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

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

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

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

R. H. KENNETT.

\section*{THE IMAGE OF GOD.}

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

In his commentary on Numbers at p. 155, Dr Buchanan Gray refers to a suggestion contained in an article of mine (Jewish Quarterly
Review x 669) to read לַעֲלֹם בְּלָה בְּלָה in ch. xiv 9. But if any merit attaches to this suggestion it is due entirely to Dr Neubauer, who put it forward in the Athenaeum of Feb. 28, 1885, p. 280. I think that when writing in the Jewish Quarterly Review x, I may have had in mind an imperfect recollection, or unconscious memory of his proposed emendation. Had my recollection been explicit I should, of course, have acknowledged the debt. So too as regards the vocalization of לַעֲלֹם, for which Dr Gray refers to another paper of mine (Jewish Quarterly Review xi 259), I ought to have quoted that of the LXX, Σαλτραα, given by him at p. 399. Such oversights will happen to any man who reads widely without making written notes—a fault pardonable to an invalid.

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

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

---

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

GREY HUBERT SKIPWITH.

A FURTHER NOTE ON COSMAS.

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

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

161 C ἐν γὰρ ἐξ ἡμέρας συνετέλεσε, καὶ κατέπανσεν] ἐν γὰρ ἐξ ἡμέρας ἐποίησεν ὁ Θεός τὸν ὦμαν καὶ τὴν γῆν καὶ πάντα τά ἐν αὐτοῖς καὶ τῇ ἕβδομῃ κατέπανσεν V.L.S.

176-7 οὗτος ὦμανοι καὶ γῆς Κύριος ὑπάρχων, οὗ καὶ χειροποιήσεις ναοὶ κατοικεί, οὗτος ὑπὸ χειρῶν ἀνθρώπων θεατεῖται, προσδεόμενος τοὺς, αὐτὸς διδὼν πάση ζωήν καὶ πνεύμα καὶ πάντα, ἐποίησε τε ἐξ ἐνός αἰματος] V.L.S. read ὑπάρχων Κύριος and omit οὗ κ震撼 χειροποιήσεις . . . πάντα καὶ αἵματος.

180 D τοιοῦτος γὰρ ἕμν ἔπρεπεν ἀρχιερεὺς γενόμενος] V.L.S. have δοὺς ἀκακος ἀμάντος κεχωρικόρες ἀπὸ τῶν ἀμαρτωλῶν καὶ ψυχονιστός τῶν ὦμανοι αὐτὴς ἀρχιερείας.

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

212 B τί νόμα αὕτου ἵωάνην. V and S add καὶ καλέσει τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ ἵωάνην.

221 B δι’ ἄνθρωπον ἀνάστασις νεκρῶν εἰσήχθη ἐν τῇ γῇ] καὶ ἀνακεφαλαίωσασθαι τὰ πάντα ἐν τῷ Χριστῷ, τὰ τε ἐν τῷ ὦμαν (τοῖς ὦμανοις L S) καὶ τὰ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς (ἐν τῇ γῇ L S) V.L.S.

245 C προφήτην ὑμῖν ἀναστήσει Κύριος ὁ Θεός ὑμῶν. αὐτοῦ ἀκούσετε. Καὶ δὲ ἄνθρωπος δὲ ἐὰν μη ἀκούση διὰ ἀν λαλήσῃ ὁ προφήτης ἑκεῖνος ἐπὶ τῶν ἀνόματι μου, ἐξολοθρευθήσεται ἡ ψυχή αὐτῆ ἐκ τοῦ λαοῦ αὐτῆς] προφήτην ὑμῖν ἀναστήσεις Κύριος ὁ Θεός ἐκ τῶν ἀδελφῶν ὑμῶν ὡς ἐμέ. αὐτοῦ ἀκούσετε κατὰ πάντα, ὅσα ἐν εἴπῃ πρὸς ὑμᾶς. ἢτας δὲ πάσα ψυχή ἡ ἑτε (ἐκ τῆς L S) οὐκ ἀκούσει (εἰςάκοινε L¹, εἰςάκοινε L²S) τοῦ προφήτου ἑκεῖνου ἐξολοθρευθήσεται ἐκ τοῦ λαοῦ αὐτῆς V.L.S.

253 A τὶ ἔστω ἄνθρωπος, ὃ ἐμχήση αὐτοῦ, ἡ νῦν ἄνθρωπου, ὅτι