PRIESTS AND WORSHIP IN THE LAST DECADE OF THE TEMPLE AT JERUSALEM.

Professor Adolf Bückler of Vienna has written a highly estimable work on the Priests and Worship in the last decade of the Temple in Jerusalem, which, by reason of its wealth of new ideas and importance, is in many respects subject to criticism. As far as I know, two scientific reviews, both entering into details, have thus far appeared; one by Herr A. Epstein, and another by Prof. L. Blau. In the following remarks I do not intend to discuss Prof. Bückler's work, but to produce some data referring to this subject, which I hope will serve to throw light upon the last decade of the Temple of Jerusalem in its many phases.

It has already been pointed out by Herr Epstein, that Prof. Bückler's investigations are especially instructive in reference to the schools in Jabne and Lydda. Among other things Prof. Bückler mentions certain Tannaites, whose name is introduced by the word נאכ. Prof. Bückler considers this title to be quite obscure (p. 92). This title is, however, so frequently met with that it does not sound at all unfamiliar. The point may be characterized as a sort of bon mot, not rare among Talmudists; namely, a question which is only put because the questioner has a good answer in petto. Prof. Bückler asks the question only because he thinks he has a good answer to give; namely, he is of opinion that such Doctors of the Law had stood "in relations" to the sanctuary in Jerusalem. Prof. Bückler quotes even Matthew xxiii. 9, where this title also occurs in Greek (πάρηπ); consequently, the meaning is at least not obscure. It would also be appropriate to cite the Greek word πάνω, about which we read in Sophocles (Greek Lexicon of the Roman and Byzantine Periods, p. 839): "PAPA, father, a title given to bishops in general, and to those of Alexandria and Rome in particular." The Roman "Pope" (Italian papa, French pape) has retained his title up to the present day. This sort of designation certainly came from Judaism into Christianity. This circumstance might have been made use of by Prof. Bückler to show, that those priests, or, as he expresses himself, those men are called "father" who stood in some relation to the sanctuary.

But in truth neither from this, nor from the proofs adduced by

1 II Jahresbericht der israelitisch-theologischen Lehranstalt in Wien, 1894, 1895.
2 Monatschrift für Geschichte & Wissenschaft des Judenthums, XL, 138-144.
4 The citation of verse 10 is probably only a lapsus, for nothing can be found there referring to this subject.
Prof. Büchler, can this inference be drawn. It is so very natural to address a beloved and revered person as father, that there is really no necessity to look for a reason. We have the example of Elisha, who calls the prophet Elijah his father (2 Kings ii. 12). Besides, it appears to me, that this custom still obtains at the present day in Eastern countries. It may of course be asked why the title of אב was given to certain persons only, and not to the great multitude of Doctors of the Law. This I consider to be an idle question, because there is no suitable answer to it. For my friend Prof. Büchler is mistaken when he thinks that the persons named by him bore the title all through from the beginning to the end. Thus, for instance, it is not true that Jose b. Dosithai had no other title but that of אב, for in Genesis Rabba, c. 78, 4, he is called יָבֵי אֵלִי; this passage, like some other, proves moreover that the sayings of Abba Jose do not always bear reference to the sanctuary. In Deuteron. Rabba, c. 4, 8, and Levit. Rabba, c. 5, 4, a certain יָבֵי אֵלִי is mentioned, who neither was a teacher of the Law nor did he live during the time of the temple. Compare also יָבֵי אֵלִי, Jer. Demai, 24 a. In the name אב, and also in other cases, אב is a proper noun. We also find אב (Tanchuma, בראשית, § 20, ed. Buber), where the priestly office is clearly not designated by אב.

Consequently I venture to maintain that Prof. Büchler’s inferences drawn by him from the title of אב are as untenable as those which he makes from another idiomatical phenomenon; namely, that Doctors of the Law are mentioned only as וב, followed by the name of the father. The latter conclusions have been completely refuted by Prof. Blau. But even the distinction made by Prof. Blau, that

---

1 In a recent work of Deismann, Bibelstudien (Marburg, 1895), p. 273, a papyrus is published, where a certain Lycerion called a revered person πάτερ.

2 It would be more correct to write Dōsthai, for יָבֵי אֵלִי is always written without Yod; in the Greek Ἀρσενίας the accent is, by reason of Syncope, moved to the first syllable. I will here remark, that a Jew Ἀρσενίας is already mentioned in the epilogue of the Septuagint to the book of Esther.

3 Vid. Bacher, Agada der Tanaiten, II, 388. He quotes there from Midrash Samuel, c. 32, אב ווי אב, which also shows that אב was merely an expression of veneration.

4 Vid. Aruch, s. v. אב.

5 Revue, 1. c.—Why does not Blau quote the name of Bar-Kappara? The name אב and וב is also found in Semachoth, VIII; וב ב in Jer. Sanhedrin, 18 c.
in ordinary cases the name of the father only is mentioned, and the name of the scholar himself only then added when it is preceded by the honouring title of “Rabbi”—even this distinction cannot be upheld. For according to my belief people are in ordinary cases called by their own names only, to which subsequently the name of the father may be added. This is usually the case in Greek and Latin, from which languages the existence of the same custom can be proved in reference to persons of the Jewish race. But this is so natural that it requires no proof. It is known that under primitive conditions of culture the descent from the mother’s line was principally considered, and then the child most likely added the name of the mother. Why should the Jews, more than others, have suppressed their own names? Why should they have deviated from a custom that was prevalent in the Bible? As a matter of fact they never relinquished that custom; even at the present day in Synagogal rites, they use their own name and that of their father. The fact therefore remains that names like עַבְרָי, אֲלִישָׁע יִזְרֶה, יִזְרֶה בָּן יִשְׂרָאֵל were customary, and that such as בָּן חוֹתֶא בַּעֲאֵי, &c., were exceptional. The causes for such appellations can be recognized in some cases, but are in the majority of cases unknown.

Valuable informations about the sanctuary of Jerusalem have come down to us from scholars who lived in Sephoris. Prof. Büchler attempts to prove that many distinguished families of priests had fled from the warlike Jerusalem to Sephoris. He chiefly relies on the genealogy (מלכת הח箂) which had been found in Jerusalem (Jer. Taanith, 68 a; Genesis Rabba, c. 98, 8), in which we also find בָּן הָיוֹדָה מַיִּים תְּפָרִית. The whole argument is based upon this notice. Herr Epstein¹ had already pointed out that this passage is corrupt. Unfortunately, neither Herr Epstein nor Prof. Büchler has noticed that this passage ofensor חַיָּה occurs also in Mishna Arachin, II, 4, and Tosifra Arachin, I, 15². In the Tosifra we read בֵּית צֶפֶרָיָא מָטָא מיַד אַמָּה, which means, “The house Sippor is from Emmaus.” It is known that Emmaus lay in the province of Judaea; thus the passage means

¹ Monatsschrift, i. c., p. 141.
² Epstein quotes Strashun ad loc. (ד’ א’ וו”י in ed. Wilna, 1884), without noticing that Strashun had already the correct notion that the notice in the Mishna had to be combined with Mishna and Tosifra Arachin.
³ (in the ordinary editions of the Mishna) is, of course, a corruption of ספורה, v. Rappoport, p. 112. Prof. Büchler disregarded Rappoport’s discussion; the passage from the Mishna he quotes p. 181, n. 2.
⁴ The Aramaic ספורה corresponds with the Hebrew ספורה.
⁵ Vid. Graetz, Monatsschrift, 1853, p. 112, who rightly distinguishes Emmaus.
to say that “the house of Sippor is from Judaea.” The passage in Jerushalmi will therefore have to be inverted; instead of read יִרְשָׁלְמִי מְיַרְשַׁאָל דְּבֵרֵי סְפֵרוּי וּכְתֵּבָר מְיַרְשַׁאָל דְּבֵרֵי סְפֵרוּי 1, and in Genesis Rabba, instead of read רִבְּרוּי מְיַרְשַׁאָל דְּבֵרֵי חַוָּה דְּבֵרֵי חַוָּה דְּבֵרֵי סְפֵרוּי 2. This notice would thus be fully borne out by those of the Mishna and Tosifta. This would also raise a difficulty mentioned by Herr Epstein; namely, that in a genealogy the names of ancestors must be expected rather than those of the places where the people lived. According to our assumption, the passage really says, that the house of Sippor was descended from the tribe of Judah, and is thus in conformity with the other portions of the genealogy.

Prof. Bühler further asserts that there was a Synagogue in Sepphoris which was called the Babylonian Synagogue כְּתֵבָר מְיַרְשַׁאָל דְּבֵרֵי. I may as well mention first that besides the passages quoted by Prof. Bühler, Jer. Megillah, 75 b, must be cited. Based on this, Prof. Bühler would prefer to read in Jer. Taanith, 64 a, and Jer. Nazir, 56 c, כְּתֵבָר מְיַרְשַׁאָל דְּבֵרֵי instead of כְּתֵבָר מְיַרְשַׁאָל דְּבֵרֵי 3. I cannot accept this opinion. I consider כְּתֵבָר as a proper noun, the Greek βυζαντινά, a town in the south of Judaea. I rely on the passage in Jer. Aboda Zara, 43 b: כְּתֵבָר בָּרוּי, where only a town can be meant. In connexion with this I mention that there were in the south of Judaea twenty-four such towns, which had a Greek form of government, and were for this reason βυζαντινά, Jer. Nedarim, 38 a, and Jer. Shebnoth, 34 d, כְּתֵבָר בָּרוּי וְיַרְשַׁאָל 4. It is said that they were destroyed—it seems in the war of Hadrian against Bar-Cochba—on account of the careless oaths of their inhabitants. The sin of indifference in the matter of oaths is also mentioned in other sources; thus, in Tanchuma, old edition, יִתְרָכָא § 7; Tanchuma, ed. Buber, יִתְרָכָא § 16, and מְסַלְּכָה § 1; Numeri Rabba, c. 22, 1; only in these passages a thousand cities 5 are mentioned, which were said to have lain in “the mountain of the King” (רְחֵם הָאֱלֹהִים). We know also from


1 Or כְּתֵבָר מְיַרְשַׁאָל דְּבֵרֵי יִרְשָׁלְמִי.

2 It is known that כְּתֵבָר מְיַרְשַׁאָל דְּבֵרֵי was also written for כְּתֵבָר מְיַרְשַׁאָל דְּבֵרֵי.

3 Strashun, in *Nachschau zu Genesis Rabba*, c. 52, 4, quotes the reading כְּתֵבָר מְיַרְשַׁאָל דְּבֵרֵי instead of כְּתֵבָר מְיַרְשַׁאָל דְּבֵרֵי רֹבְרוּי.

4 For this we read in Pesikta Rabbathi, c. 22, p. 41 a, ed. Friedmann הָעָלָה ; cf. *Aboth di R. Nathan*, version I, c. 20, p. 72, ed. Schechter.

5 Always כְּתֵבָר מְיַרְשַׁאָל דְּבֵרֵי. The number may have its origin in an erroneous transcription of וְיַרְשַׁאָל דְּבֵרֵי, out of וְיַרְשַׁאָל דְּבֵרֵי, and then 20,000 cities were spoken of; vid. Threni Rabba, II, 2.
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other sources that the war of Hadrian had raged particularly in "the mountain of the King"; there is, therefore, an historical substratum in this narrative. It is, however, nowhere said that the destruction originated with the Romans; the matter seems rather to have been brought about in this way, that those cities, for reason of their Greek customs, were rather disliked by the warriors for the national cause, and that the first work of the Bar-Cochba revolt had been to punish them. Similar frictions between the Jewish and Hellenistic population of Palestine are also otherwise historically attested. The crime committed by these cities was perhaps not the taking of an unnecessary oath, but a criminal breach of faith.

Prof. Büchler further deals with the question as to the language spoken by the priests of Jerusalem during the last decennium of its existence. In reference to this much ventilated question, Prof. Büchler comes to the conclusion that before 63 the official language of the priests had been Aramaic, in accordance with the conditions of the time, but that after 63 it had been Hebrew, under the influence of the Pharisees. Here also Prof. Büchler's arguments are not of sufficient force. He relies on the account as to the divine voice heard by the High Priest Simon in the sanctuary speaking in the Aramaic language. Prof. Büchler lays particular stress on these words, but it escaped him that the same words are also used, on an occasion where there is no question either of sanctuary or of priests. The reason of the Aramaic being used in the narrative does not lie in the circumstance that the priests spoke that language, but in the fact that such was the historical style of the time. As a further proof I will only mention that we have an Aramaic account about the High Priest Simon referring to quite an ordinary event (Pesikta Rabbathi, c. 14, p. 65 a, ed. Friedmann, and parallel passages). Prof. Büchler thinks everywhere of priests; thus he could also have applied in proof of his proposition the passage in Joma, 18 a, where we are told in Aramaic that Martha, the daughter of Boethus, had

1 The terms נוהטנה ונהסיה שלמה are reproached for their great pride in Gittin, 37 a. That ונוהטנה should mean rich people is a misunderstanding (W. Bacher, Agada der Tanaiten, I, 57, note 3). The most unmistakable passage occurs in Semachoth, c. 8, טפז בהנהטנה שלמה, followed immediately by the word המלך (circus).
2 Pages 60–67.
3 The year 63 B.C. is according to Prof. Büchler a turning-point in the history of the Temple Worship.
4 Semachoth, c. 8; ונהסיה שלמה אומרים; I consider these words to be authentic, although they are absent in Sanhedrin, 11 a; cf. Jer. Sanhedrin, 18 c.
5 Vid. my observation in Revue des Études Juives, XXX, 217.
sent the king Jannaeus two *Kab* of Denars, because he had appointed Josuah ben Gamla High Priest. (Vid. Tosafoth, ibid.; cf. Tosifita Joma, I, 14, and Threni Rabba, c. 9, 16.) Prof. Büchler thinks that this account is *Aramaic*, because it speaks about a priest. But I am of opinion that we have here a fragment from a lost historical work.

We must remember that the Scroll of the Fasts (רמוא הקדש) was also composed in Aramaic. The insufficiency of Prof. Büchler’s argumentation is characterized by the circumstance that he draws important inferences from the single word רמוא in Mishna Joma, III, 1, and Tamid, II, 2, a word, the meaning of which is by no means certain.

Prof. Büchler’s attention is directed to everything which bears even the slightest reference to priests. Thus he attempts to prove, that priests married usually only girls of priestly descent¹. I consider this statement to be fully proved. Prof. Büchler cites himself (p. 16) the Talmudical account, according to which eighty pairs of priestly brothers married in one night eighty pairs of sisters descended from priests. It is all the more remarkable that Prof. Büchler does not utilize the passage in proof of his proposition ². I myself might adduce an additional strong proof for the statement. Namely, in Levit. Rabba, c. 20, 10, we find that the children of the high priests were particularly careful in the choice of their wives (ר״ם ל״ע) אברomialו ויאกรณע וניל ונותני שין מגניה אי ונאשח והנהו ל״ג, cf. Tanchuma,>a, § 6, p. 156 b, ed. Buber, Pesikta, 172 b, ed. Buber, Midrash Psalm lxxviii. 18)³. There are, however, also examples of Israelite (non-priestly) maidens being married to priests (in the above-cited Mishna Arachin, II, 4)⁴. Here it ought to have been mentioned that this fact was not generally recognized, for R. Chanina b. Antigons says differently. It can, however, be pointed out, that, according to Tosifta, Aboda Zara, III, 10, Rabban Gamliel I gave his daughter to the priest Simon ben Nethanel for a wife ⁵.

Prof. Büchler conjectures that with the expression נ基准 קדישה

¹ It is true Prof. Büchler speaks only of high priests, but the proposition can also be extended to common priests.

² The legendary character of the narrative does not prevent Prof. Büchler from utilizing it on another occasion.

³ The references given by Herr Epstein, l. c., p. 142, note 1, must be supplemented by these passages.

⁴ Not priests of high standing, as Prof. Büchler thinks, but priests generally are named here.

⁵ Prof. Büchler cites the passage himself, p. 14, note 2.
a community of priests is meant. Prof. Büchler's expositions are, in respect to this, very happy, and throw a correct light upon a number of data. Blau has strengthened Prof. Büchler's opinion with numerous fresh data. I may be allowed here to make myself an observation: In Mishna Eduyoth, VII, 8 (cf. M. Kelim, V, 5), מָלָא בְּמַנָא is mentioned (Tosifla Eduyoth, III, 1, Var. פּוֹלָל). He seems to be the same as an מַנָא, in Pesachim, 104 a, who is surnamed בן של קדושים, "the son of holy ones." The surname, the reason for which is given in so peculiar a manner, seems to me to have been derived from the father's name; מַנָא is the Greek proper noun ἀγγός, equal to the adjective ἅγιος, holy. The form מַנָא was taken for a plural, and thus בן קדושים became בן של קדושים. Menahem, to judge from his decisions, was a priest, and it is probably owing to this circumstance that popular etymology took hold of his name and made a saint of him. For the present I give this with all reserve, although I think this is on the right track. Further I observe, that Blau's assertion, that the expression הָסִדָּר does not apply to the priestly character, is evident from the following passages: Sanhedrin, 11 a (several times מַנָא הָסִדָּר) ; Sabbath, 127 b, מַנָא הָסִדָּר.

I now turn to one of the boldest assertions of Prof. Büchler's, namely, that the so-called Woes in the Gospel of Matthew (c. xxiii) are directed against the priests, although in the chapter in question no priests, but Pharisees and Doctors of the Law, are mentioned. Herr Epstein rightly rejects this impossible assertion, and refutes it with undeniable proofs. Another proof against this statement, and, in my opinion, not less undeniable, lies in the words πλειωνωσιν γάρ τά φυλακτήρια αὐτῶν, "they enlarge the phylacteries" (verse 5). We know from the whole Talmudical literature that the wearing of the Tefillin is a characteristic Pharisaical institution. The same is also evident in Jerome's works. It might be asserted a priori, that the priests, who more inclined towards Sadducism, did not wear the phylacteries. But we have even information about it expressis verbis. The Talmud says it expressly of the הָסִדָּר תפָלִין, of the Tefillin to be worn on the arm: והני הבנימ ההלל והישעוה בכם רוח, Arachin, 3 b; but the

1 Revue, i.e., p. 150.
3 R. Samuel b. Meir was not aware of the reason.
4 Fick, Griechische Personennamen, p. 5, mentions ἀγγός, ἁγνάς, ἀγνά, ἁγγόν; all from ἅγιος, holy.
5 Prof. Büchler does not touch upon this point; but I cannot suppose that he would divide the chapter, which evidently forms one whole.
6 Vid. my essay in this Review, VII, 238.
priests did not wear them on the head either, because they were covered by the יֵעַ, or חָלְפָה. If the matter is treated critically, it appears from the discussion of the Talmud, that the priests did not wear any phylacteries at all; it seems that the Mishna first obliged them to do so. But ציֵעַ and ציָּה have the same fate, and presuppose the same data; consequently, we can maintain, that the priests did not wear the fringes either. For this reason alone Matthew, xxiii, cannot refer to the priests.

Prof. Büchler makes a very minute and valuable investigation about the officials of the temple. Among these the אַמְרָבִל is frequently mentioned. For the purpose of fixing the character of that dignity, Prof. Büchler quotes Targum Jonathan to Isaiah xxii. 23, where we find: האַמְרָבִיל מַחְמוֹם אֲחָו מֶפָתָה בִּתְי מַכְרֵשָא הֵלוֹמִן בַּת וּדְרֵי בִּרְיָה. Prof. Büchler observes to this: . . . . “which says, that the key of the sanctuary was in the hands of a dignitary who was called Amarkol” (p. 94). But I see that the Targum says more than this, for the words: “The dominion of the house of David in his hand” (in the text only עלון שבעמך), cannot possibly mean a simple temple official, like the Amarkol. But Prof. Büchler takes no notice of these words of the Targum, although these very words carry us back to the source of the Targum. For in Leviticus Rabba, c. 5, 5, the same verse of scripture is the subject of a controversy. R. Eleazar holds that Shebna had been a high priest, but R. Jehudah maintains that he had been an Amarkol. Now, as it is frequently the case, both opinions are blended together in Targum Jonathan: מַמָּח הַרַּבִּים כַּסְפָּדָא שָּׁלֹל &c. refers to the Amarkol, שָׁלֹל &c. refers to the high priest. In view of this freedom of treatment, the Targum cannot justly be called sufficient evidence. The passage in the Midrash shows, however, that the Amarkol took part in the affairs of the sanctuary, but not in the offering up of the sacrifices; consequently, he was not a priest, but an Israelite (layman). For all these reasons I cannot admit Prof. Büchler’s concluding words that he had correctly discerned the position and signification of the Amarkol, although I am unable to substitute another theory of my own. Prof. Büchler himself remarks, that the Targum of the Prophets renders the word יֵעַ treasurer, in Zech. xi. 13, with Amarkol, although we should have expected נָבָר; but we cannot urge closely paraphrastic interpretations. I am surprised that Prof. Büchler does not think it worth while to prove, in respect to the word נָבָר, that it

1 Prof. Büchler, on another occasion, also speaks of a double translation (p. 100).
2 Difference between וּדְרֵי בִּרְיָה and וּדְרֵי בִּרְיָה.
denoted a priestly office. Taanith, 29 a, proves nothing, for there ראש המנזר is to be taken metaphorically, and not literally, as Prof. Büchler himself admits.

Nor can I agree that it was proved that the ראש המנזר was a priestly person; the "plain and evident result"¹ is rather that the first man of the division was a layman. This is not contradicted either by Sifre, Numbers, § 9, or by Sifra, Lev. xiv. 11. For in the former passage it is not said that the priest was assigned to render the service; but only, that the action be performed under the supervision of the priest; and, according to this, the other passage must be explained in the same way².

The opinion that bal haflaš (Tosifla, Kelim, Baba Kama, I, 6, p. 569, ed. Zuckermanel) denoted a dignitary in the temple, I consider to be altogether erroneous. Prof. Büchler does not examine the word itself³; moreover, he omits to show a connexion between the word and its meaning as adopted by him. In my opinion, bal haflaš is probably nothing else but "the man of the bean (fabā)"; i.e. the ancestor of the house of Fabius (ממגר), vid. Perles, Beitritte zur rabbinischen Sprach- und Sagenkunde, p. 6. Some proof for this assumption may lie in the circumstance that in Mishna Taharoth, VII, 9, some books read יריב אלינור פָלֶין instead of ייריב פָלֶין.

I observe besides that important and detailed notices on the composition of the mishmar are found in Jer. Taanith, 68 a, which have not been made use of by Prof. Büchler. Among other things, it is said there that the Chiefs of the Order (صمאר) were sometimes degraded to Chiefs of Families (עמור ראשים שמארת והוא עצמון בית) (אבות).

A leading idea of Prof. Büchler's, which goes through the whole work, is this, that the Pharisees were suspicious of the priests, and therefore superintended the latter. Thus he writes: "Unequivocal and fully reliable traditions, which we are soon going to consider, put it beyond doubt, that the presence of non-priestly elders at the sacerdotal performances was not an ancient custom and settled usage, but has to be counted among the rights obtained by the Pharisaical side during the last decennium of the existence of the Temple." This idea may be correct in itself; but I think, it also ought to have been mentioned, that the presence of non-priestly elders was not a right obtained by the Pharisees, but the assist-

¹ Prof. Büchler's own words, p. 92.
² Prof. Büchler gives a good instance of this also, cf. his remark on Mishna Zebachim, IX, 3 (p. 70, note 4).
³ Page 98, where the subject is dealt with in an off-hand manner.
ance rendered by the teachers of the Law, versed in the Halacha, to priests who lacked such training. This idea is quite plainly expressed in traditional literature¹, and the sources display evidence of a calm treatment of the subject, and that they give no indication whatever that any struggle had taken place.

Prof. Büchler then speaks of the connexion between priests and Levites. At the very commencement he meets with a difficulty (p. 119); namely, the letter of Antiochus the Great, communicated by Josephus, mentions the teachers of the law of the temple (και γραμματεῖς τοῦ ἱεροῦ)², who, according to the context, could only have been Levites. Prof. Büchler sees a difficulty in this, that nothing similar is to be found in the literature of the Talmud and Midrash. Against this I draw attention to the frequently expressed view, according to which the teachers were of the tribe of Levi³; and more especially to the remarkable circumstance, that Moses, the chief of the Levites, is, in two places, very emphatically called Israel’s teacher of the law (משה ר comunità, Sotah, 13 b)⁴.

Prof. Büchler collects on this occasion several data, which prove that the singing in the temple was done by the priests; but Prof. Büchler cannot acquiesce in this, and vindicates, in spite of this, the singing in the temple by the Levites. This opinion, which is meant to agree with the Halacha, is really opposed to it; for according to the latter, priests, Levites, and Israelites had to participate in the singing without fail. (Jer. Taanith, 67 d: ντι της bατης το ωτοτο, where the word της refers to all three categories, as the discussion there proves⁵. This of course would not mean to say that there was not any singing which was reserved exclusively for the Levites.

Prof. Büchler does not mention with a single word⁶ that the Levites were also divided into orders (משוררים), and yet this is evident from the words of R. Jose b. Chanina in Jer. Megillah, 73 b: מוכן

¹ Numeri Rabba, c. 11, 3: הכהנים המנזרים ואניהם מנהנים заболевания וקהל נמי, והם מנהנים את הדבר המ بتاريخו, וחקי הכתובות יד ומכות חזון ש יודעים מלזון. מנהנים דבר פנים ומכות חזון, &c. The same also Canticum Rabba, III, 6. I do not want to examine the historical value of these notices; but so much is certain that the co-operation of the “Pharisees” appears here in quite a different light.

² Büchler translates “scribes,” but it means “teachers of the law.”

³ In connexion with Genesis xlix. 7.

⁴ Prof. Bacher pointed out to me that these words are also found in Targum Onkelos to Deuteronomy xxxiii. 21.

⁵ See Prof. Büchler, p. 127, on the singing by laymen.

He priests in the principal source, a Talmud, means consisting in which, among other things, is mentioned in which, introductory mention is always allowed to be made a few observations on the particular way in which the so-called twenty-four orders (ב"מ Mishmar) were constituted; and I should say at once that Blau does not properly call the order consisting of Israelites (laymen) "Mishmar," for the Talmud, in the passage quoted by Blau, always used the expression Ammud, and the term for this is always only Maamad. The difference between the two expressions is this, that always means the order of Israelites only (Jer. Taanit, 67 d, מאמῶν), and further on always only ישראלי, whilst was the order consisting of Cohanim, Levites, and Israelites. An order of the latter kind was always present in Jerusalem during the service (ibidem: ינפ על כל מתמר ומשמר היה עומר יוחסין של הבונים של היהישראלי). Then follows immediately: "It has been taught: twenty-four thousand," i.e. the just-mentioned order consisted of a body of priests, Levites, and Israelites, to the number of 24,000 men. The members of this order were convened from the whole of Palestine. The Baraita continues: "from Jerusalem only a whole Ammud (24,000) could be drafted." This means that Jerusalem always contained such a population of priests, Levites,

2 Quoted by Prof. Büchler, p. 137.  
3 Page 136.  
4 In the edition of Salomon (Salmon) London, Vienna, 1857, this prayer is printed on p. 20.  
5 Revue, l. c., p. 151.  
6 הני משמרות וארבעה אלו.
and Israelites, that an Ammud could always be formed from them, and Jericho also contained so many people as to suffice for half an Ammud. This may really have been so. Then a small exaggeration follows. "Jericho could also have furnished a complete Ammud, but it sent only half an Ammud, in order to preserve Jerusalem's prerogative." The words following next form the natural complement: "The priests for the service, the Levites for the Duchan; the Israelites, on the other hand, prove per se that they were the deputies from the whole of Israel." This means that it was not necessary to bring up to Jerusalem, from the whole of Palestine, the Israelite portion of the Ammud—besides, this would have been an impossibility, for, in that case, it would have been just as necessary to summon deputies from Egypt and Babylonia and from the Jews of other countries—but the mere fact that there were also Israelites in the Ammud, gives it the character of a representation of the whole of Israel. This I believe gives a clear meaning to the whole passage, and it is unnecessary to amend it in any way, as Blau has, not very happily, attempted to do.

In further laying stress upon the difference between Mishmar and Ammud, I am unable to accept Blau's opinion that the Baraitha contained in Bab. Taanit, 27 a, was only another edition of the above-mentioned Baraitha, and was to be modified accordingly. The Baraitha, as contained in the Babylonian Talmud, exhibits, to my mind, no difficulties, although Epstein\(^2\) does not see his way clear about it. We give a translation: "There are twenty-four Mishmars in Jerusalem, twelve of which were in Jericho; when the turn of a Mishmar came round to go up [to Jerusalem], the one half of a Mishmar went up from Palestine to Jerusalem, and the other half of a Mishmar went up from Jericho, and for the reason, to enable them to provide drink and food to their brethren in Jerusalem." Namely, there was in Jericho a large colony of priests, who occupied themselves with agriculture; therefore it was ordained, that of the Mishmars of the country—with the exclusion of Jericho—always one half,—and of the Mishmar of Jericho likewise one half went up to Jerusalem. Accordingly, the rest of Palestine, as well as Jericho, sent

---

1 This passage also proves that the Levites used to stand upon the סנה.  
2 *Monatsschrift*, l. c., p. 144.  
3 As if it were written בהנה תשעה סנהו, as the Talmud correctly explains.  
4 The words אמרו שיאמרו לארץ ישראל, which would be superfluous, plainly say that always one half of a Mishmar, scattered over all Palestine, went up.
twenty-four times a year one half of a Mishmar to Jerusalem. I do
not see why such an arrangement could not have been made, by
means of which it was even possible to distribute systematically
every Mishmar over the whole country and over Jericho, and which
would thus cause no difficulty. Prof. Büchner has been able to
understand this Baraita, and also the one in Jerusalem in which he
proposes a small alteration only. I think even this to be unnecessary;
much more so the alterations of Epstein and Blau.

In conclusion, I observe that the Baraita discussed by Blau, which
treats of the four families of priests, is also found in Jer. Taanit, 68 a.

I made these observations, partly when I first read Prof. Büchner's
work, and partly on reading the said reviews. I have not treated the
matter systematically, and this may be my excuse, that I publish here
only stray notes, and not a finished essay.

Samuel Krauss.

ZADOC KAHN'S SERMONS.

Sermons et Allocutions adressés à la jeunesse israélite, par ZADOC
Kahn, Grand-Rabbin de France. (Paris: Durlacher, 1896.)

M. Zadoc Kahn's reputation as a preacher deservedly stands high
among his own countrymen, and several of his sermons which have
found their way across the channel have attracted attention here.

The volume under consideration is a new edition of a work which
originally appeared in 1877. It consists of a collection of sermons
and addresses delivered to children, or to adults on topics connected
with childhood. But it is more than a mere reprint, for it contains
some addresses which do not figure in the earlier edition, and which
are now printed for the first time. The volume might have been
conveniently divided into two parts, Part I (pp. 1-162) comprising
nine sermons, Part II (pp. 163-293) containing fifteen addresses on
special occasions.

The author states what he regards as the ideal method to be
adopted by the preacher to children. In the course of an excellent
sermon, entitled "Be Young," he feels for a moment that he is
talking above the heads of his young auditors, and exclaims: "How-
ever, I must not lose sight of the fact that after all you are children,
and that it behoves me to speak to you in a language adapted to your