

the oldest *stratum* of the Pentateuch Moses is the sole priest, we should naturally conclude that Eli was descended from Moses.

But it is probably a mistake to suppose that in the early days of the Hebrew Monarchy the actual descent of a priest went for anything. The chief sanctuaries probably had their own traditions as to the origin of their ritual. Thus, for example, Ophrah seems to have ascribed its ritual to the priest-king Gideon; and had not tradition related the destruction of Gideon's family, it is not improbable that the priests at Ophrah would have been known as 'sons of Gideon'. In like manner we may suppose that the Bethel 'use' was associated with Aaron. In a new sanctuary, such as Micah's, unless the ritual had been prescribed by some theophany, it was desirable, though not necessary, to have some one with a priestly training.

Mr McNeile's argument on p. 8 depends on the assumption that Josiah intended to admit priests from North Israel to the temple at Jerusalem. That there were images at most, if not all, the important sanctuaries of both Israel and Judah down to the end of the eighth century B. C. is extremely likely, and in North Israel, probably still later. But the priests whom Ezekiel has primarily in view are those of *Judæan* sanctuaries such as Beersheba (unless we adopt the improbable supposition that his polemic is directed against the amalgamation of worship of Judæa and Samaria, of which tidings had reached him in Babylon), and Mr McNeile brings forward no evidence to shew that these were Aaronites. Anathoth was not a 'high place', but a suburb of Jerusalem, and the priests who resided there were definitely connected with the Zadokite priests at Jerusalem.

It may be pointed out that, if, as Mr McNeile contends, 2 Kings xxiii is historical, there were *no priests left in North Israel*, for Josiah put them all to death (2 Kings xxiii 19, 20). And even if the 'all' be not understood *au pied de la lettre*, is it likely that the survivors of the barbarous massacre, which Josiah is said to have ordered, would have been authorized by the same king to officiate in his temple at Jerusalem?

R. H. KENNETT.

THE IMAGE OF GOD.

Two valuable books, already familiar to readers of the JOURNAL, have lately come into my hands at Naples, and this circumstance leads me to put together a few observations which may be fitly registered under the above heading.

In his commentary on Numbers at p. 155, Dr Buchanan Gray refers to a suggestion contained in an article of mine (*Jewish Quarterly*

Review x 669) to read צלמם for צלם in ch. xiv 9. But if any merit attaches to this suggestion it is due entirely to Dr Neubauer, who put it forward in the *Athenæum* of Feb. 28, 1885, p. 280. I think that when writing in the *Jewish Quarterly Review* x, I may have had in mind an imperfect recollection, or unconscious memory of his proposed emendation. Had my recollection been explicit I should, of course, have acknowledged the debt. So too as regards the vocalization of צלפחד, for which Dr Gray refers to another paper of mine (*Jewish Quarterly Review* xi 259), I ought to have quoted that of the LXX, Σαλπααδ, given by him at p. 399. Such oversights will happen to any man who reads widely without making written notes—a fault pardonable to an invalid.

In the *Jewish Quarterly Review* for April 1905 (xvii p. 502, p. 503 *ad fin.* and p. 506 *ad fin.*), I have said my say about בצלאל, and also as to the phrase of Gen. i 27, בצלם אלהים. Now I wish to raise three very doubtful questions. (1) Is there any relation between the traditional name of the inspired artist of the Cherubim and the phrase which describes the making of Man? (2) Is there any relation between the name of the Boeotian festivals¹ of the Great and Little Daedala—a word which is said to signify 'wooden images', and is no doubt formed by reduplication of the stem Δαλ.—and the Semitic צל? Lastly, if Greek δαυδαλ = Hebrew צלצל, is there any connexion between the Cretan Δαίδαλος and the Biblical בצלאל? Or are these suggestive resemblances due to pure coincidence?

Together with Dr Gray's *Numbers*, there reaches me Dr Driver's commentary on Genesis, and I wish it could have been put into my hands at eighteen or twenty years of age. Yet I must enter a respectful protest against the strangely artificial interpretation which the writer has assigned to the language of Gen. i 26, 27. I cannot think that we have any right to read into the text of the Old Testament such an abstraction as *self-conscious reason*, borrowed from the metaphysics of modern Germany. It would, for instance, be more apposite if we were discussing the Upanishads than it can be to the concrete and poetic imaginings of the Hebrew Scriptures. The five lines cited from Ovid at the foot of p. 16 are really much more to the point. Surely such expressions as צלם and רמות cannot naturally be applied to τὰ μὴ φαινώμενα. They apply obviously and directly to the bodily semblance and uplifted countenance of man, and צלם is mentioned in immediate juxtaposition with the distinction of sex (i 27). Compare the expressions of 2 Kings xvi 10, ואת רמות המזבח ואת תבניתו, and the repeated תבנית

¹ Seyffert *D. C. A.* ed. Nettleship and Sandys, 1895. See Frazer *Golden Bough* 1st ed. I 100; 2nd ed. I 225.

Deut. iv 15-18. Neither Bezaleel nor Daedalus, we may be sure, would have found a difficulty in the statement. May I plead for a reconsideration?

GREY HUBERT SKIPWITH.

A FURTHER NOTE ON COSMAS.

V = Vat. Gr. 699 (s. viii-ix). L = Laur. Plut. ix cod. 28 (s. xi).
S = Sinaiticus 1186 (s. xi).

IN a former note on the text of Cosmas Indicopleustes printed in this JOURNAL (January 1905), I alluded to the untrustworthiness of Montfaucon's edition, particularly as regards the biblical and patristic quotations. I gave, however, practically no illustration of his inexactness in the latter, so I think it will not be considered superfluous to illustrate it more fully. The instances which follow are not intended as a complete collection of all the biblical quotations, but only as some of the worst instances of Montfaucon's freedom.

161 C *ἐν γὰρ ἕξ ἡμέραις συνετέλεσε, καὶ κατέπαυσεν*] *ἐν γὰρ ἕξ ἡμέραις ἐποίησεν ὁ Θεὸς τὸν οὐρανὸν καὶ τὴν γῆν καὶ πάντα τὰ ἐν αὐτοῖς καὶ τῇ ἑβδόμῃ κατέπαυσεν* V L S.

176-7 *οὗτος οὐρανοῦ καὶ γῆς Κύριος ὑπάρχων, οὐκ ἐν χειροποιήτοις ναοῖς κατοικεῖ, οὐδὲ ὑπὸ χειρῶν ἀνθρώπων θεραπεύεται, προσδεόμενός τινος, αὐτὸς διδούς πᾶσι ζωὴν καὶ πνοὴν καὶ τὰ πάντα, ἐποίησέ τε ἐξ ἐνὸς αἵματος*] V L S read *ὑπάρχων Κύριος* and omit *οὐκ ἐν χειροποιήτοις . . . πάντα* and *αἵματος*.

180 D *τοιούτος γὰρ ἡμῖν ἔπρεπεν ἀρχιερεὺς γενόμενος*] V L S have *ὅσος ἄκακος ἀμίαντος κεχωρισμένος ἀπὸ τῶν ἀμαρτωλῶν καὶ ὑψηλότερος τῶν οὐρανῶν* after *ἀρχιερεὺς*.

200 D *Ἐγὼ εἰμι Κύριος . . . προσκυνήσεις* is inserted by Montfaucon without the authority of the MSS.

212 B *ὕψιν σοι*] V and S add *καὶ καλέσεις τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ Ἰωάννην*.

221 B *δι' ἀνθρώπου ἀνάστασις νεκρῶν εἰσῆχθη ἐν τῇ γῇ*] *καὶ ἀνακεφαλαιώσασθαι τὰ πάντα ἐν τῷ Χριστῷ, τὰ τε ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ (τοῖς οὐρανοῖς L S) καὶ τὰ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς (ἐν τῇ γῇ L S)* V L S.

245 C *προφήτην ὑμῖν ἀναστήσει Κύριος ὁ Θεὸς ὑμῶν. αὐτοῦ ἀκούσεσθε. Καὶ ὁ ἄνθρωπος ὃς ἐὰν μὴ ἀκούσῃ ὅσα ἂν λαλήσῃ ὁ προφήτης ἐκείνος ἐπὶ τῷ ὀνόματι μου, ἐξολοθρευθήσεται ἡ ψυχὴ αὐτῆ ἐκ τοῦ λαοῦ αὐτῆς*] *προφήτην ὑμῖν ἀναστήσει κύριος ὁ θεὸς ἐκ τῶν ἀδελφῶν ὑμῶν ὡς ἐμέ. αὐτοῦ ἀκούσεσθε κατὰ πάντα, ὅσα ἂν εἴπῃ πρὸς ὑμᾶς. ἔσται δὲ πᾶσα ψυχὴ ἣτις (εἴ τις L S) οὐκ ἀκούσει (εἰσακούει L¹, εἰσακούσει L²S) τοῦ προφήτου ἐκείνου ἐξολοθρευθήσεται ἐκ τοῦ λαοῦ αὐτῆς* V L S.

253 A *τί ἐστιν ἄνθρωπος, ὅτι μμνήσκη αὐτοῦ, ἢ υἱὸς ἀνθρώπου, ὅτι*