

imagine who'd taught them; I hadn't), and one of the good Sisters who saw them said, 'Oh, look at those rough lads! That's Fr. Stanton's influence.' It wasn't my influence at all; it was the influence of the buns and the glass of milk. Then the service began, and we had that Litany of Monro's ['The Story of the Cross'], and they all sang it: and when we got to the last section beginning:

Oh, I will follow Thee,  
Star of my soul,  
Through the deep shades of life  
To the goal,

they all sang the last word as 'gaol'—and upon my word before the next Good Friday every one of 'em had been in gaol."

## The Grandson.

BY THE REV. MOSES GASTER, PH.D., CHIEF RABBI OF THE SPANISH AND PORTUGUESE  
JEWS' CONGREGATIONS, LONDON.

ON the Punic inscription of Byblos which dates from the fifth to fourth cent. B.C. the name of Yehomelek appears as the son of Yeharba'al and then יבן יבן of Armelek.

The word for son is here duplicated. It has hitherto been taken to mean 'the son of the son,' i.e. the grandson of the person mentioned after the second יבן, 'son.' All who have discussed and commented on this inscription have been unanimous in the opinion that we have here a strictly genealogical line stretching from Yehomelek to Armelek, and that the last mentioned name was the third in the direct line of descent separated one from the other only by one generation. This unquestionably has a direct bearing on history and chronology, and unless properly elucidated might easily lead to confusion and wrong conclusions. Hence the value to be attached to this description of the relation between Yehomelek and Armelek, the assumed 'grandson' and 'grandfather,' and the proper relation which existed between them.

It is surprising that no one should have felt the obvious difficulty of translating יבן יבן as grandson. To whom does it refer? If to Yehomelek then it is unnecessary, for it is evident to the most casual reader that Yehomelek, being the son of Yeharba'al, must be the grandson of Armelek, the very next person mentioned in the inscription. And if it is to refer to Yeharba'al, then why should the name of his father have been omitted and only that of his grandfather given? If they knew the latter surely they must have known the former, and there is no reason why he should not have been mentioned. Another explanation must therefore be sought.

Neither the mason who cut the inscription nor the king who ordered it invented this way of recording the genealogy of the royal family. They merely followed what must have been the universal practice. It must have appealed to the readers and must have been clearly understood by them. Otherwise, if unintelligible or open to an ambiguous interpretation, it certainly would not have been used on a royal public monument, nor is it admissible to see in it a mistake of the mason. What then could be the real meaning of the duplication of the word 'son'?

Is it a mere coincidence that we find in the oldest Samaritan Chronicles hitherto preserved precisely the same use of the duplicate 'son' in passages containing lists of members of ruling families.

The oldest Chronicle, or what is considered to be the oldest, the Tolidah, is assumed to have been compiled in the first half of the twelfth century. This, however, is the date only of the compiler, not that of the material used by him. It is no doubt very ancient material, consisting originally of lists of genealogies jealously preserved through the ages, without any other biographical or historical detail as is the case in the 'Chain of the Samaritan High Priests' (published by the present writer in the *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society*, April 1909), or other similar lists preserved with such tenacity among the peoples and families of the East. These are the skeletons for the more ample chronicles of which the Samaritans have also a goodly number. In every one of them one can find the same materials used and to such an extent that the one seems to be merely an amplified copy

of the other. Here, then, we find we are dealing with very old material faithfully handed down and equally faithfully preserved. This is not the first instance in which I have had occasion to convince myself of this fact, and the more Samaritan texts will be published and critically examined the more will it be established as an unassailable axiom that we have in this literature an extremely old relic of times which go back to that of the Maccabean period, if possible, even older still. In these Chronicles, short and long, we find various genealogical lists in which, as in the Byblos inscription, we meet with  $\text{בן}$  and  $\text{בן בן}$ , *i.e.* son, and the duplication, *e.g.* in the Tolidah, ed. Neubauer, p. 16.

I have obtained from the Samaritans two copies of this Tolidah which may assist in the publication of a new and revised edition. One of them (my Cod. No. 1161) is very carefully and calligraphically written, and has as marginal glosses some highly important additions. Among them the description of the burning of a red heifer for the preparation of the ashes required for the purification from uncleanness. But this by the way.

In order to be quite sure in my interpretation of the Samaritan Chronicles, especially the portion connected with the calendar, I read it with the Samaritans, and when I asked what the duplication of  $\text{בן}$  meant I was told by them that it did not mean 'grandson,' but on the contrary it marked a break in the direct line of succession. One or more links in the chain were missing. Only those names were then mentioned which were genealogically connected but not in the direct line of father and son in unbroken succession. Only the fact that the first named was the ancestor of the last named was to be conveyed to the reader by this duplication. This at once solves the problem of the Punic inscription. By using the form  $\text{בן בן}$  Yeharba'al or Yehomelek was to be shown as the descendant of that ancestor who probably was a famous man in the local history. It was a source of pride to be connected, in direct descent, with such an ancestor. And this was a very important point, which Yehomelek did not wish to have overlooked or forgotten. Now the Samaritans, living in close proximity to the Phœnicians and in constant contact with them, could easily have borrowed that practice from them. Any one acquainted with the history of Oriental nations is aware of the immense value of proper genealogical tables.

The link between the Samaritans and the old

Phœnician tradition is furnished by the Palmyrene tradition. In some of the inscriptions the same duplication of son,  $\text{בן}$ , is found. In these inscriptions the use of this formula is still more surprising, for we find here long genealogical lists, and it is therefore rather curious to find suddenly in the midst of them  $\text{בן בן}$ , when so many other names are connected with one another by the simple  $\text{בן}$ . Lidzbarski, in his *Handbuch der Nordsemitischen Epigraphik* (Weimar, 1898), p. 135, notices this fact, and the only explanation he can give is that it is a repetition and due in all probability to a mistake made by the mason or to the unwitting omission of a name between the double  $\text{בן}$ , which has fallen out by some error. How unsatisfactory such an explanation must be is self-evident. Those who erected these monuments would not have exposed themselves to the ridicule of tolerating such faulty inscription. And if they were keen enough to reproduce a whole string of names they would certainly not have allowed a single one of them to drop out, owing to some mason's error. The real explanation seems to be that this repetition served to show that here was a lacuna in the genealogy, and that one or more links in the chain were really missing.

Kings and priests (Kohanim), more than any other members of the community, watched jealously over their genealogical lists, so as to prove the purity of their descent and the qualification for the service in the Temple. The same held good with the royal house of David and his descendants and also other prominent families. No wonder therefore that, even in cases where an intermediate link had snapped, they none the less were anxious to connect the surviving members and at the same time to preserve historical accuracy by marking the fact that in one place there was a gap. Once this fact is recognized some of these chronological difficulties might disappear. Among the Jews a slightly different practice prevailed. True, the word  $\text{בן}$  (son) was not reduplicated, but the same meaning was evidently attached to it, notably in such cases where the whole weight was put on the first ancestor, or ancestors. The immediate line of succession was of secondary value, so long as it could be traced in a direct line. The very chapter in Matthew 1 proves this to have been the case. For the sake of symmetry it was divided up in groups of ten. It is, however, a mistake to take it as meaning that each one of the men was the

immediate son of the preceding man. One or more links may be missing, yet it did not affect the real intention of the author of the genealogy to prove the descent from David. The name of the ancestor becomes a patronymic. We find Mephibosheth called the son of Saul (2 S 19<sup>24</sup>) though he was the grandson. Even Obed is called the son of Naomi though he was only indirectly her grandson (Ru 4<sup>17</sup>).

The best proof for such abbreviated lists where  $\text{בן}$  is used with the figurative meaning of descendant is the genealogy of Mordecai (Est 2<sup>5</sup>), or even the genealogy of David in Ru 4<sup>21ff</sup>. In Ezekiel we already find the prophet being called son of Adam, being directly connected with the first ancestor. The Messiah is then called the Son of David (Sanhed. 98a ff.). Jesus is called the Son of Man or Adam. This would solve the difficulty among others of the genealogy of Machir which is so perplexing (Gn 50<sup>29</sup>, Nu 26<sup>29</sup>, etc.). Examples can be adduced to prove such use of the word 'son' in the applied meaning of descendant. More numerous are the examples in the long lists in the books of Ezra, Nehemiah, and especially Chronicles, where, by applying this principle, difficulties which have appeared insurmountable would thus be set at rest. If we turn now to post-Biblical literature, the principle seems to have been even more generally applied than has hitherto been realized. Names of well-known scholars like Ben Azai, Ben Johai, Ben Zakkai by their very form show that they are not meant to be taken otherwise than as being patronymics, and not the

names of the immediate father, as has hitherto been assumed. We have, then, in the Chapters of the Fathers (5<sup>22</sup>) a certain Ben Bg Bg, and in the next verse (23) a certain Ben Hē Hē. No one has as yet succeeded in explaining these curious names. It is probable, however, in view of the foregoing that these names were those of well-known personalities, of whom their descendants had reason to be proud. They were well known to the contemporaries, but owing to some political or religious reason—sectaries—were mentioned only by some initials. Be that as it may, this use of  $\text{בן}$  to mark descent has continued for many centuries. The greatest Massorites are known as Ben Asher and Ben Naphtali. There is not the slightest doubt that these two names stand for two schools and two families of Massorites. So probably is the case with Ben Ezra. There are a large number of persons who claim to belong to the Ben Ezra family. It would be easy to multiply examples from the Rabbinical and mediæval literature. It is sufficient to refer to Levy's Talmudic Dictionary, *s.v.* vol. i. 238–241. Many a chronological difficulty could thus be obviated, if we allow the same latitude to the interpretation of the simple  $\text{בן}$ , and see in it the parallel to  $\text{בן בן}$  without the graphic duplication. Once this is established it will be helpful in many directions towards the elucidation of many Biblical and post-Biblical genealogical and chronological problems. Of no less importance is the fact that we have here again another proof for the high antiquity of the Samaritan Tradition.

## Contributions and Comments.

### The Ethics of the Jael Narratives.

THE real difficulty in the Jael story is not in the fact that she murdered Sisera. That act (as was admirably shown in the article on Jael in THE EXPOSITORY TIMES for May) was one which could be justified up to the hilt according to the morality of her time, and was therefore in the circumstances worthy of the highest commendation. The crucial difficulty is to be found in the honour accorded to a person who had deliberately violated the most sacred law of social morality known to the Semites. Considering the fundamental place this unwritten

law held in the estimation of Jael's contemporaries, it seems inconceivable that its violation could under any circumstances have been palliated, much less deemed worthy of the very highest praise. The suggestion made that Arabs have sometimes been known to act in defiance of this law does not really help matters; even in these days atrocious crimes are sometimes committed, but those who commit them are nevertheless considered beyond the pale of civilized society.

Nor does it suffice to say, with Dr. Bernard (*Hastings' Bible Dictionary*), that 'Jael's act was *not* in accordance with contemporary morality. . . .