ANDREWS UNIVERSITY

SEMINARY STUDIES

VOLUME III JULY 1965 NUMBER 2

CONTENTS

ANDREWS UNIVERSITY, BERRIEN SPRINGS, MICHIGAN, USA

ANDREWS UNIVERSITY
SEMINARY STUDIES
The Journal of the Seventh-day Adventist Theological Seminary
of Andrews University, Berrien Springs, Michigan.

ANDREWS UNIVERSITY SEMINARY STUDIES publishes papers and short notes in English, French and German on the following subjects: Biblical linguistics and its cognates, textual criticism, exegesis, Biblical archaeology and geography, ancient history, church history, theology, philosophy of religion, ethics and comparative religions.

The opinions expressed in articles are those of the authors and do not necessarily represent the views of the editors.

ANDREWS UNIVERSITY SEMINARY STUDIES is published in January and July of each year or as a double issue in July. Annual subscription rates of $2.50 are payable to Andrews University, Berrien Springs, Michigan 49104, USA.

Subscribers should give full name and postal address when paying their subscriptions and should send notice of change of address at least five weeks before it is to take effect; the old as well as the new address must be given.

THE PASCHA AND THE ORIGIN OF SUNDAY OBSERVANCE

LAWRENCE T. GERATY
Berrien Springs, Michigan

Earle Hilgert [1] has reviewed the evidence for the thesis that the origin of the Christian weekly Sunday observance was influenced by an ancient Jewish sacerdotal calendar, perhaps through the practice of the Qumran Jews and their predilection for the calendar found in the Book of Jubilees, [2] or at least one similar to it. He concluded that "a psychological orientation toward Sunday derived from Qumran or related circles may well have been a contributing factor in the establishment of Sunday observance in the early church." [3] And in the light of the emphasis of the Jubilees' calendar on the keeping of yearly feasts on specific days of the week rather than allowing them to rove through all the days of the week as did normative Judaism (an analogy in the United States might be Thanksgiving Day reckoning as opposed to Christmas Day reckoning), Hilgert further suggested that "a psychological predilection for Sunday in a paschal context could have been an encouragement for the observance of the weekly Sunday, and/or vice versa." [4]

It is the purpose of this article to review the historical evidence which may elucidate the possibility of a weekly Sunday service being encouraged by a prior annual Sunday observance of the Christian Pascha, later Easter.

[1] Earle Hilgert, "The Jubilees Calendar and the Origin of Sunday Observance," *AUSS*, I (1963), 44-51.

[2] Jubilees 6 : 29-38 in R. H. Charles, *The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament* (Oxford, 1913), II, 22, 23.

[3] Hilgert, *op. cit.*, pp. 49, 50.

[4] *Ibid.*, p. 51.

The Pascha in the New Testament

The fact that the Synoptic and Johannine accounts of passion week differ is well known.[5] But though there is apparent disagreement on the days of the month for the crucifixion and resurrection, all the Gospels agree on the days of the week on which these events took place, i.e. the crucifixion on Friday and the resurrection on Sunday. In the ensuing years, no doubt, Christians observed this paschal period in commemoration of the death and resurrection of their Lord at the same time as their Jewish neighbors were celebrating their Passover. Thus Paul's first letter to the Corinthians states, "For Christ, our paschal lamb, has been sacrificed. Let us, therefore, celebrate the festival, . . ."[6] Later in the same letter, Paul connects Jesus' resurrection with a special liturgical occasion, the Wave-Sheaf celebration, when he says, "But in fact Christ has been raised from the dead, the first fruits of those who have fallen asleep."[7]

On what days of the week would these early Christians have celebrated these feasts? Would it not have depended upon the time when their Jewish neighbors celebrated them as well as upon their own traditions? The divergent Jewish traditions would constitute differing backgrounds for the reckoning of the feasts first celebrated by Christians. Some Christians, emphasizing Christ's death, observed the Pascha on Nisan 14, while still others, emphasizing His resurrection, observed the feast on the Sunday following Nisan 14.[8]

Since the day of the Lord's resurrection had made such a profound impression upon the early Christian community,

[5] For a proposed solution in the context of the various calendrical traditions, see A. Jaubert, *La date de la Cène* (Paris, 1957), pp. 105-136.

[6] 1 Cor 5 : 7, 8 (RSV).

[7] 1 Cor 15 : 20 (RSV). Cf. James Moffatt's comment in *The First Epistle of Paul to the Corinthians* (London, 1959), p. 238, where Clement of Alexandria is said to have used Lev 23 : 9, 10 to support the idea that as the sheaf was to be lifted on the morrow after the Sabbath, *i.e.*, on the first day of the week, the third after Passover, so the Son of God was raised on the third day.

[8] See n. 25, below.

could it be possible that the Pascha became known as the "Lord's Day" (that is, the "Lord's [Resurrection] Day")? [9] Undoubtedly it would have first been an annual commemoration as indicated by the foregoing Corinthian references and by the very Jewishness of the early church. At least there seems to be no positive proof that it immediately became a weekly feast. [10] It is interesting to note in this connection that 1 Cor, the (paschal?) letter which gives us the institution of the Eucharist, contains more than a fifth of all the NT references to Christ as Lord and nearly double that of any other single NT book. [11]

The Pascha in the Early Christian Church

What hints, if any, are there in the early literature that the Pascha was celebrated as an annual Lord's Day festival? 1) Undoubtedly one of the earliest is the phrase "Lord's Day" in the *Didache*, an ancient baptismal or organizational manual. Although this rendition from κατὰ κυριακὴν δὲ κυρίου συναχθέντες [12] has been disputed, [13] it is nevertheless the preferred translation. If so, the context would indicate that this could be an

[9] Contrast, however, the apocryphal *Acts of John*: "And on the seventh day, it being the Lord's day, he said to them: Now it is time for me also to partake of food. And having washed his hands and face, he prayed, and brought out the linen cloth, and took one of the dates, and ate it in the sight of all." (All translations from the early sources are from *ANF* unless otherwise indicated.) It is not clear from the context whether "seventh day" refers to the seventh day of their journey or the seventh day of the week. If taken to be the former, it could conceivably be an annual day, but it is very possibly the latter.

[10] C. W. Dugmore, "Lord's Day and Easter," *Neotestamentica et Patristica* (a Cullmann Festschrift and Supplement to *Novum Testamentum*, vol. VI; Leiden, 1962), pp. 274, 275.

[11] Vincent Taylor, *The Person of Christ in New Testament Teaching* (London, 1963), p. 144. "The Lord" is mentioned 222 times in the NT, 46 times in 1 Cor, 26 times in Acts, and infrequently in the other books, its mention being rare in the Gospels (with the exception of Lk), and completely absent in Tit, the Epistles of John and Jude.

[12] *Didache* 14 : 1.

[13] *E.g.*, F. H. Yost, *The Early Christian Sabbath* (Mountain View, Calif., 1947), p. 32.

annual day for baptism[14] and the celebration of the Eucharist.[15]

2) Another early reference (*ca.* A.D. 112) comes from Pliny's familiar letter to Trajan, wherein reference is made to the affirmation of certain former Christians that "the whole of their guilt, or their error," had been that

> they were in the habit of meeting on a certain fixed day before it was light, when they sang in alternate verses a hymn to Christ, as to a god, and bound themselves by a solemn oath, not to any wicked deeds, but never to commit any fraud, theft or adultery, never to falsify their word, nor deny a trust when they should be called upon to deliver it up; after which it was their custom to separate, and then reassemble to partake of food—but food of an ordinary and innocent kind. [16]

Keeping a weekly Sabbath (until the Jewish-Roman war of A.D. 132-135) or even a possible weekly Sunday would not necessarily have involved guilt, but an annual vigil service in honor of the Lord's resurrection might, because of its uniqueness. The Romans were used to, and permitted, the weekly religious rites of the Jews on their Sabbath, and

[14] Cf. Tertullian, *On Baptism*, 19: "The Passover affords a more than usually solemn day for baptism; . . . After that, Pentecost is a most joyous space for conferring baptisms, . . . "

[15] It is interesting to note that a recognition of this possibility existed in the nineteenth century when J. Rendel Harris tried to show from the tenor of the *Didache* and its context, that it must have had reference to some great annual festival, perhaps similar to the day of atonement. See his *The Teaching of the Apostles* (London, 1887), pp. 105, 106. More recently, C. W. Dugmore, *op. cit.*, pp. 276-279, after an analysis of similar passages in the *Didache* and *Apostolic Constitutions*, has argued convincingly that "the use of κυριακή as a technical term for Easter Day thus seems to be reasonably attested. Its use as a normal description of the first day of every week would only have been possible after Sunday had become a regular day of worship among Christians and had to be thought of as a weekly commemoration of the Resurrection." Jakób Jocz accepts Dugmore's contention with regard to κυριακή in "Tertia Die, Secundum Scripturas," *CJTh*, IX (1963), 181. Contrast O. Cullmann, *Early Christian Worship* (Chicago, 1953), p. 11: "The Lord's Day of the first Christians was therefore a celebration of Christ's resurrection. *Each* Lord's Day was an Easter Festival, since this was not yet confined to one single Sunday in the year."

[16] Pliny, *Letters*, x. 96 (in *The Loeb Classical Library*).

possibly of pagan sun worshipers on their Sunday. [17] However, now they had on their hands a new sect, the Christians, meeting on a *stato die ante lucem* and attributing divine honors to some person other than the Roman emperor; and this could certainly be looked upon as a danger to the Roman peace. Thus the reaction of the Romans, the time of meeting, and to a lesser degree the content of the service, would seem to indicate an Easter vigil celebration—if indeed earlier examples of this celebration were anything like what they later came to be. [18]

3) Towards the latter part of the second century, the apocryphal *Gospel of Peter* twice applies the term "Lord's Day" to the actual day Christ rose from the dead. [19] It may be illustrative of contemporary usage.

4) One of the strongest hints that "Lord's Day" may have originally referred to an annual resurrection day—a hint recognized in this passage by an editor of *The Ante-Nicene Fathers* [20]—comes from Irenaeus (*ca.* A.D. 170):

> This [custom], of not bending the knee upon Sunday, is a symbol of the resurrection, through which we have been set free, by the grace of Christ, from sins, and from death, which has been put to death under Him. Now this custom took its rise from apostolic times, as the blessed Irenaeus, the martyr and bishop of Lyons, declares in his treatise *On Easter*, in which he makes mention of Pentecost also; upon which [feast] we do not bend the knee, because it is of equal significance with the Lord's day, for the reason already alleged concerning it. [21]

[17] R. L. Odom, *Sunday in Roman Paganism* (Washington, D.C., 1944), p. 155.

[18] The explanation that the Christians met in the dark for fear of the civil authorities is possible but not probable for the reason that this is not a characteristic response; at least this would appear to be the only instance if it were. Dugmore, *op. cit.*, p. 280, indicates that the evidence of this letter is too meager "to enable us to draw any conclusion other than the Christians met on some fixed day . . . to offer prayer and recite the Decalogue and that, at some unspecified time, they held a common meal."

[19] *Gospel of Peter*, 9, 12.

[20] A. Roberts and J. Donaldson, eds., *ANF* (New York, 1896), I, 569, n. 9.

[21] *Fragments from the Lost Writings of Irenaeus*, 7 (in *ANF*, I, 569).

Here the Lord's Day is related directly to Easter and compared to Pentecost. [22]

As the annual Lord's day festival developed, it undoubtedly followed the lines of the two differing traditions mentioned earlier. The "Asia Minor" custom, attributed to John and Philip [23] and patterning after normative Judaism, celebrated the festival on Nisan 14, whatever day of the week that happened to be. The "Roman" custom, attributed to Peter and Paul, [24] and following, perhaps, the precedent of the Jubilees-Qumran tradition (or one similar to it), celebrated the festival always on the Sunday after Nisan 14. [25] Both traditions were apparently so ancient and deeply rooted that any break with them caused bitter resentment and the history of the controversy over the two is well known. [26] The ultimately dominant tradition, i.e. that Easter had to be celebrated on Sunday, no doubt won out in the end, because 1) it was the more widespread, 2) it became the focal point of pressure for ritualistic uniformity, 3) it had influential backers, and 4) it was *not* the tradition of normative Judaism and thus less likely to be called "Judaistic" by a Jew-loathing world.

Influence of the Pascha on the Weekly Sunday

Having reviewed the historical evidence that may possibly indicate early Christian observance of the Pascha in the con-

[22] It would not be impossible, in this particular context, to see a similar relationship in Tertullian, *The Chaplet*, 3: "We count fasting or kneeling in worship on the Lord's day to be unlawful. We rejoice in the same privilege also from Easter to Pentecost day." Cf. also his *On Prayer*, 23. In commenting on these passages, Jocz, *op. cit.*, p. 182, says Tertullian "obviously refers to Easter."

[23] Eusebius, *Church History*, v. 24.2, 3; cf. Sozomen, *Church History*, vii. 19.

[24] Sozomen, *loc. cit.*; cf. Eusebius, *op. cit.*, v. 23.1.

[25] The Qumranites themselves seem to have held their Wave-Sheaf celebration on the 2d Sunday after Nisan 14 (nevertheless *always on a Sunday*), but other ancient traditions, including the Boethusian, Samaritan, and Karaite, held to the 1st Sunday after Nisan 14.

[26] Eusebius, *Church History*, v. 23-25.

text of an annual Lord's Day festival, the question remains, how may this have encouraged a weekly Sunday service? The annual festival was natural, because of the impact of the original event (Christ's death and resurrection), supported by the fact that Jewish Christians retained from their backgrounds an already established festival (Passover and Wave-Sheaf Day). Keeping the form of the feast, they changed its content. In fact, not to have changed the content (from pointing towards deliverance from sin to a memorial of that deliverance) would have denied Christ's Messiahship. Would the immediate observance of a weekly Sunday festival for divine worship have been as natural? No, for at least two reasons: 1) As Rordorf[27] points out, there are no parallels in any sect of Judaism where it is known that divine services were held weekly on Sunday. Although Hilgert[28] allows for a psychological orientation toward Sunday from segments of Judaism, he also observes that "such an attitude by itself could scarcely have given rise to the observance of Sunday as a day of worship." 2) The Jewish Christians *already had* an established weekly day of religious worship on the seventh day of the week—the Sabbath. Why would there have been a need for a second?[29]

Nevertheless, by A.D. 150, it appears that in Rome, at

[27] Willy Rordorf, *Der Sonntag* (Zürich, 1962), p. 186.

[28] Hilgert, *loc. cit.*

[29] Why was there a need (and where was the authority) to change either the form or the content of the Sabbath day rest? Apparently many early Christians realized there was no need, because the seventh-day Sabbath was observed in apostolic times and widely kept until at least the fourth century. See Acts 13 : 14-16, 42-44; 15 : 19-21; 16 : 12, 13; 17 : 2; 18 : 4, 11; 25 : 8; 28 : 17; Chrysostom, *On Galatians*, 1 , 7; Socrates, *Church History*, v. 22; Sozomen, *op. cit.*, vii. 19; R. A. Kraft, "Some Notes on Sabbath Observance in Early Christianity," *AUSS*, III (1965), 18-33; C. W. Dugmore, *op. cit.*, p. 279: "As a matter of historical fact the Sabbath did not disappear as a day of Christian worship until the late fourth or early fifth century." Further, as Dugmore asks (*op. cit.*, pp. 274, 280), "Is it not remarkable how little evidence there is in the New Testament and in the literature of the sub-Apostolic age that Sunday was the most important day in the Christian week, if in fact it was the occasion of the supreme act

least, there were some who held services on a weekly Sunday. How did this "custom" arise? As van Goudoever correctly observes,

> Of all parts of the liturgy the feasts are perhaps the most enduring: it is practically impossible to change the date and form of old festivals [as is illustrated by President Franklin D. Roosevelt's attempt to change the week for Thanksgiving], the creation of a new religious festival is almost unthinkable. [30]

If weekly Sunday observance was not "created" by Christians, would it not have come from Judaism? Undoubtedly so. But it could hardly have come from Judaism *except via the Sunday paschal tradition.* This possibility explains how the custom could have derived from Judaism and yet, in the fact of its *weekly* celebration, be distinctively Christian. Thus Christians would not have invented a new feast, nor would they have changed the day, but rather they would have "reduced" it, to use van Goudoever's expression: "In this process of reduction the 'Sunday' became the feast *par excellence* in the primitive Christian Church" [31] (no doubt for similar reasons as have already been mentioned for the ultimate triumph of the Easter Sunday tradition over the Quartodeciman practice). [32]

Van Goudoever also offers some interesting suggestions as to how the celebration of Easter Sunday may have influenced weekly Sunday observance. He holds that since Christ rose on the Sunday of the Omer (the Jewish ceremonial day for offering the first fruits of the barley harvest) and the Holy Spirit descended on the apostles on the Sunday of Pentecost (the Jewish ceremonial day for offering the first fruits of the wheat harvest), the whole fifty-day period was annually celebrated in the Christian Church, as it was in Judaism, but

of Christian worship, viz. the Eucharist? . . . It is not until about A.D. 150 that we find any clear and unmistakable reference to a regular meeting of Christians for worship, including the Eucharist, on the 'day of the Sun' (Justin, I *Apol.*, lxvii)."

[30] Van Goudoever, *Biblical Calendars* (Leiden, 1961), p. 151.

[31] *Ibid.*

[32] See above, p. 90.

as a period of rejoicing and the founding of the New Covenant community. [33] Into this fifty-day period he puts Acts 20 : 7 as a Saturday night-Sunday morning vigil service (many lights, much speaking, and the breaking of bread). [34]

Carrington suggests it is hardly possible to suppose that all first fruits of all crops everywhere in Palestine were offered on the two great Sundays especially set aside for the purpose, and asks whether it was not implied that *any* Sunday in this period of fifty days was a proper day for first fruits. [35] He thinks 1 Cor 16 : 2 may support this supposition since it directs that offerings be laid aside on Sunday, and since in 2 Cor 9 (where the same subject is continued), he finds that the theology of such offerings is worked out from the Hebrew theology of seed-time, harvest, and thank offering. [36]

Van Goudoever also explains how he thinks Sunday observance could have spread from the seven Sundays within the fifty days to the other Sundays throughout the year by an analogy with the synagogue: Just as the weekly Sabbath was held in commemoration of the yearly Passover (Dt 5 : 15) as well as, of course, a memorial of creation (Ex 20 : 11), the early Christians could have begun to keep the weekly Sunday in commemoration of the annual Sunday when their Lord arose. [37]

Rordorf, however, disagrees with this general thesis. His primary contentions are three: 1) The Sundays between the first and last Sundays of the harvest period had no special significance in Judaism, therefore the roots of Sunday observance must be sought in Christianity itself. [38] 2) Van Goudoever

[33] Van Goudoever, *op. cit.*, pp. 151-194, 221-235.

[34] *Ibid.*, p. 167; cf. Philip Carrington, *The Primitive Christian Calendar* (Cambridge, 1952), p. 38.

[35] Carrington, *loc. cit.*

[36] *Ibid.*

[37] Van Goudoever, *op. cit.*, p. 174.

[38] Rordorf, *op. cit.*, p. 186: "Die 5 Sonntage zwischen dem ersten und letzten Sonntag der Erntezeit hatten im Judentum keinerlei besondere Bedeutung. Wenn die Christen sie also durch Gottesdienste auszeichneten, dann haben wir im Judentum dafür keine Parallele

fails to solve the problem of how the weekly custom came from a yearly one.[39] 3) Throughout the first century the weekly Sunday service took place on Sunday evening while the yearly Easter service was celebrated from Saturday night to Sunday morning; this seems unmistakably to indicate that the Easter service had its own roots independent from the weekly Sunday service.[40]

These objections may be answered with the following observations: 1) Carrington has suggested the possibility that any Sunday within the fifty days was appropriate for the offering of first fruits.[41] Even without this conjecture, however, is it not possible to distinguish between the importance of a day and its regular observance? The writer would readily agree with Rordorf that the "observance" is distinctively Christian, but could it not have been influenced, all the same, by a psychological predilection based on the day's importance in Judaism? 2) Though van Goudoever may not have "solved" the problem of the gap from a yearly to a

und müssen die Wurzeln dieses Brauches im Christentum selber suchen."

[39] *Ibid.*, pp. 186, 187: "Auch *Goudoever* löst das Problem nicht, wie es von einem jährlichen Brauch zu einem wöchentlichen kommen konnte. Er scheint zwar einen 'Übergang' dadurch zu schaffen, dass nach ihm nicht nur *ein* Sonntag (der Ostertag), sondern sieben aufeinanderfolgende Sonntage jährlich regelmässig gefeiert wurden; trotzdem bleibt die Frage nicht weniger brennend: wie kamen dann die Christen dazu, den auf die Zeit der Wochen von Ostern bis Pfingsten beschränkten Brauch der Sonntagsfeier auf das ganze Jahr auszudehnen?"

[40] Rordorf, "Zum Ursprung des Osterfestes am Sonntag," *ThZ*, XVII (1962), 170: "Der wöchentliche Sonntagsgottesdienst fand während des ganzen ersten Jahrhunderts am Sonntagabend statt, der jährliche Ostergottesdienst aber, . . . in der Nacht vom Samstag auf den Sonntag und am frühen Morgen des Sonntags. Es wäre höchst merkwürdig, ja geradezu unverständlich, wenn wir zwar eine innere Abhängigkeit des Osterfestes am Sonntag von der wöchentlichen Sonntagsfeier anzunehmen hätten, der Termin des Gottesdienstes aber in dieser Weise verschoben worden wäre. Diese Differenz scheint ein untrügliches Anzeichen dafür zu sein, dass *der Ostergottesdienst eigene*, von der wöchentlichen Sonntagsfeier unabhängige *Wurzeln* hat."

[41] See above, p. 93.

weekly observance, he has, in the writer's estimation, made a significant contribution towards its solution.[42] 3) The methodology by which Rordorf reaches his conclusion—particularly with respect to a Sunday *evening* service—may be questioned. Was there, indeed, *regularly in the first century* such a service *side-by-side* with an annual celebration? Moreover, was the weekly service (when it does come clearly to view) so radically different from the annual? The similarities between the two customs appear to be greater than the dissimilarities; and most investigators have seen a definite relationship, if none other than that they both commemorate the same event. Certainly, Rordorf's distinction is too easily made.

Conclusion

Though this investigation may not have *proved* anything startling, nevertheless there often is value in reconsidering what may too readily have been regarded as a foregone conclusion. The NT and historical evidence bearing on the problem is by no means complete, and what there is, certainly is not conclusive. But such evidence as we do have would seem to indicate the *possibility* of there having been a tradition from the beginning of the Christian church in which an annual Sunday celebration in honor of the Lord's resurrection was known and observed as the "Lord's Day." This tradition gradually won out over the Quartodeciman practice. At the same time, and along with other factors not investigated in this article, it began to encourage the weekly observance of Sunday as the Lord's Day—again a memorial of the resurrection. The transfer may have been accomplished in part through the influence of definite precedents in Judaism, such as the offering of first fruits on regular Sundays within the fifty days. It may also have been influenced through psychologically natural attitudes from Judaism towards keeping weekly days in commemoration of events which were already celebrated annually, such as the Exodus (of which the yearly

[42] See above, p. 93.

Passover and weekly Sabbath were both commemorative [43]). Whatever the solution, Rordorf has correctly pointed out the problem. But is it not simpler and more cogent, on the basis of the evidence, to postulate an annual Lord's Day celebration which gradually spread to become the weekly Lord's Day, rather than to assume the reverse, or even to conclude that both celebrations began together at the same time—the one with and the other without a direct precedent in Judaism?

[43] Cf. Max Joseph, "Sabbath," *The Universal Jewish Encyclopedia* (New York, 1943), IX, 295, 296: "However, the Sabbath is not merely a 'day of rest' and a 'day of blessing,' but also a 'day of sanctification.' As such it has been associated with three ideas: the idea of creation, the social idea, and the exodus of Israel from Egypt. . . . 'And thou shalt remember that thou wast a servant in the land of Egypt, and the Lord thy God brought thee out thence by a mighty hand and by an outstretched arm; therefore the Lord thy God commanded thee to keep the sabbath day' (Deut. 5 : 15), . . . The Sabbath became a 'memorial of the going out of Egypt,' presenting to the picture of the redemption expected in the future the counter-piece of the release achieved in the past."

DID DAVID USE ASSYRIAN-TYPE ANNALS?

ALGER F. JOHNS
Andrews University, Berrien Springs, Michigan

In the study of ancient history, the various systems of chronological reckoning are of incalculable value. The B.C. and A.D. dates, of course, can be expanded indefinitely to include all possible events, and so the Christian era is unique in this respect. Many nations of antiquity had their own individual systems of chronological reckoning which covered long periods or eras of their history. However, to the student of the Biblical records it becomes readily apparent that no single coherent system was used for Biblical history.

It is obvious to any Bible reader that in the times of the divided kingdoms historical events, both in the Northern Kingdom of Israel and in the Southern Kingdom of Judah, were dated to particular years of the kings' reigns. In this respect, this era of Biblical history utilized a system closely resembling the method of reckoning used by Babylonians, Persians, and others. For all practical purposes, for contemporary people this was a rather satisfactory method for keeping track of both historical events and business transactions or any others matters in which dating was necessary. [1]

Leaving aside entirely the question as to when Judah or Israel were using postdating or antedating, [2] the earliest Biblical reference to an event dated by a specific king occurs

[1] Some difficulties arise for us to determine the exact year, however, when several of the kings bore the same name. Thus there are Darius I, Darius II, and Darius III; Artaxerxes I, Artaxerxes II, and Artaxerxes III. Since the documents do not refer to the kings by number but only by name, the historian must depend upon context or some other way of determining the sequence in order to properly place these documents within the reigns of their respective kings.

[2] See Edwin R. Thiele, *The Mysterious Numbers of the Hebrew Kings* (2d ed.; Chicago, 1955), pp. 14ff.

in the United Monarchy, referring to one of the years of King Solomon's reign as follows:

> And it came to pass in the four hundred and eightieth year after the children of Israel were come out of the land of Egypt, in the fourth year of Solomon's reign over Israel, in the month of Zif, which is the second month, that he began to build the house of the Lord (1 Ki 6 : 1).

Thus the beginning of the building of the Temple is said specifically to have taken place in the fourth year of Solomon's reign. Similar is the statement that the completion of the Temple building took place in the eleventh year of Solomon's reign (1 Ki 6 : 38). The same method of dating was used in the reigns of the successors of Solomon. In the Southern Kingdom the first dated event took place in the fifth year of Rehoboam's reign (1 Ki 14 : 25), and in the Northern Kingdom the first dated event is dated to the 18th year of Jeroboam's reign (1 Ki 15 : 1).

It only takes a casual reading of the subsequent records in the books of Kings and Chronicles to realize that this method of dating events was employed during the reigns of all the subsequent kings of the Northern and Southern Kingdoms—on and on down to the end of the existence of the two states. But what of the period before Solomon's reign? What system of chronicling history was employed during those periods of the monarchy when Saul was reigning or when David was reigning? Admittedly, the Bible has no direct evidence as to what type of system was used, and the absence of any specific event dated to any specific year of the reigns of either Saul or David cannot be construed as absolute proof that they did not use this method of dating historical events. However, there remains the possibility that another type of reckoning was used, and for such a possibility it is quite relevant to make a comparison with the various types of records preserved from ancient Assyria.

The ancient Assyrian practice was to designate each year, not by its numerical order in the years of the king's reign, but

ANDREWS UNIVERSITY

SEMINARY STUDIES

VOLUME III
1965

ANDREWS UNIVERSITY, BERRIEN SPRINGS, MICHIGAN, USA

CONTENTS

rather by the name of an annual honorary official who was called *limu* or *limmu*, also known as an "eponym" (a term derived from the Greek ἐπώνυμος). Thus it is generally held that the Assyrians originally used neither an era nor the years of the king upon which to base their records. From at least the period of the Third Dynasty of Ur and apparently down to the end of Assyria, the Assyrians appointed someone to this honorary office of *limmu*, either a high court official, the governor of some province, a general, or the king himself. [3] The Assyrian calendar year (which began in the spring and ended in the spring) was then given the name of the individual who held the office of *limmu* for that calendar year, and historical events that took place in Assyria were dated by the names of these men. Lists of these officials, the so-called *limmu* lists, were apparently kept in every city for use for official or business purposes.

There were two main types of *limmu* lists, which have been discussed by Sidney Smith as follows:

> Long lists of these officials were compiled, which fall into two main classes; the more important of the two gave the name of the *limu*, his official capacity in the Assyrian state, and a brief note concerning the chief event in the year so far as the king himself was concerned, while the second class simply recounted the names. The two classes may be conveniently referred to as the eponym chronicle and the eponym lists. [4]

What Smith calls the "eponym chronicle" is called by other historians the "Assyrian Chronicle" or the "Assyrian Expedition Lists." [5]

Whereas the records preserved in the eponym lists have always been simple, containing usually only one main event for each year or at the most two events, there is another class of Assyrian records which have been grouped together

[3] Sidney Smith, *The Early History of Assyria* (London, 1928), p. 343.

[4] *Ibid.*

[5] A. H. Sayce, ed., *Records of the Past*, II (London, 1889), 112; Robert W. Rogers, *History of Babylonia and Assyria* (2d ed.; New York, 1915), I, 502, 503.

under the general term "annals." The various annals of the Assyrian kings represent a wide spectrum ranging from simple accounts of what happened year by year, to very elaborately detailed records of military expeditions and other activities. They date back at least to the reign of Arik-dên-ilu.[6] The annals of the kings of Assyria may be divided into three general groups in regard to the dating methods employed. First, the records might refer to events as occurring in the year of a specific *limmu* or eponym. Secondly, the annals might be dated to a numbered year of a king's reign. Thirdly, the events contained in the annals might be simply dated to a certain military campaign of the king in numerical order, which, in turn, might or might not be in consecutive years of his reign. Any one of these three methods could be used by the various kings, or there could be any combination of these methods. In general, the earlier annals tended to date events by referring to the *limmu* or eponym.

In addition to these records, there are annals that list campaign after campaign, without giving the number of the campaign (whether it is the first campaign, or the second, etc.), as, for example, the annals of Ashur-dân II.[7] The successive campaigns of the king might be against a new foe each year, or there could be a second campaign in a subsequent year against the same country. For example, the annals of Ashur-bêl-kala are dated by the regnal years of the king, and in his first year there was an expedition against Uruaṭri and another one in his third regnal year.[8] The annals of Ashurnaṣirpal are usually dated to the *limmu* or eponym.[9] Actually, he dated the events of his first year by the year of

[6] Daniel D. Luckenbill, *Ancient Records of Assyria and Babylonia*, I (Chicago, 1926), 24.

[7] Ernst F. Weidner, "Die Annalen des Königs Aššurdân II von Assyrien," *AfO*, III (1926), 151-161.

[8] Weidner, "Die Annalen des Königs Aššurbêlkala von Assyrien," *AfO*, VI (1929), 75-94.

[9] J. M. Rodwell, "The Annals of Assur-nasir-pal," *Records of the Past*, III, 45, 55, 59, 65.

his reign, but the events of his second, third, fourth, fifth, and sixth years by the *limmu* or eponym; and the events of his seventh, eighth, and ninth years follow in order but without dating by the *limmu* or any other method. [10] In the "Monolith Inscription" of Shalmaneser III he refers either to his "accession" year or to the first year of his reign, then to his second year as his own *limmu* year, and in subsequent years to the various eponyms, whereas in his so-called "Black Obelisk" inscription he refers to his "accession" year, his first year, his second year, his third year, then to an eponym year, then to his fifth year, sixth year, etc. [11] In another edition of his annals the events are dated specifically to successive eponyms for the first five years, and then the pattern changes to the sixth campaign, seventh campaign, eighth campaign, ninth campaign, tenth campaign, etc. [12] Sargon II apparently always dated his records to the specific year of his reign rather than to the year of an eponym or *limmu*. [13] The annals of Sennacherib were recorded chiefly by campaigns. The known number of his campaigns is eight, but his eighth and last campaign was not in the last year of his reign. [14] The records of Ashurbanipal were also dated by campaigns, and in his first campaign against Egypt, he completely subdued 22 lesser kings along the way to his main foe. [15]

In summarizing these records of Assyria it may be said that, as a general rule, there was one major event recorded for each year as indicated by the *limmu* lists, although there might have been many minor expeditions in the same year.

[10] E. A. Wallis Budge and Leonard W. King, *Annals of the Kings of Assyria*, I (London, 1902), 269, 288, 302, 311, 326, 346, and lxvii.

[11] Luckenbill, *op. cit.*, I, 213, 216ff, 201ff.

[12] Joachim Ménant, *Annales des rois d'Assyrie* (Paris, 1874), pp. 109ff, 113ff.

[13] Luckenbill, *op. cit.*, II, 2-23; Julius Oppert, "The Annals of Sargon," from *Records of the Past*, VII, 29.

[14] Luckenbill, *The Annals of Sennacherib* (Chicago, 1924), p. 17.

[15] Luckenbill, *Ancient Records*, II, 292, 293.

For example, Tiglath-pileser I seems to have conquered 42 lands in five years, besides other small localities, stated as follows:

> In all, forty-two lands and their princes from beyond the Lower Zab, a region of distant hills, unto the further side of the Euphrates, and the land of Hatti and the Upper Sea of the West, from the beginning of my rule up to the fifth year of my reign, my hand has conquered. I have made them to be under one rule; I have taken hostages from them, and have laid tribute and tax upon them.—This does not include many other wars against enemies who could not oppose my might.—I have pursued them in my chariots where the country was good, and on foot where it was difficult. I have kept back the foot of the enemy from my land. [16]

The records for certain years might be very brief and for other years fairly expansive. For example, in the inscriptions of Sargon II there is only one campaign listed for each of his second, third, fourth, fifth and sixth years respectively, but he records two campaigns for his ninth year, and then for his twelfth and 13th years, the records were greatly expanded in details. These were the last of his annals but not the last years of his reign. [17] Usually when more than one country or land was involved in one year's fighting, the two or more countries were located near each other. But this was not always true; Tiglath-pileser I, for example, carried out two military campaigns in his accession year requiring his army first to march to the northwest, and after the successful completion of that campaign, to the east. [18]

Thus the records of the Assyrian kings could be very brief or could be expanded, could have one main event for each year or could have more than one event, and could on occasion show campaigns conducted against the same enemy, in several

[16] Luckenbill, *Ancient Records*, I, 85; cf. George S. Goodspeed, *A History of the Babylonians and Assyrians* (New York, 1909), p. 167, and Budge and King, *op. cit.*, pp. xlv-xlvi.

[17] Arthur G. Lie, *The Inscriptions of Sargon II: The Annals* (Paris, 1929), pp. 7, 9, 11, 13, 29, 35ff.

[18] Luckenbill, *Ancient Records*, I, 74-76; H. W. F. Saggs, *The Greatness that was Babylon* (London, 1962), p. 89.

consecutive years, but each time that same enemy would be mentioned again for that subsequent year. All of these various possibilities are reflected in the records of the reign of David, as a close comparison will show. The main conclusion is that the Assyrian records, if complete as far as can be ascertained, had at least something of interest or value indicated for each calendar year, minor though that historical event might appear. This careful accumulation of year-by-year records was the outstanding distinction of the Assyrian records.

Turning now to the Biblical records of the reign of David during the United Monarchy, the length of his reign is given as 40 years. That this particular period of 40 years is far more exact than other similar periods mentioned in Biblical records (where, in some cases, 40 years may be equivalent to "a generation"), is seen by the fact that the period represents the sum of two periods, one of 7 1/2 years and one of 33 years, as follows:

> David was thirty years old when he began to reign, and he reigned forty years. In Hebron he reigned over Judah seven years and six months: and in Jerusalem he reigned thirty and three years over all Israel and Judah (2 Sa 5 : 4, 5).

This text is identical for all practical purposes with the record found in 1 Ki 2 : 11. Of the total number of 40 years mentioned for David specifically in these verses, the first year he reigned in Jerusalem apparently would be counted as the eighth year of his reign. The principal events of his reign will be examined in the order in which they are referred to in 2 Sa, to see if there is any discernible pattern in the reign of David (remembering that often the principal event might be a military campaign against some neighboring nation or city—if these records are similar to the historical records of Assyria—unless, of course, some event at home transcended in importance the military campaign, in which case that would be the important event for the year).

The military highlight of the year in which David began to reign over all Israel would be the campaign against Jeru-

salem and the Jebusites (2 Sa 5 : 6ff.). This event would then have occurred in the eighth year of David's reign.

The next major campaign was against the Philistines in the valley of Rephaim (2 Sa 5 : 17-21), and if this were the next annual event, it would have taken place in the ninth year of David's reign.

The next major event recorded is another campaign against the Philistines in the same valley (2 Sa 5 : 22-25), and if this is the next annual occurrence of major importance in the chronological list, it would have fallen in the tenth year of David's reign.

The Biblical record continues:

> Again, David gathered together all the chosen men of Israel, thirty thousand. And David arose, and went with all the people that were with him from Baale of Judah, to bring up from thence the ark of God, whose name is called by the name of the Lord of hosts that dwelleth between the cherubims (2 Sa 6 : 1, 2).

This is the next major event discussed in the Biblical record (which devotes 23 verses to it), and it would thus be the highlight of that particular year, *i.e.*, the eleventh year of David's reign.

The next chapter begins with the statement: "And it came to pass, when the king sat in his house, and the Lord had given him rest round about from all his enemies; . . ." (2 Sa 7 : 1). It will be noted that this verse corresponds very closely to some of the references in the Assyrian *limmu* lists, where the simple expression "in the land" is used to indicate the absence of any military campaign for that year. For example these records mention for three consecutive years: "753 Ashur-nirâri, king of Assyria, in the land, 752 . . . in the land, 751 . . . in the land"; as well as for various previous years: "764 . . . in the land, 768 . . . in the land." [19] In other words, in both the Biblical and the Assyrian records, that particular year was marked by no outstanding military campaign nor any major event at home that was more

[19] Luckenbill, *Ancient Records*, II, 435.

important than the simple fact that the land had rest, or had lived in peace during that particular year. If this interpretation is correct, the statement of 2 Sa 7 : 1 would then refer to the twelfth year of David's reign.

The next outstanding event seems to be the campaign against the Philistines at Methegammah (2 Sa 8 : 1). Again, if this is the next annual event, it would mark the 13th year of David's reign.

The next event recorded was the campaign against Moab, which resulted in the subjugation of that nation (2 Sa 8 : 2). If this represents the highlight of the year, it would indicate the 14th year of David's reign.

The next occurrence was a war against Zobah, a powerful Aramaean city-state. This war also involved Damascus (2 Sa 8 : 3-13). As a result of this campaign, David was able to extend his borders far to the north, which then must have happened in the 15th year of David's reign.

The next highlight of his reign was a campaign against Edom (2 Sa 8: 14ff.), and this would have occurred in the 16th year of David's reign.

The next main activity recorded was the beginning of a campaign against the Ammonites, who solicited extensive support from their Aramaean neighbors (2 Sa 10 : 6ff.), probably in the 17th year of David's reign.

The next recorded campaign was against Hadadezer [20] of Zobah again, for he had enlisted Aramaean support from the other side of the Euphrates (2 Sa 10 : 15-19). This Aramaean rebellion was completely crushed, an activity which would then have taken place in the 18th year of David's reign.

The highlight of the following year, which would be the 19th year of David's reign, was the campaign against the Ammonites. Having crushed the Aramaeans, David was free to attack the Ammonites at this time, at their capital city (2 Sa 11 : 1). But connected with this, and beginning with

[20] The same king is variously called Hadadezer (2 Sa 8 : 3) and Hadarezer (2 Sa 10 : 16).

verse 2 and onward, there is a domestic event recorded which is preserved by the later prophets, and so there were two major events during David's 19th year, the rest of the chapter being devoted to David's experience with Bathsheba and Uriah.

Whether or not the visit of Nathan the prophet to David (2 Sa 12 : 1ff.) occurred during his 19th year, or, as indicated by 2 Sa 12 : 15, the child of David and Bathsheba had been born at the time of Nathan's visit, the events of chapter 12 from verses 15 through 23 may be considered as the main events during the 20th year of David's reign.

One of the highlights of the following year, the 21st year of his reign, as recorded in the Biblical chronicles, would be the birth of Solomon (2 Sa 12 : 24, 25).

However, the Biblical record immediately returns to a consideration of military affairs, and the successful conclusion of the campaign against the Ammonites was also an important event for the same year (2 Sa 12 : 26-31), which would be the 21st year of David's reign.

The outstanding event of the next year was a domestic scandal (2 Sa 13 : 1ff.). The experience of Tamar and Amnon was probably the talk of the land during David's time, as well as being something which later prophets incorporated in the Scripture record. This would have occurred in the 22d year of David's reign.

The record continues: "And it came to pass after two full years, that Absalom had sheepshearers in Baalhazor, which is beside Ephraim: and Absalom invited all the king's sons" (2 Sa 13 : 23). Because of the specific expression used here, "two *full* years," it seems that these would cover the 23d and 24th years of David's reign.

The narrative continues:

> But Absalom fled, and went to Talmai, the son of Ammihud, king of Geshur. And David mourned for his son every day. So Absalom fled, and went to Geshur, and was there three years (2 Sa 13 : 37, 38).

In the absence here of the expression "three *full* years," it may be assumed that the normal inclusive reckoning was used; in other words, the time that Absalom fled would be the time that he killed Amnon, or in the 24th year of David, and so this three-year span would include the 24th, 25th and 26th years of David's reign.

The next highlight is recorded as follows: "So Joab arose and went to Geshur, and brought Absalom to Jerusalem" (2 Sa 14 : 23). Following the principles noted above, this event also would have taken place in the 26th year of David's reign, in other words, at the end of the three-year period, inclusive, of Absalom's exile.

The next recorded event is as follows: "So Absalom dwelt two full years in Jerusalem, and saw not the king's face" (2 Sa 14 : 28). Again note the expression "two *full* years"; following the same principle, this represents the highlights of David's 27th and 28th years.

The record continues: "And it came to pass after forty years, that Absalom said unto the king, I pray thee, let me go and pay my vow, which I have vowed unto the Lord, in Hebron" (2 Sa 15 : 7). Here there is an obvious error or discrepancy. It is outside the purpose of this study to analyze or discuss the text in detail; this error must have come in fairly early, for it is also found in the LXX. It is impossible that a forty-year period is meant here, so an alternative will be followed, according to which some ancient authorities read "four years." [21] If this is correct, the four years would be inclusive, and would thus cover the 28th, 29th, 30th, and 31st years of David's reign. It was in the 31st year of David's reign, then, that the rebellion of Absalom occurred, and this was, of course, a major event, as is shown by the number of chapters devoted to it.

After settling this major rebellion, the next chief event is recorded in the following words:

[21] Kittel's *Biblia Hebraica*[3] refers to Lagarde's LXX edition and the Peshitto as having the reading "four years" instead of "forty years."

> Then there was a famine in the days of David three years, year after year; and David inquired of the Lord. And the Lord answered, it is for Saul, and for his bloody house, because he slew the Gibeonites" (2 Sa 21 : 1).

The three years referred to would be the 32d, 33d, and 34th years of David's reign.

Again a campaign against the Philistines, Israel's ancient enemies, was the highlight of the following year of the reign of David (2 Sa 21 : 15-17), which would be the 35th year of his reign, if our sequence is correct. An interesting sidelight is recorded when David was told: "Thou shalt go no more out with us to battle, that thou quench not the light of Israel" (2 Sa 21 : 17). Imagine the king wanting to do his part, still with a fiery spirit, though his body might be aged—going out to battle at the approximate age of 65.

The next recorded highlight was also a campaign against the Philistines at Gob, or Gezer (2 Sa 21 : 18; cf. 1 Chr 20 : 4), which then would have taken place in the 36th year of David's reign.

The succeeding year's campaign was similar to that which was conducted the year before (2 Sa 21 : 19), and this would have occurred in the 37th year of David's reign.

Once again, in the following year, the opponents were still the Philistines, but this time the locale of the military action was the city of Gath (2 Sa 21 : 20), and this would have happened in the 38th year of David's reign.

Chapters 22 and 23 of 2 Sa are concerned with some of the final incidents and speeches or pronouncements of the reign of David. The next main historical event is recorded in chapter 24, as follows: "And again the anger of the Lord was kindled against Israel, and he moved David against them to say, Go, number Israel and Judah" (2 Sa 24 : 1). The numbering of Israel was the main event of David's 39th year and thus closes the book of 2 Samuel. Coming into the book of 1 Kings, the first few verses would also be a record of some of the later events of David's 39th year.

The main event of the 40th and final year of David's reign was the rebellion of Adonijah and the seating of Solomon upon the throne (1 Ki 1 : 5ff.).

In summarizing this comparison of the Assyrian records with the Biblical records of the reign of David, it seems quite apparent to the present writer that there is a strong probability that there existed annual year-by-year records for David's reign. This year-by-year record for the events of his reign seems to have been carefully preserved from the time of his reign in Jerusalem on, although there is complete silence for the seven years' reign in Hebron before he reigned over all Israel. As noted above, the reference to some of the time when there was peace in the land closely parallels those Assyrian records in which it simply says, "in the land," meaning that there was no military expedition outside of Assyria.

Another very interesting comparison is that the major expedition in so many of David's years of reign was against the perennial enemy, the Philistines. This parallels very closely the records of one of the kings of Assyria, Adad-nirâri II, in which, year after year (dated by the *limmu* or eponym), it is stated that he marched against the "wide land of Hanigalbat," until finally he had successively marched against Hanigalbat six times. [22]

Admittedly, there are not enough data to prove that this proposed reconstruction of the events of David's reign is correct, but those data which are preserved, such as the ages of David and Solomon respectively, fit very well into the picture. The record of basic skeletal events of his reign before their expansion by later prophetic writers seems to parallel rather closely the Assyrian records, especially the expanded or longer *limmu* lists.

[22] Luckenbill, *op. cit.*, I, 111, 112, 113.

VETTIUS VALENS AND THE PLANETARY WEEK

ROBERT L. ODOM
Washington, D.C.

A very important testimony concerning the planetary week in the second century A.D. is that of Vettius Valens, a noted astrologer of Antioch, who was active during the reigns of Antoninus Pius (138-161) and Marcus Aurelius (161-180). His *Anthology*, an astrological treatise written in Greek, has been a valuable subject of study by scholars because of the astronomical and chronological data it contains. [1] Otto Neugebauer, noted expert in the mathematics of ancient astronomy, has worked out, with the collaboration of Henry B. Van Hoesen, the horoscopes recorded by that astrologer. In their book presenting their findings they say:

> The importance of the *Anthology* of Vettius Valens for our subject can be illustrated by the following figures. With its about 130 (partial or complete) horoscopes it contains twice as many examples of Greek horoscopes as all papyri combined. Without Vettius Valens (whose examples range from A.D. 37-188) we should have only five examples of 'literary' horoscopes before A.D. 380. [2]

The same scholars report:

> The fact that every one of these horoscopes can be shown to be astronomically correct for a date in the first or second century A.D. is therefore proof that Vettius Valens was using empirical material exclusively, collected either by himself or by his predecessors. [3]

[1] Franz Cumont, "The Frontier Provinces of the East," *The Cambridge Ancient History, XI* (New York, 1936), 643; *Astrology and Religion among the Greeks and Romans* (New York, 1912), pp. 36, 86, 87, 93; *The Oriental Religions in Roman Paganism* (New York, 1956), p. 171; F. H. Colson, *The Week* (Cambridge, Engl., 1926), pp. 47-52.

[2] Otto Neugebauer and Henry B. Van Hoesen, *Greek Horoscopes* (Philadelphia, 1959), p. 176. I gratefully acknowledge the kindness of Dr. Neugebauer for reading this paper and making helpful suggestions, although the conclusions reached are my own.

[3] *Ibid.*

They also say: "The *Anthology* contains some 40 explicit references to years of the Roman imperial period and about 100 horoscopes which do not quote their dates but which can be dated astronomically." [4] These horoscopes range from A.D. 37 to 188. [5] Moreover, "all evidence agrees that Vettius Valens must have worked for at least twenty years, from 154 to 174, on the composition of the *Anthology*." [6]

In his *Anthology*, Vettius Valens presents a chapter in which he tells how to find the day of the week on which a given birth date—the year, the month, and the day of the month—had fallen. This information was then deemed important in astrology, because each day of the week was supposed to be under the aegis of the planetary god after which it was named. Besides giving us his mathematical formula for that purpose, he presents an example showing how it worked. His style is terse, his jargon that of persons of his profession, and the mathematical short cut he employs in his formula a clever device. Here is the Greek text of his statement:

Περὶ δὲ τῆς ἑβδομάδος καὶ σαββατικῆς ἡμέρας οὕτως. τὰ ἀπὸ Αὐγούστου ἔτη πλήρη καὶ τὰς ἐμβολίμους ἀναλαβὼν πρόσθες καὶ τὰς ἀπὸ Θὼθ ἕως τῆς γενεθλιακῆς ἡμέρας καὶ ἐκ τούτων ἀφαίρει ὁσάκις δύνῃ ἑπτά, τὰς δὲ λοιπὰς ἀπὸ Ἡλίου· εἰς οἷον δ' ἂν καταλήξῃς ἀστέρα, ἐκείνου ἔσται ἡ ἡμέρα. ἡ δὲ τάξις τῶν ἀστέρων πρὸς τὰς ἡμέρας οὕτως ἔχει· Ἥλιος Σελήνη Ἄρης Ἑρμῆς Ζεὺς Ἀφροδίτη Κρόνος. ἡ δὲ τῶν ζωνῶν διάθεσις οὕτως· Κρόνος Ζεὺς Ἄρης Ἥλιος Ἀφροδίτη Ἑρμῆς Σελήνη· ἐκ ταύτης δὲ τῆς διαθέσεως αἱ ὧραι σημαίνονται, ἐκ δὲ τῶν ὡρῶν ἡ ἡμέρα τοῦ ἑξῆς ἀστέρος. οἷον ἔτος δ' Ἀδριανοῦ Μεχὶρ κατὰ Ἀλεξανδρεῖς ιγ' νυκτὸς ὥρα α'· τὰ ἀπὸ Αὐγούστου ἔτη πλήρη ρμη' καὶ ἐμβόλιμοι λς' καὶ ἀπὸ Θὼθ ἕως ιγ' Μεχὶρ ἡμέραι ρξγ'· γίγνεται τμζ'. ἀφαιρῶ ἑβδομάδας μθ', λοιπαὶ δ'· ἀπὸ Ἡλίου καταλήγει εἰς Ἑρμοῦ ἡμέραν, καὶ ἡ α' ὥρα νυκτὸς Ἑρμοῦ, ἡ δευτέρα Σελήνης, ἡ

[4] *Ibid.*
[5] *Ibid.*, pp. 176, 177.
[6] *Ibid.*, p. 177.

τρίτη Κρόνου, ἡ τετάρτη Διός, ἡ πέμπτη Ἄρεως, ἡ ἕκτη Ἡλίου, ἡ ἑβδόμη Ἀφροδίτης, ἡ ὀγδόη Ἑρμοῦ, ἡ ἐνάτη Σελήνης, ἡ δεκάτη Κρόνου, ἡ ἑνδεκάτη Διός, ἡ δωδεκάτη Ἄρεως· [ἡ] ἡμέρα α' Ἡλίου, β' Ἀφροδίτης, τρίτη Ἑρμοῦ, τετάρτη Σελήνης, πέμπτη Κρόνου, ἕκτη Διός, ἑβδόμη Ἄρεως, ὀγδόη Ἡλίου, ἐνάτη Ἀφροδίτης, δεκάτη Ἑρμοῦ, ἑνδεκάτη Σελήνης, δωδεκάτη Κρόνου. εἶτα ἑξῆς γίγνεται ἡ ἐπιοῦσα ἡμέρα τουτέστι Μεχὶρ ιδ'· ἔσται Διὸς καὶ ἡ α' ὥρα.

A translation with explanatory words added in brackets to make the meaning clearer would read thus: "And concerning the week and [the] sabbatical day [the formula is] thus: Taking [the number of] full years and the [number of] intercalations from [the commencement of the Era of] Augustus, add also the [number of] days from [the first day of] Thoth to the birth date, and subtract from [the total of] these [numbers] seven as many times as possible, and [count] the remaining (days) from [that of the] Sun [Sunday]. And in this manner you may reckon the [planetary] star to which the day belongs. And the order of the [planetary] stars in relation to the days [of the week] holds thus: Sun, Moon, Mars, Mercury, Jupiter, Venus, [and] Saturn. But the arrangement of their orbits [around the earth is] thus: Jupiter, Mars, Sun, Venus, Mercury, [and] Moon. Moreover, by this [same] arrangement the hours [of each day] are designated; and by means of the hours [is indicated the] day of the next [planetary] star.

"For example: Year 4 [of the reign] of Hadrian, Mechir 13 according to [the calendation of the] Alexandrians, [and] hour 1 of night [are the birth date]. The full years from [the commencement of the Era of] Augustus [are] 148, and [the] intercalations [are] 36, and from [the first day of] Thoth to Mechir 13 [are] 163 days. They are [thus a grand total of] 347. Subtract 49 weeks [from this sum, and] there remain 4 (days). From [the day of the] Sun [Sunday] count to [the] day of Mercury [Wednesday], and the hour 1 of night [is that] of

Mercury; the second, [that] of [the] Moon; the third, [that] of Saturn; the fourth, [that] of Jupiter; the fifth, [that] of Mars; the sixth, [that] of [the] Sun; the seventh, [that] of Venus; the eighth, [that] of Mercury; the ninth, [that] of [the] Moon; the tenth, [that] of Saturn; the eleventh, [that] of Jupiter; the twelfth, [that] of Mars; [and] hour 1 of day [is that] of [the] Sun; the second, [that] of Venus; the third, [that] of Mercury; the fourth, [that] of [the] Moon; the fifth, [that] of Saturn; the sixth, [that] of Jupiter; the seventh, [that] of Mars; the eighth, [that] of [the] Sun; the ninth, [that] of Venus; the tenth, [that] of Mercury; the eleventh, [that] of [the] Moon; the twelfth, [that] of Saturn. Therefore the following day will be Mechir 14, and hour 1 will be [that] of Jupiter." [7]

In order to understand the mathematical formula presented by Vettius Valens for finding the day of the week on which a birth date had fallen, and to see how accurate that formula is shown to be by the example which he presents to illustrate the way it works, it is imperative that the data and the means he employed be clearly kept in mind. Hence we shall discuss them at this juncture.

1. Vettius Valens used a system of calendation that had been in vogue at Alexandria, Egypt, during the imperial period since the reign of Augustus.

Prior to the conquest of Egypt by Octavius and his making it a province of the Roman Empire, the Egyptian calendar year had consisted of twelve months of 30 days each, which amounted to 360 days. Five supplementary or epagomenal days, added to the 360, completed the calendar year and gave it a grand total of 365. No extra day was intercalated every fourth year to align the calendar year with the tropical solar year of 365.242 days. However, Egyptian savants had long been aware that their system of calendation was defect-

[7] Vettius Valens, *Anthologiarum libri*, V. 10. 10-33. The Greek text is given according to the edition of G. Kroll (Berlin, 1908), p. 26; the translation is mine.

ive, but the people of Egypt refused to accept any reform of their calendar. [8]

When Julius Caesar and his adviser, the Alexandrian astronomer Sosigines, [9] planned in 46 B.C. the reform of the Roman calendar, they assumed that the mean length of the tropical solar year was precisely 365.25 days and made this the mean length of the year of the new calendar introduced into use by the Roman government on January 1, 45 B.C. After three successive common years of 365 days each, every fourth year was to have 366 days by the intercalation of an extra day in February. By perpetuating this quadrennial cycle, that Julian calendrical system continued in vogue until A.D. 1582, when the reform introduced by Pope Gregory XIII was first adopted.

Because the old Egyptian calendar year of 365 days was one fourth (0.25) of a day shorter than the mean calendar year of 365.25 days in use among the Romans, the New Year's Day of the Egyptians came one full day earlier every four years in relation to the Julian calendar from 45 B.C. onward. As a result of this shifting, it would take 1,461 Egyptian calendar years ($365 \times 1{,}461 = 533{,}265$ days) to equal 1,460 Julian calendar years ($365.25 \times 1{,}460 = 533{,}265$ days). Thus the Egyptian New Year's Day slowly regressed, at the rate of one day every four years, through all the seasons of the natural year and through all the twelve months of the Julian calendar in a cycle of 1,460 Roman years or 1,461 Egyptian years. [10]

[8] Ptolemy III (Euergetes I), who reigned from 247 to *ca.* 222 B.C., and was noted as a generous patron of learning, attempted to reform the Egyptian calendar by his famous "Decree of Canopus," in 238 B.C., to provide for the regular intercalation of an extra (sixth) epagomenal day every fourth year, but his people would not accept it. See Duncan McNaughton, *A Scheme of Egyptian Chronology* (London, 1932), pp. 297-299; J. P. Mahaffy, *The Empire of the Ptolemies* (London, 1895), p. 234.

[9] Pliny the Elder, *Natural History*, II. 6 (Loeb ed., I, 192, 193); XVIII. 57 (Loeb ed., V, 322, 323).

[10] Censorinus, *De die natale*, 18 (F. Hultsch, ed. [Leipzig, 1867],

During a civil war among the Romans, Octavius defeated Mark Antony, assisted by Queen Cleopatra of Egypt, in a great battle near the Epirot town and promontory of Actium on the south side of the Ambracian Gulf. This engagement took place on September 2, 31 B.C., in the year when Octavius was consul for the third time, with M. Valerius Messala Corvinus as his colleague. [11] A Roman historian says:

> Such was the naval battle in which they [Augustus and Mark Antony] engaged on the second of September. I do not mention this date without a particular reason, nor am I, in fact, accustomed to do so; but Caesar now for the first time held all the power alone, and consequently the years of his reign are properly reckoned from that day. [12]

It was from that date—September 2, 31 B.C.—that the Romans reckoned their Actian Era, in commemoration of the victory of Augustus over Mark Antony in the battle of Actium. But *this is not the era of Augustus, and September 2, 31 B.C., is not the beginning of it, as employed by Vettius Valens in accordance with Alexandrian usage.*

After the battle of Actium, Mark Antony fled to Egypt, rejoined Cleopatra, and made preparations to defend that country against invasion by his adversary. As winter was approaching, Octavius passed through Greece and part of western Asia to the island of Samos. [13]

On January 1, 30 B.C. Octavius later known as Augustus, became consul for the fourth time, with Marcus Licinius Crassus as his colleague. [14] In mid-winter he sailed for Brun-

pp. 38, 39); Theon of Alexandria, *Commentaire sur les tables manuelles astronomiques de Ptolemée*, Abbé Halma, ed., I (Paris, 1822), 30.

[11] For the names of the Roman consuls in the year in which the battle of Actium was fought, see Valleius Paterculus, *The Roman History*, II. 84 (Loeb ed., pp. 226-228); Dio Cassius, *Roman History*, L. 10 (Loeb ed., V, 454-457).

[12] Dio Cassius, *op. cit.*, LI. 1 (Loeb ed., VI, 2-7).

[13] Suetonius, *The Lives of the Caesars*, "Octavius Caesar," 17 (Loeb ed., I, 147); Valleius Paterculus, *op. cit.*, II. 85 (Loeb ed., pp. 228-231); Dio Cassius, *op. cit.*, LI. 1-4 (Loeb ed., VI, 2-15).

[14] For the names of the Roman consuls for 30 B.C., see Dio Cassius, *op. cit.*, LI. 4 and 19 (Loeb ed., VI, 10-15, 50-55).

disium, where he settled complaints of disgruntled veterans. Having done this, he left for Greece on the 30th day after his arrival in Brundisium. From Greece he went to Asia via Rhodes. Moving quickly down through Syria, he invaded Egypt and laid siege to Alexandria, which he took on August 1, 30 B.C. [15] Mark Antony committed suicide by the sword, and Cleopatra later in the same month took her life by pressing a venomous asp to her breast. [16] Thus ended the long reign of the dynasty of the Ptolemies over Egypt. That country now became a part of the Roman Empire by conquest, and Gneius Cornelius Gallus, commander of one of the invading armies, became the first Roman governor of Egypt by appointment from Augustus. [17]

Clement of Alexandria, writing *ca.* A.D. 200, said:

> From the taking of Babylon to the death of Alexander, a hundred and eighty-six years. From this to the victory of Augustus, when Antony killed himself at Alexandria, two hundred and ninety-four years, *when Augustus was made consul for the fourth time.* [18]

Note that Clement places the death of Mark Antony, which occurred when Augustus took the city of Alexandria, in the year when he was consul for the fourth time. That was the year 30 B.C. Moreover, Clement states that the interval from the death of Alexander the Great to that of Mark Antony was 294 years. This agrees exactly with the computation given

[15] The date—"*K. Aug. . . . Aug. Alexan. recepit*" (On the Kalends of August [August 1]. . . . Augustus took Alexandria)— is found in an inscription of the ancient calendar of Antium. See *CIL*, Vol. X (1883), pt. 1, no. 6638, p. 664; Vol. I (1893), pt. 1, col. 3, p. 323; Paulus Orosius, *Historiae*, VI. 19 (*MPL*, XXXI, 1050, 1051), where the date is given as "*Kalendis Sextilibus*" (on the Kalends of August, or August 1), *Sextilis* being the original Latin name of the month now called August.

[16] Dio Cassius, *op. cit.*, LI. 5, 9-13 (Loeb ed., VI, 14-17, 24-39); Suetonius, *op. cit.*, 17 and 18 (Loeb ed., I, 144-149); Valleius Paterculus, *op. cit.*, II. 87 (Loeb ed., pp. 232-235).

[17] Dio Cassius, *op. cit.*, LI. 17 (Loeb ed., VI, 46-49); Eutropius, *Abridgment of Roman History*, VI. 7 (J. S. Watson, ed. [London, 1886], p. 499).

[18] Clement of Alexandria, *Stromata*, I. 21 (*ANF*, II, 332).

in the *Canon* of the kings compiled by Claudius Ptolemy, the Alexandrian astronomer, earlier in the second century A.D.

The precise date when Augustus *completed* his conquest and occupation of Alexandria is not known. Though the city fell on August 1, as already shown, he spent some time there before Cleopatra ended her life and before he concluded his arrangements for the provisional administration of Egyptian affairs by the Romans. It was about the last of August that he left Alexandria and passed through Syria into Asia, to spend the winter there. [19]

In the meantime news of the conquest of Egypt and of the death of Antony and Cleopatra reached Rome. The senate and the people there were so highly elated by Augustus' success in bringing the civil war to a conclusion that they voted great honors for him. "The day on which Alexandria had been captured they declared a lucky day, and directed that *in future years it should be taken as the starting-point in their reckoning of time.*" [20]

Thus history records that the era of Augustus began in the year when that Roman ruler conquered Egypt by taking Alexandria, which was 30 B.C. It was this era, and not the Actian, that Vettius Valens used in his mathematical formula for ascertaining the day of the week on which a birth had occurred.

2. The twelve months of the Egyptian calendar were as follows: (1) Thoth, (2) Phaophi, (3) Hathyr, (4) Choiak, (5) Tybi, (6) Mechir, (7) Phamenoth, (8) Pharmuthi, (9) Pachon, (10) Payni, (11) Epiphi, (12) Mesore, followed immediately by five epagomenal days to make a total of 365. Thus Thoth 1 was the New Year's Day of the Egyptians. In his illustration of the way his formula works, Vettius Valens mentions the months of Thoth and Mechir. The era of Augustus according to the Alexandrians began with Thoth 1 of 30 B.C., and it is from that date that Vettius Valens reckoned

[19] Dio Cassius, *op. cit.*, LI. 18 (Loeb ed., VI, 48-50).
[20] *Ibid.*, LI. 19 (Loeb ed., VI, 52-55).

in making his calculations. To what month date of the Julian calendar did Thoth 1 correspond in 30 B.C.? The answer will be given below.

3. Vettius Valens speaks twice about "intercalations," indicating that he used the reformed Egyptian calendar, and not the old one which had no intercalation. This raises another question: When did the first intercalation of an extra day in the new calendar used at Alexandria begin? Evidence shows that it began in the reign of Augustus. Diodorus Siculus, writing during the early part of the reign of that Roman emperor, said:

> The Thebans say that they are the earliest of all men and the first people among whom philosophy and the exact science of the stars were discovered, since their country enables them to observe more distinctly than others the risings and settings of the stars. Peculiar to them is their ordering of the months and years. For they do not reckon the days by the moon, but by the sun, making their month of thirty days, and they add five and a quarter days to the twelve months and in this way fill out the cycle of the year. But they do not intercalate months or subtract days, as most of the Greeks do. [21]

Thus in the time of Diodorus Siculus provision had been made for the intercalation of the extra day as needed to make the mean calendar year of the Egyptians 365.25 days long.

Strabo in the early part of the reign of Augustus noted that the Egyptians

> . . . reckon the days, not by the moon, but by the sun, adding to the twelve months of thirty days each five days each year; and, for the filling out of the whole year, since a fraction of the day runs over and above, they form a period of time from enough whole days, or whole years, to make the fractions that run over and above, when added together, amount to a day. [22]

The same writer refers to "the fractions of the day and

[21] Diodorus Siculus, *The Library of History*, I. 50 (Loeb ed., I, 174-177).

[22] Strabo, *Geography*, XVII. 1. 47 (Loeb ed., VIII, 124, 125).

night which, running over and above the 365 days, fill out the time of the true year." [23]

It is evident therefore that during the early part of the reign of Augustus the Alexandrians reformed their system of calendation by intercalating (adding) a sixth epagomenal day at the end of every fourth year. By this means they kept their calendar dates synchronized with the corresponding ones of the Julian calendar.

However, this does not mean that the Egyptians discontinued the use of their old system of calendation, which made no provision for the insertion of an intercalary day once in four years. The fact is that both the old and the new calendars were used simultaneously in Egypt throughout the Roman imperial period. It was chiefly at Alexandria, the seat of learning as well as the headquarters of the government of Egypt as a Roman province, that the reformed calendar was most appreciated and used. This is logical, because the Roman government officers there would hardly be in a mood to be inconvenienced by the instability of the old Egyptian calendar in their business transactions.

Theon, an astronomer at Alexandria during the reign of the Emperor Theodosius the Elder (379-395), wrote a valuable commentary on the astronomical works of Claudius Ptolemy, the noted astronomer at Alexandria during the reigns of Hadrian (117-138) and Antoninus Pius (138-160). In writing his works on astronomy, Ptolemy had used the old system of Egyptian calendation. Theon, in his commentary on the tables of the astronomical manuals of Ptolemy, explained how to convert dates given according to the old Egyptian system of calendation into their corresponding dates in the new system. In doing so, he speaks of the calendar year of the old system as "The Egyptian year," and of the calendar year of the new system as "the year of the Greeks, or of Alexandria." It must be remembered that Egypt had been incor-

[23] *Ibid.*, XVII. 17. 29 (Loeb ed., VIII, 84, 85).

porated into the Hellenistic Empire by Alexander the Great, after whom the city of Alexandria was named; and that the Macedonian dynasty of the Ptolemies ruled over Egypt for a period of about 294 years—from the death of Alexander the Great in 323 B.C. till the death of Queen Cleopatra in 30 B.C. Hence Theon says:

> Here, now, is the way of taking the month and the day of the Egyptians: Inasmuch as the year of the Greeks, or of Alexandria, followed by us is of 365 days and a quarter, and that of the Egyptians is of 365 days only, as we have said, it is evident that by the end of four years the year of Alexandria counts one day less than the Egyptian year, and that in 1,460 years it counts 365 days, that is, one Egyptian year, less. Alexandria and Egypt begin together the year, the months, and the days, in the manner of Egypt, but for one year only, and, at the beginning of the following year, the Egyptians begin to have one quarter of a day's advance, and so forth. Now this period of 1,460 years, commenced from a certain time, terminated *in the fifth year of the reign of Augustus*; so, *from this last epoch*, the Egyptians begin all over again to find themselves every year one quarter of a day in advance. Therefore, when at any time of the year of Alexandria, or of the Greeks, we want to know the month and the day counted then by the Egyptians, taking the quarter of the sum of the years *from the fifth of Augustus* until the year in question, because, as we have already said, they have one day more every four years, and omitting the residue, that never exceeds 3, we will thus have the number of the days that the Egyptian year is in advance of the years of Alexandria that they have called *tetraëterides*. [24]

A little farther on in the discourse Theon reminds his readers that "we have said that *the return of the coincidence of the year of Alexandria with that of Egypt occurred five years after the beginning of the reign of Augustus*." [25]

The portions of Theon's statements, as italicized above by us to call attention to them, plainly state that the adoption of the new Alexandrian calendar took place in the fifth year

[24] Theon of Alexandria, *op. cit.*, I. 30. The *tetraëterides* was a four-year cycle by which one day was intercalated to make up the quarter of a day in excess of the 365 days of each calendar year of that period. Our present system of intercalating an extra day in February every fourth year similarly operates on the basis of a four-year cycle.

[25] *Ibid.*, I. 32.

of the reign of Augustus as reckoned by the Alexandrians, who dated the era of Augustus from Thoth 1 (August 31) of 30 B.C. Five years later the adoption of the Alexandrian calendar began with Thoth 1 (August 30) of 26 B.C. Thoth 1 of both the old and the Alexandrian calendars then fell on the same date. In 25, 24, and 23 B.C., both fell on August 29. Though there was an accumulation of one fourth of a day per year for one of them, no *perceptible* divergence between the two systems of calendation was apparent during the first three years of that first four-year cycle for the Alexandrian system of calendation. But at the close of the fourth year of that first four-year period, a sixth epagomenal day was intercalated in the Alexandrian calendar year to give to each year of the four-year cycle a mean length of 365.25 days, while no such extra day was provided for the old calendar year still in use among the Egyptians. Consequently, whereas the last (fifth) epagomenal day of the year 23/22 B.C. fell on August 28, 22 B.C., for the old calendar, the last (sixth) epagomenal day fell on August 29, 22 B.C., for the Alexandrian calendar. As a result of this, Thoth 1 which followed immediately in the old calendar fell on August 29, 22 B.C., and Thoth 1 which followed immediately in the Alexandrian calendar fell on August 30, 22 B.C. [26] Thus one day of divergence between the two systems of calendation first became apparent in 22 B.C., two days in 18 B.C., three days in 14 B.C., etc. [27]

Albiruni, the Arab scholar (A.D. 973-1045), wrote in his notable work on chronology: "It was Augustus who caused the people of Alexandria to give up their system of reckoning by non-intercalated Egyptian years, and to adopt the system of the Chaldeans, which in our time is used in Egypt." [28] Also:

[26] The shift of one day for Thoth 1 from August 31 in 30 B.C. to August 30 in 26 B.C. was due to the fact that an extra day was intercalated in February of the Roman calendar in 29 B.C. because it was a leap year for the Latins.

[27] See the calendrical table in Appendix II.

[28] Albiruni, *The Chronology of Ancient Nations*, tr. C. Eduard Sachau (London, 1879), p. 33.

> They [the Egyptians], as we have mentioned, used the names of the thirty days till the time when Augustus, the son of Gajus [Caius Julius Caesar], ruled over them. He wanted to induce them to intercalate the years, that they might always agree with the Greeks and the people of Alexandria. Therefore *he waited till five years of his rule had elapsed, and then he ordered them to intercalate one day in the months every fourth year,* in the same way that the Greeks do. [29]

Thus Albiruni, like Theon, has stated that it was in the fifth year of the reign of Augustus that the (Alexandrian) calendar, with the intercalation of an extra day every fourth year, was adopted in Egypt. Theon says that the reason for the choice of that year—the fifth of the emperor's reign, which was 26 B.C.—was that a 1,460-year Sothic cycle had terminated then. Albiruni credits Augustus with having ordered Egypt to adopt the plan of intercalating an extra day every four years.

What we have presented above concerning the Alexandrian era of Augustus and the adoption of the Alexandrian system of calendation in Egypt is supported further by historical documents and by astronomical data, some of which we shall present now.

A papyrus document from the Roman imperial period presents a horoscope of a person born on "Phaophi 1, but according to the ancient reckoning Phaophi 11." [30] A difference of ten days is seen between the date Phaophi 1 of the new Alexandrian calendar and that of Phaophi 11 of the old calendar. Thus the Roman date was a September 28 during the years A.D. 15 to 18, in the reign of Tiberius. [31]

Another horoscope carries the double date of "Pharmuthi 6 . . . which the Romans call the kalends of April [April 1]"

[29] *Ibid.*, p. 58. During the Roman imperial period the Greeks also had a reformed calendar and were intercalating an extra day every fourth year. Albiruni refers elsewhere to the epagomenal days of the Egyptian calendars as "the small month."

[30] Bernard P. Grenfell and Arthur S. Hunt, eds., *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri*, II (London, 1899), 137, 138.

[31] See years 45 to 48 in the calendrical table in Appendix II.

in the third year of the Emperor Titus. [32] The date is Pharmuthi 6 (April 1) of A.D. 81, the third year of the reign of Titus and the year in which he died.

Another interesting feature of the Alexandrian calendar of Egypt was the way in which the intercalation of the sixth epagomenal day at the end of the fourth (last) year of the four-year cycle affected the relationship of Thoth 1 to its corresponding date in the Julian calendar. This extra epagomenal day actually was intercalated as the last day of the four-year cycle. Consequently the next day, which was Thoth 1 of the following year, fell one day later in relation to the Julian calendar. Thus Thoth 1 fell on August 30 in the first year, and on August 29 in the next three years, of the four-year cycle. But during the month of Mechir of the first year of the next four-year cycle, February of the Julian calendar was given an extra day, because it was a leap year for the Latins, and this compensated for the shift produced by the intercalation made at the close of the last year of the Alexandrian four-year cycle. The following shows the relation of each year of the new Alexandrian four-year cycle to the Julian calendar:

Year 1: August 30 to August 28
Year 2: August 29 to August 28
Year 3: August 29 to August 28
Year 4: August 29 to August 29

Year 1: August 30 to August 28
Year 2: August 29 to August 28
And so on *ad infinitum*

The intercalation was always made in the Alexandrian calendar of Egypt about six months before the intercalation was made in the Julian calendar. The first intercalation in the Alexandrian calendar of Egypt was made in 22 B.C.—

[32] Frederick G. Kenyon, ed., *Greek Papyri in the British Museum*, I (London, 1893), 132-139.

when the first four-year cycle ended—and the additional (sixth) epagomenal day corresponded to August 29 of that year insofar as the Julian calendar was concerned. About six months later, early in 21 B.C., the intercalary (bissextile) day was inserted between February 24 and 25 of the Julian calendar, and it corresponded to Mechir 30 of the Alexandrian calendar. The following table illustrates how this was done:

The Alexandrian Year 23/22 *B.C.—Aug.* 29 *to Aug.* 29

1. Thoth	1-30	—	Aug.	29	to Sept.	27
2. Phaophi	1-30	—	Sept.	28	to Oct.	27
3. Hathyr	1-30	—	Oct.	28	to Nov.	26
4. Choiak	1-30	—	Nov.	27	to Dec.	26
5. Tybi	1-30	—	Dec.	27	to Jan.	25
6. Mechir	1-30	—	Jan.	26	to Feb.	24
7. Phamenoth	1-30	—	Feb.	25	to Mar.	26
8. Pharmuthi	1-30	—	Mar.	27	to Apr.	25
9. Pachon	1-30	—	Apr.	26	to May	25
10. Payni	1-30	—	May	26	to June	24
11. Epiphi	1-30	—	June	25	to July	24
12. Mesore	1-30	—	July	25	to Aug.	23
Epagomenae	1-5	—	Aug.	24	to Aug.	28
Epagomena	6	—			Aug.	29

The Alexandrian Year 22/21 *B.C.—Aug.* 30 to *Aug.* 28

1. Thoth	1-30	—	Aug.	30	to Sept.	28
2. Phaophi	1-30	—	Sept.	29	to Oct.	28
3. Hathyr	1-30	—	Oct.	29	to Nov.	27
4. Choiak	1-30	—	Nov.	28	to Dec.	27
5. Tybi	1-30	—	Dec.	28	to Jan.	26
6. Mechir	1-29	—	Jan.	27	to Feb.	24
,,	30	—			Feb.	24b
7. Phamenoth	1-30	—	Feb.	25	to Mar.	26
8. Pharmuthi	1-30	—	Mar.	27	to Apr.	25
9. Pachon	1-30	—	Apr.	26	to May	25
10. Payni	1-30	—	May	26	to June	24
11. Epiphi	1-30	—	June	25	to July	24
12. Mesore	1-30	—	July	25	to Aug.	23
Epagomenae	1-5	—	Aug.	24	to Aug.	28

Having discussed at length the era of Augustus (established in 30 B.C.) and the new system of calendation (adopted in Egypt in 26 B.C.), let us now consider the mathematical formula of Vettius Valens for ascertaining the day of the

week on which a given birth date fell, and his illustration of how it works.

Vettius Valens took Thoth 1 (August 31), 30 B.C., as the commencement of the era of Augustus and the primary point of reference in making his computations. The date fell on Sunday, the first day of the week. He knew this fact. For this reason he first added up all years from the beginning of the era of Augustus, the intercalated days, and the days lying between Thoth 1 and the birth date under consideration. From this total number he then subtracted as many sevens as possible and thus ascertained "the sabbatical day" (Saturday) which marked the end of the last full week before the one in which that birth occurred.

Another important factor is that Vettius Valens did not use the Roman civil day, which was reckoned from midnight to midnight. *He employed the day as reckoned from evening to evening.* When he mentions a day of the week or a day of the month, he is speaking of a day that began with the evening (about sunset) before the midnight marking the commencement of the civil day. This is shown by the fact that he counts the 24 hours of the day invariably from the first hour of night.

When one takes the Roman civil day (midnight to midnight) into account, Sunday, August 31, 30 B.C., was the beginning of the era of Augustus. But when one takes the day from evening to evening as Vettius Valens did, it is obvious that Sunday, Thoth 1, marking the beginning of the era of Augustus, actually began at sunset on Saturday afternoon of August 30, 30 B.C., according to Roman civil time. Thus, that date, as Vettius Valens used it, corresponded to Sunday, Thoth 1 (August 30/31), 30 B.C., Roman civil time. Therefore, Neugebauer and Van Hoesen, in their work on Vettius Valens, are correct in saying that dates of the Alexandrian calendar can be converted into Julian dates by the formula "Augustus 0 Thoth (I) 1 = — 30 August 29." [33] Also:

[33] Neugebauer and Van Hoesen, *op. cit.*, pp. 2, 3.

> In the Alexandrian calendar a sixth epagomenal day is added every fourth year. Consequently the Alexandrian year remains in fixed relation with the Julian [Roman] year, the first of Thoth being for three years in succession August 29, then once August 30, etc. [34]

In the example which he gave to illustrate the working of his formula, Vettius Valens states that from the commencement of the era of Augustus to the commencement of the fourth year of the reign of Hadrian, according to the Alexandrian system of calendation, there were 148 full years. That is, 148 full years comprise the interval from Thoth 1 (August 30), 30 B.C., to Thoth 1 (August 30), A.D. 119. From Thoth 1 (August 30), 30 B.C., to the beginning of the Christian era there were 29 years, 4 months, and 1 day. From the commencement of the Christian era to Thoth 1 (August 30), A.D. 119, there were 118 years, 7 months, and 29 days. Thus the total number of years for the entire period was 148, as follows:

B.C. —	29 years,	4 months,	1 day
A.D. —	118 years,	7 months,	29 days
Total	148 years,	0 months,	0 days

The testimony of Vettius Valens is, therefore, historical proof that the era of Augustus, according to Alexandrian reckoning, began on Thoth 1 (August 30), 30 B.C. [35]

However, Vettius Valens says that 36 intercalations were made in the Alexandrian calendar during that period of 148 years of the era of Augustus. The 36 intercalations corresponded to 36 four-year cycles or 144 years ($4 \times 36 = 144$).

[34] *Ibid.*

[35] F. H. Colson, translator of the works of Philo Judaeus for the Loeb Classical Library, has well said: "There has been some controversy as to whether this was August 30th or 31st. Mommsen (rightly, I believe) decided in favor of the latter, though he does not seem to have known the passage in Valens, which, I think, must decide the controversy finally. For any one who takes the trouble, and it is no more, to calculate, will find that August 31st in that year actually was what we call Sunday" (*The Week*, pp. 52, 53). Colson erred in supposing that Mechir 13 of the fourth year of Hadrian's reign fell on February 7, A.D. 119 (*ibid.*, pp. 47-52).

Inasmuch as the thirty-sixth intercalation was made on the very last day of that 148-year period—that is, on August 29, A.D. 119—this means that the first four-year cycle of the 36 began 144 years previous—that is, on August 30, 26 B.C.; and that the first intercalation was made four years later—on August 29, 22 B.C. Thus the total number of years for the entire period of 36 four-year cycles was 144, as follows:

25 years,	4 months, 1 day
118 years,	7 months, 29 days
144 years,	0 months, 0 days

The horoscopes of Vettius Valens and his formula for ascertaining the day of the week on which a birth date fell are, therefore, historical proof that the adoption of the Alexandrian calendar began with Thoth 1 (August 30), 26 B.C., and that the first intercalation made in it took place on August 29, 22 B.C., according to the Julian calendar.

Why did Vettius Valens merely add 148 (the number of the full years) and 36 (the number of intercalations) and 163 (the number of days from Thoth 1 to Mechir 13 of the fourth year of the reign of Hadrian) together in order to find out how many days in excess of the total number of full weeks (*hebdomads*, "sevens") would remain? He knew that the year of 365 days contains one day in excess of 52 full weeks ($7 \times 52 = 364$). The number 148 was the total number of such excessive days for the 148 years at the rate of one day per year. However, he knew that 36 of those 148 years were leap years of 366 days each, and that he should allow an additional day of excess for each of them. So he needed to add 36 days more to the 148. Moreover, there yet remained the 163 days from Thoth 1 to Mechir 13 in the fourth year of Hadrian's reign, which formed only a part of a full year. They had to be taken into account. Thus, by adding together the 148, the 36, and the 163 days, he had a total of 347. Instead of dividing the 347 days by 7, he simply subtracted 343 days (49 weeks) from the 347 days, and had a remainder of only four days. This means that from Sunday, Thoth 1 (August

30/31), 30 B.C., to Mechir 13 (February 8), A.D. 120, minus four days comprised an even number of full weeks, and that Mechir 9 (February 4) of that year was "the sabbatical day" (Sabbath, day of Saturn, Saturday)—the last day of the last full week of that period. As there remained 4 days till Mechir 13—the birth date given—he needed only to count them by beginning thus: Mechir 10 (February 5) would be the day of the Sun (Sunday); Mechir 11 (February 6) would be the day of the Moon (Monday); Mechir 12 (February 7) would be the day of Mars (Tuesday); and Mechir 13 (February 8) would be the day of Mercury (Wednesday).

That mathematical short cut used by Vettius Valens in his formula is a clever one indeed, perhaps novel to us. But we must remember that the decimal system of mathematics which we employ today is a great improvement over the clumsy numerals and arithmetic of the Greeks, in which the letters of the alphabet, and not the Arabic numerals such as we have, served as numbers. To see that the mathematical formula of the astrologer provided him with a correct answer, let us solve his problem another way:

There were 148 Alexandrian years from Thoth 1 (August 30), 30 B.C., to Thoth 1 (August 30), A.D. 119. But only 36 of those years were leap years, and 112 were common years. The 112 common years of 365 days each had a total of (112 × 365) 40,880 days. The 36 leap years of 366 days each had a total of (36 × 366) 13,176 days. Then there were 163 days in the fraction of a year from Thoth 1 (August 30), A.D. 119 to Mechir 13 (February 8), 120. Adding together the 40,880 days and the 13,176 days and the 163 days, we have a grand total of 54,219 days for the whole period from Sunday, Thoth 1 (August 30/31), 30 B.C. to Wednesday, Mechir 13 (February 8), A.D. 120. Dividing the 54,219 days by 7, we find that they consisted of 7,745 weeks plus 4 days. Therefore Mechir 13 (February 8), A.D. 120, was the fourth day of the week—Wednesday (Mercury's day)—as Vettius Valens has said.

Another interesting and important fact, in this connection,

is that Mechir 13 in the fourth year of the reign of Hadrian, as a calendar date, figures in four different horoscopes in the *Anthology* by Vettius Valens, apart from his mathematical formula for ascertaining the day of the week on which a birth date had fallen. In all four instances Neugebauer and Van Hoesen have worked out the horoscopes and found that Mechir 13 in the fourth year of Hadrian was February 8, A.D. 120. [36]

In the example which he gives to illustrate his method of ascertaining the day of the week on which a birth date had fallen, Vettius Valens stated that it belonged to the fourth year of the reign of Hadrian, according to the Alexandrian system of calendation. The biographer of Hadrian indicated that he began to reign as emperor on August 11, and other evidence shows it was in A.D. 117. [37] However, evidence shows further that though Hadrian's reign began only 18 days prior to Thoth 1 (August 29), A.D. 117, that fraction of the Alexandrian year from Thoth 1 (August 29), A.D. 116, to Thoth 1 (August 29), 117, was reckoned as the first year of his reign. The Alexandrian year from Thoth 1 (August 29), A.D. 117, to Thoth 1 (August 29), 118, was counted as his second year as emperor. And the Alexandrian year from Thoth 1 (August 29), A.D. 118, to Thoth 1 (August 29), 119, was his third.

We are specific in this matter for a good reason. There is extant a

> . . . copy of a letter translated from the Latin which was posted in the commander's quarters at the winter camp of the third Cyrenaic and the Twenty-second Deioteiran legions in the 3rd year of Traianus Hadrianus Augustus Publius Aelius in his third consulship which he held with Rusticus as colleague. Dated the day before the Nones of August [August 4] or Mesore 11. [38]

That letter was the publication of a legal decision by Hadri-

[36] Neugebauer and Van Hoesen, *op. cit.*, pp. 180, 181, and Table 15. The four horoscopes referred to are Vettius Valens, *op. cit.*, I. 4, p. 20; 10, p. 26; 20, p. 36; V. 7, p. 215.

[37] Aelius Spartianus, *Hadrian*, 4 (Loeb ed., I, 12, 13).

[38] Allan Chester Johnson, *Roman Egypt to the Reign of Diocletian* (Baltimore, 1936), p. 678.

an concerning the heirship of children born to soldiers not legally married but while in military service. The document is not only doubly dated as having been issued "on the 4th of August which is the 11th of Mesore," [39] but names of the Roman consuls for the year—which is A.D. 119—are given too.

Mesore 11 of the Alexandrian calendar fell on August 4, A.D. 119, the year in which Hadrian was consul for the third time, with C. Junius Rusticus as his colleague. The double dating, which gives the month date according to the Alexandrian calendar and the month date according to the Julian calendar, together with the names of the Roman consuls for the year, testifies to the veracity of Vettius Valens in the use of calendrical data.

Claudius Ptolemy, the Alexandrian astronomer already mentioned, wrote an astronomical treatise called *The Mathematical Composition*, which is better known today as *The Almagest*, a title given to it by Arabian scholars. In that work he mentions 19 eclipses of the sun and moon. His *Canon* lists the reigns of kings successively, with the number of years they reigned individually and collectively, from noon of Thoth 1 (February 26), 747 B.C., down to his own time in the second century A.D. The astronomical observations made by him as recorded in *The Almagest* extend from A.D. 127 to 151. His life covered the reigns of Trajan (98-117), Hadrian (117-138), and Antoninus Pius (138-161). He considered Hipparchus (*ca.* 135 B.C.) his master in astronomy and often cited him as an authority on the subject.

Ptolemy mentions using in an astronomical problem a partial lunar eclipse which he had observed:

> We took that [lunar eclipse] observed in Alexandria in the year 9 of Hadrian, Egyptianwise Pachon 17-18 at 3 3/5 equatorial hours before midnight; and the moon was eclipsed likewise to the extent of 2 digits from the southern side. [40]

[39] Arthur S. Hunt and C. C. Edgar, eds., *Select Papyri*, II (Cambridge, Mass., 1956), 88, 89 ("Letter of Hadrian").

[40] Claudius Ptolemy, *The Almagest*, R. Catesby Taliaferro, ed., IV. 9, in "Great Books of the Western World," XVI (Chicago, 1939), 136.

Ptolemy used the astronomical day, which was reckoned from noon to noon. [41] Because the Egyptian civil day was reckoned from sunrise to sunrise, [42] and the Roman day from midnight to midnight, he was careful to indicate both of the civil days involved in each of the dates he gave for the eclipses he observed. Though he states that the moon was partially eclipsed on Pachon 17-18, yet the fact that he reports that it occurred "before midnight" shows that it actually occurred on Pachon 17 according to old Egyptian count. Pachon 17 of the old Egyptian calendar corresponded to Pharmuthi 10 (April 5) of the new Alexandrian calendar in the ninth year of Hadrian, which was from Thoth 1 (August 29), A.D. 124, to Thoth 1 (August 29), 125. Thus the eclipse of the moon took place on April 5, A.D. 125, [43] according to the Julian calendar.

Another document from that period is a birth certificate of Nerenius Gemella, a girl born in the year when Nonius Torquatus Asprenate was consul for the second time, and M. Annius Libone was consul for the first time, "on April 13 in the twelfth year of the Emperor Caesar Trajan Augustus, which was Pharmuthi 18 in Alexandria for the Egyptians." [44] This double dating, with the names of the Roman consuls for the twelfth year of the reign of Hadrian, one of whose names was Trajan, means that the birth occurred on Pharmuthi 18 (April 13), A.D. 128, according to the Alexandrian calendar.

Ptolemy says:

> Since, of the first equinoxes observed by us, one of the most accurate occurred as the autumn equinox in the year 17 of Hadrian,

[41] See note 45 below for data concerning Ptolemy's use of the astronomical day (noon to noon).

[42] Richard A. Parker, *The Calendars of Ancient Egypt* ("Studies in Ancient Oriental Civilization," XXVI; Chicago, 1946), p. 10.

[43] This lunar eclipse is listed as No. 2058 in Theodor R. von Oppolzer's *Canon of Eclipses* (New York, 1925), p. 345, the date given as April 5, A.D. 125.

[44] John G. Winter, ed., *Papyri in the University of Michigan Collection*, III (Ann Arbor, 1936), 149, 150.

> Egyptianwise Athyr 7, very nearly 2 hours after midday—it is clear that at that time the sun was 116° 40' in mean movement on the eccentric circle, away from the apogee in the direction contrary to the movement of the heavens. But from the reign of Nabonassar to the death of Alexander [the Great] amounts to 424 Egyptian years; and from the death of Alexander to the reign of Augustus, 294 years; and from the year 1 of Augustus, Egyptianwise Thoth 1, midday (for we establish the epochs from midday) to the year 17 of Hadrian, Athyr 7, 2 hours after midday, amounts to 161 years, 66 days, and 2 equatorial hours. And therefore from the year 1 of Nabonassar, Egyptianwise Thoth 1, midday, to the time of the autumn equinox just mentioned amounts to 879 years, 66 days, and 2 equatorial hours. [45]

As Ptolemy was using the old Egyptian calendar, but reckoning the day from noon to noon, the date of that autumnal equinox has been computed as September 25, A.D. 132, in the seventeenth year of the reign of Hadrian according to the Alexandrian reckoning. And note that he adds the important observation that "from the year 1 of Augustus, Egyptianwise Thoth 1, midday (for we establish the epochs from midday) to the year 17 of Hadrian, Athyr 7, 2 hours after midday, amounts to 161 years, 66 days, and 2 equatorial hours." This means that the autumnal equinox of September 25, A.D. 132, in the seventeenth year of Hadrian's reign, took place in the 162d year of the era of Augustus, according to the Alexandrian system of calendation. This shows conclusively that by the Alexandrian reckoning the era of Augustus began with Thoth 1 (August 30/31) 30 B.C., as Vettius Valens has indicated. And it should be remembered that Vettius Valens and the Emperor Hadrian were contemporaries of Claudius Ptolemy.

Concerning another astronomical problem Ptolemy says:

> Again of the three eclipses we have chosen from those most carefully observed by us in Alexandria, the first occurred in the

[45] Claudius Ptolemy, *op. cit.*, III. 7. This statement shows that Ptolemy used the astronomical day, reckoned from midday to midday, not only in making astronomical observations, but also in reckoning the years of the kings since the first year of Nabonassar, king of Babylon, which began on Thoth I (February 26), 747 B.C., according to the Alexandrian reckoning.

year 17 of Hadrian, Egyptianwise Payni 20-21; and we accurately calculated the middle of it to have occurred 3/4 equatorial hour before midnight. And the eclipse was total. [46]

That total eclipse of the moon occurred during the night of May 6, A.D. 133, in the latter part of the seventeenth year of the reign of Hadrian according to the Alexandrian reckoning. [47]

The same Alexandrian astronomer says:

"The second [lunar eclipse] occurred in the year 19 of Hadrian, Egyptianwise Choiac 2-3; and we calculated the middle of it to have occurred 1 equatorial hour before midnight. And there was an eclipse to the extent of 1/2 + 1/3 of the diameter from the southern side." [48]

That partial lunar eclipse occurred on October 20, A.D. 134, in the nineteenth year of the reign of Hadrian according to the Alexandrian reckoning. [49]

Ptolemy goes on to say:

"The third of the [lunar] eclipses occurred in the year 20 of Hadrian, Egyptianwise Pharmuthi 19-20; and we calculated the middle of it to have occurred 4 equatorial hours after midnight. And there was an eclipse to the extent of 1/2 of the diameter from the northern side." [50]

That partial eclipse of the moon occurred on Pharmuthi 20 (March 6), A.D. 136, in the twentieth year of Hadrian's reign according to the Alexandrian reckoning. [51]

In three respects the calendation used by Vettius Valens, insofar as the days of the week and the 24 hours of the day are concerned, differs significantly from that depicted in

[46] *Ibid.*, IV. 6. 2.

[47] That lunar eclipse of May 6, A.D. 133, is listed as No. 2071 in von Oppolzer's *Canon*, p. 345.

[48] Claudius Ptolemy, *op. cit.*, IV. 6. 2.

[49] That lunar eclipse is listed as No. 2074 in von Oppolzer's *Canon*, p. 345.

[50] Claudius Ptolemy, *op. cit.*, IV. 6. 2.

[51] That lunar eclipse is listed as No. 2075 in von Oppolzer's *Canon*, p. 345.

the astrological calendars used in the West during the period in which he wrote. He placed Sunday (the day of the Sun) first in the order of the days of the week. The astrological calendars of the West placed Saturday (Saturn's day) first. [52] He began the 24 hours of the day with the first hour of night, thus reckoning the day from evening to evening. In this respect he was in accord with the Athenians, for both Varro [53] and Pliny the Elder [54] state that in their time the day was counted from sunset to sunset by the people of Athens. Too, the Jews and the early Christians did likewise. Moreover, he assigned the first hour of the night to the planet for which that day is named. The astrological calendars of the West during that period assigned the first hour of the morning (the sunrise hour) to the planet for which the day was named. [55]

Significant is the fact that in his astrological formula Vettius Valens, who undoubtedly was a pagan, used the week of seven days, reckoned the seven-day week as beginning with the day of the Sun (Sunday) and ending with "the sabbatical day" (Sabbath day), and reckoned the 24-hour day from evening to evening. This suggests that such usage may have been more widespread throughout the Roman world during the second century A.D. than some church historians in modern times have suspected. [56]

[52] Robert L. Odom, *Sunday in Roman Paganism* (Washington, D.C., 1944), pp. 56-59, 64, 115-121, 204-217.

[53] Varro, quoted by Aulus Gellius, *Attic Nights*, III. 2 (Loeb ed., I, 238-241).

[54] Pliny the Elder, *op. cit.*, II. 79 (Loeb ed., I, 318-321). See also Censorinus, *op. cit.*, 23 and 24.

[55] Odom, *op. cit.*, pp. 201-217.

[56] Writing shortly before the beginning of the second century A.D., Josephus said, in reply to an attack on the Jews by the learned grammarian, Apion of Alexandria: "The masses have long since shown a keen desire to adopt our religious observances; and there is not one city, Greek or barbarian, nor a single nation, to which our custom of abstaining from work on the seventh day has not spread" (*Against Apion*, II. 39 [Loeb ed., I, 405, 407]). Theophilus, bishop of Antioch (168-181), wrote, "concerning the seventh day, which all men acknowledge; but the most know not that what among the Hebrews is called

In conclusion, the work of Vettius Valens certainly provides conclusive evidence that the era of Augustus began on Sunday, Thoth 1 (August 31, midnight to midnight; or August 30/31, evening to evening), 30 B.C.,[57] and that the continuity of the cycle of the seven-day week suffered no disruption whatever from that date down to Wednesday, Mechir 13 (February 8), A.D. 120, in the fourth year of the reign of Hadrian, *as reckoned by the new Alexandrian system of calendation.* He provides evidence that the adoption of the Alexandrian calendar in Egypt began with Thoth 1 (August 30), 26 B.C., and that the perceptible divergence between this new calendar and the old one first occurred on August 29, 22 B.C., when the sixth epagomenal day was first intercalated at the end of the first four-year period of the new calendar. Historical documents and astronomical records of that period confirm the testimony of Vettius Valens concerning that matter.

APPENDIX I

THE NEW (ALEXANDRIAN) CALENDAR OF EGYPT

Month	*Days*	*Corresponding Roman Date*
1. Thoth	1-30	Aug. 29(30) — Sept. 27(28)
2. Phaophi	1-30	Sept. 28(29) — Oct. 27(28)
3. Hathyr	1-30	Oct. 28(29) — Nov. 26(27)
4. Choiak	1-30	Nov. 27(28) — Dec. 26(27)
5. Tybi	1-30	Dec. 27(28) — Jan. 25(26)
6. Mechir	1-30	Jan. 26(27) — Feb. 24b
7. Phamenoth	1-30	Feb. 25 — Mar. 26

the 'Sabbath,' is translated into Greek the 'Seventh' (ἑβδομάς), a name which is adopted by every nation, although they know not the reason of the appellation" (*To Autolycus*, II. 12 [*ANF*, II, 99]). It is not strange, therefore, that Vettius Valens of Antioch, though he was a pagan, should refer to the seventh-day Sabbath in Greek as "the sabbatical day."

[57] From Thoth 1 (August 29), A.D. 284, and long thereafter the era of Augustus was called "the era of Diocletian." This was done in honor of Diocletian, who became emperor on September 17, 284. After his death, some ecclesiastical writers referred to it as "the era of the Martyrs," because of the terrible persecution which the Christians suffered under the reign of that ruler.

Month	*Days*	*Corresponding Roman Date*			
8. Pharmuthi	1-30	Mar.	26	— Apr.	25
9. Pachon	1-30	Apr.	26	— May	25
10. Payni	1-30	May	26	— June	24
11. Epiphi	1-30	June	25	— July	24
12. Mesore	1-30	July	25	— Aug.	23
Epagomenae	1-5(6)	Aug.	24	— Aug.	28(29)

Note: A sixth epagomenal day was intercalated (added) at the end of every fourth year of the four-year cycle, and thus was August 29 of that year. For this reason Thoth 1 of the first year of every four-year cycle always fell on August 30. But because an extra February 24 was intercalated as a "bissextile day" between February 24 and 25 of the Julian calendar once every four years, Thoth 1 fell on August 29 during the last three years of the four-year cycle. During the first centuries of the Christian era the intercalary day of the Julian calendar was not added as February 29 as is customary to do now.

APPENDIX II

THE TWO CALENDARS OF EGYPT DURING THE ROMAN IMPERIAL PERIOD

This table shows the correspondence between the new (reformed) and the old calendars used in Egypt during the Roman imperial period after that country was incorporated into the Roman Empire in 30 B.C., and also their relationship to the Julian calendar.

Column 1 lists the years of the era of Augustus according to the Alexandrian reckoning, beginning with 30/29 B.C.

Column 2 lists the Egyptian years as they corresponded to the Julian years, the portion in *italics* indicating where the intercalation was made in each leap year of the new (reformed) calendar of Egypt, and the portion in **bold** indicating where the intercalation was made in each leap year of the Roman calendar.

Column 3 shows the count of the leap year intercalations of the new (reformed) calendar of Egypt from 22 B.C.

Column 4 shows the Julian date on which Thoth 1 of the new (reformed) calendar of Egypt fell each year.

Column 5 shows the Julian date on which Thoth 1 of the old calendar of Egypt fell each year.

Column 6 shows the number of days of divergence between the Julian dates on which Thoth 1 of the new (reformed) calendar and Thoth 1 of the old calendar of Egypt fell from 22 B.C. onward.

This Table, prepared primarily for use with the preceding article, covers only the 60 Egyptian calendar years of the Roman imperial period from 30 B.C. to A.D. 31. It is a simple matter to extend the coverage further into the Christian era.

1. Years of Augustan Era	2. Corresponding Roman Years		3. Intercalations	4. Thoth 1 in New Calendar		5. Thoth 1 in Old Calendar		6. Days of Divergence
1	30/**29**	B.C.	—	—	—	Aug.	31	—
2	29/28	,,	—	—	—	,,	30	—
3	28/27	,,	—	—	—	,,	30	—
4	27/26	,,	—	—	—	,,	30	—
5	26/**25**	,,		Aug.	30	,,	30	—
6	25/24	,,		,,	29	,,	29	—
7	24/23	,,		,,	29	,,	29	—
8	23/*22*	,,	1	,,	29	,,	29	—
9	22/**21**	,,		,,	30	,,	29	1
10	21/20	,,		,,	29	,,	28	1
11	20/19	,,		,,	29	,,	28	1
12	19/*18*	,,	2	,,	29	,,	28	1
13	18/**17**	,,		,,	30	,,	28	2
14	17/16	,,		,,	29	,,	27	2
15	16/15	,,		,,	29	,,	27	2
16	15/*14*	,,	3	,,	29	,,	27	2
17	14/**13**	,,		,,	30	,,	27	3
18	13/12	,,		,,	29	,,	26	3
19	12/11	,,		,,	29	,,	26	3
20	11/*10*	,,	4	,,	29	,,	26	3
21	10/**9**	,,		,,	30	,,	26	4
22	9/8	,,		,,	29	,,	25	4
23	8/7	,,		,,	29	,,	25	4
24	7/6	,,	5	,,	29	,,	25	4
25	6/**5**	,,		,,	30	,,	25	5
26	5/4	,,		,,	29	,,	24	5
27	4/3	,,		,,	29	,,	24	5
28	3/*2*	,,	6	,,	29	,,	24	5
29	2/**1**	,,		,,	30	,,	24	6
30	1/1	A.D.		,,	29	,,	23	6
31	1/2	,,		,,	29	,,	23	6
32	2/*3*	,,	7	,,	29	,,	23	6
33	3/**4**	,,		,,	30	,,	23	7
34	4/5	A.D.		Aug.	29	Aug.	22	7
35	5/6	,,		,,	29	,,	22	7
36	6/7	,,	8	,,	29	,,	22	7
37	7/**8**	,,		,,	30	,,	22	8
38	8/9	,,		,,	29	,,	21	8
39	9/10	,,		,,	29	,,	21	8
40	10/*11*	,,	9	,,	29	,,	21	8
41	11/**12**	,,		,,	30	,,	21	9
42	12/13	,,		,,	29	,,	20	9
43	13/14	,,		,,	29	,,	20	9
44	14/*15*	,,	10	,,	29	,,	20	9
45	15/**16**	,,		,,	30	,,	20	10
46	16/17	,,		,,	29	,,	19	10
47	17/18	,,		,,	29	,,	19	10
48	18/*19*	,,	11	,,	29	,,	19	10
49	19/**20**	,,		,,	30	,,	19	11
50	20/21	,,		,,	29	,,	18	11
51	21/22			,,	29	,,	18	11
52	22/*23*	,,	12	,,	29	,,	18	11
53	23/**24**	,,		,,	30	,,	18	12
54	24/25	,,		,,	29	,,	17	12
55	25/26	,,		,,	29	,,	17	12
56	26/*27*	,,	13	,,	29	,,	17	12
57	27/**28**	,,		,,	30	,,	17	13
58	28/29	,,		,,	29	,,	16	13
59	29/30	,,		,,	29	,,	16	13
60	30/*31*	,,	14	,,	29	,,	16	13

AN INVESTIGATION OF THE SYRIAC VERSION OF ISAIAH: I [1]

LEONA G. RUNNING
Andrews University, Berrien Springs, Michigan

Introduction

The present article in three parts is a report on a comprehensive investigation of the Syriac version of Is, one of the largest and most-used books of the OT. The study involved a large number of the extant MSS and the quotations from Is found in all the available writings of the Syrian authors, as well as the NT quotations of Is.

The aims of the investigation were originally the following:

1. To find traces of the Aramaic Targum underlying the Syriac text, and thus

2. To go behind the Peshitta revision to the Old Syriac text forms, following the type of work done by Arthur Vööbus in the area of the Pentateuch, as presented in his *Peschitta und Targumim des Pentateuchs.* [2]

3. To show the support given by the Syrian authors to variants from the Peshitta text, especially in the writings of the earliest, Aphrahat of Persia and St. Ephraim of Edessa (both of the 4th cent.), which may well lead toward reconstruction of the *Vetus Syra* text, as is also indicated by Vööbus.

As the manuscript study progressed, secondary aims came into focus:

4. To exhibit objectively, by percentages, how much

[1] This three-part article, beginning in this issue, is a condensation of an unpublished Ph.D. dissertation accepted by The Johns Hopkins University, 1964.

[2] Arthur Vööbus, *Peschitta und Targumim des Pentateuchs* (Stockholm, 1958).

influence from, or at least agreement with, the Hebrew Massoretic Text, the Aramaic Targum, the Greek version, and the Syrohexapla, is found in the various Syriac manuscripts, and

5. To see whether such influence can be shown to have increased in the later manuscripts. [3]

Part I will provide: (1) a brief survey of the studies that have been made of the Syriac version; (2) reference aids needed for understanding what will be presented in Parts II and III, namely: a list of abbreviations and symbols which are used, not only in this Part I, but also in Parts II and III, including bibliographic references for works referred to only by their abbreviations in Part II; and the list of MSS used, with their sigla and brief descriptions. Part II will present in detail the selected variants with their evaluations, and also several summary tables. Part III will include a few comparisons and conclusions concerning the manuscript study and the study of NT quotations from Is, and, finally, a summary and conclusions concerning the whole investigation.

Brief History of the Study of the Syriac Version

More than one hundred years ago Felix Perles noted the relationship between the OT Peshitta and the Targums, [4] and attributed the Peshitta to Jewish origin, contrary to the prevailing opinion of his time that it was of Christian origin. He was followed by Isaac Prager, who considered the Peshitta to be a Jewish Targum from the 2d cent. B.C. [5] Anton Baum-

[3] Material from this investigation which may be useful to the International Project to Establish a Critical Edition of the Old Testament Peshiṭta, has been sent to the Peshiṭta Institute at the University of Leiden, Holland.

[4] Felix Perles, *Meletemata pischitthoniana* (Dissertation; Prag, 1859), cited by Frants Buhl, *Kanon und Text des Alten Testaments* (Leipzig, 1891), p. 187, n.; referred to by Anton Baumstark, Vööbus, and others as J. Perles, and the place of publication as Breslau.

[5] Isaac Prager, *De veteris testamenti versione syriaca quam Peschittho vocant; quaestiones criticae*, I (Dissertation; Göttingen, 1875), 35, 45.

stark, however, while attributing this version to a Jewish rather than a Jewish-Christian origin, denied that the Peshitta was merely a Targum of the 1st or 2d cent. B.C. [6] John Pinkerton referred to W. E. Barnes' discovery that the text of Br. Mus. Add. 14,425 ("regarded as the oldest dated Biblical MS in existence," "bearing the date 'in the year of the Greeks 775,' i.e. A.D. 464") is different from that of later Pentateuch MSS and is very close to the Massoretic Hebrew text. [7] Leo Haefeli agreed with the idea of the Syrian Fathers that the Peshitta was translated from the Hebrew text of a type close to the MT, and explained the targumic elements as due to the use of Aramaic Targums in the translation process. [8]

Rubens Duval considered that the Peshitta OT was made before the NT and differed from the Hebrew and the LXX. [9] He, following Prager,[10] cited Hirzel, Kirsch, and Gesenius as believing in a Greek-Christian origin for the Peshitta, in contrast to Perles' and Prager's idea that the origin was Jewish. Then he (again following Prager) listed Dathe, Noeldeke, and Renan as holding that the origin was Jewish-Christian, and terms this the best idea, *i.e.*, converted Jews, not Ebionites. The Peshitta OT, according to these views, then, is from Hebrew, not from Greek, with influence from the Targums, as Perles stated concerning the Pentateuch, C. H. Cornill concerning Eze, and Sigmund Fränkel concerning Chr. [11]

Frants Buhl favored a Christian *origin* of the Peshitta,

[6] Baumstark, *Geschichte der syrischen Literatur* (Bonn, 1922), pp. 17, 18, and n. 9.

[7] John Pinkerton, "The Origin and the Early History of the Syriac Pentateuch," *JThS*, XV (1914), 14.

[8] Leo Haefeli, "Die Peschitta des alten Testaments mit Rücksicht auf ihre textkritische Bearbeitung und Herausgabe," *Alttestamentliche Abhandlungen*, XI, 1 (Münster, 1927), 7, 95.

[9] Rubens Duval, *Ancienne littérature chrétienne*, II, *La littérature syriaque* (Paris, 1899), p. 34.

[10] Prager, *op. cit.*, p. 14.

[11] Duval, *op. cit.*, p. 36.

though calling it a Jewish *work*; he considered that most likely the translators were Jewish-Christian. [12]

B. J. Roberts summarizes the later scholars in the two camps as follows:

> Among recent scholars who have argued for a Christian origin of the Peshitta are Gottheil, M. L. Margolis, [R. H.] Pfeiffer, and P. A. H. de Boer. On the other hand, F. C. Burkitt, A. Baumstark, L. Haefeli, P. Kahle, A. Bentzen, C. Peters and J. Schildenberger are among those who are convinced of a Jewish origin. [13]

Roberts concludes concerning the Jewish or Christian origin of the Pentateuch that "the evidence is not sufficient to rule out the one or the other." [14]

Joseph Marquart in 1903 had mentioned Adiabene as the place where a Jewish group would have needed a Syriac version of the Pentateuch, a place which would have been the cradle of Christianity for the Aramaic church of Assyria. [15] Josephus records the conversion to Judaism of King Izates II and his mother, Queen Helena, of the kingdom of Adiabene, east of the Tigris. [16] This would be the most reasonable locale for the Jewish origin of the Syriac version of the OT, and the idea has been taken up by Paul E. Kahle [17] and others. Baumstark himself held that the oldest part of the Peshitta, the Pentateuch, had Adiabene for its homeland. [18]

Vööbus considers that "the genesis of Christianity in the valley of the Tigris most probably was related to the Jewish synagogue in the diaspora," [19] and asks,

[12] Buhl, *op. cit.*, pp. 186-187.

[13] B. J. Roberts, *The Old Testament Text and Versions* (Cardiff, 1951), p. 222.

[14] *Ibid.*, p. 221.

[15] Joseph Marquart, *Osteuropäische und ostasiatische Streifzüge* (Leipzig, 1903), pp. 288, 298-300.

[16] Josephus, *Antiquities*, xx. 2-4.

[17] Paul E. Kahle, *The Cairo Geniza* (2d ed.; Oxford, 1959), pp. 270-272.

[18] Baumstark, *op. cit.*, p. 18.

[19] Vööbus, *Studies in the History of the Gospel Text in Syriac* (*CSCO*, vol. 128, subsidia, Tome 3; Louvain, 1951), p. 18; cf. also Vööbus, *Early Versions of the New Testament* (Stockholm, 1954), p. 68.

> If we consider the fact that the earliest history of the Christian Church in the lands of the Tigris and Euphrates developed out of the atmosphere of Aramaic Christianity in Palestine, is there anything more natural than to think that this atmosphere included the use of the written word? [20]

Baumstark pointed out the important connections that the Peshitta has with the Palestinian Targums, showing that this version, though clothed in an Eastern Aramaic idiom, is based on Western Aramaic targumic foundations that still show through. [21] This had just been demonstrated by Curt Peters' investigations of the Pentateuch. [22] A further demonstration was given by Schaje Wohl. [23] J. van der Ploeg's summary of more recent Peshitta studies shows the progress made in this same direction by others. [24]

Vööbus' exhaustive researches during thirty years have not only pointed up the targumic elements and substrata of the Syriac Pentateuch, [25] and provided great light on the development of the Syriac NT text; [26] they have brought a needed correction and revision of F. C. Burkitt's hastily-formed and tenaciously-held opinion that Rabbula was the author of the Peshitta revision and that it replaced all earlier text forms immediately, by official decree and enforcement. [27] Vööbus has maintained that the *Vetus Syra*, the flexible and beloved early text of the Syrian Christians, persisted long after the introduction of the revision; and that this revision started

[20] Vööbus, *Studies in the History of the Gospel Text in Syriac*, p. 18.

[21] Baumstark, "Das Problem des christlich-palästinensischen Pentateuchtextes," *OCh*, III, 10 (1935), 201, 212 ff.

[22] Curt Peters, "Peschitta und Targumim des Pentateuchs; ihre Beziehungen untersucht im Rahmen ihrer Abweichungen vom masoretischen Text," *Le Muséon*, XLVIII (1935), 1-54.

[23] Schaje Wohl, *Das palästinensische Pentateuch-Targum* (Dissertation; Zwickau, 1935), pp. 3-4, 11-12.

[24] J. van der Ploeg, "Recente Pešitta-Studies sinds 1927," *Ex oriente lux*, X (1948), 392-399.

[25] Vööbus, *Peschitta und Targumim des Pentateuchs, passim.*

[26] Vööbus, *Studies in the History of the Gospel Text in Syriac.*

[27] F. C. Burkitt, *Evangelion da-Mepharresche* (Cambridge, 1904), II, 161 ff.; *Early Eastern Christianity* (London, 1904), pp. 64 ff.

earlier than Rabbula's time, went on gradually in the hands of many unknown revisers, and did not at once quench the archaic forms, especially in the more isolated monastic circles of the Nestorian Church in the East. [28] Vööbus finds some Old Syriac text forms persisting even down into very late MSS and many authors' quotations, as presented in his studies on the Pentateuch. [29]

It was therefore the purpose of the present investigator to test whether similar findings would be forthcoming in the area of the Prophets, the text of Is; that is, traces of underlying targumic text in the MSS and the patristic literature; forms that one could safely designate as traces of the *Vetus Syra*.

Procedures

The patristic study was made first. [30] The collation base chosen was the Urmia text published by the Trinitarian Bible Society, London. [31] All quotations from Is found in the writings of the Syrian authors were compared with this Peshitta text, and, in addition, Syriac translations of some Greek writings, where the likelihood existed that the Syriac translator used his own familiar Biblical text rather than translating the Greek text or using either the Peshitta or (later)

[28] Vööbus, *Studies in the History of the Gospel Text in Syriac*, pp. 46-60, 127-134, 164-177, etc.; *Early Versions of the New Testament*, pp. 75-88, 90-103, etc.; "Completion of the *Vetus Syra* Project," *BR*, VI (1962), 49-56.

[29] Vööbus, *Peschitta und Targumim des Pentateuchs*, pp. 44, 58, 68, etc.

[30] However, the writer would recommend to anyone undertaking a similar investigation, to begin with the manuscript study, so that there is built up a background of familiarity with the Biblical text and with the types of variants that occur in the MSS, before engaging in the patristic study. Thus one's discrimination will be sharper for distinguishing allusions and loose quotations by memory, from genuine variant readings in the quotations.

[31] *Keṯābā Qaddīšā*; *Diaṯēqē ʿAttīqtā* (Holy Scripture; Old Testament, Urmia text; London, 1852, reprinted 1954).

the Syrohexapla. Of the Urmia text, M. H. Goshen-Gottstein writes: "I would not hesitate to state that in general U is superior to L (= Lee) and is therefore altogether the most reliable printed edition available, . . ." [32] Two hundred ninety variants resulted from the patristic study.

The manuscript study was begun by utilizing Gustav Diettrich's *Apparatus criticus zur Pešitto zum Propheten Jesaia.* [33] This provided 3000 variants from 28 MSS. Other MSS were chosen from the various catalogues of museums and libraries in Europe, and also were selected from the *List of Old Testament Peshiṭta Manuscripts* [34] prepared by the Peshiṭta Institute at the University of Leiden. The selected MSS (in microfilm copies) were then collated with the Urmia text. Among the 94 MSS included in this study, 42 of the 63 found in the Is index of the *List,* or 66.7% of those that are listed there, were utilized; 21 others were added to this group from the Appendix of the *List,* besides those chosen from the catalogues and not appearing in the *List.*

At the conclusion of the manuscript study, the 3000 small sheets containing the variants from Diettrich's *Apparatus* had increased to approximately 4500 sheets, each containing one or more variants with notation of the MSS showing them. The patristic collection was added on these same sheets, wherever an author's quotation showed the same variant. After completing and recording the comparison with the Hebrew, Targum, Greek, and Syrohexapla texts, the investigator evaluated all manuscript variants and selected 3049 of them as the body of material to be used in this study, eliminating merely orthographic differences and obvious

[32] M. H. Goshen-Gottstein, "Prolegomena to a Critical Edition of the Peshitta," in *Text and Language in Bible and Qumran* (Jerusalem, 1960), p. 167, n. 21.

[33] Gustav Diettrich, *Ein Apparatus criticus zur Pešitto zum Propheten Jesaia* ("Beihefte zur *ZAW,*" vol. VIII; Giessen, 1905). (This work is not without some errors.)

[34] Peshiṭta Institute, *List of Old Testament Peshiṭta Manuscripts* (Leiden, 1961).

scribal errors. Adding the 290 patristic variants, there was a total of 3339, which formed the "mine." Various methods were devised to "mine" it and extract information from it by several sets of worksheets that facilitated the counting necessary in order to arrive at percentages. [35]

Further analyses resulted in paper ribbons of data, some several yards in length. By the simple device of underlining a check mark or a text reference whenever it referred to a singular reading (a reading occurring nowhere else in the material studied), it was possible to keep track of these readings at every stage. Use of appropriate abbreviations and symbols enabled one to see at a glance the support given by the four texts (Hebrew, Targum, Greek, and Syrohexapla) and the patristic quotations, the NT Is quotations, and the codices of the Curetonian and Sinaitic Old Syriac Gospels. The use of different colors of writing on the worksheets also made various kinds of information stand out, as did also the order of arrangement (chronologically in groups by type of MS).

The huge sheets of figures with their percentages, resulting from all the analyses, were broken down into page-size tables and appear in the set of eleven tables in the unpublished dissertation. Only the briefer, summarizing tables are included in this three-part article.

List of Abbreviations and Symbols

This list gives the abbreviations used in the List of MSS to follow, and also those used in Part II and Part III, including bibliographic references for works referred to only by their abbreviations in Part II.

* original reading in a MS, where there has been a later correction.

[35] Vööbus once wrote: "I admit, I have not counted them correctly. Gladly will I leave that counting to others." *Studies in the History of the Gospel Text in Syriac*, p. 66.

Anon	*Anonymi auctori expositio officiorum ecclesiae Georgio Arbelensi vulgo adscripta*, ed. R. H. Connolly, in *CSCO*, 64, 71/Syr. 25, 28 (Paris 1911, 1913). (*Tractatus secundus*; Nest.; 10th cent. ?)
Aph	*Aphraatis sapientis persae demonstrationes*, ed. Ioannes Parisot, in "Patrologia syriaca," vol. I (Paris, 1894); II (Paris, 1907), cols. 1-50. (Early 4th cent.; Persia.)
C or Cant.	Canticles MS(S)—Psalter MSS with the addition of the Canticles or Biblical Odes at the end.
c. or cent.	century.
cor	correction (above or below line in MS).
CSCO	*Corpus scriptorum christianorum orientalum editum consilio Universitatis catholicae Americae et Universitatis catholicae Lovaniensis*; *Scriptores syri* . . . (Paris and Louvain, 1903-).
Cur	Cureton, William (ed.), *Remains of a Very Antient Recension of the Four Gospels in Syriac* (London, 1858).
Cyril	*S. Cyrilli Alexandrini commentarii in Lucam*, ed. J.-B. Chabot and R. M. Tonneau, in *CSCO*, 70/Syr. 27 (Paris, 1912); 140/Syr. 70 (Louvain, 1953). (Mid-5th cent.; transl. from Greek.)
Dion	*Dionysii bar Ṣalībī commentarii in evangelia*, eds. I. Sedláček, J.-B. Chabot, and A. Vaschalde, in *CSCO*, 15, 16, 77, 85, 95/Syr. 15, 16, 33, 40, 47 (Paris, 1906, 1915, 1922, 1931); 98/Syr. 49 (Louvain, 1933); 113/Syr. 60 (Paris, 1939); 114/Syr. 61 (Louvain, 1940). (Metropolitan of Amida, Jac.; died 1171.)
(Eph)	Ephraim as cited by Diettrich (St. Ephraim, died 373).
Eph Lamy	*Sancti Ephraem Syri, hymni et sermones*, ed. T. J. Lamy, 4 vols. (Malines, 1882-1902).
Eph *Op Om*	*Sancti Ephraem Syri, opera omnia*; Syriac and Latin, 3 vols. (Rome, 1737, 1740, 1743).
Erech	Erechthios, *Sur la nativité*, ed. F. Nau, in "Patrologia orientalis," XIII (Paris, 1919), 171-180. (Bishop of Antioch in Pisidia, mid-5th cent.; Monophysite; transl. from Greek for Nest. Church.)
Estr.	Estrangela script.
Evag	Evagrius Ponticus, ed. W. Frankenberg, in *Abhandlungen der königl. Ges. der Wiss. zu Göttingen*, hist. Kl., Neue Folge, vol. XIII, No. 2 (Berlin, 1912). (A.D. 346-399; transl. from Greek by, among others, Babai Magnus, 7th cent.)
G	Greek text of Is: *Septuaginta*; *vetus testamentum graecum*, ed. Joseph Ziegler; vol. XIV, *Isaias* (Göttingen, 1939).
H	Hebrew Massoretic Text: *Biblia Hebraica*, ed. Rud. Kittel (3d ed.; Stuttgart. 1937).
Hex or Hx	Hexapla (Greek), cited from *Septuaginta* (see G, above).

Ish	Isho'dad, *The Commentaries of Isho'dad of Merv, Bishop of Ḥadatha* (*c.* 850 A.D.), ed. and transl. Margaret Dunlop Gibson, in *Horae semiticae*, V, VI, VII, X, XI (Cambridge, 1911-1916). (Nest.; died 850.)
Jac.	Jacobite (Western Syriac; also script).
Jac Ed	*Iacobi Edesseni Hexaemeron seu in opus creationis libri septem*, eds. J.-B. Chabot and A. Vaschalde, in *CSCO*, 92/Syr. 44 (Paris, 1928), 97/Syr. 48 (Louvain, 1932). (Bishop, Jac., died 708.)
Jn Ruf	Jean Rufus, *Plérophories*, ed. F. Nau, in "Patrologia orientalis," VIII (Paris, 1912), 3-161. (Monophysite; died after 518; transl. from Greek.)
L or Lect.	Lectionary MS(S).
Livre P	*Livre de la perfection*, in *Oeuvres spirituelles*, by Martyrius (Sahdona), transl. André de Halleux, in *CSCO*, 200, 201, 214, 215/Syr. 86, 87, 90, 91 (Louvain, 1960, 1961).
M or Mass.	Massora (correction) MS(S).
mg	margin(al reading).
Nest.	Nestorian (Eastern Syriac; also script).
NT	New Testament: Peshitta text, *The New Testament in Syriac* (London, 1955). Greek text, *Novum testamentum graece*, eds. E. Nestle, *et al.* (24th ed.; Stuttgart, 1960).
om	omit, omission.
OT	Old Testament: Peshitta text, *Keṯāḇā Qaddīšā*; *Diaṯēqē 'Aṯīqtā* [Holy Scripture; Old Testament, Urmia text] (London, 1952, reprinted 1954). Hebrew Massoretic text, see H, above; Greek text, see G, above; Aramaic Targum, see T, below; Syrohexapla, see S, below).
( )	parentheses around a symbol for a version or text, in citing evidence for a variant, mean that the quotation is slightly different but in substance supports the variant reading.
pr	praem. = praemissum: sent (placed) before.
S	Syrohexapla: *Codex syro-hexaplaris Ambrosianus*, in "Monumenta sacra et profana ex codicibus praesertim Bibliothecae Ambrosianae," vol. VII (Milan, 1874). (Transl. from the Greek text, Origen's 5th col., by Paul, Bishop of Tella, in 617-618.)
sey.	*sĕyāmē* plural dots.
Sin	Sinaitic Syriac: *The Four Gospels in Syriac; transcribed from the Sinaitic Palimpsest by the Late Robert L. Bensly, J. Rendel Harris, and F. C. Burkitt*, ed. Agnes Smith Lewis (Cambridge, 1894).
Syn Nest	*Synodicon orientale ou recueil de synodes nestoriens*, ed. J.-B. Chabot (Paris, 1902).
Syr Did	*The Didascalia Apostolorum in Syriac and English*, ed. and transl. Margaret Dunlop Gibson, in *Horae semiticae*, I, II (London, 1903).

t	text.
T	Targum Jonathan: *The Bible in Aramaic*, ed. Alexander Sperber, vol. III (Leiden, 1962).
transl.	translator, translated.
Zach	Zacharias Rhetor, *Historia ecclesiastica Zachariae Rhetori vulgo adscripta; Accedit fragmentum historiae ecclesiasticae Dionysii Telmahrensis*, ed. E. W. Brooks, in *CSCO*, 83, 84/Syr. 38, 39 (Paris, 1919, 1921); 87, 88/Syr. 41, 42 (Louvain, 1924).

List of MSS

The following 94 MSS were used in this study. Twenty-eight of them furnished their evidence by way of Gustav Diettrich's 1905 publication, *Ein Apparatus criticus zur Pešitto zum Propheten Jesaia*, and are labeled "Diettrich" in parentheses, together with his siglum for each. The remaining MSS were studied on microfilms purchased from the respective libraries and museums where they are located. Each is labeled in parentheses with the siglum of the Peshiṭta Institute, Leiden University, [36] which indicates their century, preceding the Diettrich label where this occurs, unless it was chosen outside the MSS listed and dated by the Peshiṭta Institute in its *List of Old Testament Peshiṭta Manuscripts*. In such a case, the date given is from the Appendix of the *List*, if the MS is found there, or from the catalogue from which it was ordered.[37]

[36] The sigla of the Peshiṭta Institute used in this article are the following, as taken from the *List*, pp. v-x; after the numeral indicating cent., the following letters show the contents of the MSS:

a = MS comprising a complete or almost complete Bible (or OT alone)
d = MS containing the prophetic books
h = MS containing one book only
j = MS containing fragments of more than one book
k = fragment of one book only
m = massoretic MS
t = MS containing Ps and the Biblical Odes or Canticles, poems
p added to any letter means that the MS is a palimpsest.

The number following the letter indicates the sequence of that type of MS found in the cent. indicated.

[37] S. E. Assemanus, *Bibliothecae Mediceae Laurentianae et Palatinae codicum MSS. orientalium catalogus* (Florence, 1756-1759); S. E. and J. S. Assemanus, *Bibliothecae Apostolicae Vaticanae codicum manu-*

The addition of raised -c indicates a Psalter MS with Canticles or Biblical Odes added; [38] addition of raised -l, a Lectionary MS; -m, a Massora correction MS; -f, a funerary MS. The initial letter of the siglum stands for the city in which the MS is located, in all cases except JR^{c} (for John Rylands Library, Manchester, since M indicates Milan). The numbering is in the order of the original catalogue numbers within the groups of types of MSS, with Diettrich's capital sigla earliest.

Credit and thanks are hereby given to each library and

scriptorum catalogus in tres partes distributus, Part I, vols. 2, 3 (Rome, 1758-1759); A. E. Goodman, "The Jenks Collection of Syriac Manuscripts in the University Library, Cambridge," *The Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society*, 1939, pp. 581-599; Agnes Smith Lewis, *Catalogue of the Syriac MSS. in the Convent of S. Catharine on Mount Sinai* (London, 1894); G. Margoliouth, *Descriptive List of Syriac and Karshuni MSS. in the British Museum Acquired Since* 1873 (London, 1899); A. Mingana, *Catalogue of the Mingana Collection of Manuscripts now in the Possession of the Trustees of the Woodbrooke Settlement, Selly Oak, Birmingham*, 3 vols. (Cambridge, 1933-1939); F. Nau, "Notices des manuscrits syriaques, éthiopiens et mandéens, entrées à la Bibliothèque Nationale de Paris depuis l'édition des catalogues," *Revue de l'orient chrétien*, 2e série, tome VI (XVI) (1911), 271-313; [V. Rosen and J. Forshall,] *Catalogus codicum manuscriptorum orientalium qui in Museo Britannico asservantur, Pars prima, codices syriacos et carshunicos amplectens* (London, 1838); Eduard Sachau, *Verzeichnis der syrischen Handschriften der königlichen Bibliothek zu Berlin*, 2 vols. ("Die Handschriften-Verzeichnisse der königlichen Bibliothek zu Berlin," XXIII; Berlin, 1899); Jean Simon, "Répertoire des bibliothèques publiques et privées d'Europe contenant des manuscrits syriaques," *Orientalia*, XI (1940), 271-288; R. Payne Smith, *Codices syriacos, carshunicos, mendaeos complectens*, Part VI of *Catalogi codicum manuscriptorum Bibliothecae Bodleianae* (Oxford, 1864); W. Wright, *Catalogue of Syriac Manuscripts in the British Museum, Acquired Since the Year* 1838, 3 vols. (London, 1870-1872); W. Wright and S. A. Cook, *A Catalogue of the Syriac Manuscripts Preserved in the Library of the University of Cambridge*, 2 vols. (Cambridge, 1901); Hermann Zotenberg, *Catalogues des manuscrits syriaques et sabéens (mandaïtes) de la Bibliothèque Nationale* (Paris, 1874).

[38] The Song of Isaiah is the third Canticle or Biblical Ode following the Ps in Syriac Psalter MSS, and includes Is 42 : 10-13 and 45 : 8 (the latter verse not always being given). The Prayer of Isaiah is the ninth Canticle or Biblical Ode in such MSS, and includes Is 26 : 9-19.

museum for the use made in this study of its Syriac MSS. An asterisk marks the sigla of MSS which have one or more readings that are included in the 101 variants evaluated in Part II of this article.

*B (9d1; Diettrich S) Berlin (formerly in the Deutsche Staatsbibliothek, now in the University Library, Tübingen, West Germany). Sachau 201, a vellum MS of the Prophets, Estr., 8-9th cent.; Is on folios 1^{a}-30^{b}. (91 variants were found, or 3% of the total of 3049; 3 were singular, or 3.3% of the 91.)

*C^{1} (12a1; Diettrich B) Cambridge (University Library). Univ. O.o.1.2 ("Buchanan Bible"), a vellum complete Bible in 2 vols., Jac.; Is in vol. II on folios 136^{b}-146^{b}. (202 variants, or 6.6%; 35 singular, or 17.3%.)

*C^{2} (12d1; Diettrich C) Cambridge. Univ. Ll.2.4, a paper MS of the Prophets, Jac., dated A.D. 1173/4; Is on folios 1^{b}-31^{a}. (119 variants, or 3.9%; 14 singular, or 12.1%.)

*C^{3} (15d1; Diettrich k) Cambridge. Univ. Add. 1965, a paper MS of the Prophets, Nest., dated A.D. 1492/3; Is on folios 1^{b}-57^{b}. (118 variants, or 3.9%; 4 singular, with no support from any source, 3.4%.)

*C^{4} (17d2; Diettrich l) Cambridge. O.o.1.7, a paper MS of the Prophets, Nest., dated A.D. 1682; Is on folios 1^{b}-49^{a}. (169 variants, or 5.5%; 14 singular, or 8.3%.)

*C^{5} (18d1; Diettrich t) Cambridge. O.o.1.18, a paper MS of the Prophets and Cant., Nest.; Is on folios 1^{a}-69^{b}. (220 variants, or 7.2%; 38 singular, or 17.3%.)

*F^{1} (9a1; Diettrich F) Florence (Biblioteca Medicea Laurenziana). Orientali 58, = Pal. Med. I, a vellum complete Bible, Estr.; Is on folios 105^{b}-117^{a}. (443 variants, or 14.5%; 33 singular, or 8%.)

$F^{2\text{-}c}$ (15/14t1) Florence. Laur. Med. IV, a paper MS of the Ps and Cant., Jac. (Maronite), dated A.D. 1318, but a later hand on folios 1, 30, 206-208; Song of Isaiah on folios 205^{b}-206^{a}. (4 variants, or .13%; none singular.)

*J^{1} (10d1) Jerusalem (Greek Patriarchate). Syriac 20, a vellum MS of the Prophets of 9-11th cent., but several folios on paper, 16-18th cent., Estr. except first 4 and last 3 folios, which are Nest.; Is on folios 1^{b}-6^{b}, 98^{a}-100^{a}, 170^{a}-209^{b}, order mixed. (78 variants, or 2.6%; 5 singular, or 6.4%.)

$J^{2\text{-}c}$ (16t2) Jerusalem. Syriac 27, a paper MS of the Ps and Cant., Nest., dated A.D. 1585; Song of Isaiah on folios 136^{b}-137^{a}. (No variants.)

$JR^{\text{-}c}$ (18<13dt1) Manchester (John Rylands Library). Rylands Syriac MS 4, a paper MS of the Prophets, Ps and Cant., Nest., dated A.D. 1727, copied from a 13th-cent. MS now lost; Is on folios 3^{a}-28^{a}, but with lacunae and poorly written; not

used in this study. Song of Isaiah on folio 222^{b} (2 variants, or .07%; not singular).

*L^{1} (19d3; Diettrich s) London (British Museum). Oriental 4395, a paper MS of the Prophets, Nest., dated A.D. 1813; Is on folios 1^{b}-49^{b}. (129 variants, or 4.2%; 9 singular, or 7%, unsupported.)

*L^{2} (19d2; Diettrich n) London. BM Add. 7151, a paper MS of the Prophets, Nest., dated A.D. 1812; Is on folios 1^{b}-44^{b}. (139 variants, or 4.6%; 15 singular, or 10.7%.)

*L^{3} (14/11d1; Diettrich N) London. BM Add. 7152, a vellum MS of the Prophets, Nest., 10-11th cent., but folio 7 is paper, 13-15th cent., and folios 1, 5-6, 8, 17, 36-39, 77-80, 88-89, 159, 168-171, 177-189, are paper, Jac., 14-16th cent.; Is on folios 1^{a}-43^{b}. ($L^{3(1)}$, 81 variants, or 2.7%; 3 singular with no support, or 3.7%; $L^{3(2)}$, 14-16th cent., 85 variants, or 2.8%; 38 singular, or 44.7%.)

*L^{4} (6h3) London. BM Add. 12,175, a vellum MS containing extracts from the writings of Palladius, Jerome, Evagrius, Ignatius, etc., Estr., A.D. 534(?); Is on folios 232^{a}-251^{b}. (214 variants, or 7%; 36 singular, or 16.8%.)

*L^{5} (6h5; Diettrich D) London. BM Add. 14,432, a vellum MS, Estr.; Is on folios 3^{b}-120^{b} + 122^{a-b}. (239 variants, or 7.8%; 26 singular, or 10.9%.)

*L^{6} (12d2; Diettrich T) London. BM Add. 18,715, a paper MS of the Prophets and some other books, Jac., 12th cent., but folios 2-10, 101, 106-107 are 14th cent., and 1, 99, 108, 128, and 237 are 17th cent.; Is on folios 1^{b}-42^{b}. ($L^{6(1)}$, 102 variants, or 3.3%; 13 singular, or 12.7%; $L^{6(2)}$, 14th cent., 43 variants, or 1.4 %; 9 singular, or 20.9%; $L^{6(3)}$, 17th cent., 27 variants, or .89%; 15 singular, or 55.6%.)

*$L^{7\text{-}m}$ (11m2; Diettrich 𝔄) London. BM Add. 7183, a vellum Mass. correction MS, West Syrian; Is corrections on folios 51^{b}-57^{a}. (49 variants, or 1.6%; 6 singular, or 12.2%.)

*$L^{8\text{-}m}$ (9m1; Diettrich 𝔅) London. BM Add. 12,138, a vellum Mass. correction MS, Nest., dated A.D. 899; Is corrections on folios 172^{a}-187^{a}. (56 variants, or 1.8%; 9 singular, or 16.1%.)

*$L^{9\text{-}m}$ (10m1; Diettrich 𝔈) London. BM Add. 12,178, a vellum Mass. correction MS, Jac., 9-10th cent.; Is corrections on folios 78^{a}-89^{b}. (64 variants, or 2.1%; 5 singular, unsupported, or 7.8%.)

*$L^{10\text{-}m}$ (12m1; Diettrich 𝔇) London. BM Add. 14,482, a vellum Mass. correction MS, West Syrian, 11-12th cent.; Is corrections on folios 31^{a}-37^{a}. (55 variants, or 1.8%; 18 singular, or 32.7%.)

*$L^{11\text{-}m}$ (12m2; Diettrich 𝔈) London. BM Add. 14,684, a paper Mass. correction MS, West Syrian; Is corrections on folios 3^{a}-10^{a}. (45 variants, or 1.5%; 22 singular, or 49%.)

*$L^{12\text{-}l}$ (13th cent.) London. BM Add. 7168, a silk Lect. MS, Nest., Sunday and festival lections for year, mostly OT; Is, *passim*. (80 variants, or 2.6%; 22 singular, or 27.5%.)

L^{13-1} (11th cent.) London. BM Add. 14,705, fragments of a paper Lect. MS, Nest., OT and NT lections; Is, *passim*. (13 variants, or .43%; 4 singular, or 30.8%.)

*L^{14-1} (11th cent.) London. BM Add. 17,218, folios 4-22, fragments of a vellum Lect., Nest. (Malkite), OT and NT lections; Is, *passim*. (7 variants, or .23%; 1 singular, with no support, or 14.3%.)

L^{15} (5ph1) London. BM Add. 14,512, a vellum palimpsest, a 10th-cent. choral book (choral services for the principal services, ascribed to Ephraim and Jacob), written upside-down in a Nest. hand over an Estr. Biblical MS of A.D. 459/60. "Le plus ancien manuscrit biblique daté," according to Tisserant.[39] Is fragments scattered, Estr., most legible on folios 72 and 69; respectively, 16 : 1-17 : 2, and 17 : 2-18 : 3. (3 variants, or .1%; all singular, with no support.)

L^{16} (10j2) London. BM Add. 14,613, a vellum MS, Nest., of the 9-10th cent. (selections from "The Book of the Ladder"); extracts from Is (59 : 1-4, 7-9, 10-15) on folios 117^{a}-118^{a}. (1 variant, or .03%; not singular and with no support.)

L^{17} (8j1) London. BM Add. 14,668, folios 20-25, a vellum MS, fragments, Nest.; Is (7 : 3-25; 8 : 3-22; 45 : 7-47 : 11; 61 : 9-64 : 11) on folios 20^{a}-22^{b}. (8 variants, or .3%; 2 singular, or 25%, not supported.)

L^{18} (7k11) London. BM Add. 14,669, folio 25, a vellum fragment of Is (37 : 30-38 : 15), Estr. (3 variants, or .1%; none singular and all unsupported.)

L^{19} (9k3) London. BM Add. 17,213, folios 1-2, a vellum MS, fragments of Is (49 : 19-50 : 10; 57 :21-58 : 14), Nest. Left col., the Syrohexapla text; right col., the Syriac Peshitta text. (6 variants, or .2%; 2 singular, or 33.3%, with no support.)

L^{20-c} (A.D. 1204) London. BM Add. 7154, a vellum MS of the Ps and Cant., Estr.; Song of Isaiah on folios 174^{b}-175^{a}. (5 variants, or .16%; none singular.)

L^{21-c} (A.D. 1220) London. BM Add. 7155, a vellum MS of the Ps and Cant., Estr.; Song of Isaiah on folios 47^{b}-48^{a}. (1 variant, or .03%; singular, with no support.)

L^{22-c} (17th cent.) London. BM Add. 7156, a paper MS of the Ps and Cant., Nest.; Song of Isaiah on folios 145^{b}-146^{a}. (No variants.)

L^{23-c} (10t2) London. BM Add. 14,433, a vellum MS of the Ps and Cant., Estr.; Song of Isaiah on folio 198^{a-b}. (2 variants, or .07%; not singular.)

[39] Eugène Tisserant, "Le plus ancien manuscrit biblique daté; notes sur trois palimpsestes syriaques des prophètes," *RB*, VIII (1911), 85-95.

$L^{24\text{-}c}$ (10/9t2) London. BM Add. 14,436, a vellum MS of the Ps and Cant., Estr.; Song of Isaiah in a Jac. hand added on the margin of folio 68^{a} in the 10th cent., the MS being 8-9th cent. (1 variant, or .03%; not singular, but confined to Canticles MSS, and with no support.)

$L^{25\text{-}c}$ (13t1) London. BM Add. 14,675, a paper MS of the Ps and Cant., Nest.; Song of Isaiah on folios 150^{a}-151^{a}. (2 variants, or .07%; 1 singular, or 50%, with no support.)

$L^{26\text{-}c}$ (13t2) London. BM Add. 14,677, a paper MS of the Ps and Cant., Nest.; Song of Isaiah on folios 141^{b}-142^{a}. (No variants.)

$*L^{27\text{-}c}$ (9t3) London. BM Add. 17,109, a vellum MS of the Ps and Cant., Estr., dated A.D. 873/4; Song of Isaiah on folio $116^{a\text{-}b}$; Prayer of Isaiah on folio $118^{a\text{-}b}$. (21 variants, or .69%; 3 singular, or 14.3%, with no support.)

$L^{28\text{-}c}$ (10/7t1) London. BM Add. 17,110, a vellum MS of the Ps and Cant., Jac.; Song of Isaiah on folio 73^{b}, 10th cent. (1 variant, or .03%; not singular, and with no support.)

$L^{29\text{-}c}$ (10t4) London. BM Add. 17,111, a vellum MS of the Ps and Cant., Jac.; Song of Isaiah on folio 87^{a}. (1 variant, or .03%; not singular, and with no support.)

$L^{30\text{-}c}$ (11t1) London. BM Add. 17,112, a vellum MS of the Ps and Cant., Jac.; Song of Isaiah on folios 62^{b}-63^{a}. (3 variants, or .1%; 1 singular, or 33.3%, with no support.)

$L^{31\text{-}c}$ (10t5) London. BM Add. 17,125 ,a vellum MS of the Ps and Cant., Nest.; Song of Isaiah on folio 74^{a}. (1 variant, or .03%; not singular, and with no support except Ephraim.)

$L^{32\text{-}c}$ (13t3) London. BM Add. 17,219, a paper MS of the Ps and Cant., Nest.; Song of Isaiah on folio $145^{a\text{-}b}$. (1 variant, or .03%; not singular.)

$L^{33\text{-}c}$ (13th cent.) London. BM Add. 17,220, a paper MS of the Ps and Cant., Jac.; Song of Isaiah on folios 180^{a}-181^{a}. (3 variants, or .1%; 1 singular, or 33.3%, with no support.)

$L^{34\text{-}c}$ (14th cent.) London. BM Add. 17,223, a paper MS of the Ps and Cant., Jac.; Song of Isaiah on folio $58^{a\text{-}b}$. (2 variants, or .07%; not singular.)

$L^{35\text{-}c}$ (14th cent.) London. BM Add. 26,552, a paper MS of the Ps and Cant., Jac.; Song of Isaiah on folios 135^{b}-136^{a}. (3 variants, or .1%; not singular.)

$*M^{1}$ (7a1; Diettrich A) Milan (Ambrosian Library). B. 21. Inf., a vellum complete Bible, Estr., 6-7th cent., ed. Ceriani; Is on folios 145^{b}-158^{a}. (302 variants, or 10%; 54 singular, or 17.8%.)

$*M^{2}$ (17a2; Diettrich a) Milan. A. 145. Inf., a paper complete Bible, Part II, dated A.D. 1615, Jac.; Is on folios 191^{a}-238^{a}. (233 variants, or 7.6%; 22 singular, or 9.4%.)

$M^{3\text{-}c}$ (16t1) Milan. G. 31. Sup., a paper MS of the Ps and Cant., Jac. (Maronite), dated A.D. 1513; Song of Isaiah on folio $179^{a\text{-}b}$. (5 variants, or .16%; 1 singular, or 20%, with no support.)

*O^1 (17a4; Diettrich p) Oxford (Bodleian Library). Poc. 391, a paper complete Bible, Jac., dated A.D. 1614; Is on folios 410^a-436^a. (193 variants, or 6.3%; 2 singular, or 1.0%, with no support.)

*O^2 (17a3; Diettrich u) Oxford. Bod. Or. 141, a paper complete Bible, Jac. (Maronite), dated A.D. 1627, but folios 337^a-338^a, 18th cent.; Is on folios 337^a-367^a. (471 variants, or 15.4%; 273 singular, or 58%.)

*P^1 (A.D. 1695; Diettrich m) Paris (Bibliothèque Nationale). Syr. 4, vol. IV of a paper complete Bible, Nest. hand, but copied from the printed text of the Paris Polyglot (parts missing from the Peshitta are filled in from this printed text exactly); Is on the first folios of this vol. (244 variants, or 8%; 78 singular, or 32%.)

*P^2 (17a5; Diettrich z) Paris. Syr. 6, a paper complete OT, Jac.; Is on folios 313^b-343^a, folio 313^b being in another hand. (149 variants, or 4.9%; 5 singular, or 3.4%.)

*P^3 (17a6; Diettrich y) Paris. Syr. 8, a paper complete OT, Jac.; Is on folios 1^a-20^a of Part II. (384 variants, or 12.6%; 12 singular, or 3.1%.)

*P^4 (13a1) Paris. Syr. 9, a paper complete OT, extracts, Jac.; Is on folios 259^b-281^a. (99 variants, or 3.2%; 42 singular, or 42%.)

*P^5 (15a1; Diettrich x) Paris. Syr. 11, a paper complete OT, West Syrian; Is on folios 1^a-37^a of Part II. (120 variants, or 3.9%; 1 singular, or .83%.)

*P^6 (8a1) Paris. Syr. 341, a vellum complete OT, Estr.; Is on folios 131^a-143^a, 8th cent. (Folio 131, among others not showing Is text, in a 14th-cent. Nest. hand on paper.) (177 variants, or 5.8%; 22 singular, or 12.4%.)

*$P^{7\text{-}m}$ (11m5) Paris. Syr. 64, a vellum Mass. correction MS, Estr.; Is corrections on folios 112^a-118^a. (71 variants, or 2.3%; 18 singular, or 25.4%.)

$P^{8\text{-}c}$ (15-16th cent.?) Paris. Syr. 13, a paper MS of the Ps and Cant., Jac.; Song of Isaiah on folios 115^b-116^a; Prayer of Isaiah on folios 129^b-130^b. (26 variants, or .85%; 10 singular, or 38.5%.)

$P^{9\text{-}c}$ (16th cent.) Paris. Syr. 16, a paper MS of the Ps and Cant., Jac.; Song of Isaiah on folio $80^{a\text{-}b}$. (2 variants, or .07%; not singular, and with no support.)

$P^{10\text{-}c}$ (16th cent.) Paris. Syr 17, a paper MS of the Psalms and Cant., Jac.; Song of Isaiah on folio 72^a. (3 variants, or .1%; none singular, and no support.)

$P^{11\text{-}c}$ (17t3) Paris. Syr. 24, a paper MS of the Ps and Cant., Nest.; Song of Isaiah on folio $113^{a\text{-}b}$. (2 variants, or .07%; 1 singular, or 50%, with no support.)

$P^{12\text{-}c}$ (17t4) Paris. Syr. 25, a paper MS of the Ps and Cant., Nest.; Song of Isaiah on folios 100^b-101^a. (3 variants, or .1%; none singular.)

*R^{1} (16d1; Diettrich i) Rome (Vatican Library). Vaticani siriaci 4, a paper MS of the Prophets, Nest., dated A.D. 1556; Is on folios 2^{b}-57^{a}. (176 variants, or 5.8%; 14 singular, or 8%.)

*R^{2} (17a8) Rome. Vat. Syr. 7, a paper complete Bible, Jac., 16-17th cent.,; Is on folios 337^{a}-357^{b} (470 variants, or 15.4%; 5 singular, or 1.1%.)

*R^{3} (17a9) Rome. Vat. Syr. 8, a paper complete Bible, Jac., 16-17th cent.; Is on folios 251^{a}-267^{b}. (461 variants, or 15.1%; 9 singular, or 2%.)

*R^{4} (17a10; Diettrich v) Rome. Vat. Syr. 258, a paper complete Bible, West Syrian, 16-17th cent.; Is on folios 319^{a}-345^{a}. (271 variants, or 8.9%; 98 singular, or 36.2%.)

*R^{5} (17a11; Diettrich o) Rome. Vat. Syr. 461, a paper complete Bible, West Syrian, dated A.D. 1666/7; Is on folios 302^{a}-317^{b}. (449 variants, or 14.7%; 33 singular, or 7.3%.)

*$R^{6\text{-}1}$ (13th cent.) Rome. Vat. Syr. 24, a silk Lect. MS, Nest., OT and NT lections; Is, *passim*. (91 variants, or 3%; 25 singular, or 27.5%.)

*$R^{7\text{-}m}$ (19<11m7) Rome. Borgiani siriaci 117, a paper Mass. correction MS, Jac., dated A.D. 1868, copied from a MS dated 1014; Is corrections on folios 122^{a}-137^{b}. (85 variants, or 2.8%; 19 singular, or 22.4%.)

*$R^{8\text{-}m}$ (11m6) Rome. Barberiniani orientali 118, a vellum Mass. correction MS, Nest. consonants with Jac. vowels; Is corrections on folios 42^{b}-51^{a}. (142 variants, or 4.7%; 69 singular, or 48.6%.)

*$R^{9\text{-}m}$ (10m3) Rome. Vat. Syr. 152, a vellum Mass. correction MS, Nest. consonants with Jac. vowels, dated A.D. 979/80; Is corrections on folios 66^{b}-75^{a}. (82 variants, or 2.7%; 10 singular, or 12.2%.)

*$R^{10\text{-}c}$ (A.D. 1261) Rome. Vat. Syr. 11, a paper MS of the Ps and Cant., Nest. (Malkite); Prayer of Isaiah on folios 239^{b}-241^{b}. (30 variants, or 1%; 4 singular, or 13.3%.)

*$R^{11\text{-}c}$ (16t5) Rome. Borg. Syr. 25, a paper MS of the Ps and Cant., Jac., 15-16th cent.; Song of Isaiah on folio 156^{b}; Prayer of Isaiah on folios 157^{b}-158^{a}. (22 variants, or .72%; 2 singular, with no support, or 9.1%.)

*$R^{12\text{-}c}$ (19<12t5) Rome. Borg. Syr. 113, folios 1-135, a paper MS of the Ps and Cant., Jac., copied in 1868 from a 12th-cent. MS at Mosul; Song of Isaiah on folios 129^{b}-130^{a}; Prayer of Isaiah on folio $134^{a\text{-}b}$. (7 variants, or .23%; 1 singular, or 14.3%, unsupported except by Ephraim.)

$R^{13\text{-}c}$ (17t5) Rome. Vat. Syr. 261, a paper MS of the Ps and Cant., Jac., dated A.D. 1622/3; Song of Isaiah on folios 165^{b}-166^{a}; Prayer of Isaiah on folios 171^{b}-172^{a}. (26 variants, or .85%; 3 singular, or 11.5%.)

$R^{14\text{-}c}$ (15t1) Rome. Vat. Syr. 460, a paper MS of the Ps and Cant., Jac. (Maronite); Song of Isaiah on folio $189^{a\text{-}b}$. (8 variants, or

.26%, with no support; 1 singular, or 12.5%, with no support.)

$R^{15\text{-}f}$ (A.D. 823) Rome. Vat. Syr. 92, a vellum funerary MS, Nest.; Is 38 : 10-19 on folios 126^{b}-127^{a}. (3 variants, or .1%; 1 singular, not supported.)

$*S^{1\text{-}1}$ (Ca. 10th cent.) Mt. Sinai (St. Catherine's Monastery). Syriac 8, a parchment Lect. MS, mostly OT lections, Nest.; Is, *passim*. (314 variants, or 10.3%; 1 singular, or .32%, not supported.)

$*S^{2\text{-}1}$ (Ca. 12-13th cent.) Mt. Sinai. Syr. 39, a parchment Lect. MS, mostly OT lections, Nest.; Is, *passim*. (329 variants, or 10.8%; 18 singular, or 5.5%.)

$*S^{3\text{-}1}$ (Ca. 12th cent.) Mt. Sinai. Syr. 89, a paper Lect. MS, mostly OT lections, Nest.; Is, *passim*. (288 variants, or 9.4%; 49 singular, or 17%.)

$*S^{4\text{-}1}$ (Ca. 13th cent.) Mt. Sinai. Syr. 213, a paper Lect. MS, mostly OT lections, Nest.; Is, *passim*. (441 variants, or 14.5%; 92 singular, or 20.9%.)

$*S^{5\text{-}1}$ (A.D. 1214) Mt. Sinai. Syr. 234, a paper MS, labeled a *Prophetologion*, but actually a Lect. MS just like Nos. 8, 39, 89, and 213; mostly OT lections, Nest.; Is, *passim*. (426 variants, or 14%; 110 singular, or 25.8%.)

$*S^{6\text{-}c}$ (12t7) Mt. Sinai. Syr. 124, a paper MS of the Ps and Cant., Nest. (Malkite), dated A.D. 1188; Prayer of Isaiah on folios 293^{a}-295^{a}. (31 variants, or 1%; 1 singular, or 3.2%.)

$*S^{7\text{-}c}$ (A.D. 1230) Mt. Sinai. Syr. 143, a paper MS of the Ps and Cant., Nest.; Prayer of Isaiah on folios 273^{a}-275^{a}. (32 variants, or 1%; 1 singular, or 3.1%, with no support.)

$*S^{8\text{-}c}$ (A.D. 1240) Mt. Sinai. Syr. 242, a paper MS of the Ps and Cant., Nest.; Prayer of Isaiah on folios 157^{b}-158^{b}. (33 variants, or 1.1%; 6 singular, or 18.2%.)

$*S^{9\text{-}c}$ (A.D. 1196) Mt. Sinai. Syr. 257, a paper MS of the Ps and Cant., Nest.; Prayer of Isaiah on folios 114^{a}-115^{a}. (31 variants, or 1%; 1 singular, or 3.2%, with no support.)

$*S^{10\text{-}c}$ (12t8) Mt. Sinai. Syr. 260, a paper MS of the Ps and Cant., Nest. (Malkite), dated A.D. 1186; Prayer of Isaiah on folios 109^{b}-110^{b}. (25 variants, or .82%; 2 singular, or 8%, with no support.)

$W^{1\text{-}c}$ (16-17th cent.) Woodbrooke (Selly Oak Colleges Library). Mingana Syr. 25, a paper MS of the Ps and Cant., Nest.; Song of Isaiah on folios 118^{b}-119^{a}. (1 variant, or .03%; not singular, and with no support.)

$W^{2\text{-}c}$ (A.D. 1589) Woodbrooke. Mingana Syr. 284, a paper MS of the Ps and Cant., Jac.; Song of Isaiah on folio $68^{a\text{-}b}$; Prayer of Isaiah on folio $72^{a\text{-}b}$. (22 variants, or .72%; 5 singular, or 22.7%, with no support.)

$W^{3\text{-}c}$ (A.D. 1824) Woodbrooke. Mingana Syr. 300, a paper MS of the Ps and Cant., Jac.; Song of Isaiah on folio $59^{a\text{-}b}$. (5 variants, or .16%; none singular.)

W^{4-c} (A.D. 1589) Woodbrooke. Mingana Syr. 393, a paper MS of the Ps and Cant., Jac.; Song of Isaiah on folio 69^{a-b}. (5 variants, or .16%; 1 singular, or 20%, with no support.)

W^{5-c} (A.D. 1824) Woodbrooke. Mingana Syr. 428, a paper MS of the Ps and Cant., Nest.; Song of Isaiah on folio 122^{a}. (1 variant, or .03%; not singular, but confined to Cant. MSS, and with no support.)

W^{6-c} (17th cent.) Woodbrooke. Mingana Syr. 507, a paper MS of the Ps and Cant., Nest.; Song of Isaiah on folio 62^{b}. (1 variant, or .03%; not singular, and with no support.)

(To be continued)

A HISTORICAL APPROACH TO THE *'R'LM* OF IS 33 : 7

SIEGFRIED J. SCHWANTES
Andrews University, Berrien Springs, Michigan

It is well known that the words אראל in 2 Sa 23 : 20 and אריאל of the parallel passage in 1 Chr 11 : 22 have posed a major crux to translators. The same is true of אראלם in Is 33 : 7. The RSV in fact left the word in the first two of the above mentioned texts untranslated, and made the marginal observation, "The meaning of the word *'arî'ēl* is unknown." It is the purpose of this paper to present considerations which favor taking the word as a proper noun, and then suggest the possible relation between this word and אראלם of Is 33 : 7.

S. R. Driver [1] in his excellent study of the books of Samuel favored reading 2 Sa 23 : 20 with a slight emendation drawn from the LXX as follows, את שני בְּנֵי אראל "the two sons of Ariel." [2] Since אראל מואב is grammatically unsound, Driver further suggested the reading מִמּואב just as מקבצאל in the same verse, or, in a less convincing way המואבי. [3] At any rate, Driver assumes אראל to be a proper noun, and his position seems well taken.

On the other hand W. Rudolph in his commentary on the books of Chronicles [4] expresses the opinion that *'arî'ēl* is not a proper name but means "warrior, war hero," and cites the Syriac and Targum for support.

[1] S. R. Driver, *Notes on the Hebrew Text of the Books of Samuel* (Oxford, 1913), p. 368.

[2] Driver, *loc. cit.*, dismisses the clever but fanciful emendation of Klostermann, את שני בְּנֵי הָאֲרִי אֶל מַחֲבֹאָם "smote (and pursued) the two young lions into their hiding-place."

[3] These suggestions are adopted by R. Kittel in the margin of his *BH*[3].

[4] W. Rudolph, *Chronikbücher* ("Handbuch zum Alten Testament"; Tübingen, 1955), pp. 98, 99.

The presence of אראל in the inscription of the Moabite Stone is no mere coincidence, and no effort to elucidate its meaning can exclude this important source. Albright takes the אראל of the Mesha Inscription, line 13, as a proper name. He reads the pertinent section as follows, "And I brought back from there Arel (or Oriel), its chieftain, dragging him before Chemosh." [5] As early as 1943 Albright suggested this reading, [6] calling attention to the possible relation between Arel here and the name of an eponymous ancestor of a clan of Gad, recorded both in Gen 46 : 16 and Num 26 : 15-17. It is true that in both texts the spelling is אראלי and not אראל as in the Moabite Stone. This poses a slight problem since, according to Cross and Freedman, in the Moabite Stone "matres lectionis are used consistently in the final position. With the exception of the word *'nk* . . . all final vowels are represented." [7] Since five of the seven names in Gen 46 : 16 have the *nisbe* ending, it is possible that they are really gentilics denoting the clans of Gad, and not necessarily the original names of their respective progenitors.

While G. L. Harding [8] agrees substantially with Albright's translation of l. 13, A. H. van Zyl in his doctoral dissertation published in 1960 reverts to the translation of אראל "altar-hearth." [9] His only support for this is Eze 43 : 15, 16, where the pointing of the word poses problems of its own. The weakness of this view is made more evident when the same writer translates דודה by "his god," which he relates in a tortuous way to "beloved one" or "father's brother."

Now the reference to אראל in the Moabite Stone is certainly

[5] W. F. Albright, *Archaeology and the Religion of Israel* (3rd ed.; Baltimore, 1953), p. 218, n. 86; and *ANET*, p. 320.

[6] *BASOR*, No. 89 (February, 1943), p. 16.

[7] Frank M. Cross and D. Noel Freedman, *Early Hebrew Orthography* (New Haven, Conn., 1952), p. 37, n. 8. On p. 40 the same authors follow Albright in translating *'r'l dwdh* by "Arel its commander."

[8] G. L. Harding, *The Antiquities of Jordan* (New York, 1959), pp. 26, 27.

[9] A. H. van Zyl, *The Moabites* (Leiden, 1960), p. 190.

bound to the mention of the tribe of Gad, with which the Moabites seemed to have been in constant warfare. The historical relationship between the tribe of Gad and the Moabites was the object of an intensive study by M. Noth. [10] Mesha in his inscription knows nothing of the tribe of Reuben, which according to the evidence was either absorbed or dominated by the tribe of Gad. The reason for this is easy to see in the aggressiveness of Gad contrasted with the traditional instability of the Reubenites. Noth holds that not until the time of David did the tribe of Gad extend its territory southward to the Arnon at the expense of the Moabites (2 Sa 8 : 2 and 24 : 5). [11] What is certain is that the boundary line between Gad and Moab was a shifting one, and while the core of the Moabite territory was the region south of the Arnon, it undoubtedly extended with varying fortune as far north as Mount Nebo and adjacent areas. [12] According to Jugs 3:12-30 a Moabite king held territory opposite Jericho, and even crossed to the western bank of the Jordan in some plundering raid until checked by Ehud.

In Noth's opinion [13] the different treatment given by Mesha to the "land of Medeba" and the city of Jahaz—which were simply incorporated into the territory of Moab, whereas Ataroth and Nebo suffered a much harder fate, their entire populations being slaughtered in a typical *ḥērem* sacrifice—shows that Ataroth and Nebo were considered foreign territory. But this again demonstrates that the Gadites had enclaves deep in Moabite territory, and that instead of speaking of the occupation of territory we should refer only to the occupation of cities.

Even more intriguing are the relations between Gad and the city of Dibon (modern *Dhiban*), capital of Moab in the

[10] Martin Noth, "Israelitische Stämme zwischen Ammon und Moab," *ZAW*, LX (1944), 11-57.
[11] *Ibid.*, pp. 41, 42.
[12] Cf. Noth, *The History of Israel* (New York, 1958), pp. 156, 157.
[13] Noth, *ZAW*, LX (1944), 46.

days of Mesha. It was at *Dhiban* that the Moabite Stone was found by Klein in 1868. Num 32 : 34 states that the sons of Gad built Dibon and other places usually regarded as Moabite cities. Num 33 : 45, 46 makes a double reference to Dibon-Gad as if harking back to an old tradition linking Dibon with the settlement of the tribe of Gad. The same tradition is reflected in Num 32 : 34-42, which distributes the Transjordanian tribes from south to north in the order: Gad, Reuben and Manasseh.

This digression on the relations between Gad and Moab is intended to corroborate the view that Arel of Mesha's inscription might well be the name of a clan of Gad which was particularly obnoxious to the Moabites, because of either its religious stance or its fierceness in battle. Their lion-like temper in war might be reflected in their name אראל, "lion of God." This would explain why this clan should be singled out by Mesha for a particular punishment, *i.e.*, to be dragged before Chemosh, the chief god of the Moabites. If this view is correct, then the lacuna at the end of l. 17 should be rather read עבדי, "worshipers," instead of כלי, "vessels," as proposed by van Zyl. [14]

That Gad and Moab were neighbors for centuries, retaining a rather fluid identity, is clear from the preceding considerations. It is quite likely that they intermarried to a great extent. What is often overlooked is the close relation between Gad and David. Even such a meticulous researcher as Noth missed a connecting link between the two when he stated on p. 14 of his article already quoted, ". . . im Anfang der Königszeit hat das südliche Ostjordanland, so viel wir aus der erhaltenen Überlieferung wissen, keine geschichtliche Rolle gespielt." [15] Speaking of the warrior bands that joined David in his guerrilla warfare in the days when Saul put a price on his head, the Chronicler says that a group of Gadites "went over to David" (1 Chr 12 : 8-15). They are described

[14] Van Zyl, *op. cit.*, p. 191.

[15] Noth, *ZAW*, LX (1944), 14.

as "mighty and experienced warriors, expert with shield and spear, whose faces were like the faces of lions." This pointed characterization recalls the אראל of Mesha's inscription and of Gen 46 : 16.

There must be some historical reason for this attachment of the Gadites to David. It would not be fanciful to seek a possible reason in the sojourn of the ancestors of David in Moabite territory. [16] Apparently it was considered quite normal for inhabitants of Judah to cross over into Moabite territory in times of stress. Considering that the Dead Sea was fordable in the region of the Lisan peninsula as late as 1830, it is quite conceivable that the people of Judah crossed over into Moabite territory more often than is usually imagined. [17] David sent his own parents into the safety of Mizpeh of Moab, while he himself seemed to be on friendly terms with the king of Moab in those early days. [18] That David's parents should feel at home in Moab is only to be expected, considering their ancestry. The marriage of Boaz with Ruth might not be a single instance, but typical of many such occurrences. We must keep in mind, though, that Moab might designate a political unit as well as a territory which was occupied by the tribe of Gad to greater or lesser extent since the migration of the Israelites into Canaan. To sojourn in the land of Moab might mean no more than to sojourn among friendly Gadites who worshiped the same God.

With this background in mind we may turn to 2 Sa 23 : 20 and explore the possible implications of the text. The hero

[16] On the historicity of the book of Ruth see G. S. Glanzman, "The Origin and Date of the Book of Ruth," *CBQ*, XXI (1959), 201-207, and H. H. Rowley, "The Marriage of Ruth" in *The Servant of the Lord and Other Essays On the Old Testament* (London, 1952), p. 164, n. 1.

[17] See F.-M. Abel, *Géographie de la Palestine* (Paris, 1938), I, 504, who quotes Croisière for authority, saying that the Dead Sea ceased to be fordable after 1830. This is also the opinion of G. A. Smith, *The Historical Geography of Palestine* (New York, 1894), p. 500, who quotes in support Burckhardt's *Travels*.

[18] 1 Sa 22 : 3, 4.

Benaiah was the son of Jehoiada who hailed from Kabzeel. Outside this text and the parallel one of 1 Chr 11 : 22, Kabzeel is mentioned only once, and that in Jos 15 : 21. This text places it in the extreme south, "toward the boundary of Edom." In Neh 11 : 25 we find a single reference to the village of Jekabzeel, which might or not be the same, likewise settled by people of the tribe of Judah. Simons in his *The Geographical and Topographical Texts of the Old Testament* equates Jekabzeel with Kabzeel. [19] In the case of Jekabzeel there is the possibility that it was located in Moabite territory, since in the same list of Neh 11 it is mentioned next to Dibon. The OT knows no other Dibon than that of Moab, twice called Gad-Dibon as we have seen. In the light of the above considerations it would not be strange for migrants from Judah to settle in Dibon if its ancient affinities with the tribe were still remembered.

The point we are driving at is that Benaiah might well be of the tribe of Gad, living in territory which at some time or other had belonged to Moab. This would explain why he should have killed two בְּנֵי אראל of Moab. He lived there and there he established his reputation for bravery. His prowess would then consist not in having killed two mighty lions of Moab, for the same verse singles out his killing a lion in a pit in a day of snow (2 Sa 23 : 20). His prowess would rather consist in having killed two representatives of the fierce Gadite clan of Arel. That the Gadites were particularly brave in war is specifically stressed in 1 Chr 12.

If we follow the story a little further, this Benaiah who was "renowned among the thirty" heroes of David, eventually became captain of his bodyguard (2 Sa 23 : 23). This bodyguard was composed mainly of the Cherethites and Pelethites, whom most students identify with foreign mercenaries,

[19] J. Simons seems to think that Dibon of Neh 11 : 25 is a wrong transcription for Dimon (Dimonah) which is mentioned in Jos 15 : 22 (*The Geographical and Topographical Texts of the Old Testament* [Leiden, 1959], pp. 388, 389). Abel (*op. cit.*, I, 504) concurs. However, Abel rejects the equation of Dimon of Is 15 : 9 with Dibon (*op. cit.*, II, 305).

probably Philistines and their allies. At the accession of Solomon to the throne, Joab made the mistake of supporting the losing rival and was replaced in the command of the army by Benaiah, who had thrown his support behind Solomon. Benaiah's fierce disposition is further underlined by the fact that as commander of the army he struck down in quick succession, by royal command, Adonijah, Joab, and Shimei (1 Ki 2 : 25, 34, 46).

If Benaiah then was a Gadite, or a migrant from Judah to the territory of Gad (Moab), it should not be surprising that first as captain of David's bodyguard, and later as commander of the army under Solomon, he would have attached to the royal service those brave Gadites who had voluntarily joined David when his fortunes were at low ebb. And the record in 1 Chr 12 : 8-15 makes clear that these Gadites were without peer in the art of war; they were true אֲרִי אֵלִים, *i.e.*, heirs of a martial tradition, fierce as lions.

A possible reference to these permanent members of the royal bodyguard might be found in Is 33 : 7. The pointing אֶרְאֶלָּם is evidently wrong. R. Kittel suggested in the critical apparatus of his *BH* the reading אראלים, which still leaves the word as a crux in the text. The LXX offers no help for this passage. The Targum of Isaiah [20] evidently took the word for a verb and paraphrased הא כד תתגלי להון, "Behold, when it is revealed to them . . ." The Vulgate, following the same lead, renders it by *videntes*. Commenting on the text in the *Interpreter's Bible*, R. B. Y. Scott says, "an obscure word, best connected to אריאל and translated 'the priests of the altar.'" However, this is evidently an *ad hoc* translation. Much closer to the point in our opinion is Cheyne, [21] who renders it as "the Ariels, *i.e.*, 'God's lions,' picked warriors, each as a lion, and as invincible as his God." A perusal of

[20] J. F. Stenning, ed., *The Targum of Isaiah* (Oxford, 1949), p. 107.
[21] T. K. Cheyne, *The Prophecies of Isaiah*, I (New York, 1890), p. 190.

other commentaries on Isaiah shows a great variety of views on the interpretation of the word under consideration. [22]

It is our suggestion that אראלם in Is 33 : 7 should be pointed אֲרִיאֵלִים and understood as members of the royal bodyguard who traced their ancestry back to אראלי of the tribe of Gad. RSV's "valiant ones" makes good sense and goes as far as the translation of a proper name might go. It also makes a good parallel to "messengers" of the second hemistich. But historically the word is a gentilic just as Cherethites and

[22] R. Lowth in *Isaiah* (Boston, 1834), p. 61, favored the reading אראלים with the meaning "lions of God, or strong lions." H. Ewald in *Commentary on the Prophets of the Old Testament*, II (London 1876), p. 260, emended it to אֲרֻאָלִם "fearful," from רעל = ראל, Arab. *ra'ila*, "to fear." T. R. Birks in *Commentary on the Book of Isaiah* (London, 1871), p. 172, understood the word as meaning "their Ariels, or valiant captains," making no attempt at derivation. C. W. E. Nägelbach in *The Prophet Isaiah* ("Lange's Commentary on the Holy Scriptures"; New York, 1878), p. 353, connected it with אֲרִיאֵל of 1 Chr 11 : 22 and 2 Sa 23 : 20. He explained the pointing אֲרִאֶלִם by analogy with אֲבִיָּסָף of 1 Chr 6 : 8, 22, obviously related to אֲבִיאָסָף of Ex 6 : 24. F. Delitzsch in *Commentar über das Buch Jesaia* (Leipzig, 1889), p. 352, translated it by *Recken*, "heroes," connecting it with אֲרִיאֵל in the parallel passages of 2 Sa 23 : 20 and 1 Chr 11 : 22. He regarded it as a composite of אֲרִי and אֵל meaning "lions of God," but adding the *caveat* that אֵל, here, only adds the connotation of "exceptional" and "wonderful." A. Dillmann in *Der Prophet Jesaja* (6th ed., reedited by R. Kittel; Leipzig, 1898), p. 294, considered the word corrupt and suggested the reading אַרְאֵלִם "heroes," or אֲרִאֵלִם "their heroes." G. W. Wade in *The Book of the Prophet Isaiah* (2d ed.; London, 1929), p. 211, also emended the word to אֲרִיאֵלִים "Ariels," *i.e.* "lions of God," "heroes," assuming that "lions of God" was an honorific designation of a warrior. J. Skinner in *The Book of the Prophet Isaiah* in "Cambridge Bible for Schools and Colleges" (Cambridge, 1930), p. 264, remarked wryly, "This word is hopelessly obscure." He mentions the suggestion that it is a gentilic name, meaning "inhabitants of Ariel," probably in reference to Is 29 : 1. J. Fischer in *Das Buch Isaias* ("Die Heilige Schrift des Alten Testaments," VII; Bonn, 1937), p. 216, read "die von Ariel," relating it to Is 29 : 1. E. J. Kissane in *The Book of Isaiah*, I (Dublin, 1941), p. 374, favored the view that אראלם means "the men of Ariel."

Pelethites, which, by the way, disappeared from the record after David's days. Benaiah needed them no longer, since he could count on the valiant Arelites.

SOME NOTES ON THE SABBATH FAST IN EARLY CHRISTIANITY

KENNETH A. STRAND
Andrews University, Berrien Springs, Michigan

In a recent issue of the *AUSS* Robert A. Kraft presented a discussion of Sabbath observance in early Christianity. [1] Through its richness of allusion, his article suggests various further areas for investigation. [2] At the same time, that very richness may in some instances inadvertently leave an erroneous impression, for who could possibly treat so complex a matter so comprehensively without such a risk? The following notes are addressed to a possibility of this kind.

From certain incidental remarks made by Kraft, as well as the third point in his summary, [3] it would appear that Sabbath *fasting* and Sabbath *idleness* are of one and the same stock, representing a Jewish sort of observance against which

[1] "Some Notes on Sabbath Observance in Early Christianity," *AUSS*, III (1965), 18-33.

[2] *E.g.*, Quartodeciman practice in the East, particularly after the so-called "Asian settlement" of the late 2d century; analysis of the precise meaning of Sabbath "observance" and Sunday "observance" in the early Christian centuries (a matter too frequently ignored by investigators, but toward which Kraft has already taken a significant step in *op. cit.*, p. 23; see further in our note 4, below); the relationship of the Sabbath fast to developments regarding Sabbath and Sunday in the early church (one facet of which will be briefly treated in the present article); the role, significance and influence of Judaizing practices and anti-Judaizing sentiment in the whole process; the meaning of the term "sabbatizing"; the effect of Roman-Jewish, Roman-Christian and Jewish-Christian relationships; geographical factors involved in the historical picture; the matter of the annual Easter Sunday in relationship (or in lack of relationship) to the weekly Sunday; etc. Some of these areas have, of course, been explored; but most, if not all, of them still leave much work to be done.

[3] For the incidental remarks see his article, pp. 24, 28; for the summary statement, p. 32.

there was considerable Christian reaction. [4] In his summary statement, for example, he declares that

> some Christian communities observed *both* Sabbath *and* Sunday at least from the 3d century, and probably earlier, but there was a widespread attempt to divorce Sabbath observance from the ideas of solemnity (fasting) and idleness by making it a day of meditation and rejoicing (like Sunday)—that is, Sabbath "rest" was interpreted in a much wider sense than Rabbinic Judaism would permit. [5]

In essence, the foregoing statement is correct, but from it may arise a faulty impression of the origin and role of the Sabbath fast. [6] Although idleness and various Sabbath restrictions adopted by certain Christians may indeed have been borrowed from the Jews and thus have become the object of anti-Judaizing polemic, [7] the same can hardly be said regarding the Sabbath fast. Rather, the Jews themselves appear to have made the Sabbath anything but a day of fasting. The Book of Judith, for example, pictures Judith as fasting "all the days of her widowhood, except the eves of

[4] We will frequently use the term "Sabbath observance" herein, and it should be noted that when this term is applied to usage in the early church it is intended to imply what was involved in *that* practice, whatever it may have been, rather than what may be involved in any modern definition of "Sabbath observance." Kraft has already (*op. cit.*, p. 23) taken an important step in clarifying this point, but it should be remembered that his definition derives from the official position expressed in canons of the Council of Laodicea (middle to late 4th century) and thus represents *one* particular locale at *one* particular time. Although other sources would indicate wider application of definitions similar to that of Laodicea, there is no reason to suspect any monolithic uniformity or homogeneity. In fact, as Kraft himself has made clear (see p. 24 of his article; also our own further discussion below), there was historical development with respect to concepts and practices.

[5] See his article, p. 32.

[6] The term "Sabbath fast" as used herein will signify a *weekly* fast on the seventh day of the week, unless the context indicates otherwise. As we shall note presently, this practice was far from universally observed in the early church. There was, however, also an annual Sabbath fast which does seem to have been observed universally in early Christendom. It occurred on the Sabbath of the Passover/Easter season.

[7] Cf. note 15, below.

the sabbaths, and the sabbaths, and the eves of the new moons, and the new moons, and the feasts and solemn days of the house of Israel." [8] Even the strictest sects of the Jews at approximately the beginning of the Christian era evidently refused to consider the Sabbath as a fast day, as may be inferred from the Book of Jubilees (known to have been in use among the Qumran sectarians) [9] and possibly also from the *Damascus Document.* [10] That the early Christian church recognized the "non-Jewishness" of the Sabbath fast is evidenced, for example, by Augustine's rhetorical remark, "Did not the tradition of the elders prohibit fasting on the one hand, and command rest on the other?" [11] And as late as the 11th century the pattern appears to have been the same, for Cardinal Humbert in his *Adversus Calumnias Graecorum* could, as R. L. Odom has pointed out, [12] have the Roman observer of the Sabbath fast chide the Greek non-observer in the following words:

> Therefore, in such observance of the Sabbath, where and in what way do we [Latins] have anything in common with the Jews? For they are idle and keep a holiday on the Sabbath, neither plowing nor reaping, and by reason of custom do not work, but they hold a festivity and a dinner. . .. But we [Latins] observe none of these things, but we do every (sort of) work, as (we do) on the preceding five days, and we fast as we (are wont to) fast on the sixth day [Friday] [13] next to it.
>
> However, you [Greeks], if you do not judaize, tell (us) why you have something in common with the Jews in a similar observance of the Sabbath? They certainly observe the Sabbath, and you observe (it); they dine, and always break the fast, on the Sabbath. [14]

[8] Judith 8 : 6.

[9] Cf. Jubilees 50 : 10, 12, 13.

[10] *CDC*, xi. 4, 5. The normative tradition also, of course, prohibited Sabbath fasting. Josephus (*Life*, 54) makes mention of the requirement in his day to eat the noon meal on the Sabbath.

[11] Ep. 36 (To Casulanus), par. 6.

[12] "The Sabbath in the Great Schism of A.D. 1054." *AUSS*, I (1963), 77, 78.

[13] Wednesday and Friday were regular fast days in the early Christian church, as is evident from the *Didache* (8 : 1), Tertullian (*On Fasting*, chap. 14), the *Apostolic Constitutions* (V. 15. 20), and other sources.

[14] The translation is from Odom, *op. cit.*, pp. 77, 78.

The foregoing should make abundantly clear the distinction between Sabbath *idleness* and Sabbath *fasting*. The former, along with walking measured distances and other Sabbath restrictions, [15] could be (and was) considered Judaizing, but the latter was looked upon quite differently. The former concept did indeed derive from a Jewish background, but the idea of the Sabbath fast originated and developed in a Western Christian context and was in reality quite foreign to Jewish thought. The Christian East did not adopt the Sabbath fast in the early Christian era, [16] and even in the 11th century the matter was, as we have seen, a cause for dispute between East and West. On the other hand, in the earliest Christian centuries the practice had gained a foothold in the West, particularly in Rome. There were, however, important areas even in the West that did not observe it, such as Milan at the time of Ambrose (d. 397), [17] and certain churches and regions of North Africa at about the same time, as Augustine makes clear. [18] In fact, Augustine further describes the pattern of adherence to the Sabbath fast as being "the Roman Church and some few other churches near to or distant from it." [19] Moreover, with respect to North Africa, Tertullian had approximately two centuries earlier indicated the existence of a similar divergence regarding the matter of kneeling on

[15] The "measured distance" or "prescribed space" is mentioned, for example, in the interpolated form of Ignatius, *To the Magnesians*, chapter 9. The Sabbath-day's Journey is treated in detail in the *Mishnah*, tractate "Erubim"; and numerous other Sabbath restrictions are found in the tractate "Shabbath." The Talmud, of course, has much added detail.

[16] Cf., *e.g.*, the citations from Augustine in note 19, below; John Cassian, *Institutes*, III. 9. 10. etc.

[17] See Paulinus, *Vita Ambrosii*, chap. 38; also Augustine's Ep. 36 (To Casulanus), par. 32, and Ep. 54 (To Januarius), par. 3, where is related Ambrose's counsel for Augustine's mother to fast or not fast according to the custom prevailing where she might be, just as Ambrose himself fasted on the Sabbath in Rome but not in Milan.

[18] Ep. 36 (To Casulanus), par. 32.

[19] Ep. 36 (To Casulanus), par. 27. Somewhat similar descriptions are given in the same epistle, par. 4, and Ep. 82 (To Jerome), par. 14.

the Sabbath [20]—a practice which, being considered a mark of humiliation, seems to have been closely allied in meaning to that which the fast signified. [21]

It would appear that the point of origin of the Sabbath fast was Rome, from where it spread in the West; but the sources are in conflict as to how or why the practice arose in the first place. Possibly the annual Sabbath fast of the Passover/Easter season [22] was simply extended to become a weekly observance, as Tertullian seems to have thought, [23] and as may also be deduced from words attributed to Pope Sylvester I (early 4th century). [24] On the other hand, one persistent tradition current in Rome itself even in the time of John Cassian (d. *ca.* 440) links it to a fast which the apostle Peter was said to have observed on Saturday in preparation for his encounter with Simon Magus. [25] Cassian's own comment was that such a fast was not intended to be canonical but had been observed simply because of the particular emergency of the time; in fact, if the need had demanded, Peter would undoubtedly have fasted on Sunday (a day, of course, on which the Romans never fasted)! [26]

We may now sum up what has been said thus far by stating that although in one limited sense Sabbath idleness and Sabbath fasting can be classified together, in other and probably more significant ways they are virtually in opposite camps; for they differed in origin and basic intent, and they patterned differently historically (with Christians who fasted regularly on the Sabbath still uttering polemics against Judaizing [27]). We may now also add that they undoubtedly

[20] *On Prayer*, chap. 23. [21] *Loc. cit.* [22] See note 6, above.

[23] Tertullian, *On Fasting*, chap. 14. Tertullian himself (*loc. cit.*) opposed fasting on the Sabbath, except at the Passover season.

[24] See the reference in Humbert's *Adversus Calumnias Graecorum* as quoted in Odom, *op. cit.*, p. 78.

[25] *Institutes*, III. 10.

[26] *Loc. cit.*

[27] We have already referred to Cardinal Humbert. We may just add that Gregory the Great in his epistle *To the Roman Citizens* also has a striking anti-idleness polemic.

differed, as well, in ultimate effect with regard to the subsidence of Sabbath observance itself as a Christian practice. The Judaizing emphasis was at least an effort (though misguided) to respect the Sabbath, whereas the fast tended to strike a deathblow to the Sabbath by placing it in utter disrespect as a day of sadness and gloom rather than of Christian joy. [28]

The anti-Judaizing emphasis in the early church could (and did) emanate from both East and West, but the anti-fasting emphasis could arise only in circles (primarily Eastern) not observing the Sabbath fast and presumably seeing danger in this innovation. In at least the earliest period (as Kraft has aptly pointed out with respect to the Ignatian statement in *Magnesians* 9 [29]), the anti-Judaizing or anti-Sabbatizing emphasis may not have been involved with the matter of days at all, but rather with a manner of worship or way of life; namely, Christian liberty as versus Jewish legalism. [30] When this sort of polemic was first clearly applied to days (again in the early period), it was used in an effort to encourage a Sabbath observance of spiritual, rather than merely formal and legalistic, quality. [31] On the other hand, the Sabbath fast was ever (even from its very beginning) directly related to *a particular day* and *the particular treatment given that day*. Indeed, Christians who were themselves anti-Judaizers were undermining the real significance of Sabbath observance by

[28] In fact, it is not impossible that the Sabbath fast was *one* significant element (certainly there were others as well) in bringing about the ultimate ascendancy of Sunday over the Sabbath in Christian worship, as well as effecting the final disappearance of the Sabbath in certain areas, for in places where the Sabbath fast was observed it became customary regularly week by week to have a Sabbath day of gloom followed by a Sunday of joy. The effect of such a procedure, especially on the youth of the church, can readily be surmised.

[29] See his article, p. 28.

[30] This emphasis appears, of course, not only in the Fathers but also in the NT. Cf., *e.g.*, Col 2 : 14-17; Gal 4 : 9-11; and Rom, chap. 14.

[31] Kraft, *op. cit.*, p. 24, quotes the expanded version of Ignatius, *To the Magnesians*, chapter 9, which bears on this very point.

making the Sabbath a fast day. And thus, we may conclude, that whereas the anti-Judaizing polemic was directed against a legalistic "Jewish" way of life and/or a legalistic "Jewish" mode of observing days, the anti-fasting polemic was directed against a non-Jewish innovation which held within it seeds that would tend to destroy the Sabbath itself.

One further observation may be made in conclusion: The whole question of Sabbath and Sunday observance in the early church—including the history of the rise of Sunday as a Christian institution, the eclipse of Sabbath observance, and the relationship between the two days when they were both observed side by side [32]—is indeed a complex one, deserving analysis of many interrelated factors; but in the procedure, care must be taken not to overlook (as has too frequently been done) geographical considerations as well as chronological, political, theological and other concerns. Developments moved unequally from place to place, as well as from time to time, and it is here suggested that a thorough analysis which gives due regard to this fact may uncover some very striking facts and illuminating insights regarding developments in early Christian history. This sort of an approach to the history of Sabbath and Sunday in the early church is, to my mind, still an important desideratum. [33]

[32] There is abundant evidence of "observance" of both days in the early period. See, *e.g.*, Sozomen, *H.E.*, VII. 19; Cassian, *Institutes*, V. 26; *Apost. Consts.*, V. 20; VII. 23; VIII. 47, can. 64; etc. There appears to be further supporting evidence from the history of the Greek lectionary, whose lections for Sabbath and Sunday originated earlier than those for the other five days of the week. (Cf. C. R. Gregory, *Canon and Text of the New Testament* [New York, 1907], pp. 387, 388, as well as the standard work of E. C. Colwell and D. W. Riddle, *Prolegomena to the Study of the Lectionary Text of the Gospels* [Chicago, 1933]). A detailed analysis of this intriguing line of evidence as it pertains to the question of the relationship of Sabbath and Sunday in the early church would indeed be of interest.

[33] Kraft's article, by virtue of its limited scope, can hardly have been expected to accomplish this. But I have yet to see a full-scale treatment of the subject that does justice to geographical considerations. Walter E. Straw, *Origin of Sunday Observance in the Christian*

Church (Washington, D. C., 1939), has indeed outlined a history of the rise of Sunday observance on the basis of geographical considerations, but he has read into his sources a preconceived theory rather than derived from them a pattern of development. His opinion is that Rome and Alexandria introduced Sunday observance from paganism through Gnosticism, whereas Asia and Syria maintained a Sabbath practice in harmony with apostolic precedent. Possibly his thesis originated through an impression from a statement of Sozomen to the effect that in the Christian world of Sozomen's time (5th century) there were assemblies on both Sabbath and Sunday, except in Rome and Alexandria (see *H.E.*, VII. 19). But the method by which this information is read back into the earlier centuries is totally unsound. Justin Martyr, *e.g.*, is noted (p. 29) as giving evidence for Alexandria (dubious indeed!), and is referred to (p. 50) as endeavoring to bring to Christians a more sympathetic feeling toward the Greek and Oriental philosophies (the very proof of this—*Apol.*, II. 13—proves in fact, the opposite; namely, that Justin was showing to pagans the superiority of Christianity!). Indeed, the sources are altogether too frequently read without due regard to either literary or historical context. This type of treatment is certainly far different from that which is really needed.

TRANSLITERATION OF HEBREW

CONSONANTS

א	= ʾ	ד	= ḏ	י	= y	ס	= s	ר	= r
בּ	= b	ה	= h	כּ	= k	ע	= ʿ	שׂ	= ś
ב	= ḇ	ו	= w	כ	= ḵ	פּ	= p	שׁ	= š
גּ	= g	ז	= z	ל	= l	פ	= p̄	תּ	= t
ג	= ḡ	ח	= ḥ	מ	= m	צ	= ṣ	ת	= ṯ
דּ	= d	ט	= ṭ	נ	= n	ק	= q		

MASORETIC VOWEL POINTINGS

ַ	= a	ֱ, ְ (vocal shewa)	= ᵉ	ֹ	= ō
ָ	= ā	ֵי, ֶי	= ê	ֳ	= ᵒ
ָה	= ª	ִ	= i	וֹ	= ô
ֶ	= e	ִי	= î	ֻ	= u
ֵ	= ē	ָ	= o	וּ	= û

ABBREVIATIONS OF BOOKS AND PERIODICALS

AAS	Annales archéol. de Syrie
AASOR	Annual, Amer. Sch. of Or. Res.
ADAJ	Annual, Dep. of Ant. of Jordan
AER	American Ecclesiastical Review
AfO	Archiv für Orientforschung
AfP	Archiv für Papyrusforschung
AJA	Amer. Journal of Archaeology
AJSL	Amer. Journ. of Sem. Lang. and Literature
ALBO	Analecta Lovan. Bibl. et Orient.
ANF	The Ante-Nicene Fathers
AO	Acta Orientalia
ARG	Archiv für Reformationsgesch.
ARW	Archiv für Religionswissenschaft
ASAE	Annales, Serv. des Ant. de l'Ég.
ASB	Acta Sanctorum (ed. Bolland)
AThR	Anglican Theological Review
AUSS	Andrews Univ. Sem. Studies
BA	Biblical Archaeologist
BASOR	Bulletin, Amer. Sch. of Or. Res.
Bib	Biblica
BIES	Bulletin, Israel Expl. Soc.
BIFAO	Bulletin, Inst. Franç. d'Arch. Or.
BiOr	Bibliotheca Orientalis
BJPES	Bulletin, Jewish Pal. Expl. Soc.
BJRL	Bulletin, John Rylands Library
BMB	Bulletin du Musée de Beyrouth
BQR	Baptist Quarterly Review
BR	Biblical Research (Chicago)
BRG	Biblioth. Rerum Germanicarum
BS	Bibliotheca Sacra
BT	Bible Translator
BZ	Biblische Zeitschrift
CBQ	Catholic Biblical Quarterly
CC	Christian Century
CdE	Chronique d'Égypte
CH	Church History
CIG	Corpus Inscript. Graecarum
CIL	Corpus Inscript. Latinarum
CIS	Corpus Inscript. Semiticarum
CJTh	Canadian Journal of Theology
CSEL	Corpus Script. Eccl. Lat.
CT	Christianity Today
ER	Ecumenical Review
EThL	Ephemer. Theol. Lovanienses
ET	Expository Times
HJ	Hibbert Journal
HThR	Harvard Theological Review
HUCA	Hebrew Union College Annual
IEJ	Israel Exploration Journal
Int	Interpretation
JACh	Jahrb. für Ant. und Christentum

JAOS	Journ. of the Amer. Or. Soc.
JBL	Journal of Biblical Literature
JBR	Journal of Bible and Religion
JCS	Journal of Cuneiform Studies
JEA	Journal of Egyptian Arch.
JJS	Journal of Jewish Studies
JNES	Journal of Near Eastern Studies
JQR	Jewish Quarterly Review
JR	Journal of Religion
JSS	Journal of Semitic Studies
JThS	Journal of Theol. Studies
LQ	Lutheran Quarterly
MGH	Monumenta Germaniae Historica
MQR	Mennonite Quarterly Review
NKZ	Neue kirchliche Zeitschrift
NPNF	Nicene and Post-Nic. Fathers
NRTh	Nouvelle Revue Théologique
NT	Novum Testamentum
NTA	New Testament Abstracts
NTS	New Testament Studies
Num	Numen
OCh	Oriens Christianus
OLZ	Orientalistische Literaturzeitung
Or	Orientalia
OTS	Oudtestamentische Studiën
PEQ	Palestine Exploration Quarterly
QDAP	Quarterly, Dep. of Ant in Pal.
RA	Revue d'Assyr. et d'Arch. Or.
RAC	Rivista di Archaeologia Cristiana
RB	Revue Biblique
RE	Review and Expositor
RdE	Revue d'Égyptologie
RHE	Revue d'Histoire Ecclésiastique
RHPR	Revue d'Hist. et de Philos. Rel.
RHR	Revue de l'Histoire des Religions
RL	Religion in Life
RLA	Reallexikon der Assyriologie
RQ	Revue de Qumrân
RSR	Revue des Sciences Réligieuses
SJTh	Scottish Journal of Theology
STh	Studia Theologica
ThEH	Theologische Existenz heute
ThQ	Theologische Quartalschrift
ThT	Theology Today
ThLZ	Theologische Literaturzeitung
ThR	Theologische Rundschau
Trad	Traditio
ThS	Theological Studies
ThZ	Theologische Zeitschrift
VC	Verbum Caro
VD	Verbum Domini
VCh	Vigiliae Christianae
VT	Vetus Testamentum
WThJ	Westminster Theol. Journal
WZKM	Wiener Zeitschr. f. d. Kunde d. Morgenlandes
ZA	Zeitschrift für Assyriologie
ZAS	Zeitsch. für ägyptische Sprache
ZAW	Zeitsch. für die alttes. Wiss.
ZDMG	Zeitsch. der Deutsch. Morgenl. Gesellschaft
ZDPV	Zeitsch. des Deutsch. Pal. Ver.
ZKG	Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte
ZHTh	Zeitsch. für hist. Theologie
ZKTh	Zeitsch. für kath. Theologie
ZNW	Zeitsch. für die neutest. Wiss.
ZSTh	Zeitschrift für syst. Theologie
ZThK	Zeitsch. für Theol. und Kirche