



Comment on "Biblical Studies: The Last Chapter of Zechariah: The Central Sanctuary of Deuteronomy"

Author(s): G. H. Skipwith

Source: *The Jewish Quarterly Review*, Vol. 5, No. 2, (Jan., 1893), pp. 347-348

Published by: University of Pennsylvania Press

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/1449874>

Accessed: 18/06/2008 14:55

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use, available at <http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp>. JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use provides, in part, that unless you have obtained prior permission, you may not download an entire issue of a journal or multiple copies of articles, and you may use content in the JSTOR archive only for your personal, non-commercial use.

Please contact the publisher regarding any further use of this work. Publisher contact information may be obtained at <http://www.jstor.org/action/showPublisher?publisherCode=upenn>.

Each copy of any part of a JSTOR transmission must contain the same copyright notice that appears on the screen or printed page of such transmission.

JSTOR is a not-for-profit organization founded in 1995 to build trusted digital archives for scholarship. We work with the scholarly community to preserve their work and the materials they rely upon, and to build a common research platform that promotes the discovery and use of these resources. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

the Prague edition (1793) of Abraham Farisols אגרת אורחות עולם, the following lines (p. 20b):—וּשְׁם הָיָה קִאֲפִיטַעַן נִיבּוֹר בַּפְּקוּדָת פְּרִידְרִיךְ—: החמישי ז"ל מלך דענימארק זה שלשים שנה ונס הוא מצא ביעמאן יהודים רבים ובעיר המלוכה סאנא יש בכמו אלפים בעלי בתים והרבה דברים עליהן :

W. BACHER.

Budapest, September, 1892.

"*Apodasmo Judæorum capta* is unintelligible" wrote the late Professor Grätz (JEWISH QUARTERLY REVIEW, Vol. III., p. 207, note 1). Yet a glance at Liddell and Scott will remove the difficulty. ἀποδασμός, ὁ, (ἀποδατέομαι), a division, part of a whole. Thuc. i. 12, gives exactly the sense required; and the Latin writer who has transliterated this word instead of translating it, may easily have altered the gender. "*Apodasmo Judæorum capta*" in S. Jerome is thus exactly equivalent to "*partem aliquam de . . . Judæis . . . cepit*" in the Armenian version recast into Latin; and to the Greek of Syncellus, μερικὴν (comp. Cheyne, JEWISH QUARTERLY REVIEW, Vol. IV., p. 108, n. 2: μικρὴν as quoted by Grätz, III., 208, n. 1) αἰχμαλωσίαν εἶλεν Ἰουδαίων, Cp. Zech. xiv. 2.

It occurs to me to add that St. Jerome probably mistook ἀποδασμός for the name of a place, and that his words must be understood "*Apodasmo [scilicet urbe] Judæorum capta.*" (Compare Graetz's footnote.) This explains both the transliteration and the change of gender.

While on this subject, I should like to add a suggestion with regard to Is. lxvi., which Cheyne in the article above cited refers to the same occasion (JEWISH QUARTERLY REVIEW, IV. 120). Some of the difficulties of this hypothesis would perhaps be removed if vv. 7-14 ("Before she travailed . . . comforted in Jerusalem,") were regarded as a *pericope* entirely distinct from the context in which it now occurs. These verses have nothing in common as to subject-matter with those which immediately precede and follow them. They actually interrupt the evident connection between vv. 5, 6, and v. 15; and (if an English reader may be allowed to submit to the judgment of others his own impressions of style) they might well be ascribed, like chapter xxxv. and Jer. x. 1-16, to the principal author of Is. xl.-lxii., the so-called "Second Isaiah."

Zechariah xii. 2: The three clauses following "*Thus saith the Lord.*" Is this passage an interpolation by the same hand as Amos iv. 13; v. 8, 9; and ix. 5, 6?

Is. xi. 10: Is not this verse a gloss, *explaining* ver. 12 by reference to ver. 1? The last clause seems to repeat the idea of iv. 5; and the whole verse, otiose in itself, breaks the connection between 1-9 and its sequel 11-16.

G. H. SKIPWITH.

Tobit and Genesis.

THERE is a general consensus of opinion that the book of Tobit was written with a tendency. But when that has been granted, the unanimity between critics is ended. The prevalent view probably is that Tobit was intended as a recommendation of active piety, a praise of good works, and of reliance on the power of Providence to justify its ways to man. Virtue was its own reward, but God would care that no man was the worse here or hereafter for his virtue. The ingenious theory of Dr. Graetz narrowed the motive of Tobit considerably. According to his brilliant and now well-known suggestion, the author of Tobit wished to inculcate the special duty of *burying the dead*, even at the price of adding others to the category. No danger was to be shunned or feared in the furtherance of the pious occupation of interring the dead. Professor Graetz had no difficulty in finding a fitting moment for the promulgation of such a book and such a moral. He found both amid the incidents associated in the reign of Hadrian with the fall of Bar Cochba and the massacre of the gallant defenders of Bether, who were denied even the privilege of interment.

There is no doubt that the references in Tobit to the burial of the dead are strikingly numerous. If one is disinclined to accept Professor Graetz's view, how are these repeated references to be accounted for?

My own reason for doubting the acceptability of Professor Graetz's hypothesis lies in the peculiar character of chapter iv. of Tobit. Here must be sought the author's intention, for the chapter contains the summary of his view of morality and praiseworthy conduct. The virtue which is chiefly lauded is charity. There is no specific counsel with regard to the duty of burying the dead until the 17th verse is reached, and the allusion is not repeated in the whole chapter. Of course it is hopeless to recover the real text of verse 17. It is