

certain man had two sons before any of them needed redemption. 'I will arise and go to my father' before he knew that his father would see him afar off and run and kiss him. More than that, the Cross depends on the Creation for its value. It is the Creator on the Cross that gives the Cross its value. The Cross is weakness, the Creation is strength. It is not weakness we cry for. It is weakness in strength.

'Tis the weakness in strength, that I cry for!  
 my flesh, that I seek  
 In the Godhead! I seek and I find it. O Saul,  
 it shall be  
 A Face like my face that receives thee; a Man  
 like to me,  
 Thou shalt love and be loved by, for ever: a  
 Hand like this hand  
 Shall throw open the gates of new life to thee!  
 See the Christ stand!

## A Recent Find of Jewish Measures.

BY A. R. S. KENNEDY, D.D., PROFESSOR OF HEBREW IN THE UNIVERSITY OF EDINBURGH.

IN the absence of a single known specimen of the ancient Hebrew measures of length and capacity, students of the subject have hitherto been almost entirely dependent for the values of the measures mentioned in the Old and New Testaments on the equations of these with the better known measures of Greece and Rome found in Josephus and other early writers. A special interest accordingly attaches to a double series of actual measures of capacity discovered a few years ago by the Assumptionist Fathers in Jerusalem. A full account of all the finds is given by Père Germer-Durand, well known to readers of the *Revue Biblique*, in a lecture on 'Mesures de capacité des Hébreux au temps de l'évangile,' published with illustrations in a small volume entitled *Conférences de Saint-Étienne, 1909-1910* (Paris: Librairie Victor Lecoffre, Rue Bonaparte 90).<sup>1</sup>

The measures in question belong to two distinct sets, one used apparently for liquids, the other for grain, flour, and the like. The first set consists of four stone vessels found at various dates from 1889 to 1907, and standing to each other in the proportion of 1, 2, 3, 4. The largest of the four, which we propose to distinguish as A, is 'a large stone vase of conical form, furnished with two projecting ears,' and is said to measure 21.25 litres,

which is 37.42 pints.<sup>2</sup> The measures, B, C, D, are, as has been said, respectively  $\frac{2}{3}$ ,  $\frac{1}{2}$ , and  $\frac{1}{4}$  of A, and their content can be calculated accordingly.

The important question now emerges: Which of the known Jewish measures of capacity do these vases represent? There is no mark of identification, it should be said, on any of the four. Unfortunately Père Germer-Durand has gone for his identification to the Oxford *Helps to the Study of the Bible*, where the values are taken from a French work published as far back as 1859. The result is that the largest measure (A), although containing only 21.4 litres, say 37.4 pints, is identified with the bath, and B, C, and D with the fractional parts thereof.

But this is little more than one-half of the size of the bath, and of its equivalent dry measure the ephah, as given by modern metrologists. The latter, it is true, have been almost wholly guided, for the reason stated above, by the numerous indications of the values of the Jewish measures in terms of the Roman and Attic measures found in such writers as Josephus and Jerome, and in the treatises of early writers on metrology. By all

<sup>2</sup> It should be stated at the outset that the quantities given by the lecturer cannot be those obtained in every case by actual measurement. No ancient measures ever constructed were so mathematically exact! The figures given clearly represent the *theoretical* values, deduced presumably from that of the largest measure. But even in this case the value is only given to the nearest large fraction of a litre. This method introduces an element of uncertainty as to the identification of the smallest measures mentioned below.

<sup>1</sup> A summary of the lecture, with illustrations of the measures, by Mr. Herbert Loewe appeared in *The Jewish Chronicle* for August 16, 1912. Excellent illustrations without explanations were given in *The World's Work*, for December 1912.

these the log, the smallest unit of capacity in the Jewish system, is equated with the Attic xestes and the Roman sextarius, as the bath (72 logs) is equated with the metretes (72 xestai). Now it is beyond dispute that the two former measures differed but little from an English pint, making the Jewish bath and the Attic metretes to contain something like nine imperial gallons, less or more. No doubt these equations were those found to be sufficiently accurate for everyday purposes, not those of the scientific metrologist who tells us that a pint =  $\cdot 56793$  of a litre! But it is surely self-evident that a metretes of *circa* 72 pints could never have been equated with a bath of only 37.

The fact is that the new Jerusalem measures represent only *the half of the measures with which they have been identified by their finders*. In other words, A must represent the  $\frac{1}{2}$  bath of 36 logs; B,  $\frac{2}{3}$  bath of 27 logs; C,  $\frac{1}{4}$  bath of 18 logs; and D,  $\frac{1}{8}$  bath of 9 logs. The clue to the names of the new measures is probably to be found in Epiphanius, who speaks of a 'sacred' hin of 9 xestai or logs (see Hulstsch, *Griech. u. römische metrologie*, 2 ed. p. 450). Accordingly, until further evidence is available, the new measures may be provisionally identified as one, two, three, and four sacred hins, the last being also half an ephah-bath.

The following table gives the values of the more important Biblical measures of capacity, on the new basis (bath = 42.5 litres); the values suggested by the present writer in the article 'Weights and Measures' in Hastings' *DB.* iv. 912 are added for comparison.

	Values in <i>DB.</i> iv.		New Values.	
	Litres.	Pints.	Litres.	Pints.
Log	$\cdot 56$	$\cdot 99$	$\cdot 59$	$1\cdot 04^1$
Kab (4 logs)	$2\cdot 25$	$3\cdot 96$	$2\cdot 36$	$4\cdot 16$
Omer ( $7\frac{1}{2}$ logs)	$4\cdot 05$	$7\cdot 13$	$4\cdot 25$	$7\cdot 48$
Hin (12 logs)	$6\cdot 75$	$11\cdot 88$	$7\cdot 1$	$12\cdot 47$
Seah (24 logs)	$13\cdot 5$	$23\cdot 76$	$14\cdot 17$	$24\cdot 94$
Ephah } (72 logs)	$40\cdot 5$	$71\cdot 28$	$42\cdot 5$	$74\cdot 83$
Bath } (720 logs)	$405$	$712\cdot 8$	$425$	$748\cdot 3$
Homer } (720 logs)				
Cor }				

It should be said, before leaving this part of our

<sup>1</sup> This value of the log is very near the latest valuation of the Attic xestes assigned by Flinders Petrie in his article 'Weights and Measures' in the *Encycl. Brit.* <sup>11</sup>, viz. 35 cubic inches, say  $1\cdot 01$  pint (a pint contains  $34\cdot 659$  cubic inches).

subject, that the values in the above table are not decisive for the values of the measures in earlier times, when they were not quite so large as they afterwards became. Thus, in an interesting passage in the Mishna (*Menakhoth*, vii. 1), it is stated that '5 Jerusalem seahs are equal to 6 wilderness seahs,' *i.e.* the seahs of Mosaic times. This means that in the first century of our era, to which the new measures probably belong, the Jerusalem measures were  $\frac{1}{5}$ , or 20 per cent. larger than the earlier measures, say, of the days of the monarchy. It is probably the older and smaller value that Josephus has in mind when he states (*Ant.* iii. xv. 3, as amended by Hulstsch) that 30 seahs of wheat were equal to 41 modii (the modius = *circa*  $15\frac{1}{2}$  pints), for this seah of about 21 pints, when increased by a fifth, is but a trifle in excess of the new value of 25 pints given in the table.

I pass now to the second set of measures discovered by the Assumptionist Fathers. Some four or five years ago, when clearing out the ruins of the Church of St. Peter on the western hill, they came upon a small circular chamber cut in the rock, in which the mill of a private house had been installed. Of this mill an interesting description is given by the reverend Father in his lecture. In an adjoining chamber, and elsewhere in the vicinity, was found a set of eleven small stone measures, which turned out to be in definite proportional relations to each other, and all in a similar relation to the dry measure known originally as the omer, and later as the issaron, or 'tenth part' of the ephah (*Ex* 16<sup>36</sup>). An omer per head, it will be remembered, was the quantity of manna allowed to be gathered daily in the wilderness (*Ex* 16<sup>16ff.</sup>).

These eleven measures have been, wrongly as I believe, described by Père Germer-Durand as ranging from one-sixth of an omer to 8 omers, owing to his mistaken identification of measure A with the ephah-bath, as explained above. One result of this supposed equivalence, to which he himself calls attention, is the absence of the omer measure itself, the one measure we should expect to find in such a set. In reality the measures in question represent just one-half of the denominations proposed in the lecture, as was the case with the liquid measures previously discussed. Indicating the various measures, from the smallest upwards, by italics we get the following results. First, a set of fractional parts of the omer—the

value of which, as entered in the above table, was approximately half a peck—viz. (a)  $\frac{1}{15}$ , (b)  $\frac{1}{6}$ , (c)  $\frac{1}{4}$ , (d)  $\frac{2}{3}$ , (e)  $\frac{3}{4}$ , and (f)  $\frac{5}{8}$  of an omer. Then (g) the measure which I identify as the omer measure itself, valued by the lecturer as 2 omers; further (h)  $1\frac{2}{3}$  omer, which is half a seah, also called a trikab (*i.e.* 3 kabs, *τρικαβος*, תריקב) in the Talmud, otherwise the dry measure equivalent to the hin for liquids (12 logs); and finally (i) 2 omers, (k)  $2\frac{1}{2}$  omers, the quarter ephah, and (l) 4 omers.

The Assumptionist Father is probably right in his suggestion that these vessels were used for measuring out the tithes of the flour and other meal ground in the domestic mill. If this sugges-

tion is followed out, it will be found that the smaller measures, at least, are all a tenth part of familiar larger measures. Thus the three smallest measures, *a*, *b*, *c*, represent the tithe of  $\frac{1}{4}$ ,  $\frac{1}{2}$ , and  $\frac{3}{4}$  seah; the next highest denomination,  $\frac{1}{3}$  omer, the tithe of a whole seah, is not represented in the set, but *d*, *e*, and *f* are the tithes of 2,  $2\frac{1}{2}$ , and  $2\frac{1}{2}$  seahs respectively.

It is to be hoped that other specimens of all the measures discussed in this essay, and of others not represented, will soon to be found. Only when a sufficient number of specimens of ancient weights and measures are available to permit of an average being struck can reliable and definite results be obtained.

## The Great Text Commentary.

### THE GREAT TEXTS OF I CORINTHIANS.

#### I CORINTHIANS VI. 19, 20.

**Ye are not your own; for ye were bought with a price.—R.V.**

THE best exposition of the text is the simplest. Take the Apostle's own phrases separately. But we must change their order; for it is because we were bought with a price that we are not our own.

#### I.

**'Ye were bought with a price.'**

The words 'Ye were bought with a price' occur twice in this Epistle. The connexion in the two passages is somewhat different, but the leading idea is the same in both. We have a Master, an Owner, who has a paramount, absolute, inalienable property in us. We are His slaves, His chattels, His implements. All other rights over us are renounced, are absorbed, are annulled in His rights. He has acquired us by virtue of purchase. In the first passage, the present text, St. Paul says, 'Ye are not your own; for ye were bought with a price.' In the second (1 Co 7<sup>23</sup>) he says, 'Ye were bought with a price; become not bond-servants of men.' Not slaves to self, not slaves to men—this is the twofold lesson which we gather from the passages considered side by side. The ownership of self is done away. The lordship of our fellow-men is no more. One slavery alone

remains, the most abject, most absolute, of all slaveries. We are the slaves of Christ.

1. *Ye were bought.*

(1) If God bought man, it shows that He *values man*. Is there anything else that God bought besides man? You say, 'The cattle upon a thousand hills,' do they not belong to God? And all the gold and all the silver, are not these all His? Yes; they are His. Not only the cattle, but the hills on which they graze, and all the trees which beautify the hills are His too. And not only the metal, but the broad earth out of which it is dug is His property. 'The earth is the Lord's, and the fulness thereof.' He made all these. But it is not said that He bought them. He made man too. But man unmade himself, effaced the image of God, wiped out the beautiful, the Divine, and sold himself into the slavery of sin. Then, when there was no eye to pity and no arm to save, He came to help, and bought man by the gift of Jesus Christ, thus showing to us for ever how much He valued man.

(2) If God bought man, it shows that He *wants man*. We seldom buy things we do not want. There may be times when a man may try to make a tradesman believe he does not want a certain article for which he is driving a hard bargain; but that is only to beat down the price. In our daily life we but seldom buy what we do not want. God wants man, longs for him, seeks him, strives with