

THE IMAGE OF GOD :

NOTES ON THE HELLENIZATION OF JUDAISM, WITH ESPECIAL REFERENCE TO GOODENOUGH'S WORK ON JEWISH SYMBOLS¹

By MORTON SMITH

PH.D. (HEBREW UNIVERSITY, JERUSALEM), TH.D. (HARVARD),
ASSISTANT PROFESSOR OF HISTORY IN COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY

I. *Hellenization in Disguise*

DISCUSSIONS of the hellenization of ancient Judaism often take for granted that any material for which precedent can be found in the Old Testament is therefore independent of hellenistic influence. This supposition neglects the fact that rabbinic literature is almost entirely homiletic and legal. Preachers and lawyers must find proof-texts in certain books which are authoritative for their purposes. But they do not necessarily get their ideas from those books to which they must go for their proof-texts. The history of Biblical and legal exegesis bristles with examples of texts which have been made to bear meanings their authors never thought of. Consider two rabbinic instances: Ben Azzai uses the text, "This is the book of the generations of *Adam*", as an excuse to argue that the Law is the basic principle of *human* society. R. Jeremiah b. Le'azer uses the text, "Male and female he created *them*" as an excuse for teaching that when God created Adam he created *him* androgynous.² Clearly, it would be mistaken to say that because these rabbis found the texts in the Bible they must also have found the ideas there.

What holds for preachers and lawyers holds also for translators. The Hebrew text of the Bible is in a number of places obscure beyond understanding. Therefore any understandable

¹ The content of this paper was originally delivered in three lectures given in 1955 at the Hebrew Teachers' College, Boston.

² Siphra on Exod. xix. 18 and Bereshit Rabba viii. 1 (ed. Theodore, p. 55). On the former see my note in [*H*]arvard [*T*]heological [*R*]eview, xlviii (1955), 51.

translation of those places must be a reading into them of ideas supplied by the translator. Where the translator got his ideas is a question which cannot be settled at all by the fact that he read them into the Hebrew text. Thus when the LXX turned the obscure Hebrew, 'ehyeh 'asher 'eyheh,¹ which the Targums did not attempt to translate, into the clear Platonism, "I am the one being", then, even though the resultant Being did retain the gender of the Biblical God,² there is no doubt that we are looking at a hellenization of the Biblical religion.

Therefore it is often unjustified to cite the proof-text used by a preacher, or the LXX's remodellings of the Hebrew, as evidence that the ideas thus introduced are signs of Jewish tradition rather than hellenistic influence.

Of course, proof texts sometimes do happen to contain the ideas attributed to them. But even when they do, *the taking up and development of ideas by later writers may be evidence of outside influence.*

For example, let us consider the notion that man is made in the image of God. It appears in the Old Testament in two places in Genesis,³ in the second of which it is added as an explanation to a law making murder a capital offence. There is no doubt that in both these places the detail is, at very least, pre-

¹ Exod. iii. 14.

² Cf. J. Freudenthal, "Are There Traces of Greek Philosophy in the LXX?" [*Jewish Quarterly Review*, ii (1890), 220. F. is mistaken in supposing that *to on* is Stoic rather than Platonic and his explanation of an Alexandrian translation of the third century B.C. by the influence of Palestinian exegesis of the third century A.D. is not plausible. Note also his final argument (p. 222), "Who would venture to ascribe to the Soferim, Onkelos and Pseudo-Jonathan a knowledge of systems of philosophy which could only be acquired after a long devotion to their study?" No one, surely, supposes that the translators of the Old Testament were trained philosophers. But it is supposed that Greek philosophy had a large, albeit indirect, influence on the *Weltanschauung* of most thinking men (among whom were many rabbis) in the ancient world. As evidence against this latter supposition there is no importance whatever in F.'s demonstration that the translators of the LXX neglect the technical, philosophic senses of certain words. And even concerning trained philosophers, argument from this fact would be dangerous. For instance, it would prove Philo ignorant of philosophy, since, as Wolfson has shown, he is generally indifferent in his use of philosophic terms. H. Wolfson, *Philo* (Cambridge, 1947), i. 102 ff.

³ i. 26 f. and ix. 6.

exilic. Since later Biblical tradition became much opposed to physical anthropomorphism, to anything which would suggest that a statue of any sort could be in any respect a faithful likeness of the deity, it is surprising that this material survived. It is even more surprising to find it taken up by a number of rabbis and used by them not only to justify capital punishment for murder, but also to argue the dignity of man in general and to blame those who abstain from the procreation of children because they diminish the number of the images of God.¹

Now the purposes for which these rabbis used these proof texts are closely related to the culture of the Greco-Roman world. It was in that world that the notion of human dignity was given its classical development by the Stoics, and it was in that world that the practice of asceticism was spreading in the second and third centuries A.D. when these rabbis attack the consequent abstinence from procreation. So the motives of their statements are explicable by the influence of the Greco-Roman environment,² but what of the form? Why should these rabbis have chosen to rest their teaching on a proof text so apparently alien to our common notion of Jewish doctrine?

The explanation is to be found in a number of passages of the midrashim, where this thought is directly related to the contemporary importance of the images of the Greco-Roman rulers. In *Leviticus Rabba* xxxiv. 3 a story is told of Hillel. On one occasion when he was about to leave his disciples, they said to him, “ ‘ Rabbi, where are you going? ’ He said to them, ‘ To perform a commandment. ’ They said to him, ‘ What is this commandment? ’ He said to them, ‘ To bathe in the (public) bath. ’ They said to him, ‘ Is this a commandment? ’ He said

¹ Tosepta Yebamot, 8 end; cf. Yeb. 63b; Abot, 3. 14.

² This is not to say, of course, that all Jewish ascetics were necessarily imitators of Greek examples. Asceticism, like mysticism, is a psychological phenomenon which can appear in any religion, and appears in most without being the result of outside influence. What shows the influence of the surrounding world, therefore, is not the *recurrence* of asceticism, but the *increase of its importance* in the second and later centuries A.D., to which these rabbinic statements testify, and which is clearly part and parcel of the change of the Greco-Roman environment. This distinction between precedent (which is often unimportant) and active influence (which is usually contemporary) is the point to be made by this section of the paper.

to them, 'Yes. If the man who is appointed to take care of the images of kings, which are set up in theatres and circuses, scours them and rinses them, and they provide his livelihood, and not only that, but he occupies an important place among government officials; then I, who was created in the image and likeness (of God) . . . *a fortiori*.' " Substantially the same story appears in Abot de R. Nathan¹ as a comment on the words, "And let all thy acts be for the sake of Heaven".²

In the Mekilta³ we read, "The text implies that anyone who sheds blood is held to be guilty of diminishing the divine image. (Murder is thus rebellion against God, as shown by a) comparison: A human king entered a province and the citizens set up portraits of him and made images of him and struck coins (bearing) his (likeness). But after a time they overthrew his portraits and broke his images and cancelled the coins and (thus) diminished the likeness of the king. (Was not this tantamount to rebellion?). Thus anyone who sheds blood is held to be guilty of diminishing the divine image, for it is said, 'Whoso sheddeth man's blood, by man shall his blood be shed, for in the image of God made He man'" (Gen. ix. 6).

Again in Debarim Rabba⁴ the establishment of the cities of refuge is explained by the following parable: "It is like (the case of) a carver who was making an image of the king. While he was working on it, it broke in his hands. The king said, 'Had he broken it for some purpose of his own, he should have been put to death. As things are, since he broke it unintentionally, let him be condemned to the mines.' So the Holy One, Blessed be He," laid down Gen. ix. 6 as the rule and provided the cities of refuge for the exception.

Similarly, Exodus Rabba⁵ comments on the text of Gen. ix. 6 with the words, "It is like (the case of) a man who struck the image of the king and was brought into court. The king said, 'Have you not read in my ordinance that any one who touches my

¹ Text B, ch. 30, ed. Schechter, fol. 33b, now available in the translation by J. Goldin in the *Yale Judaica Series*.

² That is, of God.

³ Bahodesh, Jethro, 8, on Exod. xx. 16 (ed. Lauterbach, 2. 262) repeated in Yalqut S. 1. 299.

⁴ 2.21, repeated in Yalqut S. 1. 829.

⁵ 30. 12 (end).

image is to be put to death. Why did you not spare yourself? So if a man kills a Jew it is as if he destroyed the image of a king, and he is judged and (if found guilty) has no (chance of) life, because man was created in the likeness of the ministering angels."

The conclusion of this last story is particularly interesting because Gen. ix. 6 says bluntly, "Because in the image of God He made man", and all the rest of the above-quoted stories end with quotation of this text. Further, it is clear that the argument of the story in Exodus Rabba requires the antithesis between the king and God, not the ministering angels. So the unexpected appearance of the angels is clearly the result of a posterior revision, by which the force of the argument is weakened.¹

Another instance of such revision for the same purpose is the Targum to Ps. lxxxii. 6, which changes "I have said, 'Ye are gods, and all of you sons of the Most High'" to, "I have said, 'Behold, you are reckoned as angels (*malakaya*), and all of you as angels (*anglë*) of the Most High'". Similarly, the statement of Deut. xxxiv. 6, that the Lord buried Moses, which was taken literally by the Mishnah,² is understood later to mean that the ministering angels buried him.³ These examples, which could easily be multiplied, prove the opposition which was eventually encountered by the notion that man was the image of God. Thus they justify our surprise at seeing the notion developed by the rabbis of the Greco-Roman period, and confirm our hypothesis that such development must have been due to the influence of the cult of the statues of civil rulers.

In contrast with this later opposition, the early interpretations of Gen. i. 26 f. and ix. 6⁴ show no significant concern to palliate or

¹ It is possible that the use of the ministering angels in place of God as referents for biblical anthropomorphisms was originally a mark of an allegorizing—as opposed to a literalist—school of Palestinian exegesis. So A. Marmorstein, *The Old Rabbinic Doctrine of God, II, Essays in Anthropomorphism* (Oxford, 1937) (*Jews' College Publications*, 14), pp. 46 ff. and 140. However, it cannot be original here, since the force of the argument depends on the parallel between the mortal and the divine rulers (*melek basar wedam v. Melek malke hammelakim*).

² Sotah 1, end.

³ Midrash Tannaïm, 3. 26 (ed. Hoffmann, p. 18).

⁴ So far as represented by the entries for these verses in A. Hyman, *Torah hakketubah wehammesurah* (Tel Aviv, 1937-40), 3 vols.

refute these statements that man is the image of God.¹ Only with the medieval commentators do apologetic and philosophical explanations appear.² Indeed, the rabbinic tradition sometimes went to the extreme of anthropomorphism: Not only did it make the notion of man's likeness to God as physical and detailed as possible (it included circumcision among the distinguishing marks of the Deity),³ but it took the likeness as proof of the potential perfection of man and taught that Adam before the fall and the righteous in the world to come realized this perfection and were rightly, therefore, to be worshipped by the angels: We read in *Baba Batra* 75b, "Rabba said R. Johanan said, 'The righteous are destined to be called by the name of the Holy One, blessed be He, for it is said, "Everyone who is called by my name, him have I created, formed and made that he should also share my glory"'".⁴

¹ There are occasional traces of such a concern, e.g. the Jerusalem Targum adds *min qodam* between *demut* and *yahweh* in Gen. i. 27 (but it translates the relevant words literally in i. 26 and ix. 6, as do Onkelos, the LXX and the Peshitto, which also translate i. 27 literally). Contrast this indifference with the concern expressed by a long string of early comments on i. 26, to explain the plurality of "Let us make man". On the other hand, there was early and frequent opposition to anthropomorphism, see the material collected by Marmorstein, *Doctrine*, ii. 28 ff. and 54 f.—which could easily be increased. Marmorstein's supposition that in Palestinian Judaism there were two schools of thought, one which took the anthropomorphisms of the Bible literally, another which allegorized them, is not improbable, but the evidence he has advanced to identify the members of the schools is far from conclusive. He may be right in seeing a dramatization of a dispute about this matter in *The Martyrdom of Isaiah* (the Jewish section of the *Ascension*, according to Charles) where the wicked King Manasseh represents the adherents of the opinion that God is not visible.

² Beside the *Miqra'ot Gedolot*, ad loc., see the striking contrast in *Midrash haggadol* on *Bereshit* (ed. Margulies) between the early material on these verses and the comments of the medieval editor.

³ Wherefore Adam was created circumcized: *Abot de R. Nathan*, text A, 2 (6b), repeated in *Yalqut S.* i. 16 and 2. 261, cf. *The Dialogue of Athanasius and Zacchaeus*, 10 (ed. F. Conybeare, *Anecdota Oxoniensa* (Oxford, 1898), p. 7); *Justin*, *Dialogue*, 114; *Baba Batra* 58a and *Rashi*, ad loc. and the material collected by Marmorstein, *Doctrine*, ii. 50 f. Marmorstein's conclusion is (p. 52), "The material quoted . . . leaves no doubt that there was a school in Judaism, and an important one, too, that believed in a God who accompanies man in human form and shape".

⁴ *Isa.* xliii. 7. This translation of this and the following biblical verses is deliberately forced to indicate the interpretations put upon them by the rabbinic contexts.

“R. Samuel bar Nahmani said R. Johanan said, ‘Three are called by the name of the Holy One, blessed be He, and they are these: The righteous and the Messiah and Jerusalem. The righteous, as we have just shown. The Messiah, for it is written, “And this is his name, which he will be called, The Lord Our Righteousness”.¹ Jerusalem, for it is written, . . . “And as for the name of the city, the Lord is its name”.’² . . . R. Elazar said, ‘The trishagion will be said before the righteous as it is said before the Holy One, blessed be He.’” In a later passage in the *Tanhuma*³ and in the condensation in *Bereshit Rabbati*⁴ this potential divinity and predicted worship are presented as the direct consequences of man’s being the image of God. So it is in the Latin life of Eve (13 ff.), where, after Adam’s creation, the angels are ordered to “worship the image of God”.⁵

On the other hand, there is another passage in the *Tanhuma*,⁶ beginning, “The Holy One, blessed be He, said to Israel, ‘I am not as flesh and blood’. A human king does not permit men to be called by his name, as you know, for whenever one man wants to accuse another he calls him Augustus so-and-so, and (effectively) kills him. But Israel are called by the name of the Holy One, blessed be He. He is called God, and He called Israel Gods, for it is written, ‘I have said, “Ye are Gods”’.”⁷ The concluding promise is again that of worship by the attribution of holiness, probably the recitation of the trishagion. Here the deification of the just is to be the result of their being called by the name of God and thereby identified with him in nature or office.

(Both traditions as to deification—that by form and that by name—were known to Paul, who evidently attributed considerable importance to the choice between them, for he goes out of his

¹ Jer. xxiii. 6.

² Ezek. xlvi. 3.

³ Ed. Buber, in the supplement to *Shalah*, 39a.

⁴ Ed. Albek, p. 19.

⁵ This notion played a large part in the Life of Adam and Eve, see Kahana’s edn. 10; 33. 5; 35. 3, etc. L. Wells, in Charles’ *Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha*, ii. 137, note on ch. 12, refers to parallels from the Koran and Moses *haddarshan*.

⁶ Ed. Buber, *Qedoshim*, 37b.

⁷ Cf. John x. 34. The inevitable rationalizing and moralizing interpretation of such material appears in *Sifre Deb.* 49 (on 11. 22) and parallels. Direct opposition to the literal interpretation—which argues that there was one—appears in *Bereshit Rabba* 90. 2 (1100 f.) and *Ruth R.*, Int. 1.

way to insist that although "Messiah Jesus" was "in the form of God" yet "he did not think equality with God something to be grasped at, but . . . humbled himself . . . wherefore God, in return, exalted him exceedingly and gave him, as a free gift, the name which is above every name", so that he should be worshipped by angels, men and demons, and all "should confess that Jesus, Messiah, is The Lord".¹)

For our purpose at the moment, the important thing is the agreement of both traditions in arguing from pagan practice. The first passages quoted show that the prominence given by the rabbis to the notion of man as an image of God and as a divine being to be worshipped by the angels reflects the influence of the cult of the statues of the rulers of the hellenistic world and the

¹ Phil. ii. 5-11. A similar opposition to the notion that Adam was to be worshipped by the angels as the image of God is found in Bereshit Rabba 8. 10 (63 f.). Here, as above, the worship offered to him was the trishagion. This is explained by an article by E. Peterson, *Polemik gegen die Mystiker, Ephemerides Liturgicae*, lxi. (1947), 339 f., Peterson's observations are so much in point that I summarize them here: The Qedushah in Apostolic Constitutions, 7. 35. 3 (a section of Jewish origin) is followed by a string of blessings including several which emphasize that none is holy save God. 1 Sam. ii. 2-3 is used as a proof text, and its context is a polemic against *megalorremosyne* which could be understood as referring to heretics who attributed holiness to themselves. If the prayers in Apostolic Constitutions have this polemic purpose, they follow the Qedushah because that was the favourite prayer of Jewish mystics (Elbogen, *Gottesdienst*, 19) and it was presumably such mystics who claimed such holiness. Several Jewish magical prayers (*PGM*, 1. 12, lines 196 ff. ; 112, lines 1167 ff. ; cf. 90, line 522) and Poimandres 1. 31 suggest that the recitation of the Qedushah was conceived as a means of invoking the deity or a result of union with him. The angels in III Enoch 35. 6 are restored to their original form by the recitation of the Qedushah ; presumably the mystics held that man was, too ; i.e. he became once more the image of God. Accordingly, the recitation of the Qedushah was much loved in the second century (Finkelstein, *JQR*. xvi (1925), 31) and the polemic of the Jewish source of the A.C. probably dates from that period. Thus far Peterson. Add to his evidence the polemic passages cited in the preceding note. There is an interesting parallel between *Papyri Graecae Magicae*, ed. K. Preisendanz (Leipzig, 1928 and 1931), 2 vols. (hereinafter = *PGM*), 1. 90 (no. IV, line 522) : *hagiois hagiastheis hagiastheis hagiastheis hagiastheis* and the saying quoted in Shemot Rabba 38. 8 (of Aaron) : *yabo' qadosh wayyikkane laqqadosh wayyaqrib lipne qadosh wayyekapper 'al qedoshim*. Note also the statement in Way. R. 24. 8, that when the angels crown God with the triple crown of the trishagion he transfers two of the crowns to the head of Israel. The Jewish tradition as to the effect of the recitation of the trishagion deserves a special and thorough study.

Roman Empire.¹ So, too, the notion that the righteous will be deified by being given the name of God has been shown, by the last passage, to have been related by the rabbis to the deification which rhetoricians represented as effected by the imperial title. Unquestionably, both these notions had deep and ancient roots in magical practice, and certainly the Bible contained some texts which could be made to justify them. But the passages quoted argue strongly that the *development* of these notions and the *selection* of these texts was due to the influence of contemporary pagan practice.

In such instances as these the preacher who comes to the Bible looking for a proof text happens to find a good one, one which really says what he wants said. But this does not alter the fact that *he finds it because he looks for it, and he looks for it because of the practices or ideas which have become important in the world around him.* Therefore, when we discuss the influences at work on a religion we must look first of all to the world around it, its immediate environment.²

II. *The Evidence*

For the study of Greco-Roman Judaism it is most needful to keep all the different sorts of evidence in mind at the same time. Many works on the subject have gone astray because the authors

¹ There are many other passages in which this influence is clear, even though not explicit, e.g. Debarim Rabba, ed. Lieberman, p. 93: "R. Joshua b. Levi said, 'An angelic escort goes before a man and the criers cry out before him. And what do they say?' "Make way for the image of the Holy One, blessed by He.'" This must reflect pagan practice so familiar that there was no need to specify it.

² If this principle seem a truism scarcely worth stating, the excuse for its statement may be found in the present popularity of explanations of details of Judaism by reference to the religions of ancient Syria, Egypt, Mesopotamia and Persia. Undoubtedly the Bible does show appropriation and adaptation of material from all these sources, but it is extremely implausible to attribute to *ancient or local or peripheral* influences any characteristic of Maccabean or later Judaism which can be explained by reference to the *contemporary and universal and immediate* influence of hellenistic culture. Moreover, the factor of fashion has to be considered: While the Greeks might dabble in oriental religions and, occasionally, affect native ways, the adoption of Greek ways became, for the natives, the height of fashion (and the means of advancement). Therefore when we find what look like Greek ways appearing in the native religions, it is likely that they result from such adoption.

built on the one or two sorts of evidence each happened to know, and neglected other material which would have shown that even the evidence considered had a significance somewhat different than that supposed. It may be worth while, therefore, to list and to comment briefly on the major bodies of evidence.

To begin, as every study of Judaism must begin, with the Bible. It must be remembered that the latest books of the Old Testament are products of the hellenistic age. Greeks had ruled Palestine for almost two centuries before Daniel was written, and Greek influence had been at work there for centuries prior to the advent of Greek rule.¹ It is therefore at least plausible to attribute such traits of the later Old Testament books as the shift of concern from the nation to the individual and the increase in importance of the concept of wisdom to that great shift in ways of life and thought which prepared for Alexander's conquest.

More certain evidence of hellenization are, of course, the Greek translations of the Bible. The preserved fragments of many different versions show that the translation of parts of the Old Testament into Greek was a process which kept recurring through a long period. However begun,² it was certainly carried on in Palestine, by and for Palestinians,³ and by and for both Jews and Samaritans.⁴ Palestinian rabbinic literature knows of Greek translations and sometimes approves and uses

¹ O. Sellers, *The Citadel of Beth Zur* (Philadelphia, 1933), summarizing the results of his excavation of this site, just south of Jerusalem, says, p. 10: "Foreign influence, even when the Persians were ruling, was largely Greek. Coins and pottery patterns came from the West, rather than from the East". Again, p. 41: "Culturally, from the early part of the fifth century Palestine was dominated by Greece. The few objects showing Persian influence are almost negligible." Substantially these same results are yielded by all the archaeological finds of this area and period.

² Clem. Alex., *Strom.* 1. 150. 1 f. (= 22, end), quotes from Aristobulus a statement that Greek translations of parts of the Old Testament had been made before Alexander's conquest of the Persians (omitting *kai*, with Stählin).

³ The translations of Aquila, Symmachus and possibly Theodotion were made either in Palestine or by Palestinians. Cf. S. Lieberman, *Greek in Jewish Palestine* (N.Y., 1942), pp. 2 and 17 ff.; H. Swete, *An Introduction to the OT in Greek* (Cambridge, 1914), pp. 31-53. That Theodotion, although originally from Asia Minor, worked in Palestine, is suggested by the tradition that makes him an Ebionite.

⁴ R. Devroese, *Int. à l'étude des MSS. grecs* (Paris, 1954), p. 130, n. 6.

them¹; fragments of them have been found in the manuscripts of the Qumran sect and the material found in Origen's time near Jericho (and plausibly attributed to the Qumran group) contained at least one or two Greek translations of parts of the Old Testament². Now the Qumran group seems to have been a sort of hyper-orthodox, self-enclosed ghetto. If, even in such a place, there were some people who could read the Bible better in Greek than in Hebrew, we are justified in arguing *a fortiori* about the linguistic condition of the rest of Palestine.

After the Bible and its Greek translations come the Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha, some of them originally written in Greek, all of the rest translated into it (some of the translations being made in Palestine).³ The hellenistic elements in their content have often been discussed.⁴ Next to these come the books of the New Testament and those of the Qumran sect and the rabbinic literature of the second and later centuries. The hellenization of the Christians will hardly be disputed. In particular the epistles of the New Testament certainly come from Greco-Roman models, in so far as they were not created *ad hoc* to meet the needs of particular situations. Further, the collecting of a particular man's letters is typical of the Greco-Roman world. But the members of the Qumran group also cast their thoughts into hellenistic forms, and so did the rabbinic teachers. The commentary, in particular, is probably a form of hellenistic origin since it is the natural expression of the sort of learning which was typical of the hellenistic world.⁵ Moreover, Lieberman has shown⁶ that the exegetic methods of the rabbis were

¹ Lieberman, *Greek*, loc. cit. in n. 2; E. Bickerman, *Some Notes on the Transmission of the LXX*, *Alexander Marx Jubilee Vol.* (English section, N.Y., 1950), pp. 164-5.

² *Revue Biblique* (1956), p. 54; Swete, *Introduction*, pp. 53-6. That yet other Greek texts of the Old Testament circulated in Palestine is proved by their appearance in other Judean manuscript finds, cf. D. Barthélémy, "Redécouverte", *Revue Biblique*, lx (1953), 18 ff.

³ For example, the Greek version of Esther, made in Jerusalem in the time of Alex. Jannaeus, E. Bickerman, "Notes on the Greek Book of Esther", *Proc. Amer. Acad. Jewish Res.*, xx. (1951), 108, 114.

⁴ See the refs. in R. Pfeiffer, *History of NT Times* (N.Y., 1949), under the individual books. ⁵ Schmid-Stählin, *Gesch. d. gr. Lit.*, 6th edn., II. i. 256.

⁶ *Hellenism in Jewish Palestine* (N.Y., 1950), pp. 20-82 and especially pp. 58-60 and 69.

remarkably similar to those of the Greeks and, in several important instances, their terminology was certainly borrowed from Greek sources.¹ Similarly, the new form of Jewish law code which appears in the second century A.D. is probably to be explained by connection with the codification of Roman law which was progressing at the same time. A code which grew solely from previous Jewish tradition would presumably have been much closer in form to earlier Jewish codes, notably Dt., which the sectarian documents did imitate.² Moreover, there are a number of parallels, both of substance and of form, between the Mishnah and the Roman codes.³

All the works hitherto mentioned—the later Biblical books, the Greek translations of the Bible, the apocryphal and pseud-epigraphic literature and its Greek translations, and the works of particular sects (including the rabbinic)—all these represent one strand of evidence, that which may be called the Biblical tradition, of which further examples are to be found in the Targumim, the earliest Jewish and Samaritan prayers, the Christian and Samaritan pseudepigrapha and such minor works as the Fasting Scroll and the Testament of Solomon, as well as some Jewish works preserved only in non-Jewish sources—the Jewish liturgical elements in the seventh and eighth books of the Apostolic Constitutions,⁴ some of the prayers in the magical

¹ Ibid. *gezerah shawah* is a translation of the Greek *sugkrisis pros ison*; the Hebrew term for numerical symbolism is *gematria* (= *geometria*) and that for interpretation of words as groups of initials is *notariqon*.

² Notably the Manual of Discipline and the Damaskusschrift. The imitation extends not only to wording and style, but also to structure; e.g. the combination of historical and juridical material in a single document: The Damaskusschrift begins like Deuteronomy with a history of the recent vicissitudes of the true Israel.

³ A formal parallel between Abot and Digesta 1. 2 is alleged by B. Cohen, "Peculium in Jewish and Roman Law", *Proc. Amer. Acad. Jewish Res.*, xx. (1951), 135 ff. Cohen has demonstrated many particular parallels in points of content, and other evidences of Jewish knowledge of Roman law, see his articles in the *Louis Ginzberg Jubilee Vol.*, the *Alex. Marx Jubilee Vol.*, the *Mélanges Isidore Lévy*, etc. More general parallels of form are also to be found. Of these, the preservation of minority opinions is of very great importance and is in striking contrast to the earlier Jewish and Near Eastern tradition.

⁴ W. Bousset, *Eine jüdische Gebetsammlung, Nachrichten*, K.G.W. (Göttingen, 1915), pp. 435 ff.; E. Goodenough, *By Light, Light* (New Haven, 1935), pp. 306 ff. (on which A. Nock's comments in *Gnomon*, xiii (1937), 163, n. 1, though

papyri,¹ and so on, all of them obviously shot through with hellenistic traits.

In contrast with these, the second great body of the evidence consists of the works written by Jews in the pagan literary tradition—mostly in the tradition of profane literature, though occasionally in the form and perhaps sometimes even in the spirit of pagan religious documents. The chief preserved examples of the profane sort are, of course, the works of Philo and Josephus, of which not the hellenization, but the essential Judaism, requires demonstration.² The chief examples of the religious sort are the Sibylline Oracles. Were these written to impress Jews or pagans? If pagans—they show a Jewish missionary propaganda prepared, like Paul, to adopt pagan forms of expression and make itself all things to all men. If Jews—they show that Jews were so likely to be reading pagan oracles and to be impressed by the authority of a pagan prophetess, that it was worth while for a Jewish preacher to disguise himself as a pagan prophetess in order to reach his fellow Jews.

A third great body of evidence is that composed of references to Jews and reminiscences of Jewish works in non-Jewish authors. Beside the great number of references (and the very few literary reminiscences) scattered through pagan literature, this class includes the vast bulk of Christian and early Moslem even Nock's knowledge is not so complete as to justify his statement that the expression "having attained remission of transgressions by means of the initiation" is "not possible in Hellenistic Judaism", see p. 486).

¹ On which E. Goodenough, *Jewish Symbols in the Greco-Roman Period* (New York, 1953 ff.) (Bollingen Series, 37), ii. 153 ff. and A. Nock's comments, *Gnomon*, xxvii (1955), 558 ff. An interesting point is raised by Nock's remarks (p. 570) on a charm which he thinks cannot be Jewish, because it is part of a technique to obtain Eros as a familiar spirit. He admits, however, that "it might be the work of a Jew who had wholly or partly abandoned tradition". Now it is not to be supposed that most Jewish magicians limited their supernatural associations to Yahweh, nor that, when they had resort to lesser powers, they thought themselves, or were thought, to abandon Judaism. If a Jew could be supposed to invoke Beelzebub, he could be supposed to invoke Eros. Just what is meant by abandoning tradition? Eros appears on the carved synagogues of Palestine and the Jewish catacombs of Rome; cf. Clementine Homilies, 5. 21.

² Such a demonstration has been given in Philo's case by H. Wolfson, *Philo* (Cambridge, 1947), 2 vols. For Josephus' loyalty to Judaism see my article, "Palestinian Judaism in the First Century" in *Israel*, ed. M. Davis (New York, 1956), pp. 67 ff.

material, within which special attention is required by the series of works *adversus Iudaeos*, the works of the heresiologists, the references in Roman legal material, the liturgical reminiscences, and other equally diverse and specialized bodies of data.¹ Of all these, the works of the heresiologists and the early disputations against the Jews are the most informative (though perhaps the least reliable). They show a Judaism difficult to reconcile with the traditional picture of orthodoxy and strikingly marked by Greco-Roman influences.²

Finally there is the archaeological material, which falls into two great groups : one which is properly literary (and can be classed as archaeological only by the accident of its finding)—the papyri, the Dead Sea documents and the like ; another which is properly archaeological, in the sense that any writing on the objects is subordinate to the objects themselves, as explanations of their functions or the like. Here belong both individual objects—gems, coins, glassware, pottery, ossuaries, sarcophagi and so on—and the complexes of data yielded by excavations, which have brought to light a great number of structures—tombs, catacombs, synagogues, forts, palaces—and even whole settlements (Qumran) and towns (Gezer, Samaria, Sepphoris). The bulk of this properly archaeological material is composed of objects completely hellenistic in form.

Of these four bodies of evidence—the works of the Biblical tradition, the Jewish literature of pagan style, the testimonia concerning Jews, and the archaeological material—no one is complete by itself. Each must be constantly supplemented by reference to all the others. And each carries with it a reminder that the preserved material—even when accessible—represents

¹ The best single survey of this literature is still that in J. Juster, *Les Juifs dans l'Empire Romain* (Paris, 1914), i. 31-179. For the earlier classical literature see E. Schürer, *Geschichte des jüd. Volkes*, 3/4 edn. (Leipzig, 1901), i. 41-74 and 106-11.

² The Jew Trypho in Justin's *Dialogue* begins a philosophical dispute in which he hears without protest that the Pharisees are a *hairesis* (like the Sadducees, Genistoi, Meristoi, Galileans, Hellenianio and Baptists) whose members no one speaking accurately would call Jews (80. 4), and that the Jews maintain God does not accept sacrifices made in Jerusalem, but only prayers offered in the diaspora (117. 2). Justin was a native Palestinian. The Judaism described by Epiphanius—another Palestinian—is even more surprising.

only a small part of what once existed. By their very existence, they demonstrate how much has been lost ; by the variety of the material they preserve, they prove the extent of our ignorance and tacitly warn of the danger of supposing that what is not to be found in them was never to be found at all.

This supposition would be dangerous in any field of ancient studies, but it is especially dangerous in the study of Judaism, because Jewish material has come down to us heavily censored. The censorship has been double—an external censorship by Christian authorities and a domestic censorship by Jews. (The domestic censorship we have seen above, at work in Exodus Rabba, in the material collected by Hoffmann as Midrash Tannaïm, and in the Targum on Psalms.) What material we have, is only such as got through this double sieve.¹ Yet even this preserved material, as we have seen, testifies *consistently* to the hellenization of ancient Judaism. What, then, would have been the testimony of the material which has disappeared ? We cannot be sure.

However, it is a suggestive fact that the objections in the third century to books of haggadah were much more violent than anything now preserved in such books would seem to excuse. Rabbi Joshua b. Levi said that those who wrote such books, or who read them, would have no share in the world to come.² R. Hiyya bar 'Abba said their hands should be cut off.³ R. Ze'ira calls their works 'books of magic'.⁴ What can have justified such expressions ? Perhaps the many parallels which still exist between haggadic statements and expressions in the magical papyri⁵ are, like the shards on a tell, mere scattered indications of what has been destroyed.

III. *The Archaeological Evidence and the Work of Goodenough*

With these possibilities in mind, let us turn to the work of E. Goodenough, *Jewish Symbols in the Greco-Roman Period*.⁶

As to the usefulness of the work there is, of course, no

¹ What has disappeared in the relatively short period since the Middle Ages is suggested by S. Lieberman's book *Sheqi'in* (Jerusalem, 1939).

² J. Shabbat, 16. 1 (15c).

³ Ibid.

⁴ J. Ma'aser, 3. 10 (51a).

⁵ For examples see the last section of this essay.

⁶ New York, 1953 ff. (Bollingen Series, 37).

question. Goodenough has performed an invaluable service by bringing together a great mass of the archaeological evidence. From now on his first three volumes, in particular, are an indispensable introduction to the study of the physical remains of Greco-Roman Judaism (and no serious study of the religion can safely neglect its physical remains).

As to the significance of these remains, Goodenough finds that most of the religious Jews in the Greco-Roman world (which for him includes, as it did in fact, Palestine) were primarily concerned about salvation, by which they meant spiritual peace in this life and the assurance of happiness hereafter.¹ To describe this salvation they certainly used the language of the mystery religions and to achieve it, he thinks, they may have adopted some of the mystery rites, particularly those involving a cup of wine which brought some special blessing. They gave a mystic interpretation to the Sabbath and the festivals and called those who agreed with them 'initiates', as contrasted with those who did not. That some Jews went further than this, Goodenough says, is possible, but unsubstantiated. Moreover, even those who went this far did not necessarily abandon the Law. Most Jews, like Philo, must have continued to observe the commandments as they knew them from Scripture and from their local traditions. They did so because of their loyalty to the group, because they thought these commandments valuable as spiritual discipline, and because they attributed to them allegorical meanings. It was this allegorizing and mystical Judaism which they expressed in the symbols they put on religious objects. Outside Palestine such expression was generally free to use animal and human forms; inside Palestine it was limited to vegetable and geometrical symbols by the Pharisees, who were able to enforce this limitation from the rise of the Maccabees to the destruction of the Temple, and whose rabbinic successors continued to exert great influence until the fall of Bar Koseba. After 135, however, the successors of the

¹ Goodenough could have supported this opinion with a number of passages from rabbinic literature, for instance, *Abodah Zarah* 19b: "R. Alexandri (went about) crying, 'Who wants life? Who wants life?' All the world came flocking to him, saying to him, 'Give us life!' He said to them" (*Ps.* xxxiv. 13 ff.). R. Alexandri here begins like a typical Greek street-corner philosopher.

Pharisees were reduced to an isolated clique and the popular mystical religion had its hands free in the decoration of the synagogues of Galilee and the catacombs of Beth Shearim as well as of those in Rome and North Africa. Only with the Middle Ages did the followers of the rabbinic tradition, from their base in Babylonia, succeed in converting most Jews of the Mediterranean basin to the Judaism of the Talmud. Thus Goodenough.

It is inevitable that so comprehensive a theory should lay itself open to attack from many sides. That the Pharisees, even during the short periods when they were certainly in power, could have controlled the decorative art of the whole country seems impossible. That after the fall of Bether the rabbis were reduced to an unimportant clique is contradicted by the implications of a vast number of stories in rabbinic literature and by the provisions of Roman law, which from the time of Constantine, at least, granted the Jewish Patriarch the same rank as the foremost Christian clerics and empowered him to send out representatives to "exact" tribute from the synagogues.¹ Along with the theory of the isolation of the rabbis goes a false notion of rabbinic Judaism as almost free of Hellenization. This often results in the supposition that Hellenistic material must be contrary, or at least alien, to rabbinic influence.

In considering the work as a whole, however, it seems less important to justify these criticisms in detail than to ask how far, if justified, they would affect the theory. For the theory is not a unit. The rôle assigned to the Pharisees, for instance, is unnecessary to the interpretation of the symbols. The Pharisees and their successors, though undoubtedly important, were only one branch of the religion; therefore Goodenough may be right in refusing to force the interpretation of the archaeological material to accord with rabbinic dicta. The final truth or falsity of the theory as a whole, therefore, can be determined only by careful reconsideration of all the evidence. It is a great merit of the work to have facilitated such reconsideration, not only by collection of the archaeological material, but also by emphasis on important facts which that material, when collected, and only when collected, reveals.

¹ Codex Theod. 16. 8. 13-17.

The first of these facts—which we should never have expected even from the Greco-Roman literary remains—is the wide extent of iconic decoration from the second century on. Of course, there were some references to iconic decoration in the literature: even Herod Agrippa I, the friend of the Pharisees, had in his palace at Caesarea statues of his daughters.¹ But hitherto such details could be treated as exceptional. Now that the material has been collected it appears that decoration with human figures was customary even in Jewish religious buildings. The second and third century catacombs of Rome show Victory crowning a youth, Fortuna pouring a libation, cupids, adolescent erotes, and so on.² A similar catacomb is reported near Carthage.³ The second or third century synagogue of Capernaum had over its main door an eagle, carved in high relief. Over the eagle was a frieze of six naked erotes, carrying garlands. Inside was not only a frieze containing human, animal and mythological figures, but also a pair of free-standing statues of lions, probably in front of the Torah shrine.⁴ The synagogue of Chorazin, of about the same date, had similar statues and a frieze showing vintage scenes of the sort traditionally associated with the cult of Dionysus.⁵ Remains of some dozen other synagogues scattered about Palestine show traces of similar carved decoration.⁶ There are human figures in high relief in the second-to-fourth century catacombs of Beth Shearim.⁷ From the same period the synagogue of Dura shows a full interior decoration of frescoes representing Biblical scenes.⁸ From the fourth and fifth century synagogues of Palestine we have half a dozen mosaic floors, and there is reason to believe that in about half of them the central panel was occupied by a picture which, if not found in a synagogue, would be recognized as a representation of the sun god driving his chariot.⁹

So long as these remains were studied one group at a time, they might be explained as heretical. This is now impossible. On the other hand, it is dangerous to explain them as orthodox, first, because the meaning of orthodoxy is uncertain for this

¹ *Antiquities*, 19. 357.

³ *Id.* 2. 63-8.

⁷ *Id.* 1. 89-102.

⁴ *Id.* 1. 181-92.

⁸ *Id.* 1. 227-32.

² Goodenough, ii. 4-44.

⁵ *Id.* 1. 193-9.

⁹ *Id.* 1. 239-62.

⁶ *Id.* 1. 199-225.

period, second, because the carved decoration of the Galilean synagogues shows deliberate mutilation: human and animal figures have been chipped away carefully, so as to leave the rest of the carving undamaged.¹ Similarly, the eyes of some figures in the Dura synagogue have been gouged out, but the rest of the faces left unmarked.² Again, a sarcophagus in Beth Shearim was broken up in ancient times, probably because it showed Leda and the swan and other carved figures.³ Unfortunately, the date of the mutilations in the carved synagogues is a matter of dispute. Those who maintain that carved decoration was always permitted by orthodox Judaism can blame the destruction on the Moslems. But if these synagogues housed orthodox Judaism, then it must have been somewhat different than it is pictured by the rabbinic literature.⁴ This is true even of Dura, where the decoration looks most nearly orthodox. At Dura, in the south doorpost hole, under the plaster, was a small, irregular cavity, containing the bones of one human middle finger and the end bone of another; in the sockets of the smaller door were found several human teeth.⁵ If the finger bones had sufficient flesh attached to them when they were placed there they would have rendered everyone in the building unclean.⁶ This, however, can scarcely have been the object of the person who put them there—if we can judge by rabbinic law, for it held such uncleanness to be general in gentile lands, where graves are not marked and there is no assurance that a man may not at any moment walk above one.⁷ Therefore this is probably no mere question

¹ Goodenough, I. 184-9; 193-6; 201-4; 206; 208.

² Goodenough, in a note to me, compares Rosh Hashshana 24b, where to "put out the eye" of a figure on a ring means to disfigure it so that it will no longer occasion the suspicion that it is an object of reverence.

³ Id. I. 138.

⁴ For the upshot of the rabbinic evidence see B. Cohen, "Art in Jewish Law", *Judaism*, iii (1954), 165 ff.

⁵ Goodenough, i. 228.

⁶ 'Oholot, 2. 1.

⁷ 'Oholot, 18. 6. Further, even rabbinic tradition contains some elements which show an amazing indifference to this consideration, e.g. the story that Solomon brought the coffin of David into the Temple (*Pesiq. Rab.* 2, ed. Friedmann 6 b, & parallels). Instead of polluting it, this produced the descent of the heavenly fire. Can this story, or the practice of Dura, have been influenced by the Christian use of the remains of martyrs?

of uncleanness : Goodenough is probably right in saying that these bones were put in the building deliberately, by the builders, in some sort of " foundation ritual ".

This, therefore, is the first problem which Goodenough's work reveals : On the one hand, rabbinic literature shows us the rabbis exercising a wide influence, and its evidence is confirmed by that of Roman law. On the other hand, the preserved archaeological material shows us details which look very different from what the rabbinic literature would lead us to expect. How can these two bodies of evidence be reconciled ? Elements of the eventual reconciliation (if any) may be suggested by what has been said above : A great deal of rabbinic literature has not been preserved ; the great bulk of non-rabbinic Jewish literature has been lost ; most of the written material which *has* come down to us is preserved in late manuscripts which have passed through a double censorship. We have seen above several cases where such censorship deleted from rabbinic material references to the human form as an image of God. Compare the removal of human and animal forms from the synagogues.

Another point made clear only by Goodenough's work is the chronological sequence and change in the styles of decoration. Roughly speaking, the most important datable material falls into three great groups. First is the Palestinian material of the first centuries B.C. and A.D. ; next come the great catacombs both in Palestine and in the Diaspora, and the carved synagogues in Palestine, which are typical of the second and third centuries A.D. (contemporary with these is Dura, which is the first example of a transitional group of synagogues) ; finally come the synagogues with extensive mosaics, principally, but not exclusively, in Palestine and mostly in the fourth and fifth centuries.¹

The first group—the Palestinian material of the first centuries B.C. and A.D.—is characterized by the almost total absence of animal and human figures. It comes principally from the big tombs around Jerusalem, from ossuaries and lamps found mostly in tombs, and from the Maccabean coins. Since the

¹ While the magical gems with *Iao*, *Sabaoth* and the like cannot be dated certainly, most of them come from the third to the fifth century A.D. and from the eastern half of the Roman Empire, especially Syria and Egypt.

ossuaries and elaborate tombs could be afforded only by the rich and the coins show the choice of government officials, this material probably represents *principally* the taste of the Sadducees and the Herodians. This may partly account for the predominance—especially in the tombs—of vegetable decoration which is reminiscent of contemporary Roman style.¹ Similar Roman influence has been remarked in the Herodian coin types² and in the *opus reticulatum* of the Herodian palace at Jericho, for which Italian architects and builders were imported.³ Roman or otherwise, there is no question that vegetable and geometric decoration makes up almost all the Jewish art of this period, and that the most significant thing about this art would seem to be its *apparent* (which here does not mean *certain*) lack of significance.

Yet even some of the elements of this style of decoration seem to have had, sometimes at least, some symbolic significance, as signs of good luck or of a hope for better things either in this world or hereafter. Goodenough seems justified when he argues that some such significance must have been attached sometimes to the representation of a wine-jar or cup, sometimes with a vine growing out of it. As he points out, jar and vine together were found on an amulet placed between the thighs of a female figure in an undisturbed Jewish grave of the late Roman period in

¹ Goodenough, 3, nos. 22-32. The commonest element is an architrave decorated with triglyphs and with rosettes, wreaths, bull's-eyes, or other round objects in the metopes (nos. 25, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32). This appears also in Pompei: H. Beyen, *Die Pompejanische Wanddekoration* (Haag, 1938), I, Tafeln, nos. 82, 83; L. Curtius, *Die Wandmalerei Pompejis* (Leipzig, n.d. (1929)), figs. 60, 77, 79. In Goodenough, 3. 26 the metopes are left blank, as they are, e.g. in Curtius, fig. 43. The wreath and rosette of the lower element of Goodenough 3. 31 are strikingly similar to those of the *ara pacis*, Curtius, fig. 80, cf. L. Curtius, *Das Antike Rom* (Vienna, n.d. (1944)), no. 157. The same type of wreath appears in Pompei, Beyen 6a-c, 77, 87. The use of two vines growing from a group of three acanthus leaves, which appears in Goodenough 3. 22 and 23, also appears on the *ara pacis*, Curtius, *Antike Rom*, nos. 154, 155, 158. The pyramid of Goodenough 3. 27 recalls, of course, the pyramid of Cestius (a Neopythagorean?), Curtius, A.R., no. 177; the concave cone of 3. 28 appears in Pompei: Beyen, nos. 56-8 = Curtius, W.P., figs. 70, 74. Thus almost all the motifs found in these monuments appear in contemporary Roman art.

² J. Meyshan, "The Coinage of Agrippa the First", *Israel Explor. J.*, iv (1954), 186 ff.

³ J. Kelso and D. Baramki, *Excavations at NT Jericho* (New Haven, 1955) (Annual ASOR, 29-30), 5b and 10a-11a.

Gezer, and a design on an amulet so used is presumably significant.¹ There are also one or two ossuaries on which the sort of chalice from which the vine customarily grows has been added, more or less inexpertly, to the ready-made decoration.² Such deliberate addition does look meaningful. Another such symbol may have been the lily, since Goodenough has shown that lilies also were added inexpertly to ossuaries³ and we shall meet them presently in another connection. Apart from these, however, the most striking characteristic of the art of this period is its apparent insignificance.

This makes more important the fact established by Goodenough, that the next period—chiefly the second and third centuries A.D.—shows the sudden and widespread appearance of forms much more likely to be symbolic. These forms, as Goodenough remarks, are of two classes: first come those drawn from contemporary pagan art—eagles and other birds, erotes, victories, mythological figures like sirens and centaurs, lions and so on, which appear on both the Roman catacombs and sarcophagi and the carved synagogues of Galilee. These are the most puzzling part of the whole body of material. It is difficult to conceive of a form of ancient Judaism which would symbolize some point of its belief or practice by a carved representation of a band of erotes, but it is equally difficult to conceive of a Jewish congregation of which the leaders, choosing decorations for their synagogue, with all the range of conventional Greco-Roman decoration to choose from, should choose by mere aesthetic preference to put six naked, adolescent erotes over the main entrance. In more abstract terms; if the objects are insignificant it is very difficult to explain why they were chosen, but if they are not insignificant, what can they possibly signify?

Here the discussion is complicated by the fact that these objects are among those customarily represented by classical art, and their significance in classical art is also a matter of dispute.⁴

¹ J. Kelso and D. Baramki, *Excavations at NT Jericho* (New Haven, 1955) (Annual ASOR, 29-30), 5b and 10a-11a. 1. 166.

² Id. 3. 155 and perhaps 157.

³ Id. 3. 192 and perhaps 175.

⁴ See especially F. Cumont, *Recherches sur le symbolisme funéraire des Romains* (Paris, 1942) (H.-C. de l'Etat fr. en Syrie et au Liban, *Bibl. Arch. et Hist.*, p. 35) and A. Nock, "Sarcophagi and Symbolism", *AJA*, 1 (1946), 140 ff., summarized in

There is agreement that they were interpreted philosophically by the Pythagoreans and Stoics and by some small religious groups of lower social standing.¹ It is agreed, too, that on some monuments, at least, these common objects are used as symbols of the philosophical or religious interpretations attached to them.² On the other hand, it has been tacitly assumed that they are used on many other monuments as pure decoration or with exclusively secular meanings. This assumption is not beyond question. Every action in the ancient world had its appropriate deity—as the word *venerary* still testifies³—and it is not to be taken for granted that the figures in the wall decorations of Pompei, for instance, merely because they were not worshipped, were therefore wholly without religious significance.⁴

However, if it be granted that such a thing as wholly secular art did exist in the ancient world, and if many of the apparently Dionysiac remains be described as secular, it will follow that secular and religious art often represented the same objects in the same way. Therefore the connotations—as opposed to the significance—of the one can scarcely have been absent from the other. As Cumont says with reference to Dionysiac scenes, “it would be absurd to suppose” that they could have been used without knowledge of their common mythological significance.⁵

his review of Cumont, *JRS*, xxxviii (1948), 154 ff. Further, G. Hanfmann, *The Season Sarcophagus in Dumbarton Oaks* (Cambridge, 1951), 2 vols.; Nock, review of Goodenough, in *Gnomon* xxvii (1955), 558 ff., and the literature cited in these works.

¹ Nock, *AJA*, l. 169, finds evidence for lower class resort to allegorization in Hippolytus' report of the Naasenes, *Philosophumena*, 5. 1 ff.

² E.g. in the underground basilica in the Porta Maggiore, Nock, *AJA*, l. 168; cf. M.-J. Lagrange, review of J. Carcopino, *La basilique pythagoricienne* (Paris 1926), in *RB*, xxxvi (1927), 599 ff.

³ E.g. *kai ta Demetros kai ta Aphrodites* = “both eating and sexual gratification”, Diog. Laert. 6. 69; cf. the remarks of R. Marcus, *Jewish and Greek Elements in the LXX*, L. Ginzberg Jubilee Volume (English Section, New York, 1945), pp. 232-3.

⁴ Contrast Nock, *Gnomon*, 27. 566. In speaking of public buildings it must be remembered that the ancient state dealt with the gods as well as with men, and since the gods were concerned in all acts of life, all its functions were, to an extent, religious.

⁵ *Recherches*, p. 486, cf. Nock, *Gnomon*, 27. 564. The supposition is particularly unlikely for synagogues in the basin of the Sea of Galilee, since the largest town in the basin, Scythopolis, was the legendary site of the tomb of

Therefore any estimate of the significance of such motifs when they appear in Jewish material must explain them either by the supposition of a very tolerant, not to say syncretistic, Judaism, or by a significance sufficiently important to lead the users to overlook these inevitable pagan connotations.

For such an explanation it is not enough merely to find some excuse which might account for such objects not having been prohibited. They were not put in synagogues merely because they were not prohibited. Any number of other objects were not prohibited, but were not represented, either. It is necessary to account, first, for the representation of these particular objects, and second, for their representation in spite of the pagan connotations they must have carried. The supposition that some symbolic meaning was attached to them would satisfy these requirements and is not, *per se*, impossible, since symbolic meaning was admittedly attributed to them by some groups in the pagan world. That some Palestinian and Roman Jews followed the example of these groups in allegorizing statues and pictures, as some Alexandrian Jews did in allegorizing laws and legends, is not unlikely.

Its likelihood is increased by the fact that the other group of forms which appears in this same Jewish art of the second and third centuries is made up of Jewish objects which are almost

Dionysus' nurse, Nyssa (from whom it took its alternative name) and was a centre of his cult (G. Hill, "Some Palestinian Cults", *Proc. Brit. Acad.* (1911-12), pp. 411 ff.). Nock's statement that "only to Gentiles did the golden vine of the Temple suggest Dionysus" (my italics) is unsupported and can hardly be true, given the earlier history of the association of the cult of Yahweh with that of Dionysus-Sabazios (see the refs. collected by S. Cook, *The Religion of Ancient Palestine* (London, 1930) (Schweich Lectures, 1925), pp. 194 f.; H. Gressmann, *Die Aufgaben der Wissenschaft des nachbiblischen Jdms.* (Giessen, 1925), pp. 16 ff., and M. Nilsson, *Gesch. der gr. Religion* (Munich, 1941-50), ii. 636 f.). The mask of Silenus which accompanies the enthroned god on the YHD or YHW coin of about 350 B.C. (Goodenough 3. 670) can hardly be explained as a reference to the theatre. The cult of Dionysus had evidently made its way into Palestine by that time, but it is almost incredible that the Greek theatre should have followed it so soon. Hanfmann's suggestion, *Sarcophagus* 1. 195, that the vintage scenes on Jewish sarcophagi may be interpreted as seasonal rather than Dionysiac, neglects the fact that the vintagers are putti, and rests on what is probably a false antithesis, made possible by the separations of two connotations of vintage normally conjoined in ancient thought.

certainly symbolic¹—the menorah, the lulab, the ethrog, the shofar and the Torah shrine. It is one of Goodenough's major contributions to have pointed out² that these are all second century introductions, either extremely rare or entirely absent in the earlier periods. Some are of obvious significance. It can hardly be doubted, for instance, that the Torah shrine means the Law—however the Law may have been interpreted—and that when it is put in the centre or at the top of a decorated area it means that the Torah is the centre or the highest thing of life. But if this be granted it should follow that an equal significance is to be attached to the fact that in the diaspora the Torah shrine is comparatively rare. Outside Palestine the menorah is much more frequent and it is usually the menorah which is the centre of decorated areas. There is even one instance, in the catacomb of Torlonia, where the menorah is in the centre and the Torah is off to one side.³ Another interesting fact is that on amulets there are many menorahs⁴ but, so far as I remember, no Torah shrines.

IV. *The Menorah and the Tree*

What, then, did the menorah mean? Goodenough has pointed out an inscription under a menorah⁵ which has been restored as reading "Image of the God who sees". But the restoration is not perfectly certain.

Some evidence as to the meaning of the menorah and, especially, as to why it was appropriate for graves, is to be found in Sifre Debarim 10 :⁶ "R. Simon b. Johai says, 'The faces of the righteous in the world to come appear as seven joys : as the sun

¹ This argument is applied by Hanfmann, *Sarcophagus*, 194, to the interpretation of the sun and the seasons in the mosaics on the synagogue floors. He supposes that, because of their Roman sources, it is possible that these mosaics "may be no more than calendars", but goes on to observe that "since other mosaics in these synagogues show objects of cult, an allegorical interpretation seems more likely".

² 1. 86 ; 4. 67 f.

³ 3. 810. Cf. the gold disk, 3. 1034, where the lulab looks so much like a Torah scroll as to make its identity doubtful. (I cannot see the resemblance to 1033 referred to by Goodenough 2. 222.)

⁴ Goodenough, 3. 1009-34.

⁵ J.-B. Frey, *Corpus Inscriptionum Judaicarum* (Vatican City, 1936-52), i. 696.

⁶ On Deut. i. 10, ed. Finkelstein, p. 18.

and as the moon, as the firmament, as the stars and as the ightnings and as lilies and as the menorah of the Temple. Whence do we learn, "as the sun and as the moon"? Because it is said, "Beautiful as the moon, clear as the sun".¹ Whence, "as the firmament"? Because it is said, "And those who are wise shall shine as the glory of the firmament".² Whence, "as the stars"? Because it is said, "And those who turn many to righteousness shall be as the stars".³ Whence, "as the lightnings"? Because it is said, "They shall dart as the lightnings".⁴ Whence, "as lilies"? Because it is said, "For him who triumphs together with lilies."⁵ Whence, as the menorah of the Temple"? Because it is said, "And there are two olive trees beside it, one on the right of the bowl and the other on its left".⁶

Now this is clearly an example of what was discussed above—of a preacher getting his ideas from the surrounding world and then hunting out verses from the Bible to justify them. R. Simon has from somewhere—certainly not from the Old Testament, but probably from the Greco-Roman world around him⁷—the notion that there are to be seven classes of saints in the world to come. This notion was widely accepted in Judaism⁸ and R. Simon wished to find verses of Scripture to justify it. For this purpose he was apparently able to draw on a number of earlier interpretations which treated single verses or groups of verses as descriptions of the righteous in the world to come. The first of these interpretations used a verse from the Song of Songs, which,

¹ Song of Sol. vi. 10.

² Dan. xii. 3.

³ Ibid.

⁴ Nahum. ii. 5.

⁵ Ps. xlv. 1.

⁶ Zech. iv. 3.

⁷ Cumont, *Recherches*, p. 383, n. 4, thinks this notion comes from that of ascent through the seven planetary spheres, originally 'chaldean', then hellenized and diffused throughout the Roman Empire.

⁸ E.g. in Sifre Deb. 10 it is evidenced by two distinct sayings. It is found, beside the passage cited above, in Sifre Deb. 47 on Deut. xi. 21 (ed. Finkelstein, p. 105); in Midrash Tanna'im on the same verses of Deut. (ed. Hoffmann, pp. 6 and 40); in J. Hagiga, 2. 1 (77a); Wayyiqra Rabba, 30. 2; Midrash Tehillim on Pss. 11 (sec. 6) and 16 (sec. 12) (ed. Buber, fols. 51a and 62b); Pesiqta de Rab Kahana 28 on Lev. xxiii. 40 (ed. Buber, fols. 179b f.); and Yalqut Shim'oni 2. 59 on Judges v. 31, and 2. 656 on Ps. xi. 7. In Judaism outside rabbinic literature the idea appears in 4 Ezra (= 2 Esdras) vii. 91 ff., where it has probably been superimposed on an earlier saying listing the seven joys of the saints—a saying which also has rabbinic parallels, some of them occurring in connection with the passages cited above (notably as interpretations of Ps. xvi. 1).

in typical Hellenistic fashion, it interpreted allegorically. There it found the beloved compared to the sun and the moon, and it applied these comparisons to the righteous in the world to come. Next there was a good, strong proof text. Daniel (a work of the Hellenistic period) actually does contain the idea that the good will hereafter shine as stars and share the glory of the heaven—another notion which pretty certainly did not come from ancient Israelite belief and which was very common in the Hellenistic world.¹ So R. Simon used Dan. xii. 3 for two more classes. Next there was a verse in Nahum which said war chariots glitter like lightnings when rushing through the streets of a city. Any indefinite reference to war could be understood as referring to the war of the Messiah. Therefore someone took the comparison to lightnings as a description of the righteous, and R. Simon included it in his list. Next there was a Psalm which could be understood to refer to the Messiah and which had at the head of it three obscure words which could be forced to mean, “to him who triumphs together with lilies”. So the lilies could be taken to be the companions of the Messiah. Nobody would ever have thought of this meaning unless the lily had already become a symbol for the saints in the future life or the immortal soul or the resurrection or something of the sort. But we have seen from Goodenough that people in the century before R. Simon were already adding lilies to the decorations of their ossuaries. Further, a passage in *Tohorot*² suggests that lilies were customarily planted on graves, and the Gospels use them as an example of the saints in this present life.³ So it is not unreasonable to believe that the lily had already acquired some such meaning. Another reason for thinking it had, is that R. Simon felt compelled to work it into his list, where it is patently out of place in a series of luminaries.

¹ For the frequency of the belief in astral immortality, Nock, *AJA*, I. 162. Many rabbinic passages imply the notion; a particularly explicit development of it is in *Sifre Deb.* 47 on Deut. xi. 21 which, *inter alia*, attributes to R. Akiba the (gnostic?) belief that there are sixty heavens, explains the differences in glory of the saints by reference to the differences in glory of the stars (so I Cor. xv. 4), and compares (or identifies?) the saints' rule of the world with that of the constellations.

² 3. 7.

³ Luke. xii. 27 f. and parallel.

Finally we come to the menorah. Zechariah saw a menorah standing between two olive trees. He asked what this meant and the angel who was with him told him that the seven lamps of the menorah are the seven eyes of the Lord, and the two olive trees are the anointed who stand by the Lord.¹ That the seven lamps of the menorah are the seven eyes of the Lord—i.e. the seven planets (?)²—is echoed by the magical papyri, where the sun and moon are the eyes of Agathos Daimon = Abraarm (sic) = lao,³ and explains and confirms the reading on the inscription noticed by Goodenough, “Image of the God who sees”.⁴

Further, the notion that the menorah is a symbol of God appears in other material. Josephus in his tract against Apion⁵ tells a story circulated, but not invented, by the latter, to the effect that the Temple had been robbed by an Idumean who played on the Jews' credulity. He persuaded them that an epiphany of Apollo was to take place there. So persuaded, they remained at a reverent distance, while he played the part of the present deity by wearing a wooden device on which he had fixed three rows of lights, so that they seemed, to those at a distance, like stars moving upon the earth. Presumably Josephus is right in describing the story as a malicious fiction. But presumably, also, the story reflects what it was thought the Jews would expect to see if an epiphany took place. Evidently some Jews shared this opinion, since one carved such a deity on the walls of a catacomb in Beth Shearim⁶—a figure, in high relief, of a man

¹ Zech. iv. 1-14.

² The identification of the seven lights with the seven planets is suggested by Zechariah's statement that they “run back and forth over the whole earth” (iv. 10) and is made by ancient tradition (see below) and by many modern commentators (see T. Robinson and F. Horst, *Die Zwölf Kleinen Propheten* (Tübingen, 1954), p. 231). Professor A. Sachs, in conversation with me, has expressed doubt that the seven planets were known in Judea as an astronomical class at the time of Zechariah (520-518 B.C.). It may be that for Zechariah the seven eyes of Jahweh were seven angels conceived as analogous to the Persian administrative officials, “the eyes of the King” who travelled all over the empire and reported to the central government (CAH. 4.197-8). However, by the time of Philo and Josephus the astral interpretation was evidently standard, as their independent use of it argues. For the rabbinic use of it, L. Ginzberg, *The Legends of the Jews* (Philadelphia, 1909-38), 7 vols., vi. 65 f., n. 339.

³ PGM, ii. 122.

⁴ Of course a reference also to Gen. xvi. 13 f.

⁵ 2. 112 ff.

⁶ Goodenough, 3. 56.

wearing a menorah on his head. The thought of the man who carved this image was probably expressed by a prayer found in two Coptic magical papyri: "Jao Sabaoth be on my head, Adonai Eloi in my heart, that they lend me brilliance" and the carving has iconographic analogues among the drawings in the magical papyri.¹ Accordingly it is not surprising to find in Philo that the menorah is the symbol of "heaven" and its lights, of the planets²; in Clement of Alexandria³ that the lights symbolize the seven planets and the menorah itself is "the sign of Christ". In the Tanhuma the menorah is equated with the Lord leading Israel as a pillar of fire.⁴ In Midrash Tadshe its light is said to symbolize that of the Shekinah.⁵ In Pesiqta Rabbati⁶ the menorah is taken as a symbol of Israel and the bowl "on its head"⁷ as God. This recalls the Apocalypse⁸ where the seven golden lamps are the seven churches, and Christ is in the midst

¹ A. Kropp, *Ausgewählte Koptische Zaubertexte* (hereafter = *AKZ*) (Brussels, 1930-1), 3 vols, ii. 91 (no. 28), cf. ii. 139 (no. 40). Cf. the specification in Sifre Zutta 8. 2 that the lighting of the lamps of the menorah was to be *ķemin 'atarah*, "like a wreath" or "crown"—this Horovitz, ad loc. could not explain. Goodenough, 1. 92 follows Abi-Yonah in thinking the carving an example of a "series of human figures supporting the symbols of their religion". Even if Abi-Yonah's figures represent Christians rather than Christ, it would remain to be determined whether they were human in more than form. The carving at Bet Shearim is at least equally close to some drawings of deities in magical papyri, e.g. a figure which represents an epiphany of Bes-Helios-Iao-Sabaoth-Adonai, B.M. Pap. 122 published in *PGM*, ii. 48 ff. (no. 8, lines 65-110) and Pl. I, Fig. 6. (Note the similarity of the costumes. In the papyrus the headdress may, at the time of drawing, have been understood as a representation of lights, but was actually a simplification of the ancient "hemhem" crown, see C. Bonner, *Studies in Magical Amulets* (Ann Arbor, 1950) (University of Michigan Humanistic Series, 49), 250. Bonner's reproductions nos. 217-19 show it worn by Harpocrates whom we shall meet again, below, as an image of Iao.) See also the figure represented in *Papyri Osloenses I*, ed. S. Eitrem (Oslo, 1925), p. 20 (badly reproduced in *PGM*, ii. 177 (no. 39)). The growths from the head might be seven in number and might represent the menorah, the tree of life, or the feather crown of Bes (F. Lexa, *La Magie dans l'Égypte antique* (Paris, 1925), 3, Pl. 21, Fig. 28), but they look most like "the seedfield head of Agathos Daimon" which we shall discuss below. Agathos Daimon in the magical papyri is frequently identified or associated with Iao. The text here is a love charm of a type in which Iao is often the deity invoked (more often, I believe, than Bes). It contains nothing which could not have been written by a Jew.

² Moses 2. 102-3.

⁴ Tezawweh 1.

⁶ 8, ed. Friedmann 29b.

³ Stromata 5.6.34.9-35.2.

⁵ L. Ginzberg, *Legends*, 3. 161 and note.

⁷ Zech. iv. 2. f.

⁸ i. 12 ff.

of them, but compare also Chrysostom's statement that "as the lamp has the light on its head, so also the cross had blazing on its head the sun of righteousness".¹

Evidently the menorah may be a symbol of God,² or of the macrocosm, or of the microcosm, the individual saint. This is what we should expect in a theology influenced both by the Platonic notion of the cosmos, especially the celestial spheres, as an image of God,³ and by the Biblical notion—extended under Greco-Roman influence—of man as God's likeness. Accordingly, it is well within the limits of the evidence to see in the belief that the just were to become like the menorah a particular example of the belief that they were to become like God. Beholding his glory, as one Jew said, they were to be "changed into that same image, from glory into glory".⁴

But here we have a difficulty. R. Simon says the just will be like the menorah, but he quotes as proof text the verse about the olive trees standing beside it. Why? Because in the vision of Zechariah the menorah is the Lord and the olive trees are the just. In that case, why did not R. Simon compare the just to the olive trees? This so much troubled some copyists that the versions of the saying in *Pesiqta de R. Kahana*⁵ and *wayyiqra Rabba*⁶ dropped the reference to the olive trees and substituted the verse about the menorah. But this is clearly wrong, because, had the reference to the menorah stood there to begin with, nobody would have substituted a reference to olive trees. Another copyist, in *Midrash Tehillim*,⁷ dropped both menorah and olive trees and went back to Nahum, where the chariots are

¹ In *coemeterii appellationem*, middle (ed. Montfaucon (Venice, 1734), 2. 400 E).

² Either alone or united with the true Israel or with the individual saint. With God "on the head" of the menorah, as part of it (*Pesiq. R.* 8, cited above), cf. Christ as head of the Church (*Eph.* i. 22; iv. 15; v. 23; *Col.* i. 18); with God as (or, on) the head of the individual saint, cf. *1 Cor.* ii. 3. Here we have the same metaphor used in the same way—now for the collective relationship, again for the individual one. A particularly lucid and well-documented discussion of the Pauline concept is that by P. Benoit, "Corps, Tête et Plerôme", *RB*, lxxiii (1956), 5, ff., though I cannot agree with B.'s sharp distinction between the notion of Christ as ruler and the notion of him as physically united with the beings ruled.

³ *Timaeus* 37b-c.

⁴ *2 Cor.* iii. 18.

⁵ 28, ed. Buber, 179b.

⁶ 30. 2.

⁷ 11. 6, ed. Buber, 51a.

compared to torches as well as to lightnings ; he used the torches for his final comparison. But this, too, is certainly wrong, because all the other versions of the saying are against it and because, had the original saying used both comparisons from Nahum, it would certainly have used them together and not have inserted the lilies of Ps. 45 between them.¹

(However, this substitution made by the editor of Midrash Tehillim is instructive. It shows he was surprised by the fact that the torches of Nahum were not used. We should be, too. Certainly torches would have served better in a list of luminous objects than would lilies, and there was an independent tradition which compared their brilliance to that of the sanctified.² Therefore the fact that the lilies were kept and the torches of Nahum sacrificed confirms our previous suspicion that the comparison of the righteous dead to lilies was already standard and obligatory for the compiler of the list.)

But this does not solve the problem stated above : Why does the list compare the just to the menorah, but quote as proof the reference to the olive trees standing beside it ? The answer is, I think, that our saying was originally part of an interpretation of Ps. xvi. 11,³ translated as follows : " There are seven joys before thy face, (but) the supremacy (goes to) the pleasures at thy right hand".⁴ Our saying interpreted the first half of the verse ; it identified the seven joys with seven classes of the righteous⁵ which it compared to (1) sun, (2) moon, (3) heaven, (4) stars,

¹ Similarly, the insertion of the lightnings of Nahum between the heaven and the stars of Daniel, in Pesiq. d.R.K. 28 and Midrash Tannaïm p. 6, is a sure sign of corruption.

² When the High Priest, entering the Holy of Holies, was possessed by the Holy Ghost, " his face shone like torches " and he became, if not a god, at least more than man (Way. R. 21, end ; cf. Philo, *Quis rerum*, 84 ; *Somm.* 2. 189). A similar change took place in Phineas' face when he was possessed by the Holy Ghost ; he was therefore described as an angel, Way .R. 1. 1. Both Seth and Moses are said to have been called ' God ' because their faces shone, M. James, *The Lost Apocrypha of the OT* (London, 1920), p. 9. Cf. the transfiguration, Mark ix. 2 ff.

³ This appears from the versions in Pesiq. d.R.K., Way. R., and Midrash Tehillim, all cited above, p. 498, n. 8.

⁴ The interpreters read *soba'* as *sheba'*.

⁵ As remarked above, p. 498, n. 8, this interpretation has been imposed on the older interpretation in 4 Ezra vii. 91 ff. which originally listed seven joys.

(5) lightnings, (6) lilies and (7) olive trees. It was followed¹ by a comment on the second half of the verse. This comment inquired which class of the righteous ranked highest. It recalled Zechariah's statement² that the olive trees were on both the right hand and on the left hand of the menorah, which symbolized God, and it understood the second half of the verse ("but the supremacy goes to the pleasures at thy right hand") as declaring that those olive trees on the right of the menorah ranked highest.

Thus the menorah originally appeared as a symbol of God, in the explanation of the second half of the verse. Later it was transferred to the explanation of the first half, where it replaced the olive trees as the final term.³ Why? Partly because it was a source of light and most of the items in the list above were luminaries. Notice that in its original form the list fell clearly into two parts, a first section (classes 1-5) in which the saints are compared to luminaries, a second (classes 6 and 7) in which they are compared to vegetation. The equation of life with light was on the increase in the Roman world⁴ and the influence of this primarily pagan development upon Jewish thought is shown by the substitution of the menorah for the olive trees. The astral symbolism certainly dates back to Daniel,⁵ but the vegetable symbolism is probably older, for had it not been pre-established it would not have been included in this list, which could easily

¹ As it still is in Pesiq. d.R.K. and Way. R. and—after one brief section—in Midrash Tehillim. The section in Midrash Tehillim is another list of seven classes of the righteous. That it was originally independent is indicated by the fact that it was prefixed to our list in Sifre D. 10 (and Midrash Tannaïm, p. 6), postfixed in Midrash Tehillim.

² iv. 3.

³ However, the original reading was preserved in two versions of the saying (Sifre Deb. 47 and Midrash Tannaïm, p. 40), the proof text for it in two more versions (Sifre Deb. 10 and Midrash Tannaïm, p. 6), and evidence of the corruption in the manifestly late emendations of the other texts.

⁴ See the note on astral immortality, p. 499, n. 1. Examples of the equation appear in the Dead Sea documents ("Children of Light") and the Gospel of John (*passim*) as well as in Lucian's city of lights (i.e. souls, Vera Hist. 1.29) and in the growing pagan cult of the sun, of which the influence is reflected in Christianity (Dölger, *Sol Salutis, Die Sonne der Gerechtigkeit, Lumen Christi*), in the magical amulets and papyri, and in the synagogue mosaics.

⁵ 12. 3. An ingenious argument for astrological influence on Daniel is advanced by S. Weinstock, "The Geographical Catalogue in Acts 2. 9-11", *JRS*, xxxviii (1948), 43 ff.

have contained two more classes of luminaries. Moreover, the vegetable symbols originally outranked the astral, as proved by the original form of the saying and the following comment, which gave highest rank not to the sun, but to the olive trees. This conclusion, by the way, goes to support Goodenough's contention that the representations of lilies and olive sprigs, especially on the ossuaries of the period prior to 70, may be symbolic.¹

Further, the menorah also replaced the olive trees as the supreme term of the series of comparisons because, as shown above, it was the image of God. Now while man was at all times the image of God, he had been so most truly before the fall, and the perfection of the divine image, which he lost then, was to be restored in the world to come.² The supreme destiny of the righteous, therefore, is to become perfectly the image of God, and the influence of this belief on the development of our text is shown by the substitution of the image of God—the menorah—for that of the saint—the olive tree.

This substitution is not found only in the passage discussed. On the contrary, there are many instances of interchange or confusion of the two symbols. To understand these better we must examine at more length the meaning of the tree.

The comparison of a man to a tree and of a just man to a fruitful tree is, of course, an Old Testament commonplace,³ and is continued by rabbinic literature as a description of living men.⁴ At the same time, the material quoted above has shown that the rabbis transferred the comparison to the righteous in the world to come, and analogies for this transfer can easily be found:

¹ The symbolism persisted, of course, after the destruction of the Temple. When Aher entered paradise "he cut down the plants", i.e. used the spiritual power acquired by his mystical experience to lead good Jews into heresy (T. Hag. 2. 3, ed. Zuckerman, p. 234). As to the date of origin, the comparison of lilies to saints in the future life was perhaps unknown to the LXX translator of Ps. xlv. 1 since he rendered it as *Eis to telos, hyper ton alloiothesomenon* (reading *sheshshonim* and understanding it as Paul did in 1 Cor. xv. 52: "We shall all be changed"). This looks like a stage prior to the appearance of the symbolism and may have had something to do with it.

² See p. 477 sq. Further, Ginzberg, *Legends*, v. 112-14 and the passages cited there.

³ Ps. i. 3; lii. 10 (olive); xcii. 13 (palm and cedar); cxxviii. 3 (vine and olive); etc.

⁴ E.g. Ta'anit 5b-6a.

The saved man is compared to a tree in the Odes of Solomon,¹ and the magician who has invoked Adonai Sabaoth identifies himself, among other things, with the sacred tree.²

Perhaps it was this transference which led to the identification of the tree as the tree of life. A trace of this identification may already appear in the LXX version of Ps. i. 3, which reads, not, "He shall be like a tree planted by rivers of water", but, "He shall be like *the* tree planted by *the* dividing courses of the waters". No doubt it saw in the rivers of water a reference to the rivers of Paradise. The Targum to the same verse puts the matter beyond doubt; it renders, "He shall be like the tree of life". Similarly, the Jerusalem Talmud comments on the verse, "As for the tree of life . . . all the waters of creation go forth in diverse courses from beneath it",³ and Midrash Tehillim also interprets the verse by reference to the tree of life.⁴ Explicit identification goes back at least to the Psalms of Solomon, which declare, "The paradise of the Lord are the trees of life, which are his saints".⁵ This statement explains why, in the mosaic of Beth Alpha, the heaven from which the hand of God emerges is planted with a row of trees.⁶ The same idea explains the statement in Enoch that the trees of paradise eat the fruit of the tree of wisdom⁷ It appears also in Christian and magical works,⁸ and may therefore be taken as common to the various sects of ancient Judaism. Now the tree of life is frequently identified by apocryphal, pseudepigraphic, Christian and gnostic works with the olive tree.⁹ This identification, so far as I know, does not appear in the preserved rabbinic material, but R. Simon b. Johai's identification of the final class of saints with olive trees,

¹ xxxviii. 16 f. etc. See especially xi. 19 ff. where becoming like the trees of paradise is becoming like God.

² PGM, 2. 73 (12. 227); this is an invocation of Adonai Sabaoth, to prepare an amulet on which are to be engraved the words *Iao Sabaoth Abrasax*, *ibid.* 76.

³ Ber. 1. 1(2c). ⁴ 1. 19. ⁵ 14. 3. ⁶ Goodenough, 3, no. 638.

⁷ Enoch 32. 3. Thus all the manuscripts. Therefore Beer is mistaken, in Kautzsch's ed., in supplying "the holy" as a separate subject; Charles and Kahana rightly translate the text as is.

⁸ Kropp, AKZ, ii. 116 (no. 34), "It is Jesus Christ who gives healing to N.N. that he renew his whole body after the fashion of the tree of life which is in the midst of paradise".

⁹ Ginzberg, *Legends*, v. 119, n. 113.

and the midrashic identification of the typical saint with the tree of life, make it probable that the identification of the tree of life with the olive tree was once accepted by rabbinic, as well as by other, Jews.¹

It is upon the tree of life that God rests when he comes to the Garden of Eden—on this rabbinic, pseudepigraphic, Christian and magical texts agree.² This legend, plus the fact that the tree of life is the symbol of the saint, enables us to understand the cryptic saying of Resh Laqish, "The patriarchs, they are the throne of God".³ We should not expect this doctrine to be developed in the preserved rabbinic material, since the teaching about the throne of God is specified as that to be kept most secret of all,⁴ and quite possibly was not committed to writing.⁵

¹ Its disappearance from the preserved texts can hardly be accidental, since the rabbis are free in identifying or comparing the tree of knowledge with the rest of the trees important in the economic life of Palestine (Ginzberg, *Legends*, v. 97, n. 70). I suspect the deletion reflects dislike of the magical and religious use of oil, which played so large a part in Christian ceremonies and was justified, *inter alia*, by the legend that the olive tree had been the original tree of life; see the passages cited by Ginzberg in my preceding note and the fact remarked by H. Willoughby ("The Distinctive Sources of Palestinian Pilgrimage Iconography", *JBL*, lxxiv (1955), 62) that the most frequent inscription on ampullae from the first Christian pilgrimage period (300-600) is, "Oil of the tree of life from the holy places of Christ".

² Seder Gan 'Eden, Text B (A. Jellinek, *Bet hammidrash*, 3. 138); Apoc. of Moses 22. 4; II Enoch 8. 3 (Charles) = 5. 3 (Kahana). Kahana quotes a parallel from the Greek version of the Apocalypse of Paul, not accessible to me (ed. Tischendorf, p. 64). Kropp, *AKZ*, ii. 149 f. (no. 43) parallel ii. 104 (no. 32). From the context of the former, Davithea, who is represented as lying on the tree, is evidently a form of Sabaoth and Jesus.

³ Bereshit Rabba, 17. 6 (475); 69. 3 (793); cf. 68. 12 (786 f.). For other Jewish sayings which express the notion of the saint or scholar as theophoric, see Tanh. Wayyaqhel 7 (Students of the Law are like the Ark of the Covenant, because like it they contain God), and Tanh. ed. Buber, Wayyishlah 84a: "R. Huna said, 'If a man be corrupted by a transgression, destructive angels at once attack him. . . . What should a man do? Let him busy himself with the Law and he will be safe. And if he does not know how to repeat (by heart), let him read; and if he does not know how to read, let him take hold of (a book of) the Law and he will live, for it is said, (The Law is) "a tree of life to those who lay hold of it." So that if he is not a student of the Law he should lay hold of the book or of the professional repeater (of the oral Law), for they teach the Law, and (by so doing) he merits life.'"

⁴ Hagigah 2. 1 and parallels.

⁵ Cf. Clement of Alexandria, *Strom.* I. 1. 13-14 etc.

However, the saying has an almost exact parallel in the common Christian expression, *theophoroi pateres*, of which the active and passive senses are not to be separated. Because the saint is inspired, possessed by God, he also bears God within himself, as is declared by the Latin *Deiferi apostoli*¹ and by the figures we have seen above bearing the menorah—the image of God—on their heads.

But since the saint (the perfect man) is the image of God, and the cosmos (which is also perfect)² is the image of God, we found the menorah, being the image of God, was also the image both of the saint and of the cosmos. Therefore we should expect the tree, being the image of the saint, to be equated with the menorah, at least when the latter represents the saint, and possibly when it is used with its other meanings. Equation as representations of the saint³ is exactly what we found indicated above by the substitution of the menorah for the olive tree in the conclusion of Sifre Debarim 10.⁴ It appears also in the Targum to Hosea xiv. 7. The Hebrew describes the blessed state of Israel in the time to come with the words, “His beauty shall be like the olive tree”; the Targum reads, “Their splendour shall be like the holy menorah”. The two prophets in the Apocalypse⁵ “are the two olive trees” (of Zechariah iv. 3, which we have seen above) “and the two menorahs which stand before the Lord of the whole earth”. (Since there was only one menorah in the Temple, it is plausible to find the source of *the two* menorahs in contemporary

¹ Du Cange, *Glossarium ad scriptores mediae et inf. graecitatis, ad voc. theophoros*.

² Plato, *Timaeus*, 36 ff.

³ The equation does not seem to have been carried through to the extent of making the olive tree also the image of God, *except* when He is united with the saint. So far as I can recall this identification is absent from *all* the literatures considered (including the magical papyri of Jewish character). This fact is particularly surprising in view of the widespread tradition of tree worship both in the Semitic background (the asherah) and in contemporary Greco-Roman paganism (e.g. Apuleius, Florida 1). While the absence may be due to accident or to deletion, it does suggest that the Jewish tradition had some consistency throughout its various branches and was not wholly indiscriminate in its appropriations from the Greco-Roman world.

⁴ Finkelstein, in his note on Sifre Deb. 10 (p. 18 of his edn.), recognized the equivalence of the olive tree and the menorah from their usage as equivalents in that passage and its parallels.

⁵ 11. 4.

synagogue usage, which, if reflected by the archaeological evidence, often had two menorahs, one on either side of the Torah shrine.)¹

This equation of the tree (image of the saint) with the menorah (image of God)² extends even to their graphic representation. When sufficiently conventionalized the two are indistinguishable and there are many drawings which may represent either one.³ Often when the menorah can be distinguished it is only by the presence of the ethrog and lulab at its base.⁴ But it is just this combination with ethrog and lulab which identifies with the menorah three undoubtable trees on amulets published by Goodenough.⁵ One of these menorah-trees⁶ has a snake coiled around it, further identifying it as the tree of paradise⁷ which, as we saw above, was itself identified with the saint as the throne of God. This identification is here confirmed, for each of these trees is represented as a throne for a deity who sits on it. The deity is identified by the inscription of each of the amulets as Iao or Iao Sabaoth—but iconographically he is, in each instance, Harpocrates, one of the forms of the sun god who was becoming the great deity of the later Roman Empire.⁸ These amulets are

¹ Goodenough, 3. 58-61, 440, 639, 646, 706, 707, 817, 964-6, 973, 974.

² This coalescence of the two symbols appears already in the Assyrian period, S. Cook, *The Religion of Ancient Palestine* (London, 1930) (Schweich Lectures, 1925), p. 63 f.

³ Goodenough 3. 99 (the drawing on the right), 262, 315, 332, 342, 502, 765, 770, etc.

⁴ Id. 3. 582, 719, 730, 805, etc.

⁵ Id. 3. 1149, 1150, 1153; cf. 1103 (a lotus pod) and 1102.

⁶ No. 1153.

⁷ This identification evidently persisted or recurred in Judaism. An eighteenth or early nineteenth century Polish menorah of which the lamps are carried by a tree of life, complete with snake, is published by Judah Goldin in *These Lights, You and Judaism*, iv (1956), no. 2. The modern object should serve as a warning against any hasty supposition that the ancient ones could not have been produced by 'orthodox' Jews.

⁸ This leads us, of course, directly to the representations of the sun in the later Palestinian synagogue floors—a subject of such complexity as to require another article. As a result of Goodenough's work it is now apparent that the synagogue floors, the magical gems and the papyri, the Palestinian Amoraic literature, the Christian pseudepigrapha and the Christian patristic literature of Egypt, Palestine and Syria all come from the same period and the same area of the same world, and from closely related groups of that world; they use the same language and they must be interpreted together.

certainly related in content to the magical spells representing Davithea-Sabaoth-Jesus as "lying on the bed of the tree of life".¹ Kropp, in his commentary on these spells, *ad loc.*, identified this bed as the zodiac, and if that be taken as the sphere of the fixed stars, the outmost sphere of the cosmos, this identification is probably correct, since we have seen that the menorah was taken to represent the cosmos, especially the planetary spheres, and Iamblichus says that the lotus on which Harpocrates was customarily enthroned (and which is here identified with the menorah-tree of life) was understood to represent the celestial spheres.² In sum, the tree of life, *qua* image of the theophoric saint, the microcosm, has been made also the image of the macrocosm, the physical cosmos which likewise bears that God of whom the heavens are the throne.³

This development of the significance of the tree was undoubtedly helped by identification with the menorah, and this identification probably explains the otherwise unlikely representation of the menorah as a headdress. We saw above that this symbolized the theophoric nature of the saints, but how did so unnatural a symbol arise? The origin, I think, is to be found in the wreath. Wreaths were commonly worn in the classical world on joyous occasions and were given to the winners in the games as symbols of victory. Jews wore them in their festivals—joyous occasions of which the joy was interpreted as anticipation of their coming, eschatological victory.⁴ Both as victorious in the contest of life and as joyous, the blessed were represented as wreathed,

¹ Kropp, *AKZ*, ii. 104, cf. 107 (no. 32) and 149 f. (no. 43) and Goodenough's discussion of these (2. 166 ff.). I agree with Goodenough in thinking these charms basically Jewish.

² *De mysteriis*, 7. 2.

³ Is. 66.1. The cosmos is equated with the throne of God in *Debarim Rabba*, ed. Lieberman, pp. 95-6. The sun-god on the lotus appears already on Hebrew seals of the Persian or Hellenistic periods, S. Cook, *The Religion of Ancient Palestine*, p. 58 and n. 1.

⁴ Jubilees 16. 30 prescribes the wearing of wreaths for the feast of Tabernacles. The bearers of the ark in the representation of that feast in the frescoes at Dura, and the children accompanying them, are wreathed, C. Kraeling, *The Synagogue* (New Haven, 1956) (*The Excavations at Dura*, VIII. 1) pp. 114-17. Kraeling, *ibid.* gives reference for the eschatological interpretation of the feast. Classic, of course, is the interpretation of the Sabbath as the type of the world to come, *Tamid*, end, cf. Hebrews iv. 3-11.

and the wreath came to be one of the symbols of salvation. The Odes of Solomon entreat the hearer to "make a crown of the tree of life and put it on your head".¹ But the crown of salvation was unwithering,² it was a living crown,³ for the joy it symbolized, the divine life, did not merely rest upon the blessed but was rooted in them⁴ so that they were crowned with a living tree of life. The first of the Odes of Solomon shows this development clearly: "The Lord is upon my head like a crown⁵; and I shall not be without him. The crown of truth was woven for me; and it causeth thy branches to bud in me. For it is not like a withered crown that buddeth not, but thou livest upon my head and thou hast blossomed upon my head. Thy fruits are full-grown and perfect; they are full of thy salvation."⁶ Compare the curious growth on the head of the figure in Papyri Osloenses I,⁷ and the charm in which the Old Testament god who controls Helios is conjured by "him who sits in a fiery robe on the seed-field head of Agathos Daimon, the pantokrator and four-faced highest daimon".⁸ Since Agathos Daimon in this material is regularly the cosmos⁹ we have here the supreme fiery¹⁰ deity seated on the circle of the world.¹¹ The growth on the head has been reduced almost to insignificance and we are well along the

¹ 20. 7 f.; cf. 2 Tim. ii. 5; iv. 8; James i. 12; Apoc. ii. 10, etc. The notion is also common in rabbinic literature, v. Ginzberg, *Legends*, 1. 19, 57; 2. 196; 3. 92, 205, etc. Note that the Greek word generally translated "crown" means properly "wreath".

² 1 Cor. ix. 25; 1 Pet. v. 4; Ephraim, Hymn for the Epiphany, quoted by R. Harris and A. Mingana in their edn. of *The Odes of Solomon* (Manchester, 1920), ii. 213 f.

³ *Odes of Solomon*, 17. 1.

⁴ Cf. Philo, *Ebrietas*, pp. 222-4, the vices and virtues are trees rooted in the soul of man.

⁵ Cf. Clement of Alex., *Paed.*, ii. 8. 63. 4: The Kings of the Jews used an elaborate crown composed of gold and precious stones, but the Christians symbolically wear Christ upon their heads.

⁶ Tr. Harris and Mingana, 2. 207.

⁷ Ed. S. Eitrem (Oslo, 1925), p. 20, discussed above, p. 501, n. 1

⁸ *PGM*, ii. 132 (14a).

⁹ *PGM*, ii. 146, cf. 122, 74, etc.

¹⁰ So Sifre Deb. 49. The notion goes back to Deut. iv. 24, quoted in Heb. xii. 29.

¹¹ Isaiah xl. 22. In this charm the cosmos is described by equation of Agathos Daimon, *pantokrator* (a common title of the sun god), the divine throne as seen by Ezekiel, and *hypsistos*. On the Jewish associations of *hypsistos* and *pantokrator*, see M. Nilsson, *Gesch. d. gr. Religion* (Munich, 1941-50), ii. 636 ff.

road which was travelled, not only by Judaism and its various offshoots, but by the Greco-Roman world in general, from the divine man to the wholly transcendental deity : from the good shepherd of the early Christian catacombs to the Christ Pantocrator of the Byzantine mosaic ceilings, from the cult of heroes and rulers to Julian's satire on the Emperors and the worship of the invincible sun, from the man crowned with the menorah in Beth Shearim to the fiery and unapproachable God of the Hekalot.

The metaphor of travel, here, is carefully chosen. Just as both ends of a road exist throughout the whole time of the journey, so in a large and complex society all sorts of attitudes towards all sorts of gods are always represented by some individuals ; it is only the centre of attention, the greater interest of the greater number, which shifts from one concept to another. The point to be noticed here is that this shift in ancient Judaism seems to have been of a piece with the general religious development of the ancient world.

To return to the menorah and the tree, and summarize the specific development which this last body of evidence suggests : The wreath of divine life which rewarded the saint took root in him and became a tree of life springing from him. But the tree of life was identified with the menorah and in Jewish circles the menorah came to replace it (as we have seen above in the case of *Sifre Debarim* 10) partly because of the increasing popularity of light-symbolism, but also in part because heterodox circles like those which produced the *Odes of Solomon* and the magical amulets seem to have been very fond of the tree of life and actually to have replaced the menorah by it. The replacement of it by the menorah may be a sign of orthodox reaction. At all events, the menorah did replace the tree of life, in some instances, as a most unlikely headdress, but an acceptable symbol of that divinity which may rest on man and which is already imaged in his nature. The notion thus expressed of the relationship between man and God is of immense antiquity and common to many cultures, but its revival in ancient Judaism was probably due, in large part, to the influence of the contemporary Greco-Roman world.