sections).

o. **[yl k**, **p.** **[yl k l k**, and

q. **yl [byl k l k**, of vessels of wood, skin, leather, bone, glass, and the size of the hole whereby they become clean; also of the size of things used as a measure (6, 8, and 17 sections).

r. **dyçh**, and

s. **qrpmh**, of beds (9 and 10 sections).

t. **pyrkh**, of things which become unclean by sitting thereon (7 sections).

u. **[gwnh**, of things fastened to a *loom*, *plough*; etc. (3 sections).

v. **ˆj l çh**, of tables and chairs (10 sections).

w. **rwdkh**, of things which become unclean by riding thereon (5 sections).

x. **ˆysyr t hçl ç**, of a great many things by which three modes of uncleanness take place (17 sections).

y. **μyl kh l k**, of the outside and inside of vessels, the handle and the different duties belonging to them (9 sections).

z. **l dns**, of vessels which have straps (9 sections).

aa. **amfm dgbh**, and

bb. **l [çl ç**, how large something must be in order *to* become unclean; also, that something which is three inches long and wide may be called a dress (12 and 10 sections).

cc. *ymwn*, of cords on different things (8 sections). **dd.** *tykwkz yl k*, of vessels of glass which are fiat or a receptacle (4 sections).

53. *twl ha*, *Ohaloth, or tents* (^{<01914>}Numbers 19:14), in twenty-two chapters, treats of tents and houses retaining uncleanness, etc.

a. *μyamf μynç*, of the different modes and degrees of uncleanness over a dead body; of the difference of uncleanness in men and vessels; of the measure of the limbs of a dead body, or carcass, and of the number of the members of man (8 sections).

b. *ˆyamfm wl a*, what he comes unclean in a tent through a corpse, and what only by touching and carrying (7 sections).

c. *ˆyamfmh l k*, of adding together divers kinds of cleanness; what is not unclean in a dead body (teeth, hair and nails, provided they are no more on the corpse); of the size of openings whereby uncleanness can be propagated (7 sections);

d. *l dgm*, of vessels into which uncleanness does not penetrate (3 sections).

e. *rwnt*, when the upper story may be regarded as separated from the lower part (7 sections).

f. *yl kw μda*, how men and vessels form a cover over a carcass; of the uncleanness in the wall of a house (7 sections).

g. *hamwfh*, of a woman giving birth to a dead child (6 sections).

h. *ˆyaybm çy*, of things conveying and separating uncleanness, and of others which do not (6 sections).

i. *trwvk*, how far a large basket separates (16 sections).

j. *hbwra*, and **k.** *tybæ*, of openings in a house and cracks on a roof (7 and 9 sections).

l. *rsn*, of uncleanness in parts of the house and roof (8 sections).

m. *rwam hçw[h*, of the measure of a hole or window which may propagate uncleanness (6 sections).

n. *lyzh aybm*, and **o.** *mwgs*, of cornices and partitions in a house; of graves (7 and 10 sections).

p. *yl fl fmh l k*, continuation of graveyards (5 sections).

q. *ta crwj h*, and **r.** *dxyk*, of the *beth happras* (field in which a grave has been detected, or must be presumed, etc.); how far the houses of the heathen must be regarded as unclean (5 and 10 sections).

54. *my[gn*, *Neggaim*, or *plagues of leprosy*, in seventeen chapters, treats of leprosy of men, garments, or dwellings:

a. *my[gn twarm*, of the four indications of leprosy and their kinds (6 sections).

b. *trhb*, of the inspection of leprosy (5 sections).

c. *yamfm l kh*, of the time and signs when uncleanness is pronounced (8 sections).

d. *cy r[çb*, of the difference between the different signs of leprosy (11 sections).

e. *qps l k*, of dubious cases when uncleanness is pronounced (5 sections).

f. *hpwn*, of the size of the white spot, and the places where no leprosy occurs (5 sections).

g. *twrhb wl a*, of the changes of the spots of leprosy, and when they were rooted out (5 sections).

h. *j rwph*, of the growing of the spots (10 sections).

i. *yj çh*, of the difference between a boil and a burning (3 sections).

j. *myqtnh*, of scalds (10 sections).

k. *mydgbh l k*, **l.** *mytbh l k*, and

m. *mytb hrç[*, of the leprosy in houses and garments (12, 7, and 12 sections).

n. **yrhfm dxyb**, of cleansing a leper (13 sections).

55. **hrp**, *Parah*, or the *red heifer*, in sixteen chapters, directs how she is to be burned, etc.

a. **rmwa a r**, of the heifer's age, and ages of other offerings (4 sections).

b. **trp rmwa a r**, blemishes which make her unfit (4 sections).

c. **µymy t [bç**, separation of the priest for burning the red heifer; procession of heifer and attendants; pile for burning; gatherings the ashes (11 sections).

d. **tafj trp**, how the sacrifices may become unfit under these rites (4 sections).

e. **aybmh**, of the vessels for the sprinkling-water (9 sections).

f. **çdqmh**, of cases where the ashes or the water becomes unfit (5 sections).

g. **wal mç hçmj**, how this rite cannot be interrupted by any kind of labor (12 sections).

h. **wyhç µynç**, of keeping the water; of the sea and other waters with regard to the sprinkling-water (11 sections).

i. **tyþwl x**, continuation (9 sections).

j. **ywarh l k**, how clean persons and vessels may become unclean (6 sections).

k. **tyj wl x hj ynhç**, of the hyssop for sprinkling (9 sections).

l. **bwzah**, of the persons fit for sprinkling (11 sections).

56. **twrhf**, *Taharoth* (prop. *Tohoroth*), or *purifications*, in fifteen chapters, teaches how purifications are to be effected.

a. **rç [hçl ç**, of the carrion of a clean and unclean fowl (9 sections).

b. htyfhç hçah, of the uncleanness of the person who has eaten something unclean; of the effect of the different degrees of uncleanness (8 sections).

c. bfwrh, of beverages; of the estimation of an uncleanness after the time of its detection (8 sections).

d. qrwzh, e. rçh, and

f. hyhçµwqm, of doubtful cases of uncleanness (13, 9, and 10 sections).

g. rdqh, how a layman makes something unclean; of the care to be taken in preserving the cleanness of dresses and vessels (9 sections).

h. rdh, how to keep victuals clean (9 sections).

i. µytyz, of the cleanness in pressing the olives (9 sections).

j. l [wnh, of the same in the treatment of wine (5 sections).

57. twawqm, *Mikwaoth, orpools of water* (^{<06123>}Numbers 31:23), in fifteen chapters, treats of their construction, and the quantity of water necessary for cleansing:

a. twl [m çç, of the six different grades of pools of water, where one is purer than the preceding, from the water in the pit to the living water. (8 sections).

b. amfh, of doubtful cases concerning bathing; how much and how far drawn water makes a *mikvâh*, or bathing-place, unfit for bathing (10 sections).

c. yswy ybr, how a mikvâh becomes clean again, (4 sections).

d. j ynmh, how rain-water is to be led into a mikvâh, so as not to become drawn-water (5 sections).

e. ^y[m, of different kinds of water-spring water, river and sea water (6 sections).

f. brw[mh l k, what is regarded as connected with a mikvâh, and how mik-vaoth may become united (11 sections).

g. *ʿyl [m çy*, what makes a mikvâh complete and fit, and where the change of the color has to be considered (7 sections).

h. *l arçy ra*, of some uncleanness of the mikvâh (5 sections).

i. *wl a ʿyxxwj*, of the difference between bathing the body and a vessel (7 sections).

j. *twdy l k*, of vomiting when eating and drinking, whether it be clean or unclean (8; sections).

58. *hdn*, *Niddah*, or separation of women during their menses, after childbirth, etc., in fifteen chapters:

a. *yamç rmwa*, of computing the time of the sliddih, and where it is to be supposed (7 sections).

b. *dyh l k*, of the uiddas itself (7 sections).

c. *tl pmh*, and

d. *pytwk twnb*, of women in childbed (7 and 7 sections).

e. *ʿpwd axwy*, of the different ages of children according to their sex (9 sections).

f. *ʿmys ab*, of the blood-spots (14 sections).

g. *hdnh µd*, what makes unclean if it be damp or dry (5 sections).

h. *hawrh*, and

i. *awhç hçah*, of recognizing the blood-spots; their origin; of changes in the menses (4 and 11 sections).

j. *tqwnt*, of all kinds of suppositions concerning cleanness and uncleanness (8 sections). This treatise should be read only by persons studying medicine, it being devoted to certain rules not ordinarily discussed, although they appear to have occupied a disproportionate part of the attention of the rabbins. The objections that our modern sense of propriety raises to the practice of the confessional apply with no less force

to the subject of this tract, considered as a matter to be regulated by the priesthood.

59. *ʿyryçkm*, *Makshirinsor liquors* that dispose seeds, and fruits to receive pollution, in six chapters:

a. *l k hqçm*, of the precaution by the fault of which something has become wet (6 sections).

b. *t [yz*, of sweating and steaming; of different rights of cities in which Jews and heathen reside (11 sections).

c. *qç*, of cases where fruits are moistened unintentionally (8 sections).

d. *hj wçh*; of the regulations of rain-water in similar cases (10 sections).

e. *l bfç ym*, of cases where eatables, although they have become wet, do not change (11 sections).

f. *hl [mh*, of the seven liquors, their variety; and of such: liquors as at the same time make clean and unclean, or: not (8 sections).

60. *µybz*, *Zabim*, or bodily fluxes that cause pollution, in five chapters:

a. *hawrh*, of computing this uncleanness (6 sections).

b. *ʿyamfym l kh*, of examining whether such an issue is not enforced (4 sections).

c. *bzh*, and

d. *[çyhy ybr*, of the power and different motions towards pollution (3 and 7 sections).

e. *[gwgh*, comparison of divers pollutions and what makes the heave-offering unclean (12 sections).

61. *µwy l wbf*, *Tibbul Yom*, or baptism on the day of uncleanness (⁽¹²²¹⁶⁾Leviticus 22:6), in four chapters:

a. *µnkmh*, when cakes of bread, grain, and seeds become unclean, or remain clean through the touch of a *tibbil yôm* (5 sections).

b. **hqçm**, how far the dampness of a tibil yôm is not to be treated as strictly as that of other unclean things; how the union of unwashed hands with those of a tibil yôm made to be discerned; how the uncleanness through a tibil yôm differs from another uncleanness in all kinds of boiled things and vessels of wine (8 sections).

c. **twdy l k**, of the *chibbfor*, or connection of the parts and the whole concerning the uncleanness through a tibil yom in fruits, eggs, herbs, boiled things, and eatables of all kinds (6 sections).

d. **rç[m l kwa**, the same in separating the heave-offering, cakes, etc., according to older more lenient and recent more strict laws (7 sections).

62. **pydy**, *Yadaïm*, or *hands*, in four chapters, treats of the washing of hands before eating bread, though dry fruits are allowed to be eaten without such washing:

a. **ty[ybr ym**, how much water is required for ablution of the hands; what kind of water; of the vessels for the same; who may pour it out (5 sections).

b. **wdy l fn**, of the two ablutions whereby the unclean first water is washed away; how the ablution must take place (4 sections).

c. **pynknh**, whether and how the hands become unclean in the first degree, and how in the second; whether and how far the touching of straps of phylacteries and of holy writings defiles (5 sections).

d. **pyyb wb**, of some special discussions; of the defilement by the Chaldee in the Bible, and of the Assyrian; disputes between the Pharisees and Sadducees (T sections).

63. **wyqxw[**, *F catsin*, or stalks of fruit which convey uncleanness, in three chapters:

a. **awhçl k**, of the difference between the stalks and husks of fruits (6 sections).

b. **çbkç pytz**, what is added to the whole from stones, husks, leaves, etc. (10 sections).

14. l arçy ra twkl h, *Hilkoth Erets Israel*, relating to the ways of slaughtering animals for food after the Jewish ideas, a treatise which is much later than the Talmud.

15. ^tn ybrd twba, *Aboth di-Rabbi Nathan*, a commentary on, or amplification of the treatise *Aboth* (21 chapters). For the author of this treatise, see the art. *SEE NATHAN HA-BABLI*.

ALPHABETICAL LIST OF THE DIFFERENT TREATISES AS FOUND IN THE BABTYLONIAN TALMUD. The *first* column gives the names of the treatises; the *second* indicates the volume of the Talmud where the treatises may be found; the *third* shows the *Seder* or division under which they are given; and the *fourth* the numerical order in which they stand in the Mishna.

Picture for Talmud

Having given an analysis of the contents of the Talmud, we will now give a specimen of its text, which will present to the reader a faint idea of the mode of procedure as we find it in that wonderful work. We open the very first page of the Talmud, the treatise *Berakoth*, on blessings, commencing *ytmyam*.

Mishna. — “At what time in the evening should one say the Shema? From the time that the priests go in to eat of their oblation till the end of the first night-watch. These are the words of the rabbi Eliezei; but the wise men say until midnight. Rabbian Gamaliel says till the morning dawn ariseth. It came to pass that his sons were returning from a feast; they said unto him, ‘We have not yet recited the Shema.’ He answered and said unto them, ‘If the morning dawn has not yet arisen, ye are under obligation to recite it.’ And not this alone have they said, burn everywhere where the wise have said ‘until midnight,’ the command is binding till the morning dawn ariseth; and the steaming of the fat and of the joints is lawful until the morning dawn ariseth, and so everything which may be eaten on the same day it is allowed to eat until the morning dawn ariseth. If this is so, why do the wise say ‘till midnight?’ In order that men may be held far away from sin.”

Gemara. — “The Thanna (i.e. rabbi Judah the Holy), what is his authority that he teaches, from what time onward? And, besides that, why does he teach on the evening first, and might he teach on the morning first? The Thanna rests on the Scripture, for it is written, ‘When thou liest down and

when thou risest up,' and so he teaches, the time of reciting the Shelna, when thou liest down, when is it? From the time when the priests go in to eat of their oblation. But if thou wilt, say I, he hath taken it out of the creation of the world, for it is said it was evening and it was morning one day. If this is so, it might be the last Mishna, which teaches. In the morning are said two blessings before and one after, and in the evening two before and two after, and yet they teach in the evening first. The Thanna begins in the evening, then he teaches in the morning; as he treats of the morning, so he explains the things of the morning, and then he explains the things of the evening.”

This is less than one fourth part of the comment in the Gemara on that passage in the Mishna, and the remainder is equally lucid and interesting.

Subsidiaries to the Talmud, printed either in the margin of the pages or at the end of the treatises, are

- (1) the *Tosaphoth*, exegetical additions by later authors;
- (2) *Masorah ha-shesh Sedarim*, being marginal Masoretic indices to the six orders of the Mishna;
- (3) *Ain* or *En-Mishpat*, i.e. index of places on the rites and institutions;
- (4) *Ner Mitsvoth*, a general index of decisions according to the digest of Maimonides; and
- (5) *Perushim*, or commentaries by different authors.

IV. Literary Uses. — The Talmud has been applied to the criticism and interpretation of the Old Test. Most of its citations, however, agree with the present Masoretic text. It has probably been conformed to the Masoretic standard by the rabbins, at least in the later editions. For variations, *SEE QUOTATIONS OF THE OLD TEST. IN THE TALMUD*; for the interpretation, *SEE SCRIPTURE INTERPRETATION AMONG THE JEWS*.

The Talmud has also been used in the illustration of the New Test. by Lightfoot, Schöttgen, Meuschen, Wettstein, Gfrorer, Robertson, Nork, Delitzsch, Wünsche. But in this department, also, its utility has been overestimated, and by none more than by Lightfoot himself, who says, in the dedication prefixed to his Talmudical exercitations, “Christians, by their skill and industry, may render them (the Talmudic writings) most usefully

serviceable to their students, and most eminently tending to the interpretations of the New Test.” But not so Isaac Vossius, who said Lightfoot would have sinned less by illustrating the evangelists from the Koran than these *nebulae rabbinicae*, and exclaimed, “Sit modus ineptiendi et cessent tandem aliquando miseri Christiani Judaicis istiusmodi fidere fabellis!” (“Let Christians at length cease from playing the fool and trusting to such wretched Jewish fables as those contained in the Talmud!”) The mistake of Lightfoot is repeated by Wünsche, in his *Neue Beiträge zur Erluterung der Evangelien aus Talmud und Midrash* (Gött. 1878), whose *modus illustrandi et interpretandi* is like a Jew writing an apology for Judaism; hence great caution must be exhibited in the perusal of the latter’s work. There is only one way of using the Talmud for the New Test., for which **SEE SERMON ON THE MOUNT AND THE TALMUD**. For the Old Test. as it was in the time of the Talmud, see the next article.

V. Apparatus for Study of the Talmud. —

1. Manuscripts. — Like the text of the Old Test., the Talmud was copied with the greatest care during the Middle Ages; but, like a good many other works, these MSS. have become the prey of time, and only a few of them are extant. All that is known is (1) the first division of the Jerusalem Talmud in possession of the Jewish congregation at Constantinople; (2) a complete copy of the Babylonian Talmud from the year 1343 in the Royal Library at Munich; (3) a fragment of the same, evidently older than No. 2, in the same place; (4) a fragment: of the same from the year 1134 in the Hamburg City Library; (5) the treatise *Sanhedrin* according to the Babylonian redaction, and belonging to the 12th century, in the Ducal Library at Carlsruhe; (6) some fragments with valuable variations, preserved at the University Library of Breslau. There is no doubt that in some libraries fragments may yet be found, if the covers of old books should be properly examined, for which they have been used by ignorant binders. That such, was the case we not only know from the fragments at the Breslau University, but from a more recent discovery of W.H. Lowe, who published the *Fragment of the Talmud Babli Pesachim of the 9th or 10th Century, in the University Library at Cambridge, with Notes and Ca Facsimile* (Lond. 1879).

2. Editions. — Like the Old Test., at first only parts of the Talmud were published, on which see De Rossi, *Annales Haebraeo-typographici Sec.*

XV (Parmse, 1795). The first part of the Talmud, the treatise *Berakoth*, was published at Soncino in 1484; but the first complete edition (the basis of later ones) was published by Bomberg (Venice, 1520-23, 12 vols. fol.) (a complete. copy of which is in the libraries of Cassel and Leipsic). Since that time editions have been published at different places, which are enumerated by R. N. Rabbinowicz, in his *דמלי תה תספדה ל [רמא*, or *Kritische Uebersicht der Gesammtund Einzelausgaben des babylonischen Talmuds seit 1484* (Munich, 1877) (with the exception of the German title-page, the rest is in Hebrew). The Jerusalem Talmud was first published by D. Bomberg (Venice, 1523); then with brief glosses (Cracov. 1609; Dessau, 1743; Berlin, 1757; Schitomir, 1860-67, 4 vols fol.; Krotoschin, 1866, fol.). A new edition of Bomberg's, with commentaries, was commenced by the late Dr. Z. Frankel, of which, however, only the first division was published (Vienna, 1875-76).

3. Translations. — There exists as yet no complete translation of either of the Talmuds in any language. The Arabic translation, said to have been prepared in A. D. 1000, at the will of king Hashem of Spain, is no longer extant. A large portion of the Jerusalem Talmud is found in a Latin translation in Ugolino, *Thesaur Antiq. Sacr.*, viz. *Pesachim* (vol. 17), *Shekalim*, *Yoma*, *Sukkah*, *Rosh Hashshanah*, *Taanith*, *Megillah*, *Chagigah*, *Bezah*, *Moed Katon* (vol. 18), *Maaseroth*, *Challah*, *Orlah*, *Bikkurim* (vol. 20), *Sanhedrin*, *Makkoth* (vol. 25), *Kiddushin*, *Sotah*, *Kethuboth* (vol. 30). In the same work we also find three treatises of the Babylonian Talmud, viz., *Zebachim*, *Menachoth* (vol. 19), and *Sanhedrin* (vol. 25). Into French, the treatises *Berakoth*, *Peah*, *Dema'*, *Kilayim*, *Shebiith*, *Terumoth*, *Maaseroth*, *Maaser Sheni*, *Challah*, *Orlah*, *Bikkurim* of the Jerusalem Talmud were translated by M. Schwab (Paris, 1872-79). The treatise *Berakoth* according to the Jerusalem and Babylonian Talmuds was also translated into French by L. Chiarini (Leips. 1831) and into German by Rabe (Halle, 1777). Of the Babylonian Talmud we have German translations of *Berakoth* by Pinner (Berlin, 1842); of *Baba Metsia* by A. Sammter (ibid. 1876-79); of *Aboda Zarah* by F. Chr. Ewald (Nuremb. 1868).

These are all the translations, which are known to us.

4. Monographs. — Since the Talmud is the great storehouse of all and everything, different branches of science and religion, have been treated in monographs.

Thus, on

- a.** Botany: by Duschak, *Zur Botanik des Talmud* (Leips. 1870).
- b.** Civil and criminal law: by Frankel, *Der gerichtliche Beweis nach nos. — talmudischem Rechte, Ein Beitrag zur Kenntniss des mos. — talmudischen Criminal u. Civilrechts* (Berlin, 1846); Duschak, *Das mosaisch-talmudische Eherecht*, etc. (Vienna, 1864); Thonisson. *LaPeine de Maort dans le Talmud* (Bruxelles, 1866); Bloch, *Das mosaisch talmudische Polizeirecht* (Leips. 1.879) Lichtschein, *Die Ehe nach mosaisch-talmudischer Auffassung und das mosaisch-talmudische Eherecht* (ibid. 1879); Fassel, *Das mosdisch-rabbinische Gerichts- Verfahren itr icioilrechtlichen Sachen*, etc. (Vienna, 1858); Frankel, *Grundlinien des mosaisch-talmudischen Eherechts* (Breslau, 1860); Mielziner, *Die Verhiatnisse der Sklaven bei den alten Hebraern nach bibl. u. talmud. Quellen dargestellt* (Leips. 1859).
- c.** Coins and weights: by B. Zuckermann, *Ueber talxnudische Münzen und Gewichte* (Breslauj 1862).
- d.** Education; S. Marcus, *Zur Schul-Pddagogik des Talmud* (Berlin, 1866); Simon, *L'Education et l'Instruction des Enfants chez les Anciens Juifs d'apres la Bible elle Talmud* (Leips. 1879); Sulzbach, *Die Pddagogik des Talmud* (Frankf.-on-the-Main, 1863). **SEE SCHOOLS** in this Cyclopaedia.
- e.** Ethics mniaxims, proverbs, etc. Lazarus, *Zur Charakteristik der talmudischen .Ethik* (Breslau, 1877); maxims and proverbs are given by Dukes, *Rabbinische Blumenlese* (Leips. 1844), in *^nbrd ^yl m rps* (Warsaw, 1874), and by A. Franck, *Les Sentences et Proverbes du Talmud et du Midrash*, in the (Paris) *Journal des Savants*, Nov. 1878, p. 659-676; Dec. p. 709-721.
- f.** Geography: by A. Neubauer, *La Geographie du Talmud, Memoire couronne par l'Academie des Inscriptions et Belles-lettres* (Paris, 1868).
- g.** Mathematics:, by Zuckermann, *Das mathematische him Talmud* (Breslau, 1878); id. *Das jiidische Mass System* (ibid. 1867).
- h.** Medicine: Wunderbar, *Biblich-talmudische Medicin* (Riga, 1852-59); Halpern, *Beitrdge zur Geschichte der talmudische Chirurgie* (Breslau, 1869).

- i.** Magic Brecher, *Das Transcendentale, Magie u. magische Heilarten in Talmud* (Vierina, 1850).
- j.** Psychology: Jacobson, *Versuch einer Psychologie des Talmud* (Hamburg, 1878).
- k.** Religious philosophy: Nager, *Die Religionsphilosophie des Talmud* (Leips. 1864).
- l.** Zoology: Lewysohn, *Zur Zoologie des Talmud* (Frankf. — on-the-Main, 1858).
- m.** Labor and handicraft: S. Meyer, *Arbeit und Handwerke im Talmud* (Berlin, 1878); Delitzsch, *Jüdisches Handwerkerleben zur Zeit Jesu* (3d ed. Erlangen, 1879). The latter wrote also on the colors in the Talmud in *Nord und Süd*, May 1878.
- n.** Biblical Antiquities: Hamburger, *Biblisches- Talmudisch. Wörterbuch* (Neu-Strelitz, 1861).
- o.** *Textual Criticism.* — Lebrecht, *Kritische Lesarten der Talmud* (Berlin, 1864); Rabbowicz, *Varice Lectiones in Mischnam et in Talmud Babygonicum quum ex aliis Libris Antiquissimis et Scriptis et Impressis tum e Codice Monacensi Præstantissimo collectæ, Annotationibus instructæ* (pt. 1-8, Munich, 1868-77).
- 6.** *Bibliography.* — Pinner, in his preface to *Berakoth*, p. 9 sq.; Beer, in Frankel's *Monatsschrift*, 1857, p. 456-458; Lebrecht, *Handschriften und erste Gesamtausgaben des babyl. Talmud, in den wissenschaftlichen Blättern des Berliner Bethha Midrasch* (Berlin, 1862); Steinschneider, *Bebraische Bibliographie*. (1863), 6:39 sq.; De Rossi, *Annales Hebraeotypographici Sec. XV* (Parma. 1795); id. *De Hebraicæ Typographice Origine ac Primitiis*, etc. (ibid. 1776).
- 7.** *Linguistic Helps.* Buxtorf, *Lexicon Chaldaicum, Talmudicum et Rabbinicum* (Basil. 1640, fohl.; new ed. by B. Fischer, Leipsic, 1869-75); Lowy, *Neuhebräisches und chaldäisches Wörterbuch*, etc. (ibid. 1875; in the course of publication); *ruch*, by Nathan ben-Jechiel; new critical edition by A. Kohut, *Plenum Arich Targum Talmudico-Midrasch Verbale et Reale Lexicon* (Vienna, 1878 sq.); Brull, *Fremdsprachliche Redensarten*, etc. (Leipsic, 1869); Geiger, *Zur Geschichte der talmudischen Lexicographie*, in *Zeitschrift d. D. M. G.* 1858. 12:142; Stein, *Talmudische*

Terminologie (Prague, 1869); Zuckermann, in Gratz's *Monatsschrift*, 1873, p. 421-430, 475-477; 1874, p. 30-44, 130-138, 183-189, 213-222; Rülf, *Zur Lautlehre der aramaisch-talmudischen Dialecte*, i, *Die Kehllaute* (Leipsic, 1879); Berliner, *Beiträge zur hebräischen Grammatik im Talmud und Midrash* (Berlin, 1879); Kalisch [I.], *Sketch of the Talmud, including, the Sepher Jezirah, with Translation, Notes, and Glossary* (N.Y. 1877).

8. Literature in General. — Treatises on the Talmud have been written in different languages, and their number is legion. To enumerate them would be not only tedious, but useless, because, written from a certain standpoint, they only give one side of the question. Such are the treatises of Deutsch, written for the glorification of modern Judaism, and repeated by Schwab in his introduction to his treatise *Berakoth* (Paris, 1871), and of Rohling and Martin, written in a hostile spirit against Judaism, because more or less dependent on Eisenmenger's *Entdecktes Judenthum* (Königsberg, 1711, 2 vols.). Quite different is the work of A. M'Caul, *The Old Paths* (Lond. 1854), and the *Pentateuch according to the Talmud* (vol. 1, Genesis, *ibid.* 1874) by P. J. Hershon, because tending to show how Pharisaism has made the law of God void by a multitude of traditions. We therefore confine ourselves to such works as will give the reader the necessary information on the Talmud, viz. Wihner, *Antiquitates Ebraeorum* (1743), 1, 231-584; Wolf, *Bibliotheca Hebraea*, 2. 657-993; 4:320-456; Brill, *Die Entstehungsgeschichte des babyl. Talmuds*, in his *Jahrbücher* (Frankfort-on-the-Main, 1876), 2, 1-123; Auerbach, *Das jüdische Obligationsrecht*, 1, 62-114; Frankel, *Introductio in Talmud Hierosolymitanum* (Breslau, 1870 [Heb.]); Wiesner, *Gib'eth Jeruschalaim*, ed. Smolensky (Vienna, 1872 [Heb.]); Fürst, *Literaturblatt des Orients*, 1843, No. 48-51; 1850, No. 1 sq.; *id.* *Kultur u. Literaturgeschichte der Juden in Asien* (1849), vol. 1; Zunz, *Die Gottesdienstlichen Vorträge der Juden*, p. 51-55, 94; Jost, *Gesch. d. Israeliten*, 4:222 sq., 323-328; *id.* *Gesch. d. Judenthums u. s. Secten*, 2, 202-212; Gratz, *Gesch. d. Juden*, 4:384, 408-412 sq.; Frankel, *Monatsschrift*, 1851-52, p. 3640, 70-80, 203-220, 403-421, 509-521; 1861, p. 186-194, 205-212, 256-272; 1871, p. 120-137; Geiger, *Jüdische Zeitschrift*, 1870, p. 278-306; Pinner, *Compendium des hierosolym. und babylon. Talmud* (Berlin, 1832); *id.* *Einleitung in den Talmud*, in his translation of *Berakoth*, fol. 1-12; Schurer, *Handbuch der neutestam. Zeitgeschichte* (Leipsic, 1874), p. 37-49; Pressel, art. *Talmud*, in Herzog's *Real-Encyclop.*; Davidson, in Kitto's *Cyclop. s. v.*; Mauseaux, *Le Juif, le*

Judaisme, et la Judaisation (Paris, 1869), p. 76 sq.; Bernstein, **μymkj rda**, an apology for the Talmud (Odessa, 1868); Waldberg, **ykrd ywnçh**, or explanation of the logic of the Talmud (Lemberg, 1876). The expurgated passages are collected by Meklenburg in **twfmçhh txwbq**; the difficult passages of the Talmud, which are explained by Raschi, are found in **μyh tpç** (Schitomir, 1874); Jacob Brill, **γwxl çrwd**, or *Mnemotechnik des Talmuds* (Vienna, 1864 [Heb.]); Bacher, *Die Agada der babylonischen Amorder, A Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der Agadd und zur Einleitung in den babylonischen Talmud* (Strasburg, 1878); Friedlander, *Geschichtsbilder aus der Zeit der Tanaiten und Ainorder, Ein Beitrag zu Geschichte des Talmuds* (Brinn, 1879). The Hagadoth contained in both Talmuds are collected in Jacob ibn Chabib's **bq[ly γ]** (latest edition Wilna, 1877). See Fürst, *Bibl. Jud.* 1, 151; Wolf, *Bibl. Heb.* 1, 590 sq.; 3, 456 sq.; 4:866 sq.; and in Jafe's **harm hpy** (comp. Wolf, *ibid.* 1, 1204; 3, 1109; Furst, 2, 9,96); the *Tosephta* is now in course of being edited by Dr. M. S. Zuckerman (Berlin, 1876 sq.); Schwarz, *Die Tosifta der Ordnung Moed in ihrem Verhdlniss zur Mischna kritisch untersucht*, Pt. 1, *Der Tractat Sabbath* (Carlsruhe, 1879.); Jellinek, *Hagadische Hermeneutik mit Midrasch-Coommenfar* (Vienna, 1878); Placzek, *Die Agada unnd der Darwinismus*, in the *Juid. Literaturblattf* vol. 7 No. 1, 6, 8,11, 13,16,17, 23-31; Mihlfelder, *Rab: ein Lebens bild zur Geschichte des Talmud* (Leips. 1871); Fessler, *Mar Samuel, der bedeutendste Amora, Ein Beiträg zur Kunde des Talmud* (Breslau, 1879); Hoffmann, *Mar Samuel, R.ector der jüdischen Akademie zu Nehardea in Babylonien* (Leips. 1873). (B. P.)

Talmud, The Old Testament In The Time Of The.

The Talmud presupposes a text so firmly established by tradition that the Talmudists no longer venture to alter anything in it; they merely seek to settle it unchangeably for all time by means of very precise regulations on the subject of Biblical calligraphy, the different ways of reading, etc.

1. The Canon (κανών). — This word, which occurs first in the 3rd century after Christ, has no corresponding expression in Jewish writings. The Bible is called **rps**, or **rpsch**, “the Book” (*Sabbath*, fol. 13, col. 1); “the Scripture,” **abtk** (Targum 2 in ¹¹²⁴Genesis 12:42); “Holy Writings,” **çdqh ybtk** (*Sabbath*, fol. 16,col. 1); **arqm**, “Reading” (*Taanith*, fol.

27, col. 2). In *Kiddushin*, fol. 49, col. 1, we find the expression $\mu y a y b n$ $a t y r w a y b w t k w$, “the Law, the Prophets, and the Writings.”

The order of books as found in our present Hebrew Bibles is that of the Masorites, and differs from that given in the Talmud, as the following table will show:

Picture for Talmud

Besides these twenty-four books, the Talmud also quotes from the apocryphal book *Jesus ben-Sira*, better known under the name of *Ecclesiasticus*, as the passages given in the art. ECCLESASATICUS indicate. But, in spite of this book being quoted so often, we are distinctly told that it is not canonical. Thus *Yadaim*, ch. 2, says, “The book of Ben-Sira, and all the other books written after its time, are not canonical” ($\mu y d y h t a \text{ } \hat{y} a m f m \text{ } \hat{n} y a$). Again, the declaration made by R. Akiba, that he who studies uncanonical books will have no portion in the world to come (Mishna, *Sanhedr.* 10:1), is explained by the Jerusalem Talmud to mean “the books of Ben-Sira and Ben-Laanaḥ ;” and the *Midrash on Coheleth*, 12:12 remarks, “Whosoever introduces into his house more than the twenty-four books (i.e. the Sacred Scriptures), as, for instance, the books of Ben-Sira and Ben-Toglah, brings confusion into his house.” Accordingly, *Ecclesiasticus* is not included in the canon of Melito, Origen, Cyril, Laodicea, Hilary, Rufinus, etc.; and though Augustine, like the Talmud and the Midrashim, constantly quotes it, yet he, as well as the ancient Jewish authorities, distinctly says that it is not in the Hebrew canon (*De Civit. Dei*, 17:20). Comp. also Jerome, *Prol. in Libr. Solom.*, where he says that *Ecclesiasticus* should be read “for the instruction of the people (*plebis*), not to support the authority of ecclesiastical doctrines.”

2. The Alphabet. — It is difficult to determine with precision the time at which the square character was; perfected. Origen and Jerome ascribe the invention to Ezra, and so does Jose ben-Chalafta, who flourished between A.D. 138 and 164. In the Talmud we find descriptions and allusions to the form of Hebrew letters which precisely suit the square alphabet; and even in the Mishna, which was completed in the 3d century of our era, traces occur of the same. In our own days the existence of the Hebrew square alphabet before the Talmudic era has been proved by the discovery of some tombstones in the Crimea, a few of which even bear the date A.D. 6 and 30 (comp. Geiger, *Jidische Zeitschrift*, 3, 128-133, 237; 4:214 sq.). But these

stones cannot be relied upon, and the forgery has been made manifest by Dr. H. Strack, *A. Firkowitsch u. seine Entdeckungen* (Leips. 1876). In the Talmud, however, we are distinctly told not to change **a** and **[**, **b** and **k**, **g** and **x**, **d** and **r**, **h** and **j**, **w** and **y**, **z** and **^**, **f** and **p**, **μ** and **s** (*Shabbath*, fol. 103, col. 2). The Talmud also knows the five final letters **! ā**, **,**, **^**, **μ**, (*ibid.* fol. 104, col. 1), which were probably used to render reading more easy by distinguishing one word from another (thus, **tamyhl a** [the third and fourth words of the Heb. Bible] might be read **tam yhl a**, “God is dead”). The Talmud, again, not only mentions the so-called *taggin* Cyan, (**^ygt**, **μyrtk**), or calligraphic ornaments on the letters **,**, **g**, **z**, **n**, **f**, **[**, **ç** (*Menachoth*, fol. 29, col. 1 sq.; *Shabbath*, fol. 89, col. 1; fol. 105, col. 2), but also gives different combinations of the alphabet, as **l k**, **μy**, **nf**, **μj**, **[z**, **āw**, **h**, **qd**, **rg**, **çb**, **ta tç**, **^z**, **dmw**, **ql j**, **kd**, **āyg**, **[fb**, **μj a tk**, **çy**, **rf**, **qj**, **z**, **āy**, **[h**, **sd**, **^g**, **μb**, **l a**.

The first of these combinations is remarkable on account of Jerome having so confidently applied it to the word *Sheshak*, **çç**, in ^{<2453>}Jeremiah 25:26, it being the same as **l bb**.

3. The Vowel-points. — See that article.

4. Division of Words. — Hebrew was originally written, like most ancient languages, without any divisions between the words, in a *scriptio continua*, which fact accounts for the various readings in the Sept., as ^{<0071>}Genesis 7:11, **μyrç[** for **μwy rç[**; 20:16, **tj kn wl k** for **l k tj knw**; 40:17, **l ka μl km** for **l kam l km**, etc.; 1 **ḥ**Samai, **āwx ^b**, Alex. **ἐν Νασίβ**, **byxnb**; ^{<1900>}Psalms 9:1, **twml [** for **twm l [**, etc. But there is no doubt that a division of words already existed in the time of the Talmud; at least the final letters, which are already mentioned, may have served such a purpose; and in *Menachoth*, fol. 30, col. 1, the space between the words in the sacred MSS. is fixed with precision. Whether or not this division of words by points—as used in the Samaritan Pentateuch—was applied, must be left undetermined.

5. Divisions according, to the Meaning of Verses. There is no doubt that at a very early period a division according to verses (**μyqwsḡ**) existed. “Every verse divided by Moses may not be otherwise divided,” we read in *Megillah*, fol. 22, col. 1. The reason for such divisions was probably

twofold: *a.* The *reading of the Scriptures*, especially in the synagogue, led to such. The Mishna (*Megillah*, ch. 4:§ 4) mentions the $\mu\eta\upsilon\kappa\omega\sigma\pi$ in relation to this, for we read that “not less than three verses of the holy law may be read in the synagogue to each person (called to read). One verse only of the law may at one time be read to the *methurgeman*, or interpreter; but it is lawful to read three consecutive verses to him from the prophets; but if each verse should form a separate section, one verse only may be read to him at a time.” The Gemara forbids the leaving of the synagogue before the ending of such a section (*Berakoth*, fol. 8, col. 1), introduces the injunction of Ezra (^{<468>}Nehemiah 8:8; *Megillah*, fol. 3, col. 1; *Nedarim*, fol. 37, col. 2), and prescribes, in reference to the prophets, how many sections are to be read on week-days (*Baba Kamma*, fol. 82, col. 1). *b.* The *study of the law*, the instruction and school-teaching of the same produced such sense-divisions. These were distinguished from the former, which were merely called $\mu\eta\upsilon\kappa\omega\sigma\pi$, by the names $\mu\eta\mu[\text{f}]$, *clauses*, *sentence*, or also $\eta\kappa\omega\sigma\pi\eta\mu[\text{f}]$, *clause sections*; To instruct in the dividing of clauses ($\mu\eta\mu[\text{f}]\eta\kappa\omega\sigma\pi\eta\mu[\text{f}]$) was a special part of the rabbinical teaching (*Nedarim*, fol. 37, col. 1); in *Berakoth*, fol. 62, col. 1, the teacher is said to point it out to his scholars with his right hand; and according to it disputed points of the law were settled (*Chagigah*, fol. 6, col. 2). As to the sign of this division which is now found in the Hebrew Bible (:), it is not seen on the synagogue-roll, nor is it mentioned in the Talmud, but is of later origin; and we must conclude it as highly probable that these divisions into verses and periods were not first externally designated, but were merely transmitted by oral tradition, as may be seen from the following quotation. In *Kiddushin*, fol. 30, col. 1. we read: “Therefore are the ancients called Sopherim because they counted all letters in Holy Writ. Thus they said that the *Vav* in $\hat{\eta}\omega\eta\text{g}$ (^{<814>}Leviticus 11:42) is the half of all the letters in the Pentateuch; $\text{c}rd$ $\text{c}rd$ (^{<816>}Leviticus 10:16) is the middle word; ηlgthw (^{<833>}Leviticus 13:33), the middle verse; that *Ayin* in $\text{r}[\eta\epsilon]$ (^{<804>}Psalms 80:14) is the middle letter, in the Psalms, and ^{<973>}Psalms 77:38 the middle verse.” In the same passage we also read that “the Pentateuch contains 5888 verses, the Psalms eight more, and Chronicles eight less.” Now if we compare this number with that given by the Masorites, we shall find that the Talmud counts forty-three verses more than the Masorites in the Pentateuch, and this difference can only be explained from the statement made by the Talmud (*Baba Bathra*, fol. 14, col. 2), that Joshua wrote his book and eight verses

of the law (^{<05415>}Deuteronomy 34:5-12); and the Occidentals, as we read in *Kiddushin*, loc. cit., divided ^{<02939>}Exodus 19:9 into three verses. Thus much is certain, that in the time of the Talmud there was a division according to verses; but what this mark of division was, if there were any at all—at least Tr. *Sopherim*, ch. 3, § 5, is against it—is difficult to point out.

6. *Stichoi* (στίχοι). — The poetical passages in Exodus 15; Deuteronomy 32; Judges 5; 2 Samuel 22: were in the time of the Talmud already written **στιχηρῶς** (comp. *Shabbath*, fol. 103, col. 2, *infine*; *Sopherim*, ch. 12). The same may be said of the poetical books, **h̄ma**, i.e. Job, Proverbs, Psalms. The Decalogue was also originally written in ten series (**μυϛϛ**, **στίχοι**), as is intimated in the Targum on the Song of Songs, 5, 13: “The two tables of stone which he gave to his people were written, in ten rows (*shittin*), resembling the rows or beds (*shittin*) in the garden of balsam.” **SEE SHITTA.**

7. *The Smaller Sections of the Pentateuch.* — In our Hebrew Bibles, which follow the Masoretic text, the Pentateuch is divided into 669 *parashas*, or sections (**twyc̄rp**, **h̄c̄rp**), of which 290 are open (**twj wtp**, and distinguished in our Bibles by the initial letter **p**) and 379 are closed (**twmwts**, marked by the initial letter **s**). Of these *parashas* mention is made in the Talmud, viz.

1. *Taanith*, ch. 4: § 3, the history of creation is divided into seven sections, viz. ^{<00001>}Genesis 1:1-5, 6-8, 9-13, 14-19, 20-23; 24-31; 2:1-3.

2. *Berakoth*, ch. 2, § 2; *Tamid*, ch. 5, § 1; *Menachoth*, ch. 3, § 7, the sections of the prayer and phylacteries (^{<02101>}Exodus 13:1-13; ^{<03604>}Deuteronomy 6:4-9; 11:13-21; ^{<04552>}Numbers 15:37-41) are mentioned.

3. *Megillah*, ch. 3, § 4-6 (comp. also *Yoma*, ch. 7: § 1; *Sotah*, ch. 7: § 7), the following sections for the Sabbath and festivals are given, viz.: ^{<02311>}Exodus 30:11-16; ^{<02517>}Deuteronomy 25:17-19; ^{<04901>}Numbers 19:1-22; ^{<02171>}Exodus 12:1-12; ^{<03226>}Leviticus 22:26-33 (for the first day of the Passover); ^{<03649>}Deuteronomy 16:9-12 (for Pentecost); ^{<03233>}Leviticus 23:23-25 (for New Year); 16:1-34; 23:26-32 (for the Day of Atonement); ^{<0462>}Numbers 6:22-7, 18 (for the Day of Dedication); ^{<02708>}Exodus 17:8-1.3 (for Plim) ^{<04311>}Numbers 28:11-15 (for the new moon); ^{<03308>}Leviticus 26:3 sq. s Deuteronomy 28 sq. (for the fast-days).

4. *Tamid*, ch. 5, § 1; *Sotah*, ch. 7:§ 2,6; ^{<0462>}Numbers 6:22-27.
5. *Yadaim*, ch. 3, § 4, ^{<0405>}Numbers 10:35, 36.
6. *Sotah*, ch. 7:§ 7, ^{<6174>}Deuteronomy 17:14-20; Numbers 5, 11-31 19:1-22; ^{<6201>}Deuteronomy 21:1-9; 26:1-11; 14:22-27; 26:12-15; 25:5-10, and many others. In the Gemara the following parashas are mentioned:
7. *Shabbath*, fol. 115, col. 2; f 6, col . 116 , 150, ^{<0405>}Numbers 10:35, 36.
8. *Berakoth*, fol. 12, col. 2, states that “every parish which Moses divided we also divide; and any one which he did not divide, neither do we,” in reply to the question why the verse [rk to wmyq (^{<0419>}Numbers 24:9) was not taken out from the long section (ch. 22-24) and used for the prayer *Shema Israel*, i.e. “Hear, O Israel.”
9. *Ibid.* fol. 63, col. 1, ^{<0401>}Numbers 6:1-6; 5, 11-31, are mentioned. 10. *Götting*, fol. 60, col. 1, ^{<0201>}Leviticus 21:1-24; ^{<0405>}Numbers 8:5-22; 9:6 sq.; 5, 1-4; Leviticus 16; 10:8-11; ^{<0401>}Numbers 8:1-4; 19: sq., are mentioned.

That some of these were *open*, some *closed*, we read in, *Shabbath*, fol. 103, col. 2; *Menachoth*, fol. 30, 31; Jerusalem *Megillah*, fol. 71, col. 2; and in *Sopherim*, 1, 14, we also read that the open section is an empty space, the width of *three letters*, at the beginning of a line, and the *closed* is as much in the middle of a line.

8. The *larger sections*, marked in our Bibles by **p p p** and **s s s**, are not mentioned in the Talmud.
9. *Haphtarahs*. — After the reading of the law in the synagogue, it was also customary from an early period to read a passage from the prophets (comp. ^{<4135>}Acts 13:15, 27; ^{<0406>}Luke 4:66 sq.), and with that to dissolve the meeting (**λύειν τὴν συναγωγὴν**, ^{<4135>}Acts 13:43; Heb. **ryfph**); hence the reader who made this conclusion was called **ryfpm**, and the prophetic passage read **hrfph**. The Mishna repeatedly speaks of the Haphtarahs (*Megillah*, ch. 4:§ 1-3, 5,10), and as early as in the Gemara (*Megillah*, fol. 29, col. 2; fol. 31, col. 1), several Haphtarahs are named. Yet in general they cannot then have been fixed determinately, and even now different

usages prevail among the Jews of different countries, as may be seen from the table given in the art. HAPHTARAH, for, as Zunz says, “our present order is the work of later centuries.”

10. Various Readings. — The various readings so frequently found in the margins and foot-notes of the Hebrew Bibles, known as *Keri* and *Kethib* (bytkw yrq, pl. ^ˆbytkw wyyrq), are very ancient. The Talmud traces the source of these variations to Moses himself, for we are distinctly told in *Nedarim*, fol. 37, col. 2, that “the pronunciation of certain words according to the scribes (μyρpws arqm), the emendations of the scribes (μyρpws rwf []), the not reading of words which are in the text (yrq al w bytk), and the reading of words which are not in the text (al w yrq bytk), etc., are a law of Moses from Sinai (hçml hkl h ynysm).” We here mention some of the Talmudic passages which have reference to these readings:

^{<10087>}Genesis 8:17, Kethib axwh, but Keri axyh (*Bereshith*

Rabba, ad loc. sect. 34:fol. 37, col. 3). ^{<10215>}Leviticus 21:5, Kethib. hj uqjæ

but Keri wj rgy (*Makkoth*, fol. 20, col. 1). ^{<10213>}Leviticus 23:13, Kethib

hksnw, but Keri wksnw (*Menachoth*, fol. 89, col. 2). ^{<10173>}1 Samuel 17:23,

Kethib twr [mm, but Keri twkr [mm (*Sotah*, fol. 42, col. 2). Haggai 1, 8,

Kethib dbkaw, but Keri hdbka, (*Yoma*, fol. 21, col. 2). ^{<10027>}Esther 9:27,

Kethib l bqw, but Keri wl bqw (*Jerusalem Berakoth*, fo]. 14, col. 3).

^{<1004>}Ecclesiastes 9:4, Kethib rj by, but Keri rbj y (*Jerusalem Berakoth*,

fol. 13, col. 2). ^{<10315>}Job 13:15, Kethib al , but Keri wl (*Sotah*, ch. 5, § 5).

^{<10118>}Proverbs 31:18, Kethib l yl b, but Keri hl yl b (*Pakta*, ed. Buber

[Lyck, 1868], fol. 65, col. 1). ^{<2510>}Isaiah 63:9, Kethib al , but Keri wl

(*Sotah*, fol. 31, col. 1; while *Taanith*, fol. 16, col. 1, reads wl). To these

variations belongs also the substitution of *euphonisms* for *cacophonisms*.

SEE KERI AND KETHIB, § 8.

For the most part the rabbins follow the reading of the yrq, often that of ^ˆbytk, especially when they can elicit a new interpretation from the reading of the bytk; thus, e.g., ^{<10088>}Ruth 3:3, they interpret the reading of the bytk, ytdryw while the yrq reads tdryw (*Midr. Ruth Rabba*, sect. 5, fol. 43, col. 3 [Cracov. 1588, fol.]). The reading according to the bytk is cited in *Chullin*, fol. 68, col. 1, from ^{<10012>}Leviticus 2:2 and ^{<10230>}2 Samuel

23:20, in *Berakoth*, fol. 18, col. 1, *in fine*. In the Mishna we find the marginal reading **yrq** six times, that of the **bytk** twice, viz.: ^{<1822>}Leviticus 9:22, it is written **wdy**; but *il-Sotah*, ch. 7:§ 6, and *Tamid*, ch. 7:§ 2, it reads **wydy** ^{<1817>}Deuteronomy 20:7, it is written **hkpc̄**; but in *Sotah*, ch. 9:§ 6, **wkpc̄**, according to the Keri. ^{<1016>}1 Kings 6:6, it is written **[wxyh**; but in *Middoth*, ch. 4:§ 4, **[yxyh**. ^{<2303>}Isaiah 10:13, it is written **rybak**; but in *Yadaim*, ch. 4:§ 4, **rybk**. Ezekiel 43, 16, it is written **l yarahw**; but in *Middoth*, ch. 3, § 1, **l ayrahw**. ^{<18315>}Job 13:15, it is written **al** ; but in *Sotah*, ch. 5, § 5, **wl** .

The reading according to the Kethib we find in two passages, ^{<1218>}Exodus 21:8, **al** (*Berakoth*, ch. 1, § 7; *Kiddushin*, fol. 17, col. 1), and ^{<2303>}Isaiah 10:13, in *Yadaim*, ch. 4:§ 4. Words written but not read, **yrq al w bytk**, are mentioned in *Nedarim*, fol. 27, col. 2, viz. **an**, ^{<1188>}2 Kings 5:8; **taw**, ^{<2421>}Jeremiah 32:11; **rdy**, 41:3; **çmj** , ^{<2416>}Ezekiel 48:16; **a**, ^{<1812>}Ruth 3:12. Words read but not written, **bytk al w yrq**, are mentioned in *Nedarim*, fol. 37, col. 2, viz. **trp**, ^{<1018>}2 Samuel 8:3; **çya**, 16:23; **myab**, ^{<2438>}Jeremiah 31:38; **hl** , 1,29; **ta**, ^{<1821>}Ruth 2:11; **yl a**, 3, 5:17.

In connection with this we may remark that in the treatise *Megillah*, fol. 25, col. 2, we are told of certain passages of Scripture which are read in the synagogue and interpreted, read and not interpreted, and such as are neither read nor interpreted. Thus, “The intercourse of Reuben with Billah is to be read without being interpreted; that of Tamar (and Amnon) is to be read and interpreted. The (first part of the) occurrence with the golden calf is to be read and interpreted; but the second part (commencing ^{<12421>}Exodus 34:21) is to be read without any interpretation. The blessing of the priests, and the occurrence of David and Amnon, are neither to be read nor interpreted. The description of the divine chariot (Ezekiel 1) is not to be read as a Haphtarah, but R. Jehudah permits it; R. Eleazer says neither (Ezekiel 16), ‘Cause Jerusalem to know her abomination,’ etc.

11. Ablatio Scribarum, **myrpws rwf** [, *Nedarim*, fol. 37, col. 2. See the art. MASORAH, § 6.

12. Correctio Scribarum, **myrpws ^yqt**, is not mentioned in the Talmud, but reference is made to it in the *Mechilta*, *Siphri*, *Tanchuma*, *Bereshith Rabbaj* *Shemoth Rabbah* (Midrashic works, enumerated under

MIDRASH); the passages belonging to the *correctio scribarum* are given s.v. MASORAH, 5. *SEE TIKKUN SOPHERIM.*

13. Puncta Extraordinaria. — Over single letters, over entire words, we find dots or points, generally called “puncta extraordinaria.” The first instance is mentioned in the Mishna, *Pesachim*, 9, 2, over the **h** of the word **hqr**, ^{<0490>}Numbers 9:10. Ten such words which have these extraordinary points are enumerated in *Midrash Bamidbar Rabbâh* on Numbers 3, 39, sect. 3, fol. 215, col 4; comp. *Pirke de-Rabbi Nathan*, ch. 33; *Siphri* on Numbers 6, 10; *Sopherim*, 6:3; *Massora Magna* on Numbers 3, 39; *Oklahve-Oklah*, § 96. The following words are mentioned in the Talmud: ^{<018D>}Genesis 18:9, **lyba** On this passage the *Midrash Bereshith Rabba* remarks: “**wya** are pointed, but not the **l**. R. Simeon ben-Eliezer saith, wherever you find more letters than points, you must explain the letters, i.e. what is written; but where you find more points than letters, you must explain the points. In this case, where there are more points than the written text, you must explain the points, viz. **lyai** ‘where is Abraham.’ The meaning is that the points over these three letters intend to indicate that the three angels did not ask ‘where is Sarai, **hrçhya**,’, but ‘where is Abraham,’ **wya hrba**: (comp. *Baba Metsiah*, fol. 87, col. 1). ^{<018B>}Genesis 19:3, **hmqbw**. In the Talmud, *Nazir*, fol. 23, col. 1, we read: “Why is there a point over the *Vav*, **w**, of the word **hmqbw**? To indicate that when she lay down he did not perceive it, but when she arose he perceived it” (comp. also. *Horayoth*, fol. 10, col. 1; and Jerome, *Quaest. in Genesis*: “Appungunt desuper quasi incredibile et quod rerum natura non capiat coire quemquam nescientem”) ^{<0489>}Numbers 3:19, **obaw** *Ba-midbar Rabbah*, loc. cit., says that the points over Aaron indicate that he was not one of that number (comp. also *Berakoth*, fol. 4, col. 1). 9:10, **hqr**. In Mishna, *Peschim*, 9:2, we read: “What is a distant journey? R. Akiba says from Modaim and beyond, and from all places around Jerusalem. situated at the same distance. R. Eleazar says ‘any distance beyond the outside of the threshold of the court of the Temple.’ R. Jose says the reason for the point over the **h** (in our word) is to denote that it is not necessary to be actually on a distant road, but only beyond the threshold of the court of the Temple.” ^{<0228>}Deuteronomy 29:28, **ul w [Ad [awabb wovob o** *Ba-midbar Rabbah*, loc. cit., “You have made manifest, hence I will also manifest unto you hidden things” (comp. *Sanhedrin*, fol. 43, col. 2, *in fine*). ^{<0273>}Psalm

27:13, **abwbo** *Berakoth*, fol. 4, col. 1, says, “Lord of the universe, I am aware that thou greatly rewardest the just in future ages, but I know not whether I shall partake of it with them on account of my sin.” Buxtorf remarks on this passage, **μ[f al b μ[f**, i.e. a sense without any sense: The meaning probably is that **al wl** , without the points, means *if not*, like the Latin *nisi*, but with the points it signifies “a doubt.”

As to the origin and signification of these points, nothing certain can be said. According to the rabbins, Ezra is said to have been the author of them (comp. *Ba-midbar Rabbah* on ⁻⁰⁴⁰³⁹Numbers 3:39, sect. 3, fol. 215, col. 4; *Aboth de-Rabbi Nathan*, ch. 33). This much may be taken for granted, that these points were known long before the Talmud.

14. Inverted Nun, n. — Before ⁻⁰⁴⁰³⁵Numbers 10:35, and after ver. 36, we find in our Hebrew text the letter *Nun*, **n**, inverted (n). In the Talmud, *Shabbath*, fol. 115, col. 2; fol. 116, col. 1, we are told that” the section commencing **hçm rmayw ^rah [snb yhyw** (⁻⁰⁴⁰³⁵Numbers 10:35) was made by God with signs below and above, to indicate that it is not in its proper place. But Rabbi said this is not so, but that this book was counted by itself. How do you know it? R. Samuel bar-Nachman said, R. Jonathan saith (it is written) ‘She hath hewn out her seven pillars’ (⁻²¹⁰⁰¹Proverbs 9:1); this means the seven books of the law.” On the inverted *Nuns* found in Psalm 107, mention is made in *Rosh Hash-shanah*, fol. 17, col. 2.

15. The Vav Ketid in ⁻⁰⁴⁵¹²Numbers 25:12. — Of this **wyw a[yfq**, or *Vavcut*— of, which is found in our Hebrew Bible **y**, we read in the Talmud, *Kiddushin*, fol. 66, col. 2: “Whence do we have it that a person having some defect is unfit for the sacred ministry? R. Jehudah said that R. Samuel taught that this is because the Scripture says, ‘Wherefore say, Behold I give unto him my covenant of peace’— a perfect peace, and not an imperfect one. But, said one, it is written **μyl ç**, i.e. peace; but answered R. Nachman, the *Vav* in **μwl ç** is cut off” (**w yz ayh h[yfq μwl çd**).

16. The Closed or Final Mem (μ) in the middle of the word ⁻²¹⁰⁰⁶Isaiah 9:6, **hbrμl** . — In the Talmud, *Sanhedrin*, fol.. 94, col. 2, we find the following:

“Why is it that all the *Mems* in the middle of a word are *open* (i.e. **m**). and this one closed (i.e. **μ**)? The Holy One (blessed be he) wanted to.. make

Hezekiah the Messiah, and Seunacherib Gog and Magog; whereupon Justice pleaded before the presence of the Holy One, Lord of the world, "What! David, the king of Israel, who sang so many hymns and praises before thee, wilt thou not make him the Messiah? But Hezekiah, for whom thou, hast performed all the miracles, and who has not uttered one song before thee, wilt thou make him the Messiah?" Therefore has the *Mem* been closed.

17. Suspended Letters. — The suspended *Nun* we find in $h\check{c}nm$, ^{<1783>}Judges 18:30. The Talmud, *Baba Bathra*, fol. 109, col. 2, states the following: "Was he (i.e. Gershom) the son of Manasseh? while the Scripture says the sons of Moses were Eleazar and Gershom. But because he did the deeds of Manasseh (2 Kings 21), did the Scripture append him to the (family) of Manasseh." The meaning is that the prophet did not like to call Gershom the son of Moses, because it would be ignominious that Moses should have had an impious son; hence he called him the son of Manasseh, with the suspended letter, which may mean the son of Manassehb or Moses.

The suspended *Ayin* is found in $\mu y[\check{c}r]$, ^{<18815>}Job 38:15. In the Talmud, *Sanhedrin*, fol. 103, col. 2, we read the following: "Why is the $[\check{c}]$ in $\mu y[\check{c}r]$ suspended? It is to teach that when a man is $\check{c}r$, poor, in this world, he will also be $\check{c}r$ in the world to come; or, literally, poor below, he will also be poor above."

Of the suspended *Ayin* in $r[\check{y}m]$, ^{<18014>}Psalms 80:14, we read, *Kiddushin*, fol. 30, col. 2, that this letter is the mid-die letter in the Psalms.

18. Matscular and Minuscular Letters. Of words written with large and small letters in our Hebrew Bible we find nothing in the Talmud, but some of these instances are mentioned in the *Sopherim*, ch. 9. That his mode of writing must have been very ancient cannot be doubted, for there is a dispute in the Talmud, *Megillah*, fol. 16, col. 2, whether the w in $atzyw$ (^{<1730>}Esther 9:9) should be written as a majuscular or minuscular letter; and the word $j\ l\ g\ thw$ (^{<18333>}Leviticus 13:33), which is now written with a majuscular, is mentioned in *Kiddushin*, fol. 30, col. 2, as being the middle of the verses of the Pentateuch.

19. Mode of Quotations. *SEE QUOTATIONS OF THE OLD TESTAMENT IN THE TALMUD.* (B. P.)

Talmudists

Under this head we include all those rabbins whose opinions are regarded as authoritative in the Talmud. The period of these men comprises the time from about B.C. 180 to A.D. 500, i.e. from Simon the Just to the completion of the Talmud. This period is again subdivided into that of the Tanaim and that of the Amoraim — the former representing the time from about B.C. 180 to A.D. 219, the latter from A.D. 219 to A.D. 500.

I. Tanaim. — The first recognized, after Simon's death, as the head of the Sanhedrim was Antigonus of Soho, about B.C. 180. His contemporary was Eliezer ben-Charsum, celebrated for his opulence, learning, and zeal in the promotion of religious knowledge. After Antigonus, always two (or *zugoth*) stand at the head of the community—the first being the president, the second the vice-president. As the first of these *zugôth*, or pairs, are mentioned Jose ben-Joezer and Joseph ben-Jochanan, about B.C. 70. They were followed by Joshua ben-Perachja and Nithai of Arbela (q.v.). Their successors were Jehuda ben-Tabal and Simon ben-Shetach (q.,v.). The fourth pair is represented in Shemaja and Abtalion, about B.C. 47. The fifth and last pair are Hillel (q.v.) and Shammai (q.v.). Under their presidency lived Baba ben-Buta, Chanina ben-Dose, Jochanan ben-Zachai (q.v.), and Nechunjah ben-haKana (q.v.). Hillel was followed by his son Simon (benHillel) (q.v.). His successor was Gamaliel I (q.v.), who was followed by his son Simon (ben-Gamaliel) (q.v.). With Simon closes the period of the so-called *earlier* Tanaim. The *later* Tanaim first figure in history when the Temple was in ashes and Jerusalem a heap of ruins. At this period, verging upon decay, when Judaism was without any center and support, appeared Jochanan ben-Zachai, the last among Hillel's eighty disciples. Jochanan established a school at Jamniah, or Jabneh, whose president he became. His successor was Gamaliel bar-Simon (q.v.), and his fellow-laborers were Akiba ben-Joseph (q.v.), Eliezer ben-Asarja, Eliezer ben-Arak, Eliezer ben-Hyrkanos (q.v.), Ismael ben-Elisa (q.v.), Joshua ben-Hananja (q.v.), Nechunjah ben-ha-Kana (q.v.), and Tarphon (q.v.). Gamaliel was succeeded by his son Simon (ben-Gamaliel II) (q.v.), who transferred the Rabbinical apparatus to Tiberias. To his college belonged Nathan ha-Babli (q.v.), Jose ben-Halephta, Jehudah ben-Ilai, rabbi Meir (q.v.), and Simon ben-Jochai (q.v.). Simon ben-Gamaliel was succeeded by his son Judah the Holy (q.v.).

II. Amoraim. — With the life and labors of rabbi Judah ended the succession of the Tanaim, who were now followed by a new order, the Amoraim (אמוראים), i.e. the expositors of the law, at length no longer oral, but reduced to a written text. Some of the most distinguished of their number were rabbi Chija, Chanina bar-Chana, Abba Areka, or Rab (q.v.), Bar-Kappara, Jochanan bar-Napacha (q.v.), and Simon ben-Lakish (q.v.). Of the scholastic labors of these men we have the monumental result in the Palestine Gemara, commonly called *Talmud Jerushalmi* (תלמוד ירושלמי).

After the death of Judah, not only learning, but also the patriarchal dignity was more and more in the decline; for with Judah's death the star of Judaea's learning had set, never to rise again in Palestine. Rabban Gamaliel III, Judah's son, and Judah II, son of Gamaliel III, his successor, were weak in character, mediocre in learning, and deficient in theological acumen. The latter transferred his residence to Tiberias, and Galilee, once so despised, now became "the Holy Land," and Tiberias its Jerusalem. Of Gamaliel IV, the successor of Judah II, and Judah III, son and successor of Gamaliel IV, history has nothing to record, except that they close the line of Palestinian teachers. Meanwhile numerous migrations of rabbins to Babylon had taken place, especially in the reign of Constantius, who persecuted the Jews. We leave Palestine and turn to Babylon, where the schools at Sora. (q.v.), Pumbaditha (q.v.), Nahardea, and Machusa were in a flourishing condition.

At Babylon the greater and more noble part of the Jewish families settled at the Captivity, to return no more to their ancestral soil, and there the literary culture of the people took a development which exerted no small influence on the studies of after-generations. There the Jews lived under their *resh gelutha*, or prince of the exiles, whose office was of an ecclesiastical and secular kind. So long as the Temple was standing the Babylonian Jews acknowledged the presidency of the high-priest, and paid the didrachm contribution to the Temple, which, however, they did not after the destruction of that edifice. Finally, the Babylonians succeeded in establishing their own independence, in civil and ecclesiastical matters, of the Western patriarchate, and established schools of learning all over the country without material aid from those of the fatherland, though the schools took the same undeveloped form as those of the Holy Land. The names given to these schools were Aramaean forms for the Hebrew ones

of the Palestinian schools. The “house of learning” was called *Beth Ulphana* (**anpl wa tyb**); *Beth Midrash* (**tyb çrdm**), “the house of doctrine;” *Beth ha Vaad* (**d[wwh**; Heb. **tsnkh tyb**), “the house of assemblage;” *Beth Metibtha* (**atbytm tyb**; Heb. **hbyçy**), “the house of sitting;” *Beth Rabbanan* (**ˆnbr tyb**), “the house of the masters;” *Beth Sidra* (**ards tyb**), “the house of order.” The principal or rector of the school was entitled *Rab Beth Ulphana* (**anpl wa tyb br**), *Resh Metibtha* (**atbytm çyr**), *Resh Sidra* (**çyr ards**), etc.. So, too, the academical degree of *Mar* (**rm**) was equivalent to the Palestinian title of *rabbi*. (**ybr**), and was conferred after the same course of study by the *semikah*, (**hkyms**), or “imposition of hands.”

III. Schools. — The earliest school of which we have any specific information is that which was situated at

1. Nahardea. — With this school we first become acquainted towards the close of the 2d century. Nahardea was situated on the Euphrates, and for a time she was the Babylonian Jerusalem. While the Temple was yet in existence; this place had the treasury of the Babylonian congregations for the Temple-offerings which were brought to Jerusalem (Josephus, Ant. 18:12). The first rector at Nahardea was R. Shila, who was succeeded by Mar-Samuel, the astronomer (also called Ariob and Jarchinai), in A.D. 190-247. His disciples were Nachman ben-Jacob, Sheshet, Rabba ben-Abbuha, and Joseph ben-Chama. When Nahardea was sacked in 259 and the academy broken up, they migrated to

2. Machusa, a town on the Tigris, about four hours from Cesiphon, where a new academy was founded. Rabba ben-Abbuha promoted this school of learning by his lectures, and Machusa attained some celebrity. Ten years (A.D. 363) after Rabba’s death, the city was demolished by the Romans in the war under Julian. The most famous schools, however, were those at

3. Pumbaditha’ and Sora, where the Amoraim attained great renown. The teachers of these schools having already been mentioned in the arts, **SEE PUIBADITHA** and **SEE SORA**, we need only to refer to them. Of the names mentioned, we have only given the most prominent, which, in part, are already given under the respective letter, or will be treated, so far as omitted, in the supplement, volume.

IV. Literature. — Luzzatto, *μyarmaw μyant rds* (Prague, 1839); *Liber Juchasin*, ed. Filipowski (Lond. 1857); Frankel, *Hodegetica in Mischnam* (Lips. 1859[Heb.]); Weiss, *Zur Geschichte derjdischen Tradition*(Vienna, 1872-77, 2 vols. [Heb.]); Chiarini, *Le Talmudc de Babylone* (Leips. 1831), 1, 105 sq.; Bacher, *Die Agada der babylonischen Amoraer* (Strasburg, 1878). The Talmudists whose names are mentioned in the treatise *Baba Metsia* are given by Sammter in the appendix to his German translation of *Baba Metsia* (Berlin, 1879), p. 160 sq. **SEE SCRIBE.** (B. P.)

Talochon, Marie Vincent

better known by his clerical name, *Pere Elysee*, was a French surgeon, born in January, 1753, at Thorigny, and reared among the Brothers of Charity, at Paris, whose order he entered Jan. 30, 1774. He was engaged in various public and benevolent enterprises, and died in Paris Nov. 27, 1817. See Hoefler, *Nouv. Biog. Généralé*, s.v.

Tal'sas

(*Σαλθαας* v.r. *Σαλόαας*, Vulg. *Thalsas*), as corrupt Graecism (1 Esdr. 9:22) for the name ELASA **SEE ELASA** (q.v.) of the Hebrew list (^{<15012>}Ezra 10:22).

Tam, Jacob ben-Meir

better known in Jewish literature under the name of *Rabenu Tam*, was born at Remers, France, about 1100, and died in 1171. He was; a grandson of Rashi (q.v.), and youngest brother of Rashbam. (q.v.), and was famous not only as a Talmudist, grammarian, and commentator, but also for his piety, for which he obtained the appellation *Tam* (μT), in allusion to ^{<01257>}Genesis 25:27, where his namesake Jacob is denominated *Tam*=pious (μT; *vyaæ bqḫy*). Under the title of *rçyh rps*, “the book of the righteous,” he wrote additions on thirty treatises of the Talmud, published at Vienna in 1811. Supplements are given by Luzzatto from an old MS. in the *Kerem Chemed* (Prague, 1843), 7:19 sq.; *twbwçtw twl aç rçç* [, i.e. ten Talmudic decisions, also given by Luzzatto (*loc. cit.*); *ym[fh yfçm I [trbj m*, is i.e. a poem on the Hebrew accents, consisting of forty-five stanzas, five of which were first published by Luzzatto (*loc. cit.*), and the

whole forty-five of which appeared in the following work: **tw[rkhhs**, or grammatical and lexical animadversions, designed to reconcile the differences of Dunash ibn-Labral and Menachen ben-Saruk on points of grammar and exegesis (first published by Filipowski, Lond. 1855); **hrwt rps ^yqt**, or **t s twkl h**, or **y r p w s ^wqt**, a guide for transcribing MSS. of the Bible, in MS. extant; **!nt yçw r p**, or a grammatical commentary on the Bible, which has not yet come to light, but is quoted by commentators, lexicographers, and grammarians. R. Tam also enriched the Jewish ritual with some pieces, as the **µgtp byxy** (i.e. “these words are true,” etc.), in the *Machser Ashkenazimn* and sused after the *haptarah* for the second day of Pentecost. See Fürst, *Bibl. Jud.* 3, 406 sq.; De Rossi, *Dizionario Storico* (Germ. transl.), p. 306; Kitto, *Cyclop.* s.v.; Gratz, *Gesch. d. Juden*, 6:196 sq.; Braunschweiger, *Gesch. d. Juden in den romanischen Staaten* (Würzburg, 1865), p. 85; Geiger, *Parshandatha* (Leips. 1855), Vp. 24 sq.; Kalish, *Hebrew Grammar* (Lond. 1863), 2, 27; Zunz, *Synagogale Poesie* (Berlin, 1855), p. 248; id. *Literaturgeschichte zur synagogalen Poesie* (ibid. 1865), p. 265-267; id. *Zur Literatur und Geschichte*, p. 32, 109; Rapaport, in *Kerem Chemed* (Prague, 1843), 7:1-3; Luzzatto, *ibid.* p. 19-34, 35-53; Landshuth [L.], *Amude Blaabodah* (**hdwb [h ydwm []**) (Berlin, 1857), 1, 106 sq. (B. P.)

Tama

(*Kethib* in ^{<1008>}1 Kings 9:8). *SEE TADMOR.*

Ta'mah

(Heb. **j mīlʿeTe'mach**; in pause, **j mīl**; *Ta'mach*, laughter [Gesén.], or combat [Fürst]; Sept. **Θημά, Θεμά**; Vulg. *Thema*), the name of a man whose descendants (or rather a place whose inhabitants) returned among the Nethinim from the captivity with Zerubbabel (Ezra 2, 53, “Thamah” ^{<4175>}Nehemiah 7:55).

Ta'mar

(Heb. **r m ṭ**; *Tamar'*, a palm-tree, as often; Sept. **Θαμάρ** [v.r. **Θημάρ**], but **Θαιμάρν** in Ezekiel; Josephus, **Θαμάρρα**, *Ant.* 7:3, 3; 8, 1; 10, 3; Vulg. *Thamar*), the name of one place and of three remarkable women in Old-Test. history. *SEE PALM.*

1. A spot on the southeastern frontier of Judah, named in ^{<3679>}Ezekiel 47:19; 48:28 only, evidently called from a palm-tree. We naturally think of *Hazon-tamar*, the old name of *Engedi*; but this is not quite appropriate for location. Eusebius and Jerome mention a *Thamara*, a place lying between Hebron and Ailah (*Onomast.* s.v. “Hazon-tamar”); and Ptolemy (5, 16, 8) mentions a **Θαμαρό**, as do also the Peutinger Tables (Reland, *Palaest.* p. 462). Robinson identifies it with *Kurnub*, a place containing the ruins of an old fortress about an ordinary day’s journey from el-Milh towards the pass es-Sufah (*Bibl. Res.* 2, 198, 201). This, however, depends’ on a conjectural emendation of the *Onomasticon*, where, in the clause **κώμη διεστῶσα Μάψις**, (v.r. **μόλις, Μάλις**), **ἡμέρας ὁδόν**, Robinson would read **Μαλάθης** for **Μάψις**, whereby he makes Thamara a day’s journey from Malatha, which he identifies with el-Milh. Besides, as Van de Velde observes, the distance of Kurnub from el-Milh is not a day’s journey, but only four hours; nor is Kurnub to the south-west of the Dead Sea, where the Peutinger Tables place Thamara; nor are the ruins ancient (Van de Velde, *Syria*, 2, 130). Fürst (*Heb. Lex.* s.v.) regards it as identical with the *Tamar* of the *Kethib*, or text, in ^{<1008>}1 Kings 9:8; but that is generally thought to mean Tadmor (q. 6). Schwarz (*Palest.* p. 21, note) thinks that *Zoar* is meant, on the strength of certain Talmudical notices. De Saulcy (*Narr.* 1, 7) endeavors to establish a connection between Tamar and the *Kalaat Um-Baghik*, at the mouth of the ravine of that name on the south-west side of the Dead Sea, on the ground (among others) that the names are similar. But this, to say the least, is more than doubtful. It is rather to be sought at the extreme south end of the Dead Sea, where the line as run by Ezekiel evidently begins (see Keil, *ad loc.*); perhaps at some clump of palms anciently existing at *Ain el-’Arus*, near the mouth of Wady Fikreh.

2. The wife successively of Er and Onan, the two sons of Judah (^{<0386>}Genesis 38:6-30). Her importance in the sacred narrative depends on the great anxiety to keep up the lineage of Judah. It seemed as if the family were on the point of extinction. Er and Onan (q.v. respectively) had each in turn perished suddenly. Judah’s wife, Bathshuah, died; and there only remained a child, Shelah, whom Judah was unwilling to trust to the dangerous union, as it appeared, with Tamar, lest he should meet with the same fate as his brothers. That he should, however, marry her seems to have been regarded as part of the fixed law of the tribe, whence its incorporation into the Mosaic law in after-times (^{<825>}Deuteronomy 25:5;

Ⓜ224 Matthew 22:24); and, as such, Tamar was determined not to let the opportunity escape through Judah's parental anxiety. Accordingly, she resorted to the desperate expedient of entrapping the father himself into the union which he feared for his son. He, on the first emergence from his mourning for his wife, went to one of the festivals often mentioned in Jewish history as attendant on sheep-shearing. He wore on his finger the ring of his chieftainship; he carried his staff in his hand; he wore a collar or necklace round his neck. He was encountered by a veiled woman on the road leading to Timnath, the future birthplace of Samson, among the hills of Daniel. He took her for one of the unfortunate women who were consecrated to the impure rites of the Canaanitish worship. *SEE HAPELOT*. He promised her, as the price of his intercourse, a kid from the flocks to which he was going, and left as his pledge his ornaments and his staff. The kid he sent back by his shepherd (Sept.), Hirah of Adullam. The woman could nowhere be found. Months afterwards it was discovered to be his own daughter-in-law, Tamar, who had thus concealed herself under the veil or mantle, which she cast off on her return home, where she resumed the seclusion and dress of a widow. She was sentenced to be burned alive, and was only saved by the discovery, through the pledges which Judah had left, that her seducer was no less than the chieftain of the tribe. He had the magnanimity to recognize that she had been driven into this crime by his own neglect of his promise to give her in marriage to his youngest son. "She hath been more righteous than I... and he knew her again no more" (Ⓜ386 Genesis 38:26). The fruit of this intercourse was twins, Pharez and Zarah, and through Pharez the sacred line was continued. B.C. 1885. Hence the prominence given to Tamar in the nuptial benediction of the tribe of Judah (Ⓜ842 Ruth 4:12) and in the genealogy of our Lord (Ⓜ103 Matthew 1:3). *SEE JUDAH*.

3. Daughter of David and Maachah the Geshurite princess, and thus sister of Absalom (Ⓜ103 2 Samuel 13:1-32; 1 Chronicles 3, 9; Josephus, *Ant.* 7:8, 1). She and her brother were alike remarkable for their extraordinary beauty. Her name ("palm-tree") may have been given her on this account (comp. Ⓜ207 Song of Solomon 7:7). This fatal beauty inspired a frantic passion in her half-brother Amnon, the eldest son of David by Ahinoam. He wasted away, from the feeling that it was impossible to gratify his desire, "for she was a virgin"-the narrative leaves it uncertain whether from a scruple on his part, or from the seclusion in which, in her unmarried state, she was kept. Morning by morning, as he received the visits of his friend

Jonadab, he is paler and thinner (Josephus, *Ant.* 7:8, 1). Jonadab discovers the cause, and suggests to him the means of accomplishing his wicked purpose. He was to feign sickness. The king, who appears to have entertained a considerable affection, almost awe, for him as the eldest son (~~1~~2 Samuel 13:5, 21; Sept.), came to visit him; and Amnon entreated the presence of Tamar on the pretext that she alone could give him the food that he would eat. What follows is curious, as showing the simplicity of the royal life. It would almost seem that Tamar was supposed to have a peculiar art of baking palatable cakes. She came to his house (for each prince appears to have had a separate establishment), took the dough and kneaded it, and then in his presence (for this was to be a part of his fancy, as if there were something exquisite in the manner of her performing the work) kneaded it a second time into the form of cakes. The name given to these cakes (*lebibih*), "heart-cakes," has been variously explained: "hollow cakes," "cakes with some stimulating spices" (like our word *cordial*), cakes in the shape of a heart (like the Moravian *gerührte Herzen*, Thenius, *ad loc.*), cakes "the delight of the heart." Whatever it be, it implies something special and peculiar. She then took the pan in which they had been baked and poured them all out in a heap before the prince. This operation seems to have gone on in an outer room, on which Amnon's bedchamber opened. He caused his attendants to retire, called her to the inner room, and there accomplished his design. In her touching remonstrance two points are remarkable. First, the expression of the infamy of such a crime "*in Israel*," implying the loftier standard of morals that prevailed as compared with other countries at that time; and, secondly, the belief that even this standard might be overborne lawfully by royal authority, "Speak to the king, for he will not withhold me from thee." This expression has led to much needless explanation from its contradiction to ~~1~~Leviticus 18:9; 20:17; ~~16~~Deuteronomy 27:22; as, e.g., that her mother, Maachah, not being a Jewess, there was no proper legal relationship, between her and Amnon; or that she was ignorant of the law; or that the Mosaic laws were not then in existence (Thenius, *ad loc.*). It is enough to suppose, what evidently her whole speech implies, that the king had a dispensing power which was conceived to cover even extreme cases. The brutal hatred of Amnon succeeding to his brutal passion, and the indignation of Tamar at his barbarous insult, even surpassing her indignation at his shameful outrage, are pathetically and graphically told, and in the narrative another glimpse is given us of the manners of the royal household. The unmarried princesses, it seems, were distinguished by robes

or gowns with sleeves (so the Sept. Josephus, etc., take the word translated in the A. V. “diverse colors”). Such was the dress worn by Tamar on the present occasion, and when the guard at Amnon’s door had thrust her out and closed the door after her to prevent her return, she, in her agony, snatched handfuls of ashes from the ground and threw them on her hair, then tore off her royal sleeves, and clasped her bare hands upon her head, and rushed to and fro through the streets screaming aloud. In this state she encountered her brother Absalom, who took her to his house, where she remained as if in a state of widowhood. The king was afraid or unwilling to interfere with the heir to the throne, but she was avenged by Absalom; as Dinah had been by Simeon and Levi, and out of that vengeance grew the series of calamities which darkened the close of David’s reign (see Stanley, *Jewish Church*, 2, 128). B.C. 1033. **SEE DAVID.**

4. Daughter of Absalom, called, probably, after her beautiful aunt, and inheriting the beauty of both aunt and father (^{<1047>}2 Samuel 14:7). She was the sole survivor of the house of Absalom; and ultimately, by her marriage with Uriah of Gibeah, became the mother of Maachah, the future queen of Judah, or wife of Abijah (^{<1182>}1 Kings 15:2), Maachah being called after her great grandmother, as Tamar after her aunt. B.C. 1023. **SEE ABSALOM.**

Tambourine

SEE TIMBREL.

Tamburini

a name common to several Roman ecclesiastics, of whom we mention the following:

- 1.** MICHAEL ANGELUS, of Modena, was made general of the Jesuits Jan. 31, 1706, and died Feb. 28, 1730.
- 2.** PIETRO, born in 1737 at Brescia, received his theological and philosophical training at the seminary of his native place, where he afterwards acted as the head of the lyceum founded by him. He was also head of the *Collegium Germanicum* at Rome, and was promoted by Maria Theresa to a professorship of theology, and in 1779 to the chair of natural law and moral philosophy at Pavia. He resigned his professorship in 1795, but was compelled by the French authorities in Lombardy to fill the chair of ethics and international law in 1797. For three years, 1798-1801, this chair

was suppressed, but, being restored in the latter year, was filled by Tamburini till 1818, when he was appointed dean of the faculty of law. He died at Pavia, March 14, 1827. He was made a chevalier of the Iron Crown by the emperor of Austria, and received other distinctions. . He wrote, *Idea delta Santa Sede* (Pavia, 1784): *Introduzione allo Studio della Filosofia* (Milan, 1797): *Lezioni di Filosofia Morale*, etc. (Pavia, 1806-12, 4 vols.): — *Elementa Juris Naturae* (Milan, 1815): — *Cenni sulla Perafettibilita del' Umana Famiglia* (ibid. 1823): *Praelectiones de Ecclesia Christi et Universa Jurisprudencia Ecclesiastica, quae habuit in Academia Ficbnensi* (Lipsie, 1845, 4 pts.): — *Praelectione; 'de Justitia Christ. et de Sacramentis, de Ultimo Hominis Fine deque Virtutibus Theol. et Cardinalibus* (Ficino, 1783-85, 3 vols.): *Analisi delle Apologie di S. Justino Mart., con alcune Rifessioni* (Pavia, 1792): — *Ragionamenti sul l'Libro di Orig. contra Cello* (ibid. 1786): — on Tertullian, *Analisi del Libro delle Prescrizioni, con alcune Osservazioni* (ibid. 1782).

3. TOMMRASO, a Jesuit, was born in 1591 at Caltanissetta, in Sicily, was professor of theology, afterwards censor and counselor of the Holy Office, and died at Palermo in 1675. His moral and theological writings were published at Lyons in 1659, and Venice in 1755.

See *Theologisches Universal Lexikon*, s.v.; Wetzler u. Welte, *Kirch. — Lexikon*, 12:1818; Zuchold, *Bibl. Theol.* 2, 1305; Winer, *Handbuch der theol. Literatur*, 1, 316, 897, 900, 913; 2, 797. (B. P.)

Tamid

SEE TALMUD.

Tamil Version

Tamil, or Tamul, the language of the ancient kingdom of Dravira, is spoken in the extensive country now called the Carnatic, and is the vernacular language from the town of Pulicat in the north to Cape Comorin in the south, and from the shores of the Indian Ocean on the east to the Ghauts on the west. It also obtains along the whole northern coast of Ceylon, including the populous district of Jaffna, where it is spoken by a race of people sometimes called the Malabars. Tamil is likewise, the vernacular language of the Moormen of Ceylon.

A Tamil version of the New Test. was executed by Ziegenbalg, the first Protestant missionary to India, with the help of other missionaries

associated with him, at Tranquebar. He commenced the translation in 1708, and completed it in 1711. The printing of this version was delayed in order that it might receive the benefit of a thorough revisal; and this important task was committed to John Ernest Grundler, a German missionary, who had arrived in India soon after the commencement of the translation. Under his care the work was printed, bearing the title *Novum Testamentum D. N. Jesu Christi, ex Originali Texte in Linguam Damulicam o Versum, in Usum Gentis Malabaricae, opera et studio Bartholomrei Ziegenbalg et Joan. Ernesti Grundleri Serenissimi DaniseRegis Friderici IV ad Indos Orientales Missionariorum* (Tranquebarae, 1714). In 1717 Ziegenbalg commenced the translation of the Old Test., and in 1719, having carried it as far as the book of Ruth, he died, at the age of thirty-six. After his decease, and that of his fellow-laborer Grundler, which occurred during the following year, the revision of his manuscripts and the prosecution of the version of the Old Test. revolved on Benjamin Schultze, a missionary who had arrived from Halle a short time previously under the patronage of the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge. Schultze published the portion of the Old Test. translated by Ziegenbalg in 1723, and completed the version in 1727, which was published in three parts, viz. *Biblia Damulica, seu quod Deus Omnipotentissimus semet ipsum ex sua .Eternitate clarius Manifestaturus de Ccelo est Locutus, Veteris Testamenti Pars Prima, in qua Mosis Libri quinque, Josuce Liber unus, atque Liber vnus Judicum*, studio et opera Bartholornei Zegenbalgii Missionarii ad Indos Orientales in linguamr Damulicam versi continentur (Tranquebariae in littore Coromandelino, typis et sumptibus Missionis Danicne, 1723). *Biblia Damulica, seu quod Deus Sapientissim'us in sua'Divina (Economia cumn Populo Israelitico et Egit t et Locutus est. Veteris Testanenti Pars Secunda, in qua Libellus Ruth, Samnzelis Liber Prior et Posterior, Liber Nehemiae, Liber Esther, Liber Jobi, Liber Psalmorum Davidis, Liber Proverbium, Liber Ecclesiastae, et Liber Cantici Canticorum*, studio et opera, etc. (ibid. 1726). *Biblia Damulica, seu quod Deus Omniscius de gratia in Jesu Christo tempore Novi Testamenti Revelanda per Sanctos suos Prophetas est Vaticinatus. Veteris Testamenti Pars Tertiac, in qua Prophetas Majores, Esaias, Jeremias, ejusdemque Lamentationes, Ezechiel, Daniel; Prophetas Minores, Hoseas, Joel, Amos, Obadia, Jona, Micha, Nahum, fabacuc, Zephania, Haggai, Zacharias, et Malachias*, studio et opera, etc. (ibid. 1727). To these parts were added, in the year 1728, the Apocryphal books, or *Libri Apocryphi, seu Libri a quibusdam Piis Viris Ecclesice A*

ntiquae Judaicae post Prophetas Veteris Testamenti Scripti, continentes partim Varias Regulas Vitae Utiles, partim Supplementum Historic Ecclesiasticae Veteris Testamenti, scilicet Liber Sapientiae, Ecclesiasticus sive Sirach, Liber Esdras, Liber Tobiae, Liber Judith, A djectiones ad Librum Esther, Liber Ruth, Epistola Jeremiae, A djectiones ad Daniele seu Trium Virorum Hymnologia, Historia Sosannae, item Belis et Draconis, Maccabaeorum Liber Primus, Secundus, et Tertius, denique Oratio Manassis, studio et opera, etc. (ibid. 1728). Schultze likewise addressed himself to a diligent revision of the New Test., a second edition of which he put to press in 1722, and completed in 1724, at Tranquebar. It has the same title as the first, with the addition. *Editio secunda correctior et accessione sumptuariae cuiusvis capituli auctior*. In 1758 a third edition of the New Test. was printed at the same place; it had previously been subjected to another revision, in which several missionaries took a part. The second Tranquebar edition was reprinted at Colombo in 1741-43, after having undergone some alterations adapting it to the Tamil spoken in Ceylon. This edition was designed for the native Tamilian Christians in that island, and was published under the auspices of L. B. von Imhoff, the governor.

In 1777 an important version of the New Test. was published by the Rev. J. P. Fabricius, one of Schultze's successors in the Danish mission at Madras. This version is far more elegant and classical in diction than that of the Tranquebar translators. Fabricius likewise undertook the revision of Schultze's version of the Old Test., preparatory to a second edition; but the work, as revised by him, has every claim to be considered a new and independent version. He sent the translation, sheet by sheet, for examination and correction to the missionaries at Cuddalore; from them it passed to the Danish missionaries, and from these to the native translator *to*, the Danish government. The notes and corrections thus obtained were carefully collated by Fabricius, and the whole translation was again subjected by him to a searching revision. It was printed at the mission press at Tranquebar between the years 1777 and 1782 under the special care of two missionaries, one of whom was Dr. Rottler. Fabricius was esteemed an "unparalleled Tamil scholar," and his translation long held the rank of the standard Tamil version of the Scriptures in the missions of the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Tanjore and Madras, and partly in those in Tinnevely, and also in the missions of the Leipsic Lutheran Missionary Society.

The editions of the two versions of the New Test. above mentioned, printed by the Danish missionaries prior to the commencement of the present century, amount in all to fourteen, besides two versions of the Old Test. But the number of copies issued being very far from adequate to the wants of the native Christians, the deplorable scarcity of the Scriptures in the Tanil country was first pressed upon the notice of the British and Foreign Bible Society in a letter from the Rev. Dr. Buchanan, dated Madura, 1806; and in 1813 an edition consisting of 5000 copies was completed by the Serampore missionaries, the text being that of Fabricius.

As a great demand for the Scriptures still continued throughout the Tamil country, even after the circulation of this large edition, it seemed necessary to take immediate measures for issuing further supplies. The want of copies of the Scriptures appeared to be particularly felt at Ceylon, where the number of native Christians speaking the Tamil language was estimated at 45,000. Besides the edition of the New Test. published at Colombo in 1743, as above mentioned, a version of the Pentateuch, translated by Mr. De Milho, had also been printed in Ceylon, under the patronage of the Dutch government, in 1790. These editions, however, had been long exhausted, and the people in general were almost destitute of the Scriptures. It was therefore deemed advisable not only to issue another edition, but also to obtain such a revision of the existing version as might render it intelligible to the Tamil population of Ceylon and of the adjacent continent. This important version was committed to the Rev. C. T. E. Rhenius, of the Church Mission, subject to the superintendence of the Rev. Dr. Rottler (who had formerly assisted in carrying the version of Fabricius through the press) and to the inspection of the missionaries at Trichinopoly, Tanjore, and Tranquebar. To secure the greater accuracy of the work, a committee of translation was appointed at Madras in 1821. In 1829 Rhenius's version seemed to have been completed, and from the time of its appearance it has been used in the missions of the Church Missionary Society, and in those of the London Missionary Society, the Wesleyan Missionary Society, and the American Board of Missions.

But neither Fabricius's version nor Rhenius's being in universal use among Tamil Christians, neither version had acquired among them that prescriptive reverence and authority which are conceded to the authorized English version (except by Roman Catholics) wherever the English language is spoken. Fabricius's version, though admitted by all to be very faithful to the original, was regarded by Tamil scholars in general as too

frequently unidiomatical and obscure; while Rhenius's version, though generally written in clear, idiomatic Tamil, was regarded by some of those by whom it was used, and by all who were accustomed to Fabricius, as too paraphrastic, as departing too frequently, without sufficient warrant, from the renderings adopted in the principal European versions, and as needlessly differing from Fabricius's forms of expression, even when they happened to be perfectly correct.

For the sake of having a version which should be generally acceptable to Tamil Christians and Tamil scholars, the Rev. P. Percival, assisted by missionaries in Jaffna, Ceylon, undertook in 1849 a new version, known as the "Tentative Version," which has proved to be a very valuable contribution to the work of Tamil Biblical revision.

The Romanists, who had managed to evade the necessity of publishing any portion of the Holy Scriptures in Tamil during the 300 years in which they had been laboring in the Tamil country, were induced in 1857 to publish at Pondicherry a translation of their own of the Gospels and the Acts of the Apostles. This translation has been made from the Latin Vulgate, not from the original Greek, and, where it is a good translation, may be regarded as a reproduction of Fabricius, with a still more excessive zeal for literality. Where it differs from Fabricius, though occasionally it succeeds in giving a happy turn to the expression, it more often presents so curious a mixture of high and low Tamil, and the general character of the composition is so rugged and uncouth, that even the heads of the Roman community themselves need have very little fear that this long delayed, reluctantly published translation of a portion of the Scriptures should be too generally read by their people.

Taking all these circumstances into account, and considering the evils arising from the existence and use among Tamil Christians of a variety of versions of the Tamil New Test., it was felt that another effort was in the highest degree desirable to secure to the Tamil people a version which should be worthy of being accepted by all religious communities in the Tamil country, however they might differ in various other particulars. Accordingly delegates were selected from the various missionary bodies in the Tamil-speaking district. The first meeting was held at Palamcotta. It commenced on April 29, 1861 and closed on June 18, during which period the delegates worked nine hours a day. In 1863 the revision of the Tamil

New Test., under the editorial supervision of the Rev. H. Bower, was completed.

In the report for 1865 we read, “The attention of the Madras Auxiliary is now directed to a version of the Tamil Old Test., on the same principles as have led to, the successful completion of the New Test. under the editorial superintendence of the Rev. H. Bower.” The completion of this version was announced in 1869. In 1873 we read that Mr. Bower has been appointed to prepare the marginal references and alternative renderings for the Tamil Bible. Up to March 31, 1889, the British and Foreign Bible Society had disposed of 2,549,150 copies of the Tamil Bible, while of the Tamil with English 32,000 were distributed. See Masch, *Bibliotheca Sacra*, 2, 197 sq.; the *Bible of Every Land*; and the *Annual Reports* of the British and Foreign Bible Society. (B. P.)

Tam'muz

(Heb. with the article *hat-Tammuz'*, זממזח, *the Tammuz*, as if originally an appellative; Sept. ὁ Τάμμουζ), a name of great obscurity, which occurs but once in the Scriptures: In the sixth year of the captivity of Jehoiachin, in the sixth month and on the fifth day of the month, the prophet Ezekiel, as he sat in his house surrounded by the elders of Judah, was transported in spirit to the far-distant Temple at Jerusalem. The hand of the Lord God was upon him, and led him “to the door of the gate of the house of Jehovah, which was towards the north; and behold there the women sitting, weeping for the Tammuz” (זממזח Ezekiel 8:14). Some translate the last clause (זממזח אַתָּא, תַּוֹכְבִּי) “causing the Tammuz to weep,” and the influence which this rendering has upon the interpretation will be seen hereafter.

1. Etymological Signification of the Word. — If זממזח be a regularly formed Hebrew word, it must be derived either from a root זמח; or זמח; (comp. the forms זמח, זמח), which is not known to exist. To remedy this defect, Furst (*Handwb.* s.v.) invents a root, to which he gives the signification “to be strong, mighty, victorious,” and; transitively, “to overpower, annihilate.” It is to be regretted that this lexicographer cannot be contented to confess his ignorance of what is unknown. Rodiger (in Gesenius, *Thesaur.* s.v.) suggests the derivation from the root זמח; = זמח; according to which זממזח is a contraction of זמחזח; and signifies a melting away, dissolution, departure, and so the ἀφανισμὸς Ἀδώνιδος, or

disappearance of Adonis, which was mourned by the Phoenician women, and, after them, by the Greeks. But the etymology is unsound, and is evidently contrived so as to connect the name Tammuz with the general tradition regarding it. Mühlau (new ed. of Gesenius's *Lex.*) refers to Delitzsch's elucidation (*Stud. z. semit. Religionsgesch.* 1, 35, 300 sq.) from the Babylonico-Assyrian form *Duzu* (for *Dumuzi*), signifying "sprouting of life."

2. Old Interpretations. — The ancient versions supply us with no help. The Sept., the Targum of Jonathan ben-Uzziel, the Peshito-Syriac, and the Arabic in Walton's Polyglot merely reproduce the Hebrew word. In the Targum of Jonathan on ^{<0005>}Genesis 8:5, "the tenth month" is translated "the month Tammuz." According to Castell (*Lex. Sept.*), *tamuz* is used in Arabic to denote "the heat of summer;" and *Tammi* is the name given to the Pharaoh who cruelly treated the Israelites. The Vulg. alone gives *Adonis* as a modern equivalent, and this rendering has been eagerly adopted by subsequent commentators with but few exceptions. It is at least as old, therefore, as Jerome, and the fact of his having adopted it shows that it must have embodied the most credible tradition. In his note upon the passage he adds that since, according to the Gentile fable, Adonis had been slain in the month of June, the Syrians give the name of Tammuz to this month, when they celebrate to him an anniversary solemnity, in which he is lamented by the women as dead, and, afterwards coming to life again, is celebrated with songs and praises. In another passage. (*ad Paulinum*, in *Opp.* 1, 102, ed. Basil. 1565)' he laments that Bethlehem was overshadowed by a grove of Tammuz, that is, of Adonis, and that "in the cave where the infant Christ once cried, the lover of Venus was bewailed." Cyril of Alexandria (*in Oseam*, in *Opp.* 3, 79, ed. Paris, 1638) and Theodoret (*in Ezech.*) give the same explanation, and are followed by the author of the *Chronicon Paschale*. The only exception to this uniformity is in the Syriac translation of Melito's Apology, edited by Dr. Cureton in his *Spicilegiunz Syriacum*. The date of the translation is unknown; the original, if genuine, must belong to the 2d century. The following is a literal rendering of the Syriac: "The sons of Phoenicia worshipped Balthi, the queen of Cyprus. For she loved Tamuzo, the son of Cuthar, the king of the Phoenicians, and forsook her kingdom and came and dwelt in Gebal, a fortress of the Phoenicians. And at that time she made all the villages (not *Cyprians*, as Dr. Cureton translates) subject to Cuthar the king. For, before Tamuzo, she had loved Ares and committed adultery with him, and

Hephaestus, her husband, caught her and was jealous of her. And he (i.e. Ares) came and slew Tam'uzo on Lebanon while he made a hunting among the wild boars. And from that time Balthi remained in Gebal, and died in the city of Aphaca, where Tamuzo was buried" (p. 25 of the Syriac text). We have here very, clearly the Greek legend of Adonis reproduced with a single change of name. Whether this change is due to the translator, as is not improbable, or whether he found "Tammuz" in the original of Melito, it is impossible to say. Be this as it may, the tradition embodied in the passage quoted is probably as valuable as that in the same author which regards Serapis as the deification of Joseph. The Syriac lexicographer Bar-Bahlul (10th century) gives the legend as it had come down to his time. "Tomuzo was, as they say, a hunter, shepherd, and chaser of wild beasts; who, When Belathi loved him, took her away from her husband. And when her husband went forth to seek her, Tomuzo slew him. And, with regard to Tomuzo also, there met him in the desert a wild boar and slew him. And his father made for him a great lamentation and weeping in the month Tomuz and Belathi, his wife, she, too, made a lamentation and mourning over him. And this tradition was handed down among the heathen people during her lifetime and after her death, which same tradition the Jews received with the rest of the evil festivals of the people, and in that month Tomuz used to make for him a great feast. Tomuz also is the name of one of the months of the Syrians."

In the next century the legend assumes, for the first time, a different form in the hands of a Rabbinical commentator. Rabbi Solomon Isaaki (Rashi) has the following note on the passage in Ezekiel: "An image which the women made hot in the inside, and its eyes were of lead, and they melted by reason of the heat of the burning, and it seemed as if it wept; and they (the women) said, He asketh for offerings. Tammuz is a word signifying burning, as Hyne]hzē]yDæ [i (^{<ZB>}Daniel 3:19), and hryTēzæan]Tai (ver. 22)." "Instead of rendering "weeping for the Tammuz," he gives what appears to be the equivalent in French," *faisantes pleurer l'dchauffd.*" It is clear, therefore, that Rashi regards Tammuz as an appellative derived from the Chaldee root aza } azd, "to make hot." It is equally clear that his etymology cannot be defended for an instant. In the 12th century (1161) Solomon ben-Abraham Parchon, in his *Lexicon*, compiled at Salerno from the works of Jehuda Chayug and Abulwalid Merwan ben-Gannach, has the following observations upon Tammuz: "It is the likeness of a reptile which they make upon the water, and the water is collected in it and flows

through its holes, and it seems as if it wept. But the month called Tammuz is Persian, and so are all our months; none of them is from the sacred tongue. Though they are written in the Scripture, they are Persian; but in the sacred tongue the first month, the second month," etc. At the close of this century we meet for the first time with an entirely new tradition repeated by R. David Kimchi, both in his *Lexicon* and in his *Commentary*, from the *Moreh Nebuchim* of Maimonides: "In the month Tammuz they made a feast of an idol, and the women came to gladden him; and some say that by crafty means they caused the water to come into the eyes of the idol which is called Tammuz, and it wept, as if it asked them to worship it. And some interpret Tammuz 'the burned one,' as if from Daniel 3, 19 (see above), i.e. they wept over him because he was burned; for they used to burn their sons and their daughters in the fire, and the women used to weep over them.... But the Rab, the wise, the great, our Rabbi Moshe bar-Maimon, of blessed memory, has written that it is found written in one of the ancient idolatrous books that there was a man of the idolatrous prophets, and his name was Tammuz.' And he called to a certain king and commanded him to serve, the seven planets and the twelve signs. And that king put him to a violent death; and on the night of his death there weregathered together all the images from the ends of the earth to the Temple of Babel, to the golden image which was the image of the sun. Now this image was suspended between heaven and earth, and it fell down in the midst of the temple, and the images likewise (fell down) round about it, and it told them what had- befallen Tammuz the prophet. And the images all of them wept and lamented all the night; and, as it came to pass, in the morning all the images flew away to their own temples in the ends of the earth. And this was to them for an everlasting statute; at the beginning of the first day of the month Tammuz each year they lamented and wept over Tammuz. And some interpret Tammuz as the name of an animal, for they used to worship an image which they had, and the Targum of (the passage) $\mu\upsilon\gamma\alpha\ ta\ \mu\upsilon\gamma\chi\ \omega\zeta\gamma\pi\omega$ (²³⁴⁴ Isaiah 34:14) is $\text{~}y\text{~}l\ \text{w}\text{~}t\text{~}j\ \text{b}\ \text{~}y\text{~}z\text{~}w\text{~}m\text{~}t\ \text{~}w\text{~}r\text{~}[\text{r}\text{~}y\text{~}w$. But in most copies $\text{~}y\text{~}z\text{~}w\text{~}m\text{~}t$ is written with two Yavs." The book of the ancient idolaters from which Maimonides quotes is the now celebrated work on the agriculture of the Nabathseans, to which reference will be made hereafter. Ben-Melech gives no help, and Abendana merely quotes the explanations given by Rashi and Kimchi. 3. *Modern Opinions*. — The tradition recorded by Jerome, which identifies Tammuz with Adonis, has been followed by most subsequent commentators; among others, by Vatablus, Castello, Cornelius a Lapide, Osiander, Caspar

Sanctius, Lavater, Villalpandus, Selden, Simonis, Calmet, and, in later times, by J. D. Michaelis, Gesenius, Ben-Zeb, Rosenmiuller, Maurer, Ewald, Havernick, Hitzig, and Movers. Luther and others regarded Tammuz as a name of Bacchus. That Tammuz was the Egyptian Osiris, and that his worship was introduced into Jerusalem from Egypt, was held by Calvin, Piscator, Junius, Leusden, and Pfeiffer. This view depends chiefly upon a false etymology proposed by Kircher, which connects the word Tammuz with the Coptic *tamut*, to hide, and so makes it signify the hidden or concealed one; and therefore Osiris, the Egyptian king slain by Typho, whose loss was commanded by Isis to be yearly lamented in Egypt. The women weeping for Tammuz are in this case, according to Junius, the priestesses of Isis. The Egyptian origin of the name Tammuz has also been defended by a reference to the god Amuz, mentioned by Plutarch and Herodotus, who is identical with Osiris. There is good reason, however, to believe that Amuz is a mistake for Amun. That something corresponding to Tammuz is found in Egyptian proper names as they appear in Greek cannot be denied. Ταμώζ, an Egyptian, appears in Thucydides (8, 31) as a Persian officer, in Xenophon (*Anab.* 1, 4, 2) as an admiral. The Egyptian pilot who heard the mysterious voice bidding him proclaim "Great Pan is dead" was called Θαμούζ (Plutarch, *Je Dect. Oraf.* 17). The names of the Egyptian kings, Θούμμωσις, Τέθμωσις, and Θμῶσις, mentioned by Manetho (Josephus, *Cont. Ap.* 1, 14, 15), have in turn been compared with Tammuz; but, unless some more certain evidence be brought forward than is found in these apparent resemblances, there is little reason to conclude that the worship of Tammuz was of Egyptian origin.

The identification of Tammuz with an idolatrous prophet, which has already been given in a quotation from Maimonides, who himself quotes from the *Agriculture of the Nabathceans*, has been recently revived by Prof. Cholson, of St. Petersburg (*Ueber Tammuz*, etc; [St. Petersb. 1860]). An Arab writer of the 10th century, En-Nedim, in his book called *Fihrist el-'Ulum*, says (quoting from Abu Sa'id Wahb ben-Ibrahim) that in the middle of the month Tammuz a feast is held in honor of the god T'uiz. The women bewailed him because his lord slew him and ground his bones in a mill, and scattered them to the winds. In consequence of this the women ate nothing, during the feast, that had been ground in a mill (Chwolson, *Die Ssabier*, etc., 2, 27). Prof. Chwolson regards Ta'uiz as a corruption of Tammuz; but the most important passage, in his eyes, is from the old Babylonian book called the *Agriculture of the Nabathceans*, to which he

attributes a fabulous antiquity. It was written, he maintains, by one Qfitam1, towards the end of the 14th century B.C., and was translated into Arabic by a descendant of the ancient Chaldeans, whose name was Ibn-Washiyyah. As Prof. Chwolson's theory has been strongly attacked, and as the chief materials upon which it is founded are not yet before the public, it would be equally premature to take him as an authority, or to pronounce positively against his hypothesis, though, judging from present evidence, we are inclined to be more than skeptical as to its truth. Quit'ami then, in that dim antiquity from which he speaks to us, tells the same story of the prophet Tammuz as has already been given in the quotation, from Kimchi. It was read in the temples after prayers to an audience who wept and wailed; and so great was the magic influence of the tale that Quit'ami himself, though incredulous of its truth, was unable to restrain his tears. A part, he thought, might be true, but it referred to an event so far removed by time from the age in which he lived that he was compelled to be skeptical on many points. His translator, Ibn-Washiyyah, adds that Tammuz belonged neither to the Chaldaeans nor to the Canaanites, nor to the Hebrews nor to the Assyrians, but to the ancient people of Janban. This last, Chwolson conjectures, may be the Shemitic name given to the gigantic Cushite aborigines of Chaldea, whom the Shemitic Nabathaeans found when they first came into the country, and from whom they adopted certain elements of their worship. Thus Tammuz, or Tammuzi, belongs to a religious epoch in Babylonia which preceded the Shemitic (id. *Ueberreste d. altbabyl. Lit.* p. 19). Ibn-Washiyyah says, moreover, that all the Sabians of his time, both those of Babylonia and of Harran, wept and wailed for Tammuz in the month which was named after him, but that none of them preserved ally tradition of the origin of the worship. This fact alone appears to militate strongly against the truth of Ibn-Washiyyah's story as to the manner in which he discovered the works he professed to translate. It has been due to Prof. Chwolson's reputation to give in brief the substance of his explanation of Tammuz; but it must be confessed that he throws little light upon the obscurity of the subject.

It seems perfectly clear from what has been said that the name Tammuz affords no clue to the identification of the deity whom it designated. The slight hint given by the prophet of the nature of the worship and worshippers of Tammuz has been sufficient to connect them with the yearly mourning for Adonis by the Syrian damsels. Beyond this we can attach no special weight to the explanation of Jerome. It is a conjecture,

and nothing more, and does not appear to represent any tradition. All that can be said, therefore, is that it is not impossible that Tammuz may be a name of Adonis, the sun-god, but that there is nothing to prove it. It is true, however, that the name of Adonis does occur in Phoenician inscriptions (*ymæda*; see Gesenius, *Monum. Paen.* 2, 400), and the coincidences of the ancient notices above and the mode of worship detailed below with the language of Ezekiel afford the most plausible interpretation hitherto offered.

4. Ceremonies of the Cultus. — There was a temple at Amathus, in Cyprus, shared by Adonis and Aphrodite (Pausan. 9:41, 2); and the worship of Adonis is said to have come from Cyprus to Athens in the time of the Persian war (Apollodor. 3, 14,4; Pausan. 2, 20,5; Ovid, *Metam.* 10:725; Philostr. *Apoll.* 7:32; Plutarch, *Alcib.* c. 18; Athen. 15:672; Aristoph. *Pax*, 420). But the town of Byblos, in Phœnicia, was the headquarters of the Adonis worship (Hamaker, *Miscell. Phœnic.* p. 125). The feast in his honor was celebrated each year in the temple of Aphrodite (said to have been founded by Kinyras, the reputed father of Adonis) on the Lebanon (Lucian, *De Dea Syria*, § 6) with rites partly sorrowful, partly joyful. The emperor Julian was present at Antioch when the same festival was held (Amm. Marc. 22:9, 13). It lasted seven days (20, 1), the period of mourning among the Jews (Ecclus. 22:12; ^{<0010>}Genesis 1:10; ^{<0813>}1 Samuel 31:13; Judith 16:24), the Egyptians (Heliodor. Eth. 7:11), and the Syrians (Lucian, *De Dea Syria*, § 52), and began with the disappearance (*ἀφανισμός*) of Adonis. Then followed the search (*ζήτησις*) made by the women after him. His body was represented by a wooden image placed in the so-called “gardens of Adonis” (*Ἀδώνιδος κήποι*), which were earthenware vessels filled with mould, and planted with wheat, barley, lettuce, and fennel. They were exposed by the women to the heat of the sun at the house-doors or in the “Porches of Adonis,” and the withering of the plants was regarded as symbolical of the slaughter of the youth by the fire-god Mars. In one of these gardens Adonis was found again, whence the fable says he was slain by the boar in the lettuce (*ἀφάκη* = Aphaca?), and was there found by Aphrodite. The finding again (*εὔρεσις*) was the commencement of a wake, accompanied by all the usages which in the East attend such a ceremony—prostitution, cutting off the hair (comp. ^{<0828>}Leviticus 19:28, 29; 21:5; ^{<0540>}Deuteronomy 14:1), cutting the breast with knives (^{<2406>}Jeremiah 16:6), and playing on pipes (comp. ^{<4023>}Matthew 9:23). The image of Adonis was then washed and anointed with spices

placed in a coffin on a bier, and the wound made by the boar was shown on the figure. The people sat on the ground round the bier, with their clothes rent (comp. *Ep. of Jeremiah* 31, 32), and the women howled and cried aloud. The whole terminated with a sacrifice for the dead, and the burial of the figure of Adonis (see Movers, *Phonizier*, I, 7). According to Lucian, some of the inhabitants of Byblos maintained that the Egyptian Osiris was buried among them, and that the mourning and orgies were in honor of him, and not of Adonis (*De Dea Syra*, § 7). This is in accordance with the legend of Osiris as told by Plutarch (*De Is. et Os.*). Lucian further relates that on the same day on which the women of Byblos every year mourned for Adonis, the inhabitants of Alexandria sent them a letter, enclosed in a vessel which was wrapped in rushes or papyrus, announcing that Adonis was found. The vessel was cast into the sea, and carried by the current to Byblos (Procopius on Isaiah 18). It is called by Lucian **βυβλίνην κεφαλήν**, and is said to have traversed the distance between Alexandria and Byblos in seven days. Another marvel related by the same narrator is that of the River Adonis (Nahr Ibrahim), which flows down from the Lebanon, and once a year was tinged with blood, which, according to the legend, came from the wounds of Adonis (comp. Milton, *Par. Lost*, I, 460); but a rationalist of Byblos gave him a different explanation, how that the soil of the Lebanon was naturally very red-colored, and was carried down into the river by violent winds, and so gave a bloody tinge to the water; and to this day, says Porter (*Handbook*, p. 187), “after every storm that breaks upon the brow of Lebanon the Adonis still ‘runs purple to the sea.’ The rushing waters tear from the banks red soil enough to give them a ruddy tinge, which poetical fancy, aided by popular credulity, converted into the blood of Thammuz.” The time at which these rites of Adonis were celebrated is a subject of much dispute. It is not so important with regard to the passage in Ezekiel, for there does not appear to be any reason for supposing that the time of the prophet’s vision was coincident with the time at which Tammuz was worshipped. Movers, who maintained the contrary, endeavored to prove that the celebration was in the late autumn, the end of the Syrian year, and corresponded with the time of the autumnal equinox. He relies chiefly for his conclusion on the account given by Ammianus Marcellinus (22, 9,13) of the Feast of Adonis, which was held at Antioch when the emperor Julian entered the city. It is clear, from a letter of the emperor’s (*Ep. Jul.* 52), that he was in Antioch before Aug. 1, and his entry may therefore have taken place in July, the Tammuz of the Syrian year. This time agrees, moreover, with the explanation of the

symbolical meaning of the rites given by Ammianus Marcellinus (22, 9,15) that they were a token of the fruits cut down in their prime. Now at Aleppo (Russell, *Aleppo*, 1, 72) the harvest is all over before the end of June, and we may fairly conclude that the same was the case at Antioch. Add to this that in Hebrew astronomical works **zwm̄t t̄pwqt̄**, *tekuphath Tammuz*, is the “summer solstice;” and it seems more reasonable to conclude that the Adonis feast of the Phoenicians and Syrians was celebrated rather as the summer solstice than as the autumnal equinox. At this time the sun begins to descend among the wintry signs (Kenrick, *Phonicia*, p. 310),

See, in addition to the above literature, and that cited under ADONIS, Simonis, *De Significatione Thammuz* (Hal. 1744); Meursii *Adonia*, in Gronov. *Thesaur.* 7:208 sq.; *Mercersb. Review*, Jan. 1860; *Christian Remembrancer*, April, 1861.