

# Theology on the Web.org.uk

*Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible*

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

[PayPal](#)

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

---

A table of contents for *Journal of Biblical Literature* can be found here:

[https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles\\_jbl-01.php](https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_jbl-01.php)

## The Passover Papyrus from Elephantine<sup>1</sup>

WILLIAM R. ARNOLD

ANDOVER THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY, CAMBRIDGE, MASS.

AMONG the papyri discovered at Elephantine in the years 1907 and 1908, and recently published by Professor Sachau of Berlin, is one which relates to the feast of the Passover. It is Papyrus 6 of the Sachau publication.<sup>2</sup> This brief and fragmentary document is second in interest and importance only to the two papyri which preserve the text of the petition from the Jewish community at Elephantine to the Persian governor of Judea, invoking his aid toward restoring the Yahwè temple of Elephantine, destroyed in 410 B.C.

Papyrus 6 is the original of a letter addressed to this Jewish community at Elephantine in the year 419 B.C., nine years before the destruction of their temple, by a certain Hananyah, a Jew residing at some other locality in Egypt. The papyrus is, and was originally, about four and a half inches long. The fragment of it which remains is about eight and a quarter inches wide. What the original width was, we cannot say, as the left end has been torn off clean at a fold in the papyrus; probably, however, not more than an inch or two is lacking all the way down that end. Unfortunately that is not the extent of the damage. An entire section in addition is missing from the lower right-hand corner, so that in all not more than two-thirds of the original text remains. What remains is perfectly legible, however, and there can be almost no question as to its correct interpretation.

<sup>1</sup> The substance of this article was read at the meeting of the *Society of Biblical Literature and Exegesis* in New York, December 28, 1911.

<sup>2</sup> *Aramäische Papyrus und Ostraka aus einer jüdischen Militär-kolonie zu Elephantine*, Leipzig, 1911.

The letter consisted of six complete lines on the obverse side of the papyrus, after two initial words in a separate line at the top, and two and a half lines on the reverse side, besides a docket or address in one line at the lower edge, which appeared on the outside of the document when the latter was folded and sealed. The docket reads:

אחי דניה וכנתה חילא יהודיא אחיכם הנניה

A portion of the papyrus has been torn away before the word אחי, which probably contained the word אל. So that the address ran as follows: *To my brethren, Yedonyah and his associates the Judean garrison, your brother Hananyah.*

The docket enables us to piece out with assurance the gaps which worms have left in the superscription of the letter. Doing which, we secure the following text (supplementary letters bracketed; seriously mutilated ones overlined):



## TRANSLATION

- 1 *To my brethren,*
- 2 *Yedonyah and his associates the Judean garrison, your brother Hananyah: The welfare of my brethren may*  
*the Gods . . .*
- 3 *For the rest: This year, the year 5 of Darius the King, being sent from the King to Arsames . . .*
- 4 *. . . . . Now, do ye count thus fou(rteen)*
- 5 *. . . . . and from the 15th day to the 21st day of . . .*
- 6 *. . . . . Be ye clean and make yourselves ready. No work . . .*
- 7 *. . . . . ye shall not drink. And everything that leaven . . .*
- 8 *. . . . . the setting of the sun to the 21st day of Nisan . . .*
- 9 *. . . . . take into your rooms and lock up between the days of . . .*
- 10 *. . . . .*

Line 2. The full name of Yedonyah, the leader of the Jewish community at Elephantine at this date, as well as later when the temple was destroyed and for some time thereafter, was *Yedonyah bar Gemaryah*; compare Sachau Papyrus 5 (quoted below); Papyrus 15, where the first name was carelessly spelled ידניא (Sachau transcribes wrongly ידניה); and Papyrus 18, col. 7, where Yedonyah appears as the custodian of the great collection of money for the temple of Yahwè. Papyrus 15 is not improbably an account of the attack on the temple, when Yedonyah and his companions, the writer among them (read in line 4 בכבא כנא, not בכבא בכא, as Sachau), were assaulted (or insulted, אתחרפו, not אתחרבו 'killed,' as suggested by Sachau) while guarding the entrance to the temple. On the etymology of the name Yedonyah, see Sachau, *l.c.*, p. 8, and Lidzbarski, *Deutsche Literaturzeitung*, 1911, col. 2980.

After אלהיא we must supply ישאלי, literally, *The welfare of my brethren may the Gods ask after*, idiomatic for *God greet you!* The sentence is a stereotyped Aramaic formula. It does not follow from the use of such an expression that "mehrere Götter unter den jüdischen Kolonen verehrt wurden" (Sachau, *l.c.*, p. 38). On the other hand, although אלהיא is the lexical equivalent of Hebrew האלהים, it is not, in this context, synonymous with Yahwè, as maintained by Eduard Meyer.<sup>3</sup> Whether or not the Hebrew האלהים, in the mouth of a Jew of this period, meant Yahwè, would very much depend upon the matter in hand. (Commonly, the surrogate of Yahwè would be אלהים *Deity*, not האלהים *the gods*.) Hananyah certainly did not use a singular verb with the determinate plural noun, or read a meaning of his own into the accepted Aramaic rubric.<sup>4</sup> Without "worshiping" other gods or conceding their equality with the God of Heaven, even the "orthodox" Jew of this period might in his ordinary mood—the nascent Old Testament literature notwithstanding—accept both their existence and

<sup>3</sup> "Zu den aramäischen Papyri von Elephantine," *Sitzungsberichte der königlich-preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften*, 1911, p. 1051.

<sup>4</sup> Compare Lidzbarski, *l.c.*, col. 2971.

the fact of their power for good or ill. The long-exiled Judeans of Elephantine might even contribute something to the cultus of the gods of their non-Israelitish Aramean countrymen in Egypt,<sup>5</sup> without impairing their loyalty to the ancestral god.

Line 3. **וְכֵּן**, which I render *For the rest*, literally *And now*, introduces the substance of the communication, as in Ezra 4 17 and, in the uncontracted form **וְכִכְנַת**, Ezra 4 11, 7 12.

**שְׁלִיחַ**, passive participle, is not impersonal, as is assumed by Sachau and Ed. Meyer. The subject was indicated in the lost finite verb which followed the word **אֲרַשֵׁם**, and to which this participle is circumstantial; compare Nöldeke, *Syrische Grammatik*, §§ 275, 277. See further below.

Line 4. The detached letters **א** are apparently preceded by a **ר**: **רֵאָא** ?

At the end of the line I supplete, with Sachau, Ed. Meyer, and Lidzbarski, **אַרְבָּעַת עָשָׂר**, *fourteen*.

Line 5, end. Supply **נִימָן**, after the parallel in line 8.

Line 6. **אֲנִידְרִי**, *take warning, prepare yourselves*. **עֲבֹדָה** begins a new sentence.

Line 7. The **ו** of **וְ** and the **מ** of **מִיָּר** are by no means plain. If one may judge from the photographic reproduction, the ink seems to have run in the fibers of the papyrus. Or perhaps the papyrus is a palimpsest, with the earlier writing not completely removed. In any case, the two characters cannot be read otherwise.

**מְנִדְעָם**, *thing*, cf. Lidzbarski, *Nordsemitische Epigraphik*, p. 312; occurs a number of times in the papyri.

The **א** at the end of the line is certain. Doubtless we should supplete, with Sachau, **אֵתִי בָהּ**, *and everything that has leaven in it*.

Line 9. The first word preserved is not **וְעָלִי**, as Sachau, followed by Ed. Meyer. The mutilated first letter cannot be a **ו**, but may very well be **נ**. Read **נְהַעְלִי** (Hanphel of **עַלִּל**); cf. Sayce-Cowley Papyrus G 6. 7. 24. 27. Only so, moreover, can we construe **וְרַבֵּנוּ**, which otherwise remains

<sup>5</sup> Sachau Papyrus 18, col. 7.

without an object. Sachau renders, *tretet in euere Gemächer und versiegelt (macht Schluss?) zwischen den Tagen*. Meyer: *Geht in euere Kammern und siegelt (?) zwischen den Tagen*, adding what he would doubtless admit to be a rather far-fetched interpretation, "Setzt ein Siegel, macht eine Scheidewand zwischen diesen Festtagen und den Werktagen." The single object of  $\text{הַנְּעֹלִי}$  and  $\text{הַתְּמָוִי}$  preceded both verbs. We must read  $\text{הַתְּמָוִי}$  (Pa'il), which does not mean *to seal*, but *to lock up*. The reference is perhaps to merchandise, ordinarily displayed in open booths or upon the street, which they are directed to stow away during the first and seventh days of the feast (see below). If this interpretation is correct, Lidzbarski's suggested reading for the remainder of the line, " $\text{בֵּין יוֹמֵי אֵלֶּיךָ}$  *zwischen Tag und Nacht*, entsprechend  $\text{בֵּין שְׁמֵשׁ וְלַיְלָא}$ " (*l.c.*, col. 2970), must be rejected, and we must abide by  $\text{בֵּין יוֹמֵי}$ . Is  $\text{בֵּין}$  *during*?

The original letter contained six or seven more words, beyond the point where the above translation finally breaks off; but (and this is important) it contained no more, for the next line stopped half-way across the papyrus.

It is perfectly clear that we have here a letter of instruction to the Jewish community at Elephantine, with directions for the punctilious observance of a feast to which the seven days extending from the fifteenth to the twenty-first day of the month Nisan sustain some essential relation; a feast which, moreover, requires abstinence from labor during at least a part of its continuance. This can be none other than the Passover—employing the term in the looser sense, of the Passover and feast of Unleavened Bread combined. And with this much assured, we need not hesitate to find in the suspended words of line 7 a reference to the banishing of leaven from every nook and corner of the houses of the faithful.

One point only occasions remark: the prohibition of some sort of beverage. No such prohibition is found in any of the Old Testament laws concerning the Passover. And the beverage in question can hardly have been wine. The later



Rabbinical usage prescribed such repeated potations of wine during the Passover ritual<sup>6</sup> that drunkenness not infrequently resulted. The New Testament evidence is familiar. It is true that we have no positive testimony to the use of wine during the Passover festivities until late in the second century B.C.<sup>7</sup> Our earliest witness is the Book of Jubilees, which in 49 e represents the Israelites as drinking wine at the first Passover in Egypt; this implies that the drinking of wine at the Passover was not merely allowed, but actually customary and regular in the writer's day. However, the suggestion recently made by Beer that wine came into use in connection with the Passover only after 350 B.C. and under Greek influence, is lacking in plausibility. Hannah needed no Greek influence, in the opinion credited to the experienced Eli, on the occasion of another great festival at Shiloh. And while it is not probable that wine-drinking accompanied the celebration of the old nomad Passover, so long as this remained distinct from the Canaanitish feast of Unleavened Bread, it is hard to believe that the latter feast was ever observed without the use of wine, if there was any to be had. The fact will be that wine came into use in connection with the Passover ritual when, and in proportion as, it was combined and identified, in post-exilic Judaism, with the feast of Unleavened Bread. In any case, we have no reason to believe that there ever was a time when the use of wine at the Passover or at the feast of Unleavened Bread was actually prohibited. For the rest, the fact that the Old Testament laws contain no prohibition of any particular beverage, and that this brief letter of instruction to the Jews of Elephantine specifically prohibits one, leaves no doubt that the reference in the latter is to some beverage very common in Egypt and almost if not quite unknown in Palestine. This must be beer.<sup>8</sup> Egyptian beer, produced from barley with the addition of certain vegetable ingredients,<sup>9</sup>

<sup>6</sup> Mishna, *Pesahim* 10 a.

<sup>7</sup> See Beer, *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft*, 1911, p. 153.

<sup>8</sup> So also Lidzbarski, *l.c.*, col. 2970. I owe the suggestion, together with the reference to the Mishnic law, to Professor George F. Moore.

<sup>9</sup> See Wilkinson, *Ancient Egyptians*, I, pp. 53 f.

was held to fall clearly under the law of forbidden leaven: a passage in the Mishna<sup>10</sup> prohibits explicitly, during the Feast of Passover, the use of "Egyptian beer," together with other fermented liquids into which cereals have entered.

From the limited dimensions of our papyrus, and especially from the distribution of the surviving material, it is quite certain that the papyrus made no reference whatever to the slaying of the Passover lamb. The only available space for the mention of the Passover lamb is in the first half of line 5, and not even all of that half-line is available, for at least the word  $\text{לֶחֶם}$  must have stood there to complete the sentence at the end of line 4. There is room for only three or four words, not enough for the barest reference to the rite, to say nothing of any instructions in connection with it. In other words, *our papyrus related solely to the feast of Unleavened Bread.*

Nor may we suppose that the Passover lamb is to be omitted from the observance out of regard for the susceptibilities of the native Egyptians and their aversion to the slaughter of rams and he-goats, as was done later with all animal sacrifices at the restoration of the temple of Elephantine.<sup>11</sup> For it must be remembered that for nine years after the date of this papyrus, animal sacrifices continued to be offered uninterruptedly in the Yahwè temple at Elephantine. Up to this point there had been no trouble with the Egyptians. In fact, as we shall see, it is with this very communication of Hananyah's that the era of "trouble" begins.

Now a national Israelitish feast of Passover, as distinguished from the feast of Unleavened Bread, is unknown to both J and E. The word  $\text{חַמֶּזֶץ}$  in the so-called J Decalogue (Ex. 34 25) is a gloss:  $\text{חַמֶּזֶץ}$  is impossible Hebrew, and the parallel passage in Ex. 23 18 shows that it is  $\text{חַמֶּזֶץ}$  which is interpolated, and not  $\text{חֶמֶץ}$ , as maintained by Stade.<sup>12</sup> The injunction of Ex. 34 25 = 23 18 related to (the fat of) the sacrifice at any feast of Yahwè. The Passover is unknown

<sup>10</sup> Pesahim, 31.

<sup>11</sup> See Sachau Papyri 5 and 3; and compare Lidzbarski, *l.c.*, col. 2968.

<sup>12</sup> *Biblische Theologie des Alten Testaments*, p. 197.

also to E. Both these documents know only the feast of Unleavened Bread (Ex. 34 18, 23 15). I am not affirming that both or either of these authors had never heard of the Passover sacrifice, and that one or other of them may not have had it in mind in the story of the pretended "Feast of Yahwè" which the Children of Israel were to celebrate on coming out of Egypt, although there is less to support this view than is generally assumed. I am maintaining that neither of them incorporates it in his summary of the obligatory institutions common to all Israel in his own day. It need not have been such, any more than the vastly more important, and certainly annual, feast of Sheep-Shearing.

The earliest mention of the Passover in the Torah of Israel, and the earliest authentic occurrence of the word פסח in the literature of the Old Testament, is in the Deuteronomic law (Dt. 16).<sup>13</sup> Even thereafter, Ezekiel still makes no mention of it. For in Ez. 45 21 again, the word הפסח is a gloss, this time inserted against the grain, before the word הַיָּמִים, by some reader who thought the feast beginning on the fourteenth day of the first month must be פסח, though the writer himself had called it the Seven-Day Feast of מצות. In Ex. 12 18 the Priest Code makes Mazzoth begin on the evening of the fourteenth day.

The section on the Passover and Unleavened Bread in Dt. 16, where the two feasts are interwoven, is unquestionably conflated. It has been plausibly supposed (Steuernagel) that D had originally no feast of Unleavened Bread, but only Passover, besides the other two great feasts, and that the verses 3, 4, 8, which introduce the unleavened bread, are later expansions. However that may be, the narrative of Josiah's celebration in 2 Ki. 23 21-23 leaves no room for question (1) that D had the Passover as one of the three great annual feasts, whether or not combined with the eating of unleavened bread for seven days, and (2) that until the publication of the Deuteronomic law the Passover had not been recog-

<sup>13</sup> Cf. Wellhausen, *Prolegomena* 6, p. 82.

nized as a great sanctuary festival in Israel, at any rate not since the occupation of Canaan.<sup>14</sup>

In spite of all this, however, we must not hasten to assign our papyrus to pre-Deuteronomic influences. For though D introduced the Passover sacrifice, which is absent from the papyrus, into the national law, it explicitly limited that sacrifice, as well as all others, to the one single sanctuary of Jerusalem (Dt. 16 5-6). And the priestly legislation and narrative take this limitation for granted. They certainly do not repudiate it.<sup>15</sup> So that there are other and sufficient reasons for omitting the Passover sacrifice from the celebration at Elephantine. To be sure, the Jews at Elephantine had a sanctuary of their own, at which they would have felt as free to sacrifice the Passover as any other animal offering. But our papyrus relates to a ritual which is being delivered to them, as we shall see, directly from abroad, and presumably from Palestine. It is not likely that the authorities at Jerusalem would be deliberately counseling the Jews of Elephantine to violate the law *by innovation*, although they might perhaps hesitate to interfere with a sacrificial cultus which had existed continuously for a hundred and seventy years.

On the other hand, that our papyrus comes from a source

<sup>14</sup> Such is the meaning of the Hebrew of verse 21: *For no such Pesah had been made during (not from) the days of the judges who judged Israel and during all the days of the kings of Israel and the kings of Judah.*

<sup>15</sup> On this point more or less confusion prevails. We are told that the priestly legislation (Ex. 12) restored the Passover sacrifice from the sanctuary, to which it had been limited by D, to the homes of the people. But the fact is, that though P relegated the institution of it to the pre-Sinaitic days when there was no sanctuary, he took especial pains to assert that for all time thereafter it was to be a sanctuary festival: חגגם אהו חג ליהודה: לדורתיכם חקת עולם תחגגו (Ex. 12 14). Contrast with this language the expression employed in connection with the observance of the law regarding Unleavened Bread (verse 17). Had P actually made of the Passover lamb a home-institution, it would to-day be sacrificed in every quarter of the globe. The Passover of later Judaism was a home-festival only in the sense that after the lamb had been offered in the temple, it was eaten in the dwellings of the people in *attendance at the feast in Jerusalem*, not in the sense that it could be slain wherever one happened to reside. And we have no reason to believe that P intended any more latitude than this.

familiar with the priestly legislation, is indisputable.<sup>16</sup> It prescribes only the feast of Unleavened Bread, but it is the feast of the priestly law, not that of J or of E, nor yet that of Deuteronomy in its present form. For, the determination of the precise days of the month, during which the seven days' feast shall be observed, appears only in H and P. J designates no more than "seven days in the month Abib." The same is true of E.<sup>17</sup> D, in its expanded form, likewise requires merely seven days in the month Abib. All these, of course, represent the earlier and freer practice, the precise time depending upon the forwardness of the crops, which would vary from year to year and in different localities in the same year. A new element, however, in the (expanded) Deuteronomic law, unknown to J and E, is the injunction to observe the last of the seven days as a holiday, during which no work may be performed. But even this is behind the requirements of the priestly law.

It is only with the Holiness Code (Lev. 23 5-8) that we come upon the fixed determination of the days of the month for the observance of the feast of Unleavened Bread. H appoints the Passover proper (פסח לילה) for the fourteenth day of the first month; it is, indeed, probable that the Passover had always been a full-moon ceremony. Thereafter, the feast of Unleavened Bread (חג המצות) is to begin on the fifteenth day and last seven days. Both the first and the seventh days are מקרא קדש, solemn assemblies, and on those days כל מלאכת עבודה לא תעשו, *ye shall do nothing involving labor*. H does not actually connect the observances of Pesah and Mazzoth—any more than do the modern Samaritans. A person who had only the Holiness Code before him (with, perhaps, D in its original form) could easily concern himself with the observance of the one, while avoiding any mention of the other.

P's law of the Passover is contained in Ex. 12 3-14, and that of Mazzoth in Ex. 12 15-20, the section immediately fol-

<sup>16</sup> Cf. Ed. Meyer, *l.c.*, p. 1052.

<sup>17</sup> The authenticity of even this indefinite seven-day requirement in the oldest codes has been questioned, but, I think, without reason.

lowing. But here the two are actually combined. Not only are מצות mentioned in verse 8, but verse 15, which begins the law of Mazzoth, contains no date. The date follows later incidentally, in verse 18: *from the fourteenth day of the month at sunset, to the twenty-first day of the month at sunset.*<sup>18</sup> In P, as in H, the first and seventh days of the feast are "solemn assemblies," on which no labor may be performed.

On the whole, it is seen, our papyrus has closer affinities with H than with any other of the codes of the Pentateuch. The actual mention of the fifteenth day is found only in H, although the law of P does not materially differ from it. Also, in H the feast of Mazzoth is still distinct from the rite of Passover; which would make it easy to avoid even the name of Pesah.<sup>19</sup> Perhaps, too, the language in which the papyrus prohibits labor is reminiscent of H: לא עבדיה לא in the papyrus; כל מלאכת עבודה לא תעשו in H; כל מלאכה לא

<sup>18</sup> There is, by the way, no warrant for the statement sometimes made, and repeated by Eduard Meyer (*l.c.*, p. 1052, note 1), that Ex. 12 18 stretches the feast from seven days to eight. The "evening of the fourteenth day" is exactly when the fifteenth day begins, and the "evening of the twenty-first day" is in any case exactly seven whole days thereafter. There is, therefore, no reason for denying this verse to P, but quite the contrary.

<sup>19</sup> The occurrence of מצות on an ostrakon (Sachau, Plate 64, 2; previously published by Lidzbarski, *Ephemeris*, II, pp. 229 ff.), to which Ed. Meyer refers (*l.c.*, p. 1051, note 3), would prove nothing as regards our papyrus, even if the context were perfectly clear; for the ostrakon is of unknown date and uncertain provenance.

On the other hand, the "Aramean Ostrakon from Elephantine," published by Sayce, *Proceedings of the Society of Biblical Archaeology*, 1911, pp. 183 f., which he finds "especially interesting on account of its reference to the Passover," has been wrongly deciphered and entirely misinterpreted by him. To begin with, he has attempted to read it wrong end foremost; his "obverse" and "reverse" should be transposed. The ostrakon is a letter from a rather illiterate husband to his wife, bidding her take good care of the children until he returns, assuring her that he will be responsible for any bills she may incur with the provision merchants for her maintenance, directing her what to do if unable to obtain supplies from them, promising to send her something, and charging her to be of good cheer and to be sure to tell him all about the baby. If, as Sayce affirms, the ostrakon "is in an unusually good state of preservation, every letter being legible on both obverse and reverse," he has published a singularly wretched photograph of the "obverse" side. But enough of it is legible to warrant the outline I have given, and to show that the ostrakon has no mention of the Passover.

יֵעָשֶׂה בָּדֶם in P. Not much should be made of this point, however, as the Aramaic כַּכִּדָּה is the exact equivalent of Hebrew מְלֵאכָה. On the other hand, though P alone alludes to ridding the houses of leaven, the custom may well be older than P. But the question as between H and P need not be pressed.

To sum up, then, we have seen that this papyrus shows an attempt to impose upon the Jews of Egypt the observance of the feast of Unleavened Bread, not in the old Israelitish form of J or E, or even of the expanded D, but in the form prescribed by the priestly legislation. It is distinctly the post-exilic Jewish observance which is here enjoined. Whether the Jews of Elephantine had retained the old Canaanitish institution in a looser form since the days of Psammetik II, a hundred and seventy years before, we cannot tell. Probably they had not.<sup>20</sup>

For the history of Old Testament literature it is to be noted that this papyrus affords the first conclusive evidence that the Holiness Code, at all events, had been composed before 419 B.C.<sup>21</sup>

One question remains, and that perhaps the most important; namely, as to the authority behind this promulgation of the feast of Unleavened Bread.

Sachau renders the third line of the papyrus, "Und nun in diesem Jahr, dem Jahr 5 des Königs Darius, ist von dem Könige an Arsames (die Botschaft) geschickt worden —," construing the passive participle שְׁלִיחַ as neuter and third person. He accordingly assumes that it is a Passover proclamation that has *been sent* from Darius to Arsames, and draws the consequent and far-reaching conclusions on the

<sup>20</sup> The tone of the Passover Papyrus seems to assume no knowledge of the institution on the part of the Jews of Elephantine. In this respect it is in marked contrast to the two letters concerning the feast of the Rededication of the Temple, addressed by the Jerusalem Jews to those of Egypt in the years 148 and 124 B.C., respectively, and preserved in the first chapters of 2 Maccabees. Compare Torrey, in the *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft*, 1900, pp. 225 ff.

<sup>21</sup> There is, by the way, quite decisive proof that the Darius of this text is Darius II; see below, p. 29.

relations of the Persian kings to the Jewish religion. Darius will have sent a special embassy to the governor of Egypt for the express purpose of proclaiming the Passover festival to his Jewish subjects in that country. If to Egypt, then of course to his other provinces as well. But since he will hardly have dispatched such a legation for the purpose every year, Sachau concludes that Darius had been prevailed upon by some "Nehemiah" of his entourage to proclaim, or perhaps to authorize, the observance of the Passover where formerly it had been neglected or prohibited.

Incidentally, it is of course felt that this construction of the papyrus gives renewed support to the authenticity of the documents and narratives in the book of Ezra, which have been so much discredited in recent years.

Eduard Meyer hastens to speak of our papyrus as a "Regierungserlass"; affirms, on the basis of this document, that the feast of the Passover was proclaimed by royal decree of Darius II in the year 419 B.C. for the Jews of the whole empire; and concludes that Hananyah, having brought the royal decree to Egypt, now, by direction of Arsames, transmits it to the Jews of Elephantine. He declares "die Echtheit der Urkunden des Ezrabuches durch die neuen Funde in jedem Worte erwiesen." Further, "Aufs neue zeigt sich drastisch, dass das Judentum eine Schöpfung des Perserreichs ist: die babylonischen Juden haben eben die Autorität der Regierung in Bewegung gesetzt und durch sie das von Ezra verfasste Gesetz den Juden in Palästina und der Diaspora auferlegt." And he closes his discussion with the triumphant words, "Eine glänzendere Bestätigung und Ergänzung hätte die Darstellung im Buche Ezra-Nehemiah und die auf dieselbe begründete historische Anschauung nicht erhalten können, als sie dieser Osterbrief vom Jahre 419 v. Chr. gebracht hat."<sup>22</sup>

On the other hand, Lidzbarski is not so certain of the royal meddling with the religious concerns of the Jews. He thinks that the official part of the document was limited to a royal ordinance for the New Year — whatever that may be

<sup>22</sup> *L.c.*, pp. 1035, 1052 f.



—and that the details concerning the observance of the Passover were Hananyah's personal contribution. But as this latter involved absence from military duty during the seven days of the feast,<sup>23</sup> the government may have concerned itself with that aspect of the matter.

Now, in point of fact, we have neither the need nor the right to beat about the bush in this fashion. Either Eduard Meyer is entirely right, or he is entirely wrong. Either the Persian government had everything to do with the Passover celebration of our papyrus, or it had nothing whatever to do with it. The whole imposing edifice of Eduard Meyer's representation rests, like an inverted pyramid, upon the single point of the intended reference of the one word שלח in line 8 of the papyrus. If the papyrus had come down to us unharmed, we should have had in the six or seven words now lost, which followed the phrase מן מלכא שליח על ארשם, at the end of line 8 and the beginning of line 4, a complete answer to the question. Lacking those words, we must determine the reference indirectly as best we may. But that should not allow us to confuse the issue. Either the word שליח refers to Hananyah himself, or it refers to the subject matter of his letter, the observance of the Passover. It cannot, as a matter of mere syntax, have referred to both. If it referred to Hananyah, there remains nothing in the papyrus to connect the Passover with the official mission of Hananyah. If it referred to the ordinance of the Passover, there remains nothing in the papyrus to connect Hananyah with a special royal mission on any subject. And as regards Lidzbarski's halting conclusions, if the subject matter of the papyrus, all of which relates to the details of the Passover observance, was not the subject of שליח in the introductory sentence at line 8, we have no reason in the world for assuming another

<sup>23</sup> Lidzbarski's view that the papyrus directed the Jews of Elephantine to abstain from work during the entire seven days of the feast (*l.c.*, col. 2970), necessitating military leave of absence from the Persian authorities for that length of time, has no warrant either in the text of the papyrus or in the usage of Judaism from the earliest times to the present day. Moreover, it is difficult to see how the military duties of the Jews of Elephantine can have been so very strenuous in ordinary times.

neuter subject outside the existing contents of the papyrus, when the latter actually supplies us with Hananyah himself as the alternative.

On the purely linguistic merits of the two alternatives there is this to be said : שליח, though it might be used of a *dispatch*, would not be used of a royal *command*, *decree*, or *proclamation*. The substance of a royal ordinance concerning the Passover would certainly have been introduced with the words מן מלכא שים טעם, and not with מן מלכא על. On the other hand, compare the technical language of the pretended rescript of Artaxerxes to Ezra in Ezr. 7 14-17, where the king says, מן מלכא שליח . . . תקנא, *being delegated by the King . . . thou shalt buy*, etc. And later, the Aramaic of *Apostle*, whether Christian or Jewish, is שליחא.<sup>24</sup>

Now it can be shown from the contents of another papyrus, which Sachau did not decipher and interpret correctly, (1) that Hananyah was a Jew occupying a high official position in the government of Egypt; (2) that he was not Egyptian-born, but had only recently come into the country; and (3) that his activities immediately upon his arrival resulted in straining the relations of the Jews of Elephantine with their Egyptian neighbors to the point of serious trouble for a considerable period, before the destruction of their temple in the year 410 B.C.

In view of these facts, we have, I think, no course open to us but to interpret the word שליח, in line 3 of the Passover Papyrus, of Hananyah himself. *It was not a Passover proclamation, but Hananyah himself who was sent from Darius to Arsames, on some matter of state of which we have no further information.* And in this letter of his, written to the Jews of Elephantine soon after his arrival in Egypt, before proceeding with his directions for the observance of the national feast, he naturally tells them *who he is, and by what authority he speaks*: he is special ambassador from Darius II to Arsames, Persian governor of Egypt; and he speaks by the

<sup>24</sup> Because its context is as yet too obscure, I disregard the sentence ויהי שליח עליהם על זה, apparently, *and another person who was dispatched by me (Arsames) to them on this matter* (Sachau Papyrus 8, line 6).

authority — of course, *of the priests in Jerusalem, whom he had visited on his way*. It is difficult to see how any other supposition can be entertained while this one is open.

But this is not a mere supposition. The six or seven lost words between the end of line 3 and the middle of line 4 contained a statement regarding the visit to Jerusalem, with the verb in the first person singular of the perfect tense. Only so is the particular form of the date in the letter explainable or intelligible: *שָׁנָא זָא שְׁנַת ִּוּוּ ִּוּ ִּוּ דְרִיּוּדוּשׁ*. *This year, the fifth year of Darius the King, I was sent or there was sent*, is not a natural expression. For an instantaneous act of that kind, we naturally demand either more circumstance or less. The Jews of Elephantine knew as well as Hananyah what year of Darius II they were then living in. If that were the burden of his statement, *this year* would have been sufficient, unless he went on to give the time of the year as well. Still less satisfactory, though syntactically more sound, is Lidzbarski's interpretation, *This year is the fifth year of Darius*;\* but it is interesting as showing that at least one accomplished scholar feels there is something decidedly queer about the expression if interpreted as above. On the other hand, *This year, the fifth year of Darius the King, being sent from the King to Arsames, I visited the city of Jerusalem* (or something of that sort), is a perfectly natural sentence. The time of a sojourn in Jerusalem could very well be dated by the year alone. In other words, *שָׁנָא זָא* requires for its grammatical complement a finite verb of the purport I have assumed.

According to this interpretation, Hananyah, having been sent on a mission from Darius II to Arsames, traveled to Egypt by way of Palestine, and stopped over in Jerusalem in the 5th year of Darius II, receiving there the latest priestly

\* *L. c.*, col. 2969. Lidzbarski accordingly assumes that Hananyah's letter is being written on the first day of the first month of the new year. But apart from the fact that the Jews of Elephantine seem to have managed to date their documents accurately enough without receiving information on the state of the calendar from the capital of the satrapy, Hananyah must have expected his letter to be received before the first day of Nisan, when he directed his readers to "count fourteen days."

regulations regarding the feast of Unleavened Bread, and doubtless much else besides. He arrived in Egypt during the same year, probably toward the end of it, and took the first occasion to enjoin upon his coreligionists at Elephantine the proper observance of the feast, in accordance with the Jerusalem law, in time for the celebration of the first month of the 6th year of Darius II (began April 15, 418 B.C.). Strictly speaking, then, the Passover Papyrus will have been written in that fraction of the 5th year of Darius II which fell in the year 418 B.C. (January to April 14).

Before passing on to the contents of the other papyrus to which reference has been made, it is to be noted that in this Passover letter Hananyah does not speak of himself as עֲבֵדְךָ or עֲבֵדְכֶם, the form employed in addressing Yedonyah even by one of the latter's most prominent associates at the head of the community in Elephantine, but אֲדִיכֶם, *your brother*. Hananyah, it is evident even from Papyrus 6, is at least the equal of Yedonyah, and almost certainly his superior, in station.

We turn now to the text of Sachau Papyrus 11. I have succeeded in piecing out all the important lacunæ, with a result which differs considerably from the tentative and fragmentary translation published by Sachau. Sachau supposed this document to be a letter of warning against two men who were about to visit Elephantine. It is, on the contrary, a strong letter of recommendation.

In order to make evident at a glance my construction and interpretation of the Aramaic text, I vocalize after the analogy of the Biblical Aramaic, from which, except for the latter's mutations of vowel-quality and excess of Masoretic refinement, the pronunciation of these Egyptian Jews of the fifth century B.C. will not have differed materially. As before, suppletory letters are bracketed, and seriously mutilated ones overlined.

- 21 **אָד** **עֵלְמָא לְרֵימָא מֵלִימָא יְעִיבְרִימָא לַמִּלִּימָא**
- 11 **דָּמָא דְּמָא יִשְׁעֵמָא וְאֵל דְּרֵי :**
- 10 **מֵעַל דְּמָא דְּמָא מֵעַל דְּלֵבָבָא : [וְ] דָּמָא לֵבָבָא דְּמָא דְּמָא מֵעַל דְּרֵי : וְ יִשְׁעֵמָא**
- 6 **יְעִיבְרִימָא דְּרֵימָא וְ יִשְׁעֵמָא : וְ יִשְׁעֵמָא יִשְׁעֵמָא וְ יִשְׁעֵמָא דְּרֵימָא : וְ יִשְׁעֵמָא דְּרֵימָא דְּרֵימָא וְ**
- 8 **וְ יִשְׁעֵמָא וְ יִשְׁעֵמָא דְּרֵימָא דְּרֵימָא [מֵ]יִמָּא : וְ יִשְׁעֵמָא דְּרֵימָא : מֵיִמָּא יִשְׁעֵמָא וְ יִשְׁעֵמָא**
- 7 **דְּמָא יִשְׁעֵמָא דְּרֵימָא : דְּרֵימָא יִשְׁעֵמָא וְ יִשְׁעֵמָא דְּרֵימָא וְ יִשְׁעֵמָא דְּרֵימָא וְ יִשְׁעֵמָא דְּרֵימָא :**
- 9 **וְ יִשְׁעֵמָא : וְ יִשְׁעֵמָא וְ יִשְׁעֵמָא יִשְׁעֵמָא יִשְׁעֵמָא יִשְׁעֵמָא יִשְׁעֵמָא יִשְׁעֵמָא יִשְׁעֵמָא**
- 5 **יִשְׁעֵמָא יִשְׁעֵמָא יִשְׁעֵמָא יִשְׁעֵמָא יִשְׁעֵמָא יִשְׁעֵמָא יִשְׁעֵמָא יִשְׁעֵמָא יִשְׁעֵמָא יִשְׁעֵמָא**
- 4 **יִשְׁעֵמָא יִשְׁעֵמָא יִשְׁעֵמָא יִשְׁעֵמָא יִשְׁעֵמָא יִשְׁעֵמָא יִשְׁעֵמָא יִשְׁעֵמָא יִשְׁעֵמָא יִשְׁעֵמָא**
- 3 **יִשְׁעֵמָא יִשְׁעֵמָא : יִשְׁעֵמָא יִשְׁעֵמָא יִשְׁעֵמָא יִשְׁעֵמָא יִשְׁעֵמָא יִשְׁעֵמָא יִשְׁעֵמָא יִשְׁעֵמָא יִשְׁעֵמָא**
- 2 **יִשְׁעֵמָא יִשְׁעֵמָא : יִשְׁעֵמָא יִשְׁעֵמָא . . . . . about 6 words . . . . . דְּרֵימָא יִשְׁעֵמָא יִשְׁעֵמָא**
- 1 **אָד עֵלְמָא לְרֵימָא מֵלִימָא יְעִיבְרִימָא לַמִּלִּימָא וְ יִשְׁעֵמָא יִשְׁעֵמָא יִשְׁעֵמָא יִשְׁעֵמָא . . . . . 1 word . . . . .**

TRANSLATION

- 1 *To my lords Yedonyah, Uriyah, and the priests of the God Yahu, Mattan bar Yoshibyah and Neriyah bar*  
 . [1 word] .
- 2 *Thy servant Ma'uziyah: The welfare of my lords . . . [about 5 words] . . . . Be ye favored before*  
 3 *the God of Heaven. For the rest: When Waidrang, the chief of the garrison, came to Abd̄t, he put me in prison*  
*on account of a certain precious stone which*  
 4 *they found had been stolen by the traders. At last Seha and Hor, acquaintances of 'Anani, exerted themselves*  
*with Waidrang*  
 5 *and Hornufi, under the protection of the God of Heaven, until they delivered me. Now behold, they are about*  
*to come thither to you. Do you attend to them,*  
 6 *whatever their business may be. And whatever thing Seha or Hor may require of you, do you meet them in*  
*such fashion that a thing to blame*  
 7 *they may not find in you. You know the affliction which, for no reason at all, has rested upon us since Hananyah*  
*came to Egypt until now.*  
 8 *Whatever you do for Hor, you will be doing for your own selves. Hor is acquainted with Hananyah. Do you*  
*sell cheaply from our houses*  
 9 *any goods that are at hand; whether we lose or whether we do not lose, never mind. This is why I am sending*  
*to you: he*  
 10 *said to me, Send a letter ahead of us. Even if we should lose, a credit will be established because of him in the*  
*house of 'Anani. What you do*  
 11 *for him will not be hidden from 'Anani.*
- [Docket:] *To my lords Yedonyah, Uriyah, and the priests, and the Jews.*

Line 1. כרניא. The names which follow, Mattan bar Yoshiyah and Neriya, are those of the priests. There were accordingly but two priests attached to the Yahwè temple at Elephantine.

יה of the papyri should be pronounced *Yáhu*, not *Yaho*, as Sachau and others. *Yaho* cannot be derived from *Yahwè*. The alternative of *Yáhu* is not *Yaho*, but *Yò*. The *Yeho-* of Masoretic proper names is fictitious, the *o*-vowel having been reached only after the elision of the ה in compounds: *yahu—yau—yo* spelled *y(h)o*. So the name Jonathan in the living language was *Yahunatan*, *Yaunatan*, or *Yònatan* (יְהוֹנָתָן), but never *Yehonatan* (יְהוֹנָתָן). Nor, on the other hand, should we allow ourselves to be misled by the Masoretic pronunciation of such Lamed-He forms as יהוה, for this was of course pronounced *hwaw* by the Jews of Elephantine. Finally, Sachau's supposition (p. 10) that יהוה of the Mesha stone may be intended for יהוה is entirely inadmissible; in the Mesha stone the ה is necessarily consonantal.

Line 2. עכך. The singular suffix, if not a slip, probably has in mind Yedonyah alone, in spite of the plural address of the letter; for the others are not Ma'uziyah's superiors, as we shall see.

מעחיה. On the identity of the writer see below, pp. 27 ff.

Line 3. ס in סכעה is the Arabic *fa*; it occurs again in lines 6 and 8, and in Sachau Papyrus 12 (not indexed); also in the Zenjirli, Nabatean, and Palmyrene inscriptions.

יִדְרַנְג, the commander of the garrison at Elephantine, effects the arrest at Abydos not necessarily because his military jurisdiction extended to that city, but probably because Ma'uziyah, as a member of the "army of occupation," was not subject to the criminal jurisdiction of the local magistracy. —It would be well if in our ignorance of the correct pronunciation of the name יִדְרַנְג, the euphonious *Waidrang* could be conventionally adhered to.

עלדכר אכנצרי, not "wegen eines Edelsteins, eines einzigen," as Sachau; the text is merely shorthand for אכנצרי אכנצרי; cf. איש חד a certain man, Sachau Papyrus 62, obv., col. 2, line 6.

Line 4. השכחו נניב ביד רכליא. Sachau: "den man gefunden hat als gestohlen (gestohlenes Gut) in der Hand (im Besitz) von Kaufleuten." If that were the meaning, ביד רכליא would follow השכחו. Besides, if the stone was actually recovered from the merchants, the officials would have had little difficulty in tracing the thief. רכליא are not the local shopkeepers, but the visiting traders, to which class Ma'uziyah belonged. The stone may well have been purloined while being exhibited, together with other jewels, to a company of such traders, without leaving any trace of the individual thief. On נניב, passive participle with the force of the pluperfect, cf. Nöldeke, § 278 B. For ביד of the agent cf. Syriac *ص*.

על אחרן. Sachau can make nothing of this. The phrase occurs also in Sachau Papyrus 52, col. 1, line 5: על אחרן עד וי על, *at last he will remember me*; and col. 2, line 1: עד וי על until at last. Lidzbarski (*l.c.*, col. 2978) renders it correctly enough *schliesslich*, but would read על אחרן in all three passages. The letter ח, however, is perfectly distinct and unmistakable in every case. The fact is, we have here the phrase which has hitherto baffled the efforts and ingenuity of the commentators on the Aramaic text of Dan. 4 5. The spelling אחרין of Dan. 4 5 proves, if any proof were needed, that the word has nothing to do with אחרן *another*; the transmitters could never have inserted that ך, for the Kethib is at cross purposes with the Masoretic tradition, which could make nothing of it, and with the Qeri, which demands the spelling אחרן. On the other hand, the uniform spelling of the papyri, על אחרן, proves that the pointings suggested for Dan. 4 5 by Marti (*Bibl.-aram. Grammatik*, §§ 87c, 94b), אחרין or אחרין, as adverb in the one case and singular noun in the other, are alike impossible, for either form would be spelled אחרין in the papyri. For other counsels of despair, see the commentaries of Bevan and Kraetzschmar. We must accordingly point in harmony with both the Kethib of Dan. 4 5 and the spelling of the papyri, אחרין, absolute plural corresponding to the construct אחרין *after*,



and meaning (in the plural) *the end*;<sup>28</sup> compare the Hebrew אֶחָרֵי הַחֲנִית (2 Sam. 2 23), which is not *the hinder end of the spear*, but merely *the end of the spear*, a rhetorical expression analogous to פִּי הַרֶבֶב *the mouth (edge) of the sword*. In Dan. 4 5 accordingly we must read וְעַל אֶחָרָיוֹן *and at last*; the עַל was corrupted to עַד as a consequence of the erroneous interpretation "until another."

עֲלִימִי *acquainted with*, passive participle with reciprocal sense, cf. Nöldeke, § 280; not *servants of 'Anani*, as Sachau, which is impossible in this context. Seha and Hor are quite too important and influential to be anybody's "boys." Besides, the ordinary interpretation cannot be reconciled with line 8, where Hor is described as the עֲלִימִי of Hananyah. Sachau concludes that two different persons of the name Hor are mentioned in the papyrus. But even that bold remedy does not meet the substantial objection first mentioned. We must connect with עֲלִימִי to *know*, not with עֲלִימִי, *youth, servant*. Cf. Hebrew דָּוִד, and the expression רַדְדִים אֱלֹהִים *pious*, Sachau Papyrus 55, line 5 (Sachau transcribes erroneously רַדְדִים).

עֲנִי is without doubt the 'Anani alluded to in line 19 of the petition to Bagoas, Sachau Papyrus 1, where Ostanes is singled out for special mention among the nobles of Jerusalem to whom previous appeals had been directed: "Ostanes, the brother of 'Anani" can only mean that the writers are acquainted with 'Anani in Egypt and are not acquainted with Ostanes in Jerusalem. Very probably also, this 'Anani is identical with the official scribe or secretary of the chancery of Arsames, whom we meet in an original decree of the governor which has come down to us, Sachau Papyrus 8. This document is signed first in the hand which engrossed the body of it: עֲנִי סֵפֶרָא *'Anani the Scribe*; then follows in the same elegant hand the title בַּעַל טַעֲמִים *Master of decrees*,

<sup>28</sup> This use of the indeterminate plural in an abstract sense, with a value approaching that of our determinate singular, which occurs in the case of the Aramaic אֱלֹהִים as in that of the Hebrew אֱלֹהִים, has not received sufficient recognition. In English I may say, "Grapes are a delicious fruit," or, "The grape is a delicious fruit"; but I may not say, "The grapes are a delicious fruit."

or *Chancellor*, introducing the signature of this last official, which was appended in another hand : כתב נביעקב *Nebo'aqab has signed*. So, against Sachau, pp. 48 f., and Ed. Meyer, *l.c.*, p 1036 ; compare כתב מחסה בר' דיניה נפשה [דיניה] *Mahseyah bar Yedonyah has signed in person*, written in a handwriting distinct from that of the notary, Sayce-Cowley E, lines 17 f. The word ספרא which follows נביעקב in the fragment of the docket of Papyrus 8, has been robbed of its context, and may, for all we know, be *document*, and not *scribe*. The בעל מעם was, as in Ezra 4, the higher official of the two, and in this case an Aramean. Incidentally, this document shows us what the Passover Papyrus would have looked like, had it been even remotely connected with a royal rescript. Not merely would it have been officially countersigned, but the names of the superscription would be reversed, and the papyrus would begin מן חנניה על דיניה, if not indeed מן ארשם על דיניה, in the name of the governor. — For the rest, there is nothing in our Papyrus 11 to indicate that 'Anani was himself a resident of Abydos, where Ma'uziyah's misadventure occurred ; on the contrary, had 'Anani been at Abydos, the services of Seha and Hor would not have been required.

Line 5. חרנופי was either the local Egyptian magistrate at Abydos or the plaintiff in the case.

חזו עליהם, not *be on your guard against them*, as Sachau ; the expression occurs in the sense of solicitous attention in Sachau Papyrus 13, line 6 : חזי על עלימא וביתי כזי תעבד : *care for the young people and my house as thou wouldst do for thine own house* ; also in the ostrakon published by Sayce, mentioned above, p. 13, note 19 : חזי על ינקיא עד נאזיה, *care for the children until we come*.

Line 6. חור was omitted at first, and later written in over the line ; hence יבעה in the singular.

קמו קבלהם כן *let your attitude to them be such* ; כן *so*, modifying קמו.

Line 7. Second לכם, literally *you have = there is*. I have rendered *you know*.

יסירא, *punishment*. The reading of this word, which

Sachau gives up altogether, is quite certain; the only letter that is very seriously mutilated is the ך. Point after Marti, § 82, note 2.

הנים, Hebraism = הנים of the Old Testament; adverb, *gratuitously*. For the form הנים as a possible alternative of הנים compare Gesenius-Kautzsch, § 88 c. Sachau suggests the god-name Hnum = Hnub, the Egyptian god of Elephantine; but (1) the third letter, though mutilated, is distinctly a ך and not a ך, and (2) a proper name is out of place before the enclitic which follows.

די, enclitic emphasizing the preceding word; see Nöldeke, § 221.

Line 8. לחור. The writer appears to have started by writing לחנ (for Hananyah), and then corrected to לחור.

לנמשכם עכרן. The ך in both words is unmistakable, though Sachau omits the one and reads the other ך; I think there can be no question as to the letters I have supplied.

עלים. See above on line 4.

זולו. The Pe'al is to be *cheap*. The context requires the Pa'il; cf. the Aph'el, "billig verkaufen" (Dalman).

בתן. The suffix refers to writer and readers combined; Ma'uziyah's goods at Elephantine are included.

Line 9. מה חסרנא, literally, *what we may have lost or what we may not have lost, be alike to you*. Sachau transcribes מה חסרן וי לא חסרן וי. The characters between the first מה and לא are mutilated or blurred, but enough of them is visible to make certain that the papyrus had no וי in the first clause and that a letter followed the ך of the first חסרן. In any case, the word cannot be the plural participle, referring to Seha and Hor, as Sachau and Lidzbarski (*l.c.*, col. 2980). The form and reference must be the same as in line 10, where חסרן cannot be construed as the participle or as referring to the visitors, only one of whom is there being spoken of; note the suffixes in אחרודי (line 10), ליה (line 11). On the idiom and the tense, cf. Nöldeke, § 258, and מה צבו in line 6 above.

Line 10. הן לו occurs Sachau Papyrus 53, line 3. On its use with the perfect in hypothetical sentences, cf. Nöldeke, §§ 259, 875.

שִׁמְנָא. The א (for ה?) was omitted at the first writing, and inserted above the line.

שִׁמְנָא. On the use of the participle for future time in the apodosis of a conditional sentence, see Nöldeke, § 271. שִׁמְנָא שִׁמְנָא, literally, *a treasure will be laid up*. I take this to be intended figuratively: "Anani will be put under obligation to us." Compare the Syriac versions of Matth. 6 19-20, where identically the same language is employed! Evidently the Syriac reproduced the original Aramaic logion of Jesus, and that in turn played upon an old Aramaic metaphor.

אַחֲרָיו, *after him*, that is, *after his visit*.

עֲנִי כְּבֵיתָ must not be taken too literally; כְּבֵיתָ = *apud* — *chez Anani*.

Ma'uziyah, the author of the above letter, was one of the most prosperous and well-educated members of the Jewish community at Elephantine, and second in importance only to Yedonyah. When he wrote, he was temporarily absent from home, at Abydos. This appears by comparing his letter, addressed to Yedonyah and Uriyah as the chief laymen in the community, with Sachau Papyrus 10, where a Jew in difficulties elsewhere appeals for aid to the Jews of Elephantine and addresses his appeal to "Yedonyah, Ma'uziyah, Uriyah, and the garrison."

Again, this Ma'uziyah appears in Sachau Papyrus 5 as one of the five prominent Jews dispatching an official petition (perhaps to the Persian governor in Egypt, before appealing to outsiders) for permission to rebuild the temple which has been destroyed. The petition must therefore be dated after 410 B.C., though probably before 407. The five men indicting it are: Yedonyah bar Gem(aryah), Ma'uzi bar Natan, Shema'yah bar Haggai, Hoshe' bar Yatom, and Hoshe' bar Natun. This Ma'uzi, second again to Yedonyah, is certainly identical with our Ma'uziyah, and here his surname is given as *bar Natan*.<sup>27</sup>

<sup>27</sup> In Sachau's transcription of Papyrus 11, Ma'uziyah's letter to Yedonyah, there appears a memorandum scribbled by the recipients on the outside of the papyrus, which Sachau reads מְסֻדָּה בְּרֵי צִמָּא . . . ה'. The reading of the last word alone is indicated as uncertain. Unfortunately, hardly a trace of

Now we have several documents from Elephantine professedly written by the hand of this same Ma'uziyah bar Natan:

(a) Sayce-Cowley H, an act of release dated in the 4th year of Darius (420/419 B.C.), and written by the hand of Ma'uziyah bar Natan, as notary.

(b) Sayce-Cowley J, a quit-claim deed dated in the 8th year of Darius (416/415 B.C.), and written by the hand of Ma'uziyah bar Natan, as notary.

(c) Sachau Papyrus 34, a deed of gift of which the date has been lost, but in which the notary's name is given with even more precision as *Ma'uziyah bar Natan bar 'Ananyah*.<sup>28</sup>

Papyrus 11, Ma'uziyah's letter from Abydos, which is in the same handwriting as that of the three documents just mentioned, was written some time after 419 B.C. (when Hananyah came to Egypt), but before 410 B.C. (when the temple was destroyed), and while Hananyah was still in the country. Note the formal mention of the priests of the temple in the address. Besides, it is not likely that that outrage would have been committed while Hananyah was in Egypt. He doubtless returned to the king long before 410 B.C. The letter should therefore be placed some three or four years after 419 B.C.

Still other papyri in these finds introduce us to the father of our Ma'uziyah on the one hand, and to his children on the other.

In Sayce-Cowley C and D, two deeds of the 6th year of Artaxerxes (459/458 B.C.), Ma'uziyah's father, Natan bar 'Anani, appears as a witness. In Sachau Papyrus 28, a

this legend can be discerned in the photographic reproduction. But I have no hesitation in affirming that an indorsement of this sort would not have set forth Ma'uziyah's surname, and that what was set down was *וְיָ כְתוּב* or *וְיָ כְתוּב*, *Ma'uziyah's letter about Seha*.

<sup>28</sup> Sachau calls attention to the similarity of the handwriting in this papyrus to that of the mutilated, but originally superior, second copy of the petition to Bagoas (Papyrus 2), and concludes that they belong to the same period. They do, as a matter of fact, belong to the same period, but it is the *kalams* that are similar, not the handwritings. Papyrus 2 was very probably written by the hand which penned the memorandum Papyrus 3, in which case it will be the personal copy of the emissary of the Jews of Elephantine to Bagoas.

document of the 9th year of Artaxerxes (456/455 B.C.), Natan bar 'Anani is the notary, as also in Sayce-Cowley E, of the 19th year of Artaxerxes (446/445 B.C.), and still again in Sayce-Cowley G, of the 25th year of Artaxerxes (440/439 B.C.).

The sequence yielded by these documents—the father, Natan bar 'Anani, appearing as an adult witness in the 6th year of Artaxerxes, and the son, Ma'uziyah bar Natan bar 'Anani, acting as one of the leaders of the community after the 14th year of Darius—affords us more direct evidence than any which has thus far been adduced, that the Darius of the days of Yedonyah bar Gemaryah and of the Elephantine temple outrage was Darius II.

On the other hand, in the list of subscribers to the fund collected for the God Yahu (Sachau Papyrus 18), we find a brother of Ma'uziyah, Ahyo bar Natan bar 'Anani, and one of his sons, 'Anani bar Ma'uzi, with perhaps another, Meshullam bar Ma'uzi. Under the circumstances it is permissible to assume that this list, which is dated 5th year, but without the name of any king, is to be assigned to the 5th year after the expulsion of the Persians, which occurred about 404 B.C. Perhaps no king is mentioned because Amyrtæus had not yet succeeded in establishing himself firmly upon the throne of the Pharaohs. In that case, this great collection may well represent the money employed for the rebuilding of the temple of Yahwè, some seven or eight years after the petition to Bagoas.

Finally, a Natan bar Ma'uziyah, who appears in an undated papyrus (Sachau 20), is certainly the son of our Ma'uziyah bar Natan.

I have called attention to the demonstrable prosperity, education, and importance of this Ma'uziyah bar Natan, because of the deferential, almost obsequious tone in which his letter to Yedonyah refers to the person of Hananyah. It is clear that the latter was one to whose favor both he and Yedonyah earnestly aspired. And though they recognized him as the cause, or at least the occasion of their embarrassment, there was no thought of resentment or oppo-

sition, but only of continued compliance with his will and ministering to his good pleasure. I think I detect a slight difference of attitude even from that exhibited toward 'Anani, the secretary of the Persian government. From 'Anani, Ma'uziyah expects a *quid pro quo* of a commercial kind; he will return their favors in due season. Of Hananyah nothing so definite seems to be expected. It is the bare favor of an exalted personage that is involved, one who can easily do harm if he will. Moreover, Hananyah is "in Egypt"—obviously at the seat of government, and a national figure. And, as already pointed out, he is a foreign Jew, who has but recently come into the country. It can no longer be disputed that the interpretation I gave of line 3 of the Passover Papyrus is correct. It was Hananyah himself who was *sent* from Darius to Arsames, and the Passover was his private concern.

One is tempted to speculate as to the character of the tantalizing "difficulty" which Hananyah's presence in Egypt had brought upon his coreligionists at Elephantine. Clearly it was of a kind that adverse reports by Seha and Hor concerning them might help to augment. Did Hananyah bring with him a religious exclusiveness and Levitical zeal which interfered with their traditional worship, disturbed the even tenor of their pagan ways, and put an end for the time being to their cordial relations with their neighbors? Did he find them Judeans, and try to make them Jews?

Sachau has called attention to the identity in name of this Persian official and the brother of Nehemiah, Hanani = Hananyah, upon whose moving report of conditions in Jerusalem, Nehemiah was impelled to undertake his work of restoration. Hananyah was not an uncommon name, to be sure. But Jews occupying exalted positions at the Persian court cannot have been so very numerous at any time; and such Jews bearing the name of Hananyah were doubtless fewer still. It is not at all unlikely that the Egyptian papyri have introduced us once more to the brother of Nehemiah. If this be the same man, the date of Nehemiah is settled beyond all controversy, as of Artaxerxes I, not II. For we

can well suppose that Hananyah had traveled from Jerusalem to Susa, when a very young man at the Persian court, twenty-five years before he was appointed ambassador to Arsames; whereas it is well-nigh impossible to assume that he did so thirty-six years after he had attained to that dignity, and found his brother Nehemiah in the prime of life.

In any event, we have as little reason for connecting Darius II with the religious motives of Hananyah, as we have for identifying Artaxerxes with those of Nehemiah. And the Passover Papyrus gives us a picture, not of the Persian Empire espousing the cause of Yahwè and busying itself with the details of "Ezra's" ceremonial law, but of the new-born Judaism in Jerusalem reaching out to reform and to control the half-heathen Judeans of the Diaspora.

In conclusion, I venture to add a few words regarding the view which has been energetically revived since the discovery of the Elephantine papyri, and recently defended by Torrey,<sup>29</sup> to the effect that Judaism offered, on principle, no opposition to the establishment of sacrificial temples *ad libitum* outside of Palestine. Against that view it must be urged that not only do we actually know of but one such temple in the days when Judaism had come into its own, but the form of the Mishnic reference<sup>30</sup> to the temple of Leontopolis clearly shows that the latter was in fact the only one in existence in those days. The evidence of the well-informed priest Josephus is distinctly to the same effect, and incidentally contradicts the above-mentioned hypothesis as to the general attitude of Judaism on the theoretical question. Josephus manifestly had never heard of the "foreign soil" justification of the temple of Onias; which makes it hard to believe that it was anywhere entertained. In the next place, it must be remembered that the establishment of that single foreign temple was due not to religious necessities, but, like that of the Samaritans, to personal ambition, or at all events to personal vicissitudes. Circumstances rendered it innocuous to

<sup>29</sup> *Ezra Studies*, pp. 315 ff.

<sup>30</sup> *Menahoth*, 13 10.



the centralizing spirit of Judaism, and it was first tolerated and then grudgingly recognized. This much it owed to the accident of its location outside of Palestine — and outside of Alexandria. A richly endowed Aaronic monastery rather than a rival metropolitan see, it was not forced, in self-defense, to question the primacy or the legitimacy of the parent sanctuary at Jerusalem. But all this lies aside from the main point, which is, that the developed Jewish system, in contrast to the pre-Deuteronomic religion — which latter we must not make the mistake of supposing ceased to exist after 621 B.C. — had no need of more than one temple, any more than it had need of more than one tabernacle. It was not the accessibility or the location of the sanctuary, but the unity of the “congregation” and the vicariousness of the ritual that constituted the characteristic note of the priestly law. And if, as Wilrich maintains,<sup>31</sup> the temple of Onias was founded by an émigré High Priest at a time when Jerusalem was in the hands of the heathen and inaccessible, the act was more at variance with the somewhat antiquated burden of Deuteronomy than with the spirit of the Levitical law. In any case, it is impossible to imagine a temple being founded outside of Palestine under the auspices and with the approval of the Jerusalem priesthood, merely to meet the religious needs of the Diaspora.

On the other hand, there may well have been other Yahwè temples besides that of Elephantine, founded by the earliest emigrants from Judea, which were *survivals of pre-Deuteronomic Yahwism*. These the Jews of Jerusalem will have countenanced in the fifth and fourth centuries B.C., for much the same reasons that led their successors to countenance the temple of Leontopolis. It was a choice between easy, almost insensible compromise and irreparable schism. Such temples were theoretically illegitimate, but the question of their legitimacy was never a pressing one. What is more important, they were fundamentally incompatible and practically superfluous. It was not necessary to strangle them; they died a

<sup>31</sup> *Juden und Griechen*, pp. 126 ff.

natural death with the spread of the new Judaism, the Synagogue, and the Mosaic law. When once the earliest settlers in Egypt learned to believe that the sacrifices at Jerusalem availed for all Palestine, they were quite content to have them avail for all Egypt too, and taxed themselves accordingly. The temple of Leontopolis remains an accident. And if there were any other sacrificial cults of Yahwè in out of the way corners of the earth at the beginning of the Christian era, they certainly lacked the "Aaronic" priesthood and were distinctly irregular. The ceremonial law of Judaism paradoxically carried with it the death sentence of sacrifice as an essential of Jewish religious life.