THE MEANING OF ייִנְיַהּלָּא ייִנְיַהּלָּא IN THE OLD TESTAMENT


Before my attention was drawn to Sulzberger's publication I came to the conclusion that ייִנְיַהּלָּא ייִנְיַהּלָּא meant in many passages of the Old Testament 'the leaders of the land', 'the representatives of the people', something like 'Parliament'. Now I venture to suggest that in all the passages, in which ייִנְיַהּלָּא ייִנְיַהּלָּא occurs, that term means 'the landed gentry, the landowners, the landed aristocracy, the lords of the land, the representatives of the people'.

What is the origin of this term? Sulzberger says: 'The term Am Ha-Aretz has had a chequered career. In its origin it probably meant the people of a foreign land' (p. 15).

I submit that the origin of the term is simply 'the land'. ייִנְיַהּלָּא Y payments to Abraham (Gen. ch. xxiii). Joseph controlled the land, and the owners of the land had to buy the corn from him. That is the meaning of Gen. ch. xliii, v. 6 a:

וזכrosis הג連續 עלך замור הוא החובב לעליו זכר

Joseph acquired all the land of the Egyptians, that is, of the Egyptian landowners. Their land passed into the possession of the king (Gen. ch. xlvii, v. 20). And the people, that is, the owners of the land, he transferred to the towns. This is the meaning of the words אימים הגרה ערב עיר וPasswordEncoder (v. 21 a). The translation 'And as for the people, he removed them city by city' is not correct. The rendering (based upon an emended text) 'And the people he reduced to bondmen' (see Skinner's Commentary on Genesis, p. 500, and the Commentaries of

1 The substance of a paper read at the Orientalist Congress at Oxford 1928.
Holzinger, Gunkel, and Driver, also Kittel's *Biblia Hebraica*) is to be rejected. The Massoretic text triumphs. The מְכֹר (מְכֹר), were no more מְכֹר, as they were deprived of their land. They became now town-dwellers. Only the priests did not sell their land (see v. 22).

The priests were thus also a part of the מְכֹר.

That מְכֹר in Exod. ch. v, v. 5 means 'the representatives of the people' I endeavoured to shew in a short article in the *Jewish Quarterly Review*, vol. xii (1921). מְכֹר has the same meaning in Lev. ch. iv, v. 27. A member of the מְכֹר had to bring a special sacrifice. First the מְכֹר is mentioned (ch. iv, v. 3). Then the מְכֹר is referred to in v. 13. (According to Sulzberger the מְכֹר was the High Court of the מְכֹר. The English House of Lords is the highest Court of Appeal; only a small part of the House of Lords sits as a Court of Justice.) Then the מְכֹר, who is the President of the מְכֹר and of the מְכֹר, is mentioned (v. 22). Cohen, Edah, and Nasi were all component parts of the מְכֹר, each having special functions to perform.

In v. 27 the general body of the מְכֹר is mentioned. They can all afford to bring animal sacrifices: oxen, goats, and lambs. Ch. v, vv. 1–13, speaks of poor people, who were either what was called מְכֹר, or, perhaps, who did not belong to the מְכֹר, and, therefore, sometimes could not afford even doves, but only fine flour (v. 11).

מְכֹר in Lev. ch. xx, vv. 3 and 4 is probably the executive body of the מְכֹר, the lords of the land as a Court of Justice.

Sometimes the word מְכֹר is omitted and only the word מְכֹר is used.

We understand now why Lev. ch. xxi, v. 1 has the words מְכֹר, מְכֹר, מְכֹר מְכֹר (the priest) 'shall not defile himself for the dead among his מְכֹר', among his fellow-peers. And v. 3 מְכֹר receives an excellent meaning. v. 3 is regarded as very difficult. Dillmann, in his Commentary on Leviticus, says: 'v. 4 nicht mehr erklärbar und wohl corrupt'. Bertholet says: 'v. 4 ist in seiner gegenwärtigen Gestalt unverständlich', and suggests the reading of מְכֹר, מְכֹר, מְכֹר. See also Baentsch's Commentary and Kittel's *Biblia Hebraica*. The verse as it reads in the Massoretic text is now, I suggest, perfectly clear. The priest is a מְכֹר among his מְכֹר, i.e. a lord among his fellow-lords. מְכֹר מְכֹר 'master', 'lord'. The מְכֹר was a lord. 'Lord' is the English equivalent of the Hebrew מְכֹר. מְכֹר in v. 14 and מְכֹר מְכֹר in v. 15 have also the more specific meaning. The priest may only marry a daughter of the מְכֹר.

The מְכֹר in 2 Kings, ch. xi, v. 14, vv. 18, 19, and 20 denotes the representatives of the lords, the House of Lords. The lords appointed the sovereign lord, the king. In v. 17 the word מְכֹר is left out. In 2 Kings, ch. xvi, v. 15, the burnt-offering of the whole מְכֹר is mentioned together with the burnt-offering of the king. In 2 Kings, ch. xxi, v. 24, again the מְכֹר are the representative lords.
NOTES AND STUDIES

v. 35 all are the lords of the land. Note the words: נָחַר וְעַתָּם נָחַר ‘but he taxed the land to give the silver’. The land-less, the poor people, had no silver and no gold to give. The great men of the land, the big landowners, were called נָחַר (ch. xxiv, v. 15), and the poorer lords were called נָחַר (v. 14). In ch. xxv, v. 3 it is said that even the landowners had no bread (לְאָרָץ חֲלֹם). In v. 12 we read of the נָחַר they also rendered military service (אֶת הָעַנָּהוֹן מֵעַרְבָּי). The highly placed men enumerated in Isa. ch. xxxiii, vv. 2 and 3 were, it seems, members of the נָחַר. Isa. ch. v, vv. 8–23 are directed against the landowners (see especially vv. 8–10). נָחַר is mentioned in Isa. ch. xxiv, v. 4: נָחַר מִרְכָּבָּה יָדָם. In v. 6 they are called נָחַר יָד. The whole ch. xxiv, it seems, is directed against the נָחַר. The same, I think, can be said of ch. xxviii.

Jeremiah, in ch. i, v. 18, speaks of the kings of Judah, its princes, its priests, and the נָחַר. In ch. v Jeremiah speaks against the נָחַר (cf. vv. 17 and v. 31). The same can be said of ch. vii (cf. v. 16) and ch. viii (cf. v. 1 and vv. 5 and 10). In ch. xvii, v. 19 we read of the נָחַר; in ch. xix, v. 1 of the נָחַר. Ch. xxii speaks of the נָחַר (see v. 2, vv. 4 and 13 ff.). Ch. xxiii speaks of the נָחַר (cf. v. 33). In ch. xxviii the נָחַר in the sense of נָחַר is mentioned several times. In the same sense נָחַר is mentioned in ch. xxxiv (vv. 8, 10). In ch. xxxiv, v. 19 Jeremiah speaks of the princes of Judah and the princes of Jerusalem, the officers, and the priests and the whole נָחַר. In ch. xxxix, v. 8 the house of the נָחַר is called נָחַר and is mentioned together with the house of the king. ‘The House of Lords’ is almost a literal translation of נָחַר. In ch. xxxix, v. 10 we read of the נָחַר. In ch. xliv, v. 21 Jeremiah speaks of the kings, the princes, and the נָחַר, or נָחַר, is also mentioned several times in ch. lii.

Ezekiel ch. vii is directed against the lords of the land. Interesting is the exclamation in v. 2: נָחַר לְאָרָץ יִשְׂרָאֵל (comes an end’. The lords of the land will lose their land and all their possessions. Note in v. 7 נָחַר יָשִׁיב. And at the end of ch. vii נָחַר is mentioned together with the king and the prince (in v. 27) and the priest and the prophet and the elders (in v. 26). In ch. xxii, vv. 23–31 are directed against the נָחַר. The priests, the prophets, the princes, are mentioned, and then the נָחַר is spoken of (v. 29). Ch. xxxiv is directed against the נָחַר. They are called נָחַר. Ch. xliv speaks of the prince and of the נָחַר (see especially vv. 16 and 22).

Amos, in ch. vi, speaks against the נָחַר (called in v. 1 נָחַר), also in ch. viii (in v. 2 נָחַר).
Micah, in ch. ii and ch. iii, speaks against the people of the land (in ch. iii, v. 1 רַחַל ush ebru יִשְׂרָאֵל). In Hag. ch. ii, v. 4 the High Priest and the whole house of the Lord are mentioned together.

In Ps. cvii, v. 32 the people of the land is referred to in the words יִשְׂרָאֵל. Apart from this verse יִשְׂרָאֵל is not mentioned in the Psalms. The reason, it seems to me, is this: the Psalmist is not concerned with the people of the land as a group. The Psalmist is concerned more with the individual landowner, with the individual possessor of wealth. In a paper, which I read before the Society for Old Testament Study in December 1927, I endeavoured to shew that יִשְׂרָאֵל meant 'the man of wealth, the man of position (the man of wealth was mainly the owner of land), the rich man', very often with the connotation of 'wicked'. יִשְׂרָאֵל were 'the rich', very often 'the wicked rich'. And the Psalmist speaks against the individual יִשְׂרָאֵל and for the people יִשְׂרָאֵל. For this reason the יִשְׂרָאֵל is not mentioned in the Psalms.

In Job ch. xii, v. 2 יִשְׂרָאֵל has the meaning of יִשְׂרָאֵל. יִשְׂרָאֵל (v. 2) receives a much more pointed meaning: 'Surely, you are lords!'. And in v. 24 יִשְׂרָאֵל יִשְׂרָאֵל, the heads of the people of the land, are mentioned together with counsellors, judges, kings, priests, the mighty ones (אַטְנִיטֵים), men of trust, elders, princes, and the strong ones.

In Ezra, too, יִשְׂרָאֵל (יִשְׂרָאֵל is usually left out) means 'the lords of the land'. I hope, in the near future, to deal more fully with יִשְׂרָאֵל and יִשְׂרָאֵל in Ezra (especially with ch. iv, v. 4). Suffice it to say here that the יִשְׂרָאֵל mentioned in ch. ix, v. 1 were the יִשְׂרָאֵל. The princes spoke to Ezra. And 'the hand of the princes and rulers hath been first in this faithlessness' (v. 2). The lords of the land, the possessing classes, inter-married with the people יִשְׂרָאֵל (v. 2 and v. 11) or the people יִשְׂרָאֵל (ch. x, v. 2) of the other nations.

To sum up: יִשְׂרָאֵל in the whole of the Old Testament means 'the lords of the land', in the wider or narrower sense.

One more word about יִשְׂרָאֵל. יִשְׂרָאֵל was the individual member of the people יִשְׂרָאֵל. יִשְׂרָאֵל, derived from רַחַל רֵעַ, means 'the man of wealth' . יִשְׂרָאֵל, derived from רֵעַ רַחַל in the sense of 'the man of wealth', means 'the possessor of land', 'the man of wealth'.

The meaning of יִשְׂרָאֵל suggested here will, I think, yield many important results for the exegesis of the Old Testament.

A word may be added on the post-Biblical meaning of יִשְׂרָאֵל, 'the ignorant people'.

In the course of time the יִשְׂרָאֵל fell into disrepute. The prophets spoke against them. In the time of Ezra they intermarried with the other nations. 'The lords of the land' became a byword for their wrongdoings and for their neglect of the Torah, and in later times they became the
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prototype of the ignorant people. 'The lord of the land' became 'the ignorant peasant'. Hence the later term of ṣennātu for 'the ignorant people', or 'the ignorant man'. Thus this riddle also seems to be solved.

S. DAICHES.

A SYRIAC PATRISTIC MANUSCRIPT

While glancing through the written hand-list of the Oriental manuscripts in the possession of the British Museum, I noticed one Syriac codex which seemed to me to be of considerable theological interest and importance. I propose, therefore, to give a description of this volume, together with some of its principal contents.

_Oriental MS 8606_, entered under the year 1920. It consists, in its present state, of 141 parchment folios, measuring 25.2 x 16.0 cm.; written in a beautiful Estrangela hand, in double columns, 36 lines to the column. Many of the leaves have been much damaged by exposure in a damp place. Parts of the original binding have been pasted on to the inside of the modern covers. The MS is dated, according to the most reasonable interpretation of the colophon, in Nisan, A. Gr. 1034 (A. D. 723). It is imperfect, at least nine leaves being wanting at the beginning, while between folios 94 and 95 two leaves have disappeared.

The twenty-two Homilies and letters contained in this codex are in every case by (or are, at least, attributed to) Orthodox or Chalcedonian authors—one of them being a translation of the famous Tome of Leo to Flavian. We are, therefore, as Mr E. W. Brooks was quick to point out to me, dealing with a Melchite MS. All but one of these Homilies and letters are translations of Greek patristic works, the exception being Item 17, a Homily by Ephraim on the Nativity, an original Syriac poem. The chief interest of the MS consists in the fact that, of the various pieces contained in it, at least two are, so far as I have been able to discover, no longer extant in Greek and have not till now been known in Syriac translations. These are Item 14, a Homily by Amphiloctius of Iconium on John xiv 28, 'My father who sent me, is greater than I', and Item 22, a section of the Letter of Sophronius, Bishop of Jerusalem, to Arcadius, Bishop of Cyprus.

9. Fol. 34 b to 43 a. Again a homily of the same S. Athanasius the Bishop, which was said by him concerning the saying in the Gospel: 'He who blasphemes against the Spirit, it shall not be forgiven him' (Mark iii 29, Luke xii 10).

Beginning: 'Concerning the saying in the Gospel to which while writing thou didst refer me, forgive me, O my beloved, having with