A CHAPTER IN THE HISTORY OF THE HIGH-PRIESTHOOD—Concluded

JULIAN MORGENSTERN

In their letter to Bagoas, the pehah of Judea, in 408 B.C., \(^{104}\) the priests of the Jewish colony at Elephantine tell that at the time of the destruction of their temple by the Egyptian nationalists three years before they had written a letter, imploring aid in rebuilding, to Johanan, kah\(^\alpha\)na' rabba', and his associates, the priests, in Jerusalem, but had received no reply thereto. Kah\(^\alpha\)na' rabba' is manifestly the Aramaic equivalent of the Hebrew hakohen hagadol, "high-priest." It evidences unmistakably that by 408 B.C., three years after his accession to the high-priesthood, Johanan had assumed the official title hakohen hagadol. With him the office of high-priest, in the strictest sense of the term, had come into being. The use of this title in its Aramaic equivalent in this papyrus is unquestionably the first authentic record of the term which we have.\(^{105}\)

We know that Johanan came to the high-priesthood as the result of a coup. The account thereof is contained in Josephus Antiquities

\(^{104}\) Sachau, Aramäische Papyri und Ostraka aus einer jüdischen Militärkolonie zu Elephantine (Leipzig, 1911), Pts. 1 and 2; Ungnad, Aramäische Papyri aus Elephantine (Leipzig, 1911), No. 1; Cowley, Aramaic Papyri of the Fifth Century B.C. (Oxford, 1923), No. 30.

\(^{105}\) In this connection it is interesting, and even of some significance for this study, to note that, in Sir. 50:1, Simeon is called a son of Johanan and is designated merely by the simple title hakohen. However, Syr. renders this title in this verse by kah\(^\alpha\)na' rabba'. LXX and Vulg. likewise record the corresponding reading, quite as if they either read hakohen hagadol in their originals or else interpreted hakohen thereof as equivalent to hakohen hagadol. Incidentally it may be noted also that LXX and Vulg. make Simeon the son of Onias, while Syr. makes him the son of Nethanyah. This latter high-priestly name is obviously identical with the Jonathan of Neh. 12:11 and II Macc. 1:23, which name, in turn, was probably confused with Johanan, since each is represented as the son of and successor to Joiada (however, see below, n. 107). Sir. goes on to tell that it was under this high-priest that the Temple was renovated, the walls erected, and other extensive rebuilding and expansion projects in the Temple and in the city carried out. Apparently, as will become even clearer toward the end of this study, this passage of Sir. presents a summary of the most important reconstruction and reorganization projects during the periods of Nehemiah and of Johanan, the high-priest, and mistakenly ascribes all of them to its paragon high-priest, Simeon. Of especial significance for this study, as will become clear later, is the fact that this passage preserves a distinct and positive reminiscence of what must have been a far-reaching reconstruction of the Temple during this period. Actually this reconstruction did take place, as we shall see, during the high-priesthood of Johanan.
From Ezra 10:6 it is clear that many years before this, when still a

xi. 7. 1 though in a summary and skeleton form which necessarily
omits many of the most interesting and significant details. It is clear
that at the death of Joiada there were two rival claimants to the office
of chief priest, Johanan and his brother, Jesus, or Joshua. Each
brother had his body of supporters; in fact we may infer that each
headed a rival faction or party and see in this incident evidence of the
bitterness of the struggle between these two parties for the leadership
of the people through the control of this high office and of the Temple.
Jesus enjoyed the strong support of Bagoas, the Persian governor.
Despite the statement of Josephus that this Bagoas was the military
leader of Artaxerxes II, the Elephantine papyrus establishes with
absolute certainty that he was the military and political governor of
Judea also under Darius II.106

From Ezra 10:6 it is clear that many years before this, when still a

106 There is neither need nor possibility of assuming, with Torrey, that there were two
Bagoas', just as he posits that there must have been two Sanballats' ('Sanballat the Horo-
nite,' JBL, XLVII (1928), 380–89), one in the reign of Artaxerxes I and Darius II and the
other in the reign of Artaxerxes II. Josephus' statement that Bagoas was the general and
military governor of Judea under Artaxerxes II is only half-correct. The Elephantine
papyrus evidences that he held this office already in 411 B.C. under Darius II. As I have
suggested elsewhere ('Supplementary Studies in the Calendars of Ancient Israel,' loc. cit.,
pp. 126–28), we may assume with reasonable certainty that Bagoas, a Persian and not a
Jew, became governor of Judea with the accession of Darius II to the Persian throne in
424 B.C. Quite probably it was upon this occasion that Nehemiah was removed from
office, immediately after the death of his patron, Artaxerxes I, and the policy, in operation
for exactly twenty years, of having a royally appointed, Jewish governor over Judea was
discontinued, and the former policy of appointing a native Persian as governor was re-
vived. Obviously this meant that with the ascension of Darius II to the throne the in-
fluence of the Jewish community in Babylonia with the king and their consequent domina-
tion of Jewish affairs in Palestine suffered a decline and that this condition continued
throughout the twenty-year reign of Darius II. This would explain fully Bagoas' inti-
mate relations with the native Palestinian party and his support of their leader, Jesus,
son of Joiada, in his candidacy for the chief priesthood after his father's death, and his
opposition to Johanan and his pro-Babylonian party. This opposition became most in-
tense during the period 411–404 B.C., the last seven years of the reign of Darius II and
the first seven years of the high-priesthood of Johanan, the seven years following immedi-
ately upon the murder of Jesus in the Temple and of the suppression of the sacrifices in
the Temple, as recorded by Josephus. Apparently, too, with the death of Darius II and
the ascension of Artaxerxes II to the throne, another reversal of the royal Persian policy
toward the Jews took place, and a milder attitude was inaugurated—one more sympa-
thetic with and conducive to the program of the pro-Babylonian Jewish party. This brought
about the lifting of the restrictions upon the Temple cult, which Bagoas had imposed
seven years before and, in general, facilitated greatly the carrying-out of the other
details of the pro-Babylonian party program—the elevation of Johanan to the new
rank of kohen gadol, the reconstruction upon drastically new lines of the Temple,
and the beginning of the reorganization of the religious calendar and of the cult in general,
upon the basis of the now formally and officially inaugurated Priestly Code. Bagoas was
unequivocally the Persian governor of Judea still in 404 B.C. and, no doubt, continued to
hold office well into the reign of Artaxerxes II. Accordingly Josephus' statement that
Bagoas was the Persian governor of Judea under Artaxerxes II is, as has been said, half-
correct.
young man, just entering upon his priestly duties, and fired no doubt with a youthful zeal for a much-needed and far-reaching reformation of both priesthood and people, Johanan had attached himself to the program and party of Ezra.\(^\text{107}\) This was the party which was backed

\(^\text{107}\) If we may assume the authenticity and historical correctness of Ezra 10:6—and the altogether incidental and unmotivated character of the mention of Johanan there seems to justify this assumption—then it would establish beyond all question the reliability of the traditional date of Ezra's coming to Jerusalem, viz., 458 B.C., and also that he was the predecessor and not the follower of Nehemiah. Furthermore, if we may assume that the incident recounted in Ezra, chap. 10, transpired not at the beginning but rather near the end of Ezra's party leadership, say, in 445 B.C., shortly before the advent of Nehemiah and his assumption of the leadership of the pro-Babylonian party, and if, furthermore, we may assume that Johanan was quite a young man at this time, just entering upon the performance of his priestly duties, therefore approximately thirty years of age (cf. Num. 4:3 and above, n. 92), then it would follow that Johanan had been born about 475 B.C. This would mean, in turn, that in 411 B.C., when he became high-priest, he was approximately sixty-four years of age and that by that time he had been closely affiliated with the pro-Babylonian party for some thirty-four years. We may assume further that he lived and held the high-priesthood until a high old age, between eighty-five and ninety years, i.e., until 390–385 B.C. Furthermore, the picture of Jaddua, the son and successor of Johanan in the high-priestly office, at the advent of Alexander in 332 B.C. (Josephus Antiquities xi. 8. 4; cf. Zeitlin, "The Tobias Family," Proceedings of the American Academy of Jewish Research, IV (1932–33), 172) is that of a very old man. If we assume that he, too, was approximately eighty-five years old at the time, this would mean that he had been born at about 417 B.C., when his father was approximately fifty-eight years of age and shortly before he became high-priest. This would mean also that Jaddua became high-priest when he was approximately thirty years of age and that he held the high-priesthood for approximately fifty-five years. These figures, which may at first glance seem somewhat extreme, are by no means impossible, or even improbable. Certainly they correlate adequately all the historical facts regarding these various men and the period which we possess. And, if correct, they enable us for the first time to fix with reasonable precision the date of Ezra and of the unfolding of his reform program. Indirectly, too, they throw some light upon the antecedents of the Priestly Code and the date of its eventual promulgation by Johanan.

If, however, these figures seem too extreme, then the only solution of the problem is to assume that some other high-priest intervened between Johanan and Jaddua and that, contrary to the statement of Neh. 12:11, this high-priest X was the son of Johanan, while Jaddua was his son and actually only the grandson of Johanan. This high-priest X might then be the Jonathan of Neh. 10:11 and II Macc. 1:23 and the Nethanyahu of the Syr. Sir. 50:1. He may not have functioned as high-priest for more than a relatively brief period—approximately fifteen or twenty years, say, from 395 to 375 B.C.—a condition which would have resulted quite naturally from the very advanced age until which his father, Johanan, held the high-priesthood, and which would have meant that he himself became high-priest only at a relatively advanced age. Furthermore, during his high-priesthood no events of outstanding significance may have transpired. This would account for the almost complete disappearance of reminiscences of him, and likewise for the confusion of him in the few records of him which have been preserved, with Johanan. The assumption of such a high-priest X would reduce the periods of service of both Johanan and Jaddua, and correspondingly their respective ages at the time of their deaths, by approximately ten years each and thus bring the figures with regard to the length of life and period of service of each of these high-priests more within the range of ordinary human experience.

Between these two alternative hypotheses it is difficult to choose. Actually, however, such choice has little or no bearing upon our conclusions in this study, since all the significant events with which we must deal—the ascension of Johanan to the chief priesthood, the reconstitution of the office as the high-priesthood, the promulgation of Pg, and the beginning, at least, of the reconstruction of the Temple and of the reorganization of the
by the Jews of Babylonia and an integral part of whose program was, as noted above, the restoration of the Zadokite priests to their former, dominant priestly position in the Temple at Jerusalem and its cult, the substitution for the lax, tolerant, universalistic spirit and indifference to ritual of both native, levitical priests and lay population of Jerusalem and Judea\(^\text{108}\) of the extreme nationalistic and separatistic spirit and zeal of the Babylonian Jews, and in general the imposition upon the Jews of Jerusalem and Judea of the interpretation and practice of Judaism as it had developed during a century and a half among the influential, aristocratic, pious and self-righteous Jews of Babylonia.\(^\text{109}\) Nehemiah had succeeded Ezra as the leader of this movement and party. He proved himself much more vigorous and efficient than his priestly predecessor, and, animated by an almost ruthless fanaticism and also, no doubt, by the prestige which the royal favor and his high political office gave him, he was able to carry through


\(^{109}\) That the exiles in Babylonia consisted very largely of the aristocracy and the upper classes of the population is not only a natural conclusion but is also amply attested by II Kings 24:14–16; 25:11; Jer. 52:15, and by the fact that Ezekiel, of the Zadokite priestly family of Jerusalem, was likewise among the first exiles. This is corroborated by the additional statements of II Kings 24:14, 25:12, and Jer. 52:16, that only the dallat ha'ares remained in Palestine; for, whether this statement be literally correct or not, it reflects undoubtedly the popular opinion, both among the exiles in Babylonia themselves and no doubt also among those who remained resident in Judea, at least during the early portion of the Exilic period. That the exiles in Babylonia regarded themselves as superior in every way to the Jews of Palestine, the 'am ha'res, those who had never gone into exile, is beyond question. The distinction so precisely drawn in Ezra between the returning exiles, the b'ne hagolah, and the native Palestinian Jews who had not "separated themselves from the defilement of the peoples of the land," evidences this clearly. This feeling on the part of the exiles in Babylonia of their distinction from and superiority to the Jews who remained in Palestine must have begun almost immediately after the first deportation in 597 B.C. The messages of Jeremiah (chap. 24 and 29:1–20) and also the divine promise of eventual restoration of the people, purified and made regenerate by their bitter experiences in exile, announced in one form or another by Jeremiah, Ezekiel (cf. in particular 11:14–16), and Deutero-Isaiah, must have contributed mightily to the strengthening of the conviction of the exiles that they and not the poor lot who remained in Palestine were the elect of Yahweh, destined by him for eventual restoration and to become the nucleus of his revived people. Furthermore, their philosophy of separatism and particularism during and after the Exile, in relation to the peoples among whom they were dwelling, and their intense orthodoxy and ritualism, must have confirmed still further their deep-rooted, even fanatic, conviction that their interpretation and practice of Judaism, particularly if linked with Temple worship and ritual, were alone pleasing to Yahweh and therefore the authoritative norms of the practice of Judaism. Consequently the endeavor of the Babylonian Jews to impose their interpretation and practice of Judaism upon the Jews not only of Palestine but also of Egypt (cf. "Supplementary Studies in the Calendars of Ancient Israel," loc. cit., pp. 108–33) is easily comprehensible.
with at least superficial success a number of long-projected reforms, in which Ezra before him had made at the very most only dubious and qualified progress. After Nehemiah's removal from office and departure, either forced or voluntary as the case may be,\(^{110}\) from Palestine, Johanan became in all likelihood the leader of the pro-Babylonian party, as it may well be called. Certainly in 411 B.C. he was its recognized leader.

Jesus, on the other hand, was the leader of the native, Palestinian party, just as his grandfather, Eliashib, and no doubt also his father, Joiada, had been before him. Its policies of friendly and even intimate relations and of free intermarriage with the neighboring peoples, Samaritans, Ammonites, Moabites, and Philistines, he and his party continued to uphold in the face of the extreme separatism of the pro-Babylonian party. He was the leader and champion of the native, levitical priests in their struggle to maintain their priestly status against the claims and aggression of their Babylonian, Zadokite brethren. With the Persian governor, Bagoas, successor of Nehemiah and advocate of a system of Persian administration of the Judean province diametrically opposite to that of Nehemiah, he was on intimate terms, and between them there was obviously a definite understanding and working agreement. The two parties, as well as the two leaders, were the direct and undoubtedly bitter antitheses of each other, and their animosities were manifestly reflected in the mutual relations of the two priestly brothers, their leaders. Each claimed the succession to their father, Joiada, not only out of personal aspiration but also as the leader, each of his own party and the exponent of the principles for which it stood. In his claims Jesus enjoyed the support of Bagoas, by no means a negligible consideration.

The struggle was decided in drastic manner. Johanan slew his brother and rival in the very Temple itself. And apparently with Jesus thus out of the way, no further obstacle remained to block Johanan's accession to the high-priesthood. Bagoas seized the opportunity which the slaying of Jesus had given him to interfere ruthlessly in the internal administration of Jewish affairs. He took possession of the Temple with his troops, himself entered into the inner precincts thereof, in defiance of Jewish tradition and opposition, de-

\(^{110}\) Presumably at the accession of Darius II to the throne in 424 B.C.
stroyed a section of the Temple structure, and imposed a very heavy tax upon every animal slaughtered in the Temple ritual. This unhappy condition continued unabated for seven years. Nonetheless Johanan was now the high-priest, and apparently he continued in this office undisturbed until his death many years later. Despite the procedure of Bagoas, the pro-Babylonian, nationalist, and separatist party had triumphed definitively. The high-priest was the leader of a new party and a new program. Johanan's motive in refusing to answer the appeal of the Jews of Elephantine, and perhaps even to regard them as Jews, is self-explanatory. It was altogether consistent with his exclusive, separatistic program and that of his party.

Thus far we have been treading upon fairly certain historical ground. Here perhaps we may resort for a moment to hypothesis. We may very properly ask, "What was the particular occasion upon which Johanan slew his brother Jesus in the Temple?" We have no source other than Josephus, and he gives no direct information bearing upon this question. He tells merely that the two brothers were rival claimants of the succession to their father and that Jesus, relying upon the support of Bagoas, quarreled with his brother and so provoked the latter that he slew him within the very Temple. Thereupon Bagoas, incensed by the slaying of Jesus, forced his way into the Temple, despite the opposition of the pious Jews who were present.

According to the Mishna, Bagoas, as a non-Jew, could have been permitted to penetrate the Temple precincts only as far as the soreg, the outermost wall. Why should he have been so intent upon penetrating further within, into the forbidden sections, and whither did he force his way? It is natural to imagine that he forced his way into the very innermost portion of the structure, into that very same place into which the chief priest entered upon the New Year's Day. And it is an

112 In accordance with the prescriptions of Deut. 23:4, promulgated only some thirty or forty years previously at the earliest. Deut. 23:8, in which hamitri undoubtedly has in mind the Jews of Elephantine, is a modification of the originally uncompromisingly exclusive, separatistic legislation and is therefore later than the high-priesthood of Johanan.

113 Its justification was undoubtedly the basic Deuteronomic principle of the single, central sanctuary. Evidence of this is the fact that this principle, which was a distinct innovation in the Deuteronomic Code, and had to be reinterpreted, modified, and reinforced by at least three different and successive strata of legislation in Deuteronomy, chap. 12, is accepted tacitly and without question as the basic principle in the sanctuary legislation of Pq, promulgated early in Johanan's high-priesthood.

112 Kelim i. 8.
equally plausible presumption that he sought to penetrate thither just because that was the very spot upon which Jesus, his friend, had just been slain and of which event the report had just reached him. But, if this be so, then the next natural inference would be that this incident happened just at this spot upon the New Year's Day and in connection with the rite of the entrance of the chief priest into the presence of the Deity upon the New Year's Day. The contest between the two brothers, rival claimants for the chief priesthood, was to determine which of the two should in official capacity enter into the presence of the Deity.

If this assumption be correct, it is impossible not to correlate this incident in some way with the Korah story, a narrative found only in P and, therefore, obviously a product of this very period, for there, too, as has been said, in the one version we have the two rival claimants to the high-priesthood, with the decision between them to be determined by whichever of the two should emerge alive from the presence of the Deity in the all-important New Year's Day rite. True, Aaron and Korah are not brothers; in the one version of the narrative, apparently the older version, Korah is represented as a levite and as the leader of the levites in their claim to the priesthood. Whether the second and younger version of the narrative likewise represented him as a levite, or perhaps as someone nearer to Aaron in kinship than an ordinary levite would have been, is not indicated in any way. But, whatever this second version of the story may have told or implied in this connection, if our assumption that it was upon the New Year's Day and in connection with the entrance of the chief priest into the presence of the Deity that Johanan slew his brother, then it is difficult indeed not to correlate this second version of the Korah story with this incident. Probably in such cases we would have to interpret this version of the Korah story as an attempt to palliate the offense of Johanan in slaying his brother by representing the death of the latter, precisely like that of Korah, as really an act of the Deity and a divine manifestation that Johanan was the Deity's choice as high-priest.114

114 Much the same seems to be the import of the story of Phineas (Num. 25:6–13) who slew with his own hand a fellow-Jew in close proximity to the sanctuary itself because he had consorted with a foreign woman (this is manifestly an expression of the extreme separatism of the pro-Babylonian party), and who was rewarded by the Deity for this mani-
This entire hypothesis would become all the stronger if we might assume, what would be altogether natural, that the incident happened immediately after the death of Joiada and at the moment traditionally fixed for the installation of his successor. For, as we have seen, not only did the anointing and inauguration of kings in the pre-Exilic period take place upon the New Year’s Day, but also the anointing and installation of Joshua as chief priest, the successor of the kings in the early post-Exilic period, took place upon the same day; and presumably this continued to be the regular practice with Joshua’s successors. This would seem to be the implication, too, of the fact that Leviticus, chapter 9 (Pg), fixes the anointing and consecration of Aaron as high-priest upon the New Year’s Day.\textsuperscript{115} All in all we may conclude that the hypothesis has not a little plausibility; nonetheless it remains naught more than a hypothesis and should not be pushed too far. But it may be remarked in passing that, if correct, it would probably furnish another instance where two chief priests function alongside of each other upon the New Year’s Day in connection with the rite of the entrance upon this day into the presence of the Deity.\textsuperscript{116}

However, be all that as it may, this much is certain—that by 408 B.C., as the Elephantine papyrus attests conclusively, within three short years after his accession to office, Johanan had come to bear officially the specific title \textit{hakohen hagadol}. Unquestionably he was the first to bear this title. It had supplanted the earlier \textit{hakohen hamašiah}.


\textsuperscript{116} My colleague, Professor J. Z. Lauterbach, has very generously called my attention to the tradition, recorded in B. Menahot, 109b, of the two sons of the high-priest, Simon the Just, who died upon the seventh day after Yom Kippur, disputing with each other for the right of succession to their father. The Talmud records two contradictory versions of the tradition, but one detail is common to both versions, viz., that the younger brother, Onias, is on the point of being put to death and rescues himself only by fleeing to Egypt, where he establishes his own temple and functions there as high-priest. There seems to be also in both talmudic versions of the tradition a faint reminiscence that the strife between the two brothers reached a head at the moment when the one brother, clad in the high-priestly robes, ascended the altar to function in his new office for the first time. This would imply that the fraternal struggle for the high-priesthood culminated upon Yom Kippur with the entrance of the one brother into the holy of holies, into the presence of the Deity. Not improbably in this tradition or legend we may see a reminiscence both of the Johanan-Jesus struggle for the high-priesthood and of the Aaron-Korah story.
But it was far more than a mere exchange of titles. It designated an office which was in many respects entirely new. Johanan was no longer the chief priest, who was *hakohen hagadol me’ehau*, “the priest who was greatest of his brethren,” who was *primus inter pares*; he was now of a rank of holiness and of proximity to the Deity and of a station of ecclesiastical authority far transcending those of any other priest, even of the Zadokite clan, and to which no other priest outside the immediate line of inheritance from him might aspire under any conditions. To confirm him in this position an artificial genealogy, tracing his ancestry back not merely to Zadok in the days of David and Solomon but to Aaron, the brother and associate of Moses in the Exodus from Egypt and the journey through the wilderness, had been invented and worked out in all its far-ramifying details. In addition thereto the two stories of the triumph of Aaron over Korah and the budding of Aaron’s rod[117] stamped Aaron as the divinely designated choice for the high-priesthood, and the story of the Deity’s promise to Phineas[118] reaffirmed that this was to be an eternal high-priesthood, to be transmitted in unbroken line from father to son.

Like the *kohen mašiah* the *kohen gadol* was to be inducted into his high and sacred office by the rite of anointing with the holy oil, and that too upon the New Year’s Day and in connection with the ceremony of entrance into the presence of the Deity.[119] But the robes of office with which the high-priest is now endued are no longer the seemingly comparatively simple robes of office, with the culminating piece apparently a new and clean turban, with which Joshua had been clad upon the New Year’s Day of his anointing and consecration.[120] They are the far more elaborate and imposing purple robes of office described in full and almost wearying detail in Exodus, chapter 28, and culminating in the miter with the golden diadem upon the head and the ephod and the breastplate with the Urim and Tummim upon the breast.[121] At last the pronouncement of the *tiršata‘*, in Ezra 2:63

118 Leviticus, chap. 9. 
120 Zech. 3:4–5. 
121 At the great Syrian sanctuary at Hierapolis the chief priest (*apxiebos*), who, incidentally, held office for only one year and was then succeeded by another chief priest, was likewise clothed in purple robes of office and wore a golden tiara upon his head (Lucian *De dea syra* 42). Wellhausen (Prolegomena zur Geschichte Israel [6th ed.; Berlin, 1905], p. 144) holds that the purple robes and the miter with the golden tiara indicate that the
and Neh. 7:65, had been fulfilled; a priest had arisen for the Urim and Tummim.

Furthermore, there is good reason to believe that the very ceremony of the entrance of the high-priest into the presence of the Deity upon the New Year's Day underwent a certain, significant modification, calculated to accentuate the impression of divine remoteness, inaccessibility, and transcendence, and of the sanctity and authority of the high-priest, which from of old the ceremony had unquestionably always called forth. Some three centuries and a quarter earlier Isaiah had beheld the Deity enthroned upon the New Year's Day, the Day of Judgment, in the body of the Temple, surrounded by his seraphic attendants.122 There was as yet no seclusion of the Deity in the innermost sanctuary, to which only the chief priest had access, but the prophet himself, though apparently not even a priest of ordinary rank, beheld him enthroned out in the main structure of the Temple building. And even in Zechariah, chapter 3, two full centuries after Isaiah and a full century before the accession of Johanan to the high-priesthood, there is as yet no clear implication that the Deity is enthroned in the remote holy of holies, accessible to Joshua alone. Rather this prophet too is privileged to behold him enthroned apparently in the Temple building proper, upon the New Year's Day, holding court and pronouncing judgment, with Joshua standing before him and with his heavenly host, and Satan among them,123 in attendance upon him. The scene is obviously very similar to and only a little advanced beyond that of Isaiah's vision.124

122 Isaiah, chap. 6.

123 Himself a member of the heavenly host, just as in Job, chaps. 1–2.

124 Still another instance of precisely this same judgment scene occurs in 1 Kings 22:19–23. It is generally assumed without question that the incident which Micaiah b. Yimlah here describes transpired in heaven, just as apparently also the two similar, successive incidents in Job 1:6 ff. and 2:1 ff. Actually, however, in none of these three passages is this specifically stated or even necessarily implied. It is probably the reference to the heavenly host, and perhaps also the picture of Yahweh seated upon his throne, which suggest that these scenes were laid in heaven. But, as the two closely parallel scenes in Isaiah, chap. 6, and Zechariah, chap. 3, the only ones which are specifically located, suggest, the incidents recounted in 1 Kings 22:19–23 and Job 1:6 ff. and 2:1 ff. might just as well have been thought to transpire in a temple, since there, too, Yahweh is represented as seated upon a throne and also is attended by the heavenly host. However, be that as it
This is all simple and thoroughly comprehensive when we bear in mind that in the pre-Exilic Temple, and for that matter in the post-

may, we must at least assume that in I Kings 22:19-23 and also in Job 1:6 ff. and 2:1 ff. the occasion was the annual divine judgment upon the New Year's Day following immediately upon Yahweh's entrance into the sanctuary. This conclusion is confirmed perhaps by the use of hayom in Job 1:6 and 2:1 (the use of yom in 1:4 and of hayom in 1:13 in a somewhat different connotation does not affect this conclusion in any way), for, as will be shown conclusively upon some more favorable occasion, hayom, used in this manner, occasionally designates the New Year's Day (I Sam. 1:4; 9:12; I Kings 18:15 [perhaps]). Not improbably it was this very fact that hayom could be used to designate the New Year's Day which brought about the not infrequent use of the plural, yamim, with the connotation, "year" (Gen. 40:4; Lev. 25:29; Num. 9:22; I Sam. 1:20; 21; 2:19; 13:11; 14:26; 20:6; 27:7, et passim; also in the idiomatic expression, miyamim yamimah, "from year to year; annually" [Exod. 13:10; Judg. 11:40; 21:19; I Sam. 1:3; 2:10]). But, if this conclusion be correct, it would follow that the two judgment scenes in Job 1:6 ff. and 2:1 ff. occurred on successive New Year's Days; this would imply in turn, what is indeed altogether probable, that Satan was granted by Yahweh a full year for his first and unsuccessful attempts against Job, narrated in 1:13-22.

Furthermore, assuming the close relationship of all these passages, it is clear that I Kings 22:19-23 occupies a position midway between that of Isaiah, chap. 6, and those of Zechariah and Job. For in Isa. 6:1 ff. no single one of the entire heavenly host stands out with individual characteristics, and particularly as a messenger of Yahweh animated by baleful intent or charged with baneful purpose either for Israel in general or for some one specific individual in particular. In fact, in Isa. 6:8 ff. it is the prophet himself, rather than a specific member of the heavenly host, whose regular task this might be, who is charged by the Deity to bring the message of doom and destruction to the sinful nation, and this clearly because, as the Deity's question in verse 8 implies, he had no other agent whom he might send upon this mission. In I Kings, 22:19-23 there is as yet no particular member of the heavenly host whose specific and regular task this mission of evil was. Instead a certain, anonymous member of the heavenly host volunteers to aid in the fulfillment of the divine judgment upon Ahab by being a spirit of falsehood in the mouths of the prophets in order to entice him to his doom. But in Zechariah, chap 3, the figure of Satan has evolved as one of the regular members of the heavenly host charged apparently, as the very name, satan, "adversary, accuser," implies, with the specific task of finding disqualifying considerations and on the basis of these bringing against the chief priest, about to be inducted into his sacred office and to perform the characteristic rites of the New Year's Day ritual, charges which would debar him from functioning in his all-important ecclesiastic role.

By the time of the composition of Job 1:6 ff. and 2:1 ff. the figure of Satan has evolved even further, so that, still a regular member of the heavenly host of angelic attendants upon and messengers of Yahweh, he has apparently already begun to occupy a somewhat irregular and anomalous position among them, since, in both 1:6 and 2:1, the author felt the need of stating that Satan, too, was present among the heavenly host upon each of these two judgment occasions upon the two successive New Year's Days, quite as if this was a somewhat abnormal condition. Manifestly here Satan is already on his way out of the ranks of the angelic attendants upon and messengers of the will of Yahweh and is beginning to evolve, obviously under the growing influence of Persian dualism, as the counterpart of Ahriman, into the figure we meet in later Jewish and Christian literature, of the supernatural power of evil, the implacable foe of mankind, who seeks constantly to frustrate God's purposes of good for his creatures, and who, very much as the lying spirit in I Kings 22:19-23 and as Satan in the Job narrative and also in I Chron. 21:1 and Pss. 109:6, and even to a certain extent as the prophet himself in Isa. 6:8 ff., endeavors to entice men to sin against God, so that they may thus, through the application of the principles of absolute, mechanical justice, more after the Persian manner than the Jewish, become subject to the punishment of the Deity rather than to his favor. This picture of the gradual unfolding of the figure of Satan in Jewish literature and theology is interesting and illuminating indeed.
Exilic Temple in its various stages of rebuilding and remodeling, the sacrifices and all the ceremonies, with the exception of the one ceremony of the entrance of the chief priest into the presence of the Deity upon the New Year's Day, were performed not in the Temple structure proper but in the open court at the eastern front of the Temple before its eastern gate.\footnote{125} Within the Temple building itself the Deity was to be found, whether, as seemingly in the pre-Exilic belief, having entered there upon the New Year's Day through the open eastern gate for purposes of divine judgment,\footnote{126} or, as in the later post-Exilic period, as permanently resident within Jerusalem, the holy city,\footnote{127} and within the Temple. It was not into the *d'bîr* but only into the Temple proper\footnote{128} that the pre-Exilic king entered upon each recurrent New Year's Day. There, within the Temple proper, the *hekâl*, he beheld the Deity enthroned and stood in his presence, precisely as did Isaiah upon the occasion of his vision.

And that at least in the earliest stratum of *Pg* this was still the prevailing concept of the place where the Deity was to be found is fully established by Exod. 29:42–43. There the significant statement is made, not a little confusing within the program of *Pg*, that it is at the door of the *rohel môrêd*, "the tent of meeting," that the Deity meets with the children of Israel. The picture here is still precisely, or almost precisely, the same as that presented by the earlier J Code.\footnote{129} Here, too, the Deity reveals his presence and his message unto the oracular priest at the door of the "tent of meeting," in the plain sight of all the people. And his meeting here is not with the priest alone

\footnote{125} For the exceptional splendor of this particular gate cf. "The Gates of Righteousness." \indent *loc. cit.*, pp. 26 ff.

\footnote{126} Notice that in Isa. 6:3 the threshold is still shaking, clearly, despite the present statement, not because of the words which the seraphim were calling out but because Yahweh had just entered the sanctuary over this threshold; for otherwise why should merely the threshold and not the entire house shake? And actually the words which the seraphim call out sound more like a shout of greeting, hailing the advent of the august, universal Deity, who has just entered and taken his place upon the sacred throne, than like a constantly repeated cry of praise and worship; for unquestionably such a constantly repeated cry would have seriously disturbed the judgment scene which follows.

\footnote{127} Cf. Zech. 2:15 ff., 8:3.

\footnote{128} As I Kings 6:19 says explicitly, the *d'bîr* of Solomon's Temple was merely the place in which the ark was deposited; but there is as yet no implication whatever that Yahweh actually dwelt therein. So far as he was really present in the Temple at all during the pre-Exilic and early post-Exilic periods, it was in the entire building itself, in the *hekâl*, just as Isa. 6:1 represents it.

but with the people at large. Clearly we have here an old and persistent concept of Deity, sanctuary, oracular priest, and people and their relations to one another. But this is the only passage in the entire Priestly Code in which this concept of the meeting-place of the Deity with the entire people at the door of the "tent of meeting" occurs.

Elsewhere in the Priestly Code the situation is changed completely. The Deity no longer meets with the oracular priest at the door of the "tent of meetings," and in the plain sight of all the people, but only with the priest alone and in the innermost recesses of the sanctuary, enthroned in solitary and awesome sanctity between the cherubim upon the "mercy-seat" above the "ark of testimony." Hand in hand with this change goes the gradual substitution of the later term miškan, "dwelling-place," for the sanctuary, in place of the older term 'ohel mō'ed, "tent of meeting." The older term is by no means completely supplanted or rejected. It is still used not infrequently, but only in a strictly conventional sense, "sanctuary," and with the original and basic idea—that it was specifically the place of meeting between the Deity and the people, to which he came upon occasion from his permanent place of abode in the heaven—completely forgotten.

With this, too, still another modification gradually takes place. In the older strata of Pg the particular portion of the sanctuary in which the Deity is thought to be permanently present, and into which the high-priest enters in order to come into the presence of the Deity, is hagōdēš, "the holy place." The term seems to be used rather loosely, in some places to designate the entire inner sanctuary and therefore more or less identical with the 'ohel mō'ed of the tabernacle of the wilderness or the hekal of the Temple at Jerusalem, and in other places,

130 With one change perhaps, for here in all likelihood the Deity is inside the sanctuary and the priest stands in the doorway, while in the older tradition the reverse was the case. This reversal of relative positions was, no doubt, the first step in gradual evolution of the concept of the sanctuary as the dwelling-place of the Deity.

131 Exod. 25:22; 30:6, 36; Num. 17:19.

132 Actually Exod. 30:6, 36, and Num. 17:19 seem to imply a linking of the word 'edut, in the term 'aron ha'edut, with the stem, wad, rather than with the stem, ud, from which it is actually derived, quite as if the term, 'aron ha'edut, meant "ark of meeting" rather than "ark of testimony."

133 Exod. 28:29, 35; Lev. 10:4, 18; 16:2, 3; 23; Num. 4:15; I Kings 8:8, 10 (=II Chron. 5:11); Ezek. 41:26; 44:27; I Chron. 22:13; II Chron. 29:5.
in contradistinction to the כֹּהֶל מָשָׁא and the הֵקהַל, to designate rather the innermost shrine, at the western end of the sanctuary, the דְּבִיר of the Temple of Solomon. But in later strata of P a new term has come into use, gоdэș hаqָdаšim, “the holy of holies,” as distinct from hагоdэш. The latter term now designates the body of the tabernacle or Temple structure, the former hекал of the Temple, while the new term designates specifically the innermost shrine, in which the ark is deposited and in which the Deity is thought to have taken up his permanent dwelling-place in the midst of the people. More and more the concept evolves of the Deity, no longer coming into the Temple merely once a year, upon the New Year’s Day, or incidentally upon other occasions when he would reveal his will to the people, but dwelling now in the sanctuary permanently, though accessible only once in the year, and that only to the high-priest, and only when the “holy of holies” was filled with the smoke of incense from the burning censer in the high-priest’s hand; more and more the concept of the Deity is transcendentized. He is removed farther and farther from the people;134 his permanent dwelling-place in the holy of holies is circumscribed more and more by taboos of holiness and ritual purity; and access to him is made more and more difficult and infrequent.

And more and more, as the corollary to this gradual transcendentizing of the Deity, the office of the high-priest, the sole mediator now between Deity and people, or, perhaps better, between Deity and ordinary priests, who are in turn the mediators unto the people, is enhanced and elevated above what it had ever been before, to a rank of taboo, of holiness, of authority, and of privilege far surpassing those of the ordinary priest, or even those of the pre-Exilic kоhеn hаr’оš, or the early post-Exilic hаkоhеn hагаdоl mе’еhаw or hаkоhеn hаmаšiаh. And even though the supreme title hаkоhеn hагаdоl, “high-priest,” seems to have been borne definitely by Johanan, as the Elephantine papyrus evidences, nonetheless the markedly sparse use of the term in the entire biblical literature would seem to indicate that it came into formal use and to be applied officially to the recognized head of the Jewish church only slowly and gradually. Apparently not

134 And perhaps also from access by an invading foreigner, such as Bagoas, according to the previously stated hypothesis, actually was.
until the Greek period did it become the established and current title of the supreme priest.

Nonetheless the evidence seems clear beyond all question that the office, by no means identical with the office of hakohen hamašiah, held by Joshua, Joakim, Eliashib, and Joiada, but distinctly new in almost all essential respects, was first held by Johanan from 411 B.C. on, and that the inauguration of it goes hand in hand with the formulation and promulgation of the Priestly Code, or, rather, of the so-called Grundschrift thereof, Pg. And this in turn leads to another interesting conclusion, or, perhaps better, hypothesis. Pg gives a lengthy and detailed account of the manner in which the tabernacle in the wilderness was to be fashioned, equipped, and erected. Everything is according to a heavenly pattern—a pattern to be followed, of course, in the earthly sanctuary. It has been suggested quite frequently that the tabernacle in the wilderness of Pg was designed to be the pattern of the second Temple. But, even granting that this may have been so in principle, certainly it could not have served as the pattern of the Temple which was dedicated in 516 B.C., unless we may assume that Pg was composed prior to that date. And since Wellhausen scarcely any modern biblical scholar would even suggest such an idea. If the tabernacle in the wilderness actually served as the pattern of any Temple construction or reconstruction at all, it must have been of some reconstruction later by quite a bit than 516 B.C. And also the compilation of the detailed plan and equipment of the tabernacle in the wilderness of Pg must have assumed that some drastic reorganization, remodeling, and reconstruction of the Temple and its cult were contemplated for the near future. But if not the reconstruction in 516 B.C., then what reconstruction of the Temple could this have been?

This is a question of interest and extreme significance for the history of Judaism in just the period with which we are now dealing. And, quite naturally, it has its distinct bearing upon the particular question which we have under consideration, viz., the evolution of the

135 Exod. 25:9. This is a concept of definitely Babylonian origin, as was first shown by Winckler (cf. K.A.T. Berlin, 1903, p. 158).

136 The same conclusion applies equally to the plan of the rebuilt Temple in Ezekiel, chaps. 40 ff. and must have a significant bearing upon the question of the Ezekielian authorship of Ezekiel, chaps. 40–48 and the date of composition of these chapters. But this is a complex question in itself, into which we may not enter here.
high-priesthood. But it, too, is a question of such far-reaching and complex ramification that it may not be entered upon here. Suffice it to merely state here in summary manner what must await detailed proof upon some other, more appropriate occasion that there is a great mass of evidence scattered throughout biblical literature that at some time very soon after the accession of Xerxes to the Persian throne in 485 B.C. Jerusalem was besieged and captured by a coalition of hostile neighboring states, Edom, Moab, Ammon, Tyre, and Philistia. Its walls were torn down, its buildings razed, the Temple itself burned and destroyed, at least in part, and the great mass of the people scattered, no doubt sold into slavery, throughout the then known world. It was the second great dispersion. A few years later, however, probably one of the after-effects of the collapse of Xerxes’ expedition against Greece and of the consequent weakening of the neighboring hostile states through the failure of a large portion of the quotas of each in Xerxes’ army to return to their homes, and likewise through the steadily increasing aggression of the Nabataeans, conditions improved somewhat for the little Judean state. Some of the exiles found their way back to their native land; normal, economic life was resumed, though in a greatly impoverished manner; and the Temple was rebuilt after a fashion. But Jerusalem itself remained for the most part unrestored and its walls still in ruins. This was the condition which Ezra found when he returned in 458 B.C. and the dismal picture of which occasioned such grief to Nehemiah in 445 B.C. and impelled him to supplicate the permission of his royal master to return to the land of his fathers and rebuild the holy city.

Manifestly the initial reconstruction of the Temple after this destruction had been a hasty and more or less temporary undertaking. A systematic reconstruction was indispensable so soon as conditions—economic, political, social, and religious—would permit. Josephus tells that, following the murder of Jesus by his brother, Johanan, and the consequent accession of the latter to the high-priesthood, the Persian general, Bagoas, entered the Temple by force, polluted it in extreme manner and interrupted the offering of sacrifices for a period of seven years. This chronological statement of Josephus is extremely il-

---

137 Just this seems to be the implication of Mal. 1:2–5.  
138 Cf. Neh. 1:3.
luminating. We have concluded\textsuperscript{139} that the murder of Jesus, the beginning of the high-priesthood of Johanan, and consequently the commencement of the seven years of interruption of the sacrifices in the Temple all transpired in 411 B.C. This seven-year period of interruption of the sacrifices would therefore have continued until 404 B.C. This was the year of the death of Darius II and the ascension to the Persian throne of Artaxerxes II. And even though Josephus states rather clearly that Bagoas continued to function as a military leader under this second monarch, we may readily believe that with the accession of Artaxerxes II to the throne a change of policy toward the Jews of Palestine was inaugurated and a milder treatment accorded to them, which resulted in the termination of the restrictions upon the sacrifices. Not improbably the wealthy and influential Jews of Babylonia had a hand in this, just as they had undoubtedly had a hand in the expeditions to Palestine of both Ezra and Nehemiah two generations earlier.

But before the Temple cult could be definitely resumed, the Temple had necessarily to be thoroughly purified of the pollution which Bagoas had brought upon it, whatever this may have been. And what more favorable moment than this could have been found, particularly if the generous aid of the Babylonian Jews could have been counted upon,\textsuperscript{140} for the systematic rebuilding of the Temple; and not mere, mechanical reproduction of the old structure of 516 B.C., but its remodeling along quite new lines, designed to give expression and realization of the new concept of the Deity and of his permanent dwelling within the innermost recesses of the Temple, in the holy of holies? All this merely, for the present, by way of hypothesis; but a hypothesis which, if the first thesis of the destruction of the second Temple shortly after 485 B.C. can be established, has all the earmarks of com-

\textsuperscript{139} "Supplementary Studies in the Calendars of Ancient Israel," \textit{op. cit.}, p. 130, n. 212.

\textsuperscript{140} As no doubt it could with reasonable assurance, since now at last, with the murder of Jesus and the ascendancy of Johanan to the high-priesthood, the native Palestinian party was definitely crushed, its universalistic, assimilative policies were formally suppressed, and relations with the Samaritans and other neighboring peoples were reduced to a scanty minimum; while their own pro-Babylonian party, with its established policy of uncompromising, exclusive nationalism, separatism, and particularism and its complete control of the Temple and its cult and of the religious life, practice, and destiny of the people in Palestine, was in complete control and exercising absolute authority.
plete probability. And it would, of course, be of this reconstruction of the Temple, beginning in or shortly after 404 B.C., that the plan of the tabernacle in the wilderness of Pg would have been the purposed pattern.

All this accords perfectly with our general thesis that the first, tentative draft of Pg, which still employed the term "ohel mo'ed" for the sanctuary and looked upon the door thereof as the place of meeting between the Deity and all Israel, was compiled about or shortly before 411 B.C., that it was promulgated as divine law early in the high-priesthood of Johanan, and that it began to undergo extensive revision and amplification, with, particularly, the modification and elaboration of the plan of the sanctuary, soon to be rebuilt, and of the divinely appointed place of meeting of the Deity with the high-priest, between 411 and 404 B.C. All this has manifestly a salient bearing upon the evolution of the high-priesthood under Johanan. It was indeed a momentous development.

But into this we need not enter here. It suffices for the present to have traced the gradual unfolding of the office of the high-priest from its original stage when, in the pre-Exilic period, the king functioned as the supreme ecclesiastical authority and officiant of the nation, with a kohen har'os over every local sanctuary, through the early post-Exilic period, when hakohen hamašiaḥ, "the anointed priest," who was likewise hakohen haqadol me'ehaw, "the priest who was greatest of his brethren," superseded the king as the chief priest and the recognized head of the theocratic community, the q'hal Yahweh, "the community of Yahweh," to the period following 411 B.C., when, through the final triumph of the pro-Babylonian party under Johanan and a drastic reformation of the cult, of the calendar,141 and the ecclesiastic organization and the rebuilding along new lines of the Temple itself, the office of kohen gadol, "high-priest," in the true sense of the term, at last came into being.

Here we may leave this matter for the present.
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