

## The History of the Menorah

c. 1480 B.C.E. The first mention we have of the *Menorah* is in *Exodus* (xxv: 31-40) where Moses is told to make a seven branched candelabrum to be put into the tabernacle<sup>1</sup>, and is given explicit instructions as to its detailed form. Although the biblical description is fairly detailed, it is also ambiguous (see, e.g., Rashi on v. 34, basing himself on T. B. *Yoma* 52b), and it is difficult to form a clear conception of the overall form of the *Menorah*, a fact that perhaps partly accounts for the Midrashic accounts of Moses' difficulties in following God's instructions, until He Himself showed him a *Menorah* of fire as a prototype from which to work<sup>2</sup>.

c. 965 B.C.E. When Solomon built the temple in Jerusalem, it is related (*1 Kings* vii: 49) that he made ten more such candelabra<sup>3</sup>, and placed five on either side of the Mosaic one<sup>4</sup>. It seems likely that they were more or less identical in appearance to the Mosaic one<sup>5</sup>. It seems furthermore likely that the Mosaic candelabrum

<sup>1</sup> See also Josephus. *Ant.* 3. 6. 7. (NIESE. I. 144). ἵσταται λυχνία ἐκ χρυσοῦ κεχωνευμένη διάκενος σταθμὸν ἔχουσα μῶς ἑκατόν. Note that διάκενος gives no clear textual warrant for stating that it was hollow. But see Maimonides, *Hilekhoti Beth Ha-Behirah*, 3, 4. See Ibn Ezra on *Exod.* xxv: 32 טעם חלולים קנים עגולים ארוכים חלולים.

<sup>2</sup> GINZBERG, *Legends of the Jews* (1946) 2, p. 362, 3, pp. 160, 219. 5, p. 432, note 202, 6, p. 65, note 338, p. 79, note 421. See also T. B. *Menahoth* 29a and Rashi, *ibid.* ממוקם טהרה ד'.

<sup>3</sup> See also Josephus, *Ant.* 8. 3. 7. (NIESE line 90) ... καὶ λυχνίας δὲ μυρίας ἐποίησε κατὰ τῆν Μωυσεὺς προσταγήν, ἐξ ὧν μίαν ἀνέθηκεν εἰς τὸν ναόν, ἵνα καλιῆται καθ' ἡμέραν ἀκολούθως τῷ νόμῳ. Ten seems to have become ten thousand μυρίας.

<sup>4</sup> See *Baraita di-mele'kheth Ha-Mishkan* (ed. FRIEDMANN, 1908) 10, משה מימין מגורה של משה וחמש משמאל מגורה של משה, and Note, ה' ד' שעה פ' שעה. See also T. J. *Sheqalim* 6, 3 and T. B. *Menahoth* 98b.

<sup>5</sup> See 2 *Chron.* iv: 7, and KAHANA on the word כמשפסם, which he explains as meaning like in form to the Mosaic one. See also *Baraita di-mele'kheth Ha-Mishkan* 10, משה מימין מגורה של משה וחמש משמאל מגורה של משה, and Note, ה' ד' שעה פ' שעה. See Maimonides, *Hil. Beth Ha-Behirah*, 3, 4, who, basing himself on T. B. *Menahoth* 28b, states that most departures from the form of the Mosaic candelabrum in golden candlesticks would make them unfit for use. According to this in conjunction with the above *Baraita*, it would appear that Solomon's candlesticks were more or less the same in form as that of Moses. Note also Josephus. *Ant.* 8. 3. 7. (NIESE, line 90) καὶ λυχνίας δὲ μυρίας ἐποίησε κατὰ τῆν Μωυσεὺς προσταγήν which latter four words must surely refer to the form.

On the other hand, see Rashi's explanation in T. B. *Menahoth* 29a ה' ד' משה מימין מגורה של משה וחמש משמאל מגורה של משה, from which it would appear that there was a discrepancy of weight between Solomon's and Moses' candelabra, which would make these former unfit to be used. (See Rashi and Nahmanides on *Exod.* xxvi: 39 and Maimonides as cited above.) But see appendix A, where we have

only was lit, or that if Solomon's were also lit, this was presumably to give light to the large hall but without all the ritual significance that was attached to the Mosaic one<sup>6</sup>.

c. 586 B.C.E. At the destruction of the first temple by Nebuchadnezzar the Mosaic candlestick seems to have been lost. It is not mentioned among the spoils taken by Nebuzaradan, chief of the guard (2 Kings xxv: 14), and rabbinic tradition, perhaps basing itself on this fact (but never overtly stating so, and therefore possibly based on an independent tradition), includes it among those things hidden by God himself at the sack of Jerusalem<sup>7</sup>.

Solomon's candlesticks on the other hand were very probably taken to Babylon, and it may be to these that the prophet Jeremiah refers (*Jer.* lii: 19), when listing the spoils taken<sup>8</sup>.

c. 519 B.C.E. Under Ezra and Nehemiah the Jews returned to their homeland, and with the sanction of Cyrus and later Darius they began to rebuild the temple. They were granted the return of that temple property that had survived (*Ezra* i: 7-11). There is no evidence that any of Solomon's candelabra had survived and were returned. This is, indeed, unlikely as gold was usually melted down for the king's treasury. In the second temple,

shown this explanation to be unlikely and have offered a different one which would invalidate this argument. See also 1 *Chron.* xxviii: 15.

<sup>6</sup> See 2 *Chron.* iv: 20, from which it would appear that all the candlesticks were lit. On the other hand see 2 *Chron.* xiii: 11, which clearly suggests that one only was alight.

See Josephus, *Ant.* 8. 3. 7. (NIESE, line 90) ἐξ ἑνὸς μίαν ἀνέθηκεν εἰς τὸν ναόν, ἵνα καίηται καθ' ἡμέραν ἀκολούθως τῷ νόμῳ which states that one only was lit; also *Baraita di-mele'keth Ha-Mishkan*, 10, אַעפ"כ לא היה מבעיר אלא, בשל משה בלבד, which again clearly states that only the Mosaic one burned. This whole issue is a subject of dispute among the *Tanna'im*, see T. J. *Sheqalim* 6, 3 and T. B. *Menahoth* 99a. There are, in fact, two disputes; a) whether all the candlesticks were lit or only the Mosaic one, and b) whether all the tables were used or only one. In T. B. *Menahoth* 99a according to Rabbi Yosē bar Judah the Mosaic table alone was used. His opinion regarding dispute a) is not mentioned. In T. J. *Sheqalim* 6, 3 this same *Tanna* is stated to hold the opinion that all the tables were used (the opposite of what is said in T. B. *Menahoth*), and that all the candlesticks were lit. Similarly in *Baraita di-mele'keth Ha-Mishkan* 10, see FRIEDMANN'S note p. 69.

<sup>7</sup> GINZBERG, *Legends*, 3, p. 161, 4, p. 321, 6, p. 19 note 112, p. 66 note 341, p. 377 note 118.

<sup>8</sup> Note plural מנורות (Septuagint τὰς λυχνίας, acc. pl.). See also Josephus, *Ant.* 10. 8. 5 (line 145): καὶ τὰς λυχνίας. MUNKACSI, in his article on the *Menorah* (in the *Memorial Vol.* to IMMANUEL LÖW, Budapest, 1947-5707, p. 127, Heb.) seems not to have noticed this point. The passages in *Kings* and *Jeremiah* are therefore consistent, and need no emendation. (See *Encycl. Biblica* 1, col. 644 for critical opinions).

therefore, there was probably one candlestick only, made completely anew, and based upon the pattern of the Mosaic one<sup>9</sup>.

c. 168 B.C.E. The temple was plundered yet a second time, this time by Antiochus Epiphanes, who took away the candelabrum (1 *Macc.* i: 21). It seems that he also took away certain other golden candlesticks known to be in the temple, and this perhaps explains the use of the plural in Josephus' account of the plunder<sup>10</sup>.

c. 165 B.C.E. As soon as the Maccabeans reconquered Jerusalem, they cleansed the temple and reconsecrated it, made new holy vessels, among them the candelabrum (1 *Macc.* iv: 49). The book of Maccabees treats of this stage somewhat cursorily. We must therefore go to other later sources to reconstruct subsequent events. When the Maccabees first recaptured the temple-precincts, they forthwith (see note 12) set about lighting candles in the traditional manner. But no longer having the golden candelabrum, they had hurriedly to arrange a makeshift one. The only materials imme-

<sup>9</sup> *Ben Sira* xxvi: 17. (Ed. KAHANE, Tel Aviv, 5720) נר מאיר על מנורת קודש, The book of Ben Sira was composed c. 180-175 B.C.E. before the Maccabean revolt. (See R. H. CHARLES, *Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the O.T.*, Oxford, 1913, p. 293). Moreover he seems to have either seen the inside of the temple or at least to be well acquainted with it (see chap. 50).

With regard to the use of the singular, נר, this is easily understood when we bear in mind that although by night all the candles were lit (2 *Chron.* xiii: 11), throughout the whole day only one light would continue to burn (1 *Sam.* iii: 3), viz. the most westerly one. (See *Mishnah, Tamid* 3, 9, T. B. *Yoma* 33a, *Menahoth* 86b and 89a.)

There was oil enough only for the night yet by a miracle it continued to burn. This miracle stopped shortly after the death of Simon the Just (T. J. *Yoma* 6, 3) and again forty years before the destruction of the second temple (T. B. *Yoma* 39b). See also *Mishnah, Hagigah* 3, 8. T. B. *ibid.* 26b, T. J. *ibid.*, *Tosefta ibid.* 3, 13. This text of *Ben Sira* is not conclusive as it may be referring to a central candlestick among others.

<sup>10</sup> *Ant.* 12. 5. 4. (NIESE, line 250) λυχνίας χρυσαῖς (καὶ βωμὸν χρύσειον): See *Mishnah, Sukkah* 5, 2. T. B. *ibid.* 51a של שם וארבעה ספלים של זהב בראשיהם וארבעה סולמות לכל אחד ואחד וארבעה ילדים מפרחי כהונה ובידיהם כדים של שמן של מאה ועשרים לוג שהם מטילים לכל ספל וספל These candlesticks were clearly very large. With regard to the golden ladder comp. *Mishnah, Tamid* 3, 9. ואבן היתה לפני המנורה ובה ג' מעלות. As to whether there were extra candelabra to act as spares in the advent of one of them becoming unclean (as was the case with other vessels, *Mishnah, Hagigah* 3, 8), see refs. cited at end of note 9. From them it would appear that there indeed were others. See RELAND, *De Spoliis Templi Hierosolymitani* (Utrecht, 1716) pp. 8, 24. From Ben Sira himself there is no evidence, for clearly only one would be used at a time. Perhaps the others were of silver. (T. B. *Menahoth* 28b), 1 *Chron.* xxviii: 15, T. B. *Sukkah* 52b states that they were 50 <sup>2</sup>ammoth high (about 75 feet), T. J. *Sukkah, ibid.* states that they were 100 <sup>2</sup>ammoth. Although these numbers are not to be taken literally, they surely indicate that these candlesticks were very large.

diately available to them were their weapons, and so after the habit of the Greek soldier they took their hollow iron spear-heads, coated them with tin (perhaps welding them together into one single candlestick), and fixed lamps in them<sup>11</sup>. These they then

<sup>11</sup> (A) *Pesiqta Rabbathi*, Chap. 2. (Ed. M. FRIEDMANN, 1880, p. 5) (פסוק, מזמור שיר הנוכת הבית) ולמה מדליק נרות בחנוכה. אלא בשעה שנצחו בניו של חשמונאי הכהן הגדול למלכות יון שנאמר (זכריה ט. יג) ועוררת בניך ציון על בניך יון. נכנסו לבית המקדש ומצאו שם שמונה שפודים של ברזל וקבעו אותם והדליקו בתוכם נרות.

(B) T. B. *Menahoth* 28b. ר' יוסי בר' יהודה אומר אף של עץ לא יעשה כדרך ששעו מלכות בית חשמונאי. אמרו לו משם ראה שפודים של ברזל היו וקיימו בבועץ העשירו עשאום של כסף חזרו והעשירו עשאום של זהב.

This text also appears in T. B. *Rosh Ha-Shanah* 24b and T. B. *Avodah Zarah* 43a.

(C) *Megillath Ta'anith*, chap. 9 (ed. NEUBAUER, Oxford 1895, p. 16). ... ושבעה שפודים של ברזל (היו) בידם וחפום (נ'א, וחכרם) בעץ.

Clearly text B is dependent upon some text such as A + C. In text C there appear 3 important changes from text A: (1) There are 7 iron bars only, not 8. (2) They seem to have brought the bars in with them and not to have found them there. (3) They overlaid them **בעץ** and not **בבעץ**. (1) The number eight in text A seems to be motivated by the 8 days of *Hanukkah*. Only seven were needed for the lights as in text C. Clearly this (text A) is a later version of the text—the *Pesiqta Rabbathi* is at least late amoraic—and it is inevitable that such “adjustments” take place. Similarly, the biblical reference betrays its aggadic bent. The number seven in text C on the other hand suggests that it is far earlier and historically more accurate. See, however, M. LICHTENSTEIN, *Die Fastenrolle (HUCA 8-9, 1931)*. (3) This variation seems to be of importance for one can read **בעץ** either as *be-ey*, with wood, or *ba'as*, tin. It seems clear that Rabbi Yosē bar Judah (text B) had before him some text similar to C. For he thought that the Hasmonean candelabrum was of wood, a possible reading of text C to which the answer given him was **שפודים של ברזל היו** **בבעץ**. See also *Diqduqey Soferim*, *Menahoth* 28b, *Rosh Ha-Shanah* 24 (No. 100).

Although all these texts are late compared with the first book of *Maccabees*, which was certainly compiled before 63 B.C.E. (KAHANE, *Apocrypha*, Heb. Ed., Tel Aviv 1956-57:16. 2, p. 85) they appear to be variant versions of a very early tradition. This tradition was already old in the time of Rabbi Yosē bar Judah (text B), of the latter half of the 2nd cent. C.E., and there were differences of opinion as to correct readings. But there was no doubting its veracity (T. B. *Menahoth* 28b).

No doubt he had learned this tradition from his father, the famous well-known Rabbi Judah ben 'Ila'i (Hyman, *Toledoth Ha-Tanna'im We-ha'amora'im*, London, 1910, p. 727, col. 1) who is known to have been historically minded (e.g. *Mishnah, Sheqalim* 2, 4, *Ma'aser Sheri* 5, 8) and to have passed on several early traditions (e.g. T. B. *Megillah* 9a, *Menahoth* 109b). He seems to have been a specialist in the history of Judaean customs (e.g. T. B. *Rava Bathra* 100b, *Kethubboth* 12a, *Pesahim* 42b, *ibid.* 55a etc.).

One thing seems to emerge clearly from all this, namely that none of Solomon's candelabra had survived. For, if they had, what need for these new ones? Even if we were to assume that Solomon's were unsuitable because they were unclean or not identical in appearance (see note 5, app. A), they would surely have been at least as suitable as iron spearheads.

filled with ritually pure oil which they were fortunate enough to have found<sup>12</sup> and thus the lights were rekindled.

Nevertheless the strong feeling against bringing weapons into the temple, or even using iron (with its lethal associations) in the construction of the temple (note 11 end), may have activated them to construct a temporary silver candlestick (text B) until the new golden one was ready.

Only a month or so after the original re-entry into the temple-courts<sup>13</sup> everything was prepared for the great ceremony of

Moreover, the line in *1 Mac.* iv: 49 is ambiguous (καὶ ἐποίησαν τὰ σκεύη τὰ ἄγια καινὰ, καὶ εἰσήνεγκαν τὴν λυχνίαν καὶ τὸ θυσιαστήριον . . . καὶ τὴν τράπεζαν εἰς τὸν ναόν). It must be understood that the candlestick was one of these new vessels, for, if not, from where would they bring it? Antiochus had taken it away. See also *2 Mac.* x: 3.

The alternative reading in text C—חברום—recalls the *Tosefta, Soṭah* 4, 7 (Ed. ZUCKERMANDEL, p. 299 line 21)—מתכת וחברום של שפודים ששעשו לו שפודים של מתכת וחברום. Presumably the normal way of welding together pieces of metal was with tin (e.g. *Mishnah, Kelim* 30, 3). Here, according to the alternative reading, the various parts were welded together to form a complete *Menorah*. Regarding the nature of these שפודים, we have already shown (*Sinai*, 53, Jerusalem, 1963-5723, p. 280-2, Hebrew) that they were in fact spearheads. It was an army custom to use the hollow spearheads as lamps whilst on the march (*ibid.*, and LIDDELL & SCOTT, s.v. ἄβελισκολόγχιον). The Maccabean victors, on entering the temple lit lights in the only candlestick(s) available to them, so that there might be a נר תמיד (constant light) burning. (See *Sifra, Ḥemor*, 13. HERZOG *Memorial Vol.*, Jerusalem, 1962-5722, p. 585 and note 12, Hebrew.) The use of the word שפוד in the sense of spearhead occurs in one of the Dead Sea Scrolls (*Sinai, ibid.*, note 13). Moreover this army custom would appear to have gone out of use very early. (See sources cited *ibid.*, and note that no parallel word is to be found in early Latin.) This again points to the antiquity of the tradition.

As to why the iron rods should have been coated with tin, see GINZBERG, *Legends*, 3, p. 166 (*Ex. R.*, chap. 35) . . . "In the tabernacle, as later in the temple, gold, silver and brass were employed, but not iron." Here we see a distinct bias against iron, and perhaps for this reason they overlaid it with tin. On the other hand, see *1 Chron.* xxix: 7 (and see Z. W. EINHORN on *Ex. R.*, *ibid.*). Yet there is no mention anywhere in the Bible of vessels being made of ברזל. See now D. SPERBER, *REJ* 4 (124), 1-2, 1965, pp. 179-84.

[There was some iron used in the second temple, e.g. the כלה עורב, a row of spikes on the roof of the temple to keep the birds away (*Mishnah, Middoth* 4, 6, T. B. *Menahoth* 107a and Rashi *ibid.*, *Mo'ed Qatan* 9a and Rashi *ibid.* etc.) or the אונקליות של ברזל, the iron hooks on which they hung the meat to skin it (*Mishnah, Middoth* 3, 5, *Tamid* 3, 5).]

<sup>12</sup> T. B. *Shabbath* 21b. *Megillath Ta'anith*, chap. 9. From these texts one can see the urgency with which they lit the lamps (Maimonides, *Hilekhoth Hanukkah* 3, 2). See also note 11 text C.

<sup>13</sup> *Megillath Ta'anith*, chap. 8, on *Marḥeshwan* 23. This must clearly have taken place before the temple rededication (rather than almost a year after it). Cf. my article in *Sinai* vol. 54, 1964-5724, nos. 4-5 (328-9), p. 217-222.

rededication. The temple was purified, buildings of idolatry<sup>14</sup> and prostitution (note 13) which the Greeks had in the meanwhile built within the temple-area were torn down and removed, the whole interior was rebuilt, and the ritual vessels made anew<sup>15</sup>.

On the 25 Kislev 165 B.C.E. the candles were finally lit in the new golden candelabrum, the altar rededicated, sacrifices offered, and joyful festivities continued for eight days<sup>16</sup>.

Considerable care would appear to have been taken to ensure that everything even in detail should conform, as far as possible, to tradition, so that even new עטרת (certainly not essential to the celebrations) were made to replace those that Antiochus had pillaged<sup>17</sup>. It is therefore likely that the candelabrum itself conformed strictly to the traditional pattern (see App. A).

c. 63 B.C.E. Other golden candlesticks were again made to adorn the temple; but they served merely as secondary adornments to the temple, so that when Pompey entered the holy of holies (Josephus, *Ant.* xiv, 4, 4), after conquering Jerusalem and massacring many priests, he is stated to have seen one candelabrum only.

c. 54 B.C.E. Nine years later, when Crassus came and pillaged the temple, he robbed it of all its money and much of its gold. But through the astuteness of Eleazar, guardian of the sacred vessels, the candelabrum and the other sacred vessels were not taken (Josephus, *Ant.* xiv, 7, 1).

40-37 B.C.E. The earliest known plastic representation of the seven-branched candelabrum is that which appears on the coins of Antigonus Mattathias (40-37 B.C.E.), the last of the Hasmonean dynasty<sup>18</sup>. With him the policy of stressing the political role of

<sup>14</sup> *Ibid.* chap. 9, on 3 Kislev. This, too, must have taken place before the temple rededication of the 25 Kislev.

<sup>15</sup> *I Macc.* iv: 44-52. Any period less than a month would scarcely have sufficed to achieve all this.

<sup>16</sup> *I Macc.* iv: 50-57.

<sup>17</sup> *Ibid.* v. 57. See *Mishnah, Middoth* 3, 88. *Tosafoth* to T. B. *Gifin* 7a, s.v. *‘aṯaroth*. Cf. *Zech.* vi: 14. The fact that they could afford to make them testifies to their having gold. This was from a recent victory (*I Macc.* iv: 23). Thus the word *העשירי* (occurring twice) in text B (note 11) is a later explanatory addition.

<sup>18</sup> G. F. HILL, *Cat. of Greek Coins in British Museum*, 27 (London, 1914) pl. 23, fig. 11.

A. REIFENBERG, *Ancient Jewish Arts* (N.Y., 1950) p. 69; *idem, Israel's History in Coins* (London 1953), p. 22, fig. 5.

the priesthood comes most clearly to the fore, and the temple objects represented on his coins seem to be symbolic not merely of their sacred functions, but also of the political independence for which he was struggling, a political independence that was of necessity anti-Roman. Thus on the Greek side of his coins is inscribed Βασιλεως Αντιγονου, while on the Hebrew side מתתיה (ח)הבר היהודים הכהן הגדל, thus completely identifying the two roles. This combination is unique in Jewish coinage<sup>19</sup>.

The motifs on his coins further indicate this campaign for independence both by themselves representing temple objects<sup>20</sup>, thus again stressing his priestly role, and in their being sacred objects, thereby propagandising for a religious independence which was tantamount to political independence.

Moreover there appears on his coins also the vine motif<sup>21</sup>, symbolic of Israel as an independent nation<sup>22</sup>, and at the same time connected with the temple. For above the gates to the temple was a great golden vine<sup>23</sup>. This motif recurs again later in coins struck during the second revolt, as a symbol of freedom and indeed of salvation<sup>24</sup>.

M. NARKISS, *Coins of Israel* (in Hebrew) (Jerusalem, 1936) part 1, pl. 3, fig. 3 and p. 100. F. W. MADDEN, *Coins of the Jews* (London 1881) p. 102.

<sup>19</sup> It should further be noted that Mattathias Antigonus reigned after John Hyrcanus II who was merely high-priest and not king. It was to emphasise this difference between himself and his predecessor that Mattathias Antigonus put both titles on his coins.

WIRGIN and MANDEL, *The History of Coins and Symbols in Ancient Israel* (N.Y. 1958) p. 31.

GOODENOUGH, *Symbols* Vol. 3, figs. 674, 675.

<sup>20</sup> As to the meaning of the motif on the verso, see NARKISS, *ibid.* (p. 64) who suggests either the table of the Shewbread or the four corners of the altar (neither of which appears altogether satisfactory, as indeed he himself intimates). Cf. *JQR.*, Jan. 1964, p. 250-7.

<sup>21</sup> NARKISS, *ibid.*, p. 110, corp. 18.

<sup>22</sup> T. B. *Tamid* 29a, *Hullin* 92a. *Esther R.* chap. 9. *Psalm* lxxx: 9.

<sup>23</sup> Josephus, *Ant.* xv, 11, 3. *War* 5. 5. 4. *Mishnah Middoth* 3, 8. T. B. *Tamid* 29a, *Hullin* 90b. T. J. *Middoth* 4, 4 (41a). It is further referred to in Tacitus' *Histories* 5. 5 (Loeb Ed., p. 183).

<sup>24</sup> NARKISS, *ibid.* p. 65, also p. 128 corp. 110 and 112—a cluster of grapes and an inscription לחרות ירושלים. p. 127 corp. 108, p. 122 corp. 91.

The vine-leaf served a similar function, e.g. *ibid.* p. 119 corp. 79—a vine-leaf with the inscription חר(ו)ת ציין, or again, p. 122 corp. 89, the same motif with the inscription שנת א' לגאולת ישראל.

Note also the little intaglio reproduced in ROMANOFF's *Jewish Symbols on Ancient Jewish Coins* (1944), pl. 5, fig. 51, which incorporates both the candlestick motif and that of the cluster of grapes, for it shows a seven-branched candelabrum with a cluster of grapes on either side. He dates it 1st cent. C.E. (I should have thought it was later.) Similarly see A. REIFENBERG's *Ancient*

These motifs were by no means merely decorative adjuncts, but of a calculated political nature. Thus, according to one opinion, the Talmud tells us, the plaque placed above (or on) the one of the temple gates on which was engraven the likeness of the city of Susa<sup>25</sup> was there "so that the fear of the sovereignty (of Persia) might ever be upon them"<sup>26</sup>.

The candelabrum, being an integral part of the festival of *Ḥanukkah*, a festival which commemorates the regaining of Jewish religious and political independence, came to symbolise that independence itself. Josephus, who (c. 90 C.E.) did not know exactly why *Ḥanukkah* was called the festival of lights writes: "I suppose the reason was, because this liberty beyond our hopes appeared to us; and that thence was the name given to that festival" (*Ant.* xii, 7,7 trans. Whiston).

According to our interpretation of the slightly earlier Rabbinic traditions (note 11) relating to the festival of *Ḥanukkah*, the symbolism of the candelabrum was even more poignant and poetic; for, in the first instance, the very weapons of war themselves became the apparatus for diffusing the light. Thus the candelabrum symbolised not only the liberty gained, but also the manner in which it was gained; not only the freedom, but also the struggle for freedom.

Antigonus, when wishing once again to reinstate the Hasmonean dynasty and "to proclaim universally the popularity and prestige of his ancestors" (Namenyi, *The Essence of Jewish Art*, p. 51) consequently chose the symbol that best expressed both his historical justifications, his spiritual heritage, and his religious and political aims.

The candelabrum as it appears on Antigonus' coins is represented in a simplified, perhaps stylized form (without the flowers, knobs and cups etc. described in *Exod.* xxv: 31-36). Basically it corresponds in form to what rabbinic tradition describes as the Mosaic candelabrum, e.g., all its branches terminate at the same height<sup>27</sup>.

*Jewish Arts*, p. 138, where a candelabrum surmounts three figures treading grapes in a wine press. Also *ibid.* 142, 3. 143, 2. GOODENOUGH, *Symbols* 4, p. 76. 3, figs. 575 and 576.

<sup>25</sup> T. B. *Middoth* 34a. *Mishnah*, *ibid.* 1, 3.

<sup>26</sup> T. B. *Menahoth* 98a. See S. W. BARON, *Social & Religious Hist. of Jews* (1952), 2, p. 13 and p. 332. note 13.

<sup>27</sup> T. B. *Menahoth* 28b וּשְׁנֵי קָנִים יוֹצְאִים מִמֶּנּוּ אֶחָד אֵילָךְ וְאֶחָד אֵילָךְ וְנִמְשָׁכִים



It would appear to be standing on a sloping base supported on (three?) small legs<sup>28</sup> (very like the base of the chalice represented on the "heavy shekels" of the first revolt<sup>29</sup>) and would thus be in accord with rabbinic tradition according to which it stood on legs. For in the Talmud we are told it had legs, but not told how many<sup>30</sup>, whilst mediaeval texts preserving more details of the tradition state that there were three<sup>31</sup>.

Furthermore there appear between the first and sixth centuries C.E. a great number of carved and painted candlesticks with three-legged bases<sup>32</sup>. Coming as they do from different parts of Europe and the Middle East they vary greatly in their decorative style, and even format, but the three-legged base remains common

ועולים כנגד גובהה של מגורה וטפח חלקוטפח כפתור ושני קנים יוצאים ממנו אחד אילך ואחד אילך נמשכים ועולים כנגד גובהה של מגורה טפח חלקוטפח כפתור ושני קנים יוצאים ממנו אחד אילך ואחד אילך נמשכים ועולים כנגד גובהה של מגורה וטפחיים חלקי. נשתיירו שם ג' גביעים וכפתור ופרח.

<sup>28</sup> ARYEH KINDLER, *Ošar Maṭbe'oth 'Ereš Yisra'el* (Jerusalem 1958), pl. 4.

<sup>29</sup> REIFENBERG, *Ancient Jewish Coins*, pl. X.

<sup>30</sup> T. B. *Menahoth* 28b גובהה של מגורה שמונה טפחים. עשר טפחים, הרגלים והפרח ג' טפחים. This text, though a late one—Samuel was a Babylonian *'Amora* of the first generation, born c. 165 C.E. and died c. 257 C.E.—is clearly based on an early tradition. For it is difficult to imagine a late tradition growing up and not basing itself on well-known contemporary copies of the candelabrum. The one on the arch of Titus has a solid base; yet no one cited it as an example to contradict the statement of Samuel. (Cf. T. B. *Sukkah* 5a, *Yoma* 57a, *Me'ilah* 17b.) This suggests that it was realised that such representations deviated in form from the prototype and could therefore not be cited as examples of what the real candelabrum looked like. See note 99. See also *Baraita di-mele'kheth Ha-Mishkan*, chap. 10 (ed. FRIEDMANN, p. 64). Both the Mattathias candlestick and the Titus one correspond more closely to Samuel's statement than to the latter source. See also GOODENOUGH, *Symbols*, 4, p. 74, and notes *ibid.*

<sup>31</sup> Maimonides, *Hilekhot Beth Ha-Behirah*, 3, 2. Rashi on *Ex.* xxv: 31. No early sources for this tradition are known, but these authorities rarely made any statement without reliable textual sources. (But cf. *Yalqut Shim'oni*, *ibid.*, section 369, subsection 38, *end*). See *Midrash Ha-Gadol*, *Ex.* 32.

Such a base would have been consistent iconographically, for whereas the candelabrum may symbolise the world (GINZBERG, *Legends*, 3 p. 151 and 161, 6, p. 62 note 321, p. 65 note 339), the three-legged base could symbolise the three virtues on which the world is based (גמילות חסדים תורה עבודה וגמילות חסדים) (*Mishnah*, *'Avoth* 1, 1, see also *ibid.* 1, 18). Simon the Just would have known the three-legged candelabrum, note 86. (Cf. *Ex. R.* 34, 2).

<sup>32</sup> A. REIFENBERG, *Ancient Jewish Art*, 102, 2, 106, 113, 115, 139, 140, 144, 2, 154. Josephus on the other hand (*Ant.* 3. 6. 6 and App. 1) records that the Mosaic candlestick had a single base. But he may well have been inferring this from the candlestick that he (a priest) had no doubt seen in the temple, and which we know from its representation on the Arch of Titus to have had a solid base.

to them all.<sup>33</sup> Clearly then this motif was not determined by local stylistic influences<sup>34</sup>.

Moreover, even from Rome, where the Arch of Titus was there before everyone's eyes as a constant reminder of how the candelabrum appeared, namely with a heavy hexagonal base, in two steps, no corresponding representation appears on other antiquities, whereas many three-legged ones do<sup>35</sup>.

It is therefore clear that such a body of tradition postulates a candlestick with three legs, antedating the representation on the Arch of Titus or the candlestick there represented. (If on the other hand we see the Antigonus candlestick as having a solid sloping base this change may go back to the time of the Maccabees. Such a change would not invalidate it for ritual use<sup>36</sup>; on the other hand it would considerably simplify construction. At that time, when they seem to have had few skilled craftsmen—later coins are evidence of the absence of a tradition of fine craftsmanship<sup>37</sup>—this may well have been an important consideration.)

The next plastic representation of the candelabrum is that which appears on the triumphal arch of Titus at Rome, erected in the reign of Domitian c. 81 C.E.<sup>38</sup> The relief on the arch portrays

<sup>33</sup> REIFENBERG *ibid.* in Asia Minor, 141, 3. 142, 2 and 5, in Syria, 142, 1. 144, 1. 145, 3. 146, 2. 153, 1. 153, 2, in Carthage, 145, 4, in Alexandria, 146, 1. Dura Europos (c. 249 C.E.). *The Synagogue*, C. H. KRAELING (Yale, 1956), pl. 51, 59, 60, see also p. 98 fig. 28.

ROMANOFF, *Jewish Symbols on Ancient Jewish Coins*, pl. 5, fig. 51 (1st cent. C.E.) p. 36.

B. KANAEL, *Die Kunst der Antiken Synagoge* (1961), 9, 23, 34 and 35 (from Sidon), 49, 50, 55-7, 62, 63, 66, 67, 69, 70 (this last from Naro in Tunisia). All these appear on tombstones, lintels, glassware mosaics, painted synagogue decorations etc. See also GOODENOUGH, *Symbols*, vol. 3. Out of 190 examples, 132 are three-legged, and of the remainder over half are ambiguous.

<sup>34</sup> The three-legged base appears to be oriental in origin, though it first appears as a candlestick base in 6th cent. Etruscan bronzes. (Several are represented in the Brit. Mus.) These bronzes derive some of their stylistic characteristics from Phoenician sources (e.g., the motif of discs round the central shaft, cf. *BASOR*, 85, Feb. 1942, p. 18-21, figs 1-10), and so, maybe, the tripod base too. (It has been pointed out to me that such a base is more commonly found in sandy desert areas where it would serve as a firmer basis than a flat *podium*.) The tripod base is a very common feature appearing already in very early Palestinian pottery, and indeed all over Asia as far as China.

<sup>35</sup> A. REIFENBERG, *ibid.*, 131, 133, 135, 149, 152.

<sup>36</sup> T. B. *Menahoth* 28b זה את זה כפתורים מעכבים זה את זה גביעים מעכבים זה את זה רגלים מעכבים זה את זה But it is never asserted that מעכבים זה את זה רגלים מעכבים זה את זה

<sup>37</sup> E.g. *Brit. Mus. Cat.*, *ibid.* pl. 20-22.

<sup>38</sup> M. MUNKACSI, *ibid.*, p. 130. But see REIFENBERG, *ibid.*, p. 77 where he

the triumphal march in which some of the greatest of the spoils carried away from Jerusalem by Titus were borne in pomp and grandeur through the streets of Rome c. 71 C.E. (Josephus, *War*, vii, 5 5). Most impressive of all was the candelabrum. The masons who carved this panel had probably seen the original, and there is every reason to suppose that they represented it accurately, more especially in view of the fact that in Rome triumphal arches were considered as documents and accuracy was therefore demanded<sup>39</sup>.

But even at first sight one notices a certain oddity about it, namely the lack of stylistic cohesion and balance between the upper and the lower halves. The base is vastly out of proportion to what it bears and the branches grow out of their trunk somewhat uncomfortably. To a "Vitruvian trained" Roman the proportions must have appeared very strange;<sup>40</sup> and had he wished to alter it, idealise it, or even had he done it wholly from memory, he would no doubt have automatically adjusted it to fit the tenets of contemporary style.

This, in itself, suggests that we have here an accurate copy, and such a view is further borne out by the fact that the upper part conforms in essentials to later Rabbinic descriptions of the candelabrum. For example, we are told in the Talmud<sup>41</sup> that the distance between the branches was equal to their own thickness, that all the branches terminated at the same height, or that the ratio between the distance from the bottom branch to the top one (their own thickness included), and the distance from the top branch to the top of the candelabrum<sup>42</sup> was one of 5:4, all of

states that it was erected in 94 C.E. For a fuller discussion of the subject and bibliography, see NASH, *Pictorial Dictionary of Ancient Rome* (London, 1961) 1, p. 133-5 (figs. 143-5), who suggests 81 C.E.

<sup>39</sup> But see GOODENOUGH, *Symbols*, 4 (1954) p. 72; vol. 5 p. iii.

<sup>40</sup> In the opinion of an expert goldsmith, in order to support the upper part, a flat base would have to be very large and heavy, and in a ratio such as is found in our representation. A tripod base, on the other hand, could be far smaller and less clumsy, and, if for this reason alone, would no doubt be preferred. Thus the size-relationship between the upper and lower parts of our candelabrum conforms to practical rather than aesthetic demands. This again points to the same conclusions that we have arrived at by other methods (below).

I am indebted to Dr. A. SHARF, of Bar-Ilan University (Ramat-Gan), for calling my attention to this point.

<sup>41</sup> See note 24.

<sup>42</sup> This measurement is seen to be correct when one disregards the wide bowl-like shapes on the top of the branches. They are the נִרְיָה (Ex. xxv: 37) in which the oil was placed, and were according to some opinions separate

which characteristics we find in the representation on the arch of Titus. In the upper part we also find cups, knobs and flowers (though not in the same numbers as given in the Talmud<sup>43</sup>). As this whole upper section is in a style that was alien to the Roman craftsman, but was nevertheless faithfully represented, it seems likely that the whole was accurately reproduced.

The lower part, on the other hand, not only differs radically in style from the upper half, but also from all traditional descriptions given. Not only does it not have three legs, or in fact any legs, but a far larger base even than on Antigonus' coins. For the width of the base here almost equals that of the widest span of the branches. The central shaft from the base to the first span bears no relationship to that described in the Talmud<sup>44</sup>. Moreover, the candelabrum as a whole now lacks three פרחים, two כפתורים, and one גביע<sup>45</sup>, and this would make it unfit for use<sup>46</sup>.

According to the Talmud the lower part was slightly smaller in

and not to be considered as part of the *Menorah* proper (T. B. *Menahoth* 88b). Even if they were constructed out of the same piece of gold, they were still considered as separate entities and are not included in the measurements of the height of the candelabrum as stated in T. B. *Menahoth* 28b. (See notes 44 and 30.)

On the distinction between *מנורה* and *נר*, see *Gen. R.* 20, 7, where a good wife with a bad husband is likened to a *גבה על החרס של זרב ונר של החרס על גבה*.

<sup>43</sup> T. B. *Menahoth* 28b. 'נמצאו גביעים כב' כפתורים יא' פרחים יט'. Total 52. Josephus, *Ant.* 3, 6, 7. (line 145) states that "it was made with its knobs (*σφαίρις*) and lilies (*καλ κρίνα*) and pomegranates (*σὺν ἐστῆσσοις*) and bowls (*καὶ κρατῆρηδίοις*)" all of which amounted to 70 (a symbolic number).

On the Arch, as far as one can make out from RELAND's engraving, there are 16 תפוחים, 22 גביעים, 13 פרחים and 4 orbs, totalling in all 55. The correspondence in the number of גביעים is deceptive, for much of the candelabrum is damaged and there may have been more. (RELAND's engraving is also reproduced in WILLIAM KNIGHT, *The Arch of Titus and the Spoils of the Temple*, London, 1861, p. iii.)

<sup>44</sup> T. B. *Menahoth* 28b *ג' והפרח ו' טפחים הרגלים והפרח ג' טפחים של מנורה יח' טפחים חלק וטפה שבו גביע כפתור ופרח וטפחיים חלק וטפה כפתור*. Stylistically, this is more satisfactory than the form depicted on the Arch of Titus. For here the line of the central shaft is continued down throughout, preserving a unified but not monotonous axial focal line. In the Arch of Titus on the other hand the lower part of the shaft is completely different from the upper part, far wider and with a different kind of ornamentation. Thus the continuity of the central axis is no longer preserved.

The style of the upper part is consistent with certain Phoenician trends, see e.g. G. PERROT and C. CHUPIEZ, *History of Art in Phoenicia* (London, 1885) p. 138, figs. 81-83. The latter 2 are Carthaginian but clearly of Eastern, and more particularly of Phoenician, origin.

<sup>45</sup> See note 44.

<sup>46</sup> See note 36.

height than the upper one <sup>47</sup>, whereas here the lower portion is about one fifth more again. Clearly the lower half was changed and this alteration must have come about after the reign of Antigonos, for we have noted that on his coins the base is not so large.

Finally even a cursory examination of the details of the base is very revealing. It consists of two parallel hexagonal podia, the upper one being smaller in diameter than the lower. Carved on the faces of the panels are: upper centre, two eagles holding a swag between them, flanked on either side in the neighbouring panels by *Kêlê* (κῆτη, *pistrices* or seamonsters, distinguishable by their fish-tails); in the lower centre panel, a *kêtos*, and on either side two bird-headed, winged *kêlê* facing one another. If we are to accept that these were not additions by the local sculptor (this being unlikely in view of the accuracy thus far noted, and evidence to be further adduced), then we are presented with something very out of keeping with the Jewish tradition <sup>48</sup>.

The direct prototype of the base is found at the great temple at Didyma (near Miletus in S. Turkey), where there appears the earliest example of the polygonal *podium*, also with *kêlê* carved on their panelled faces <sup>49</sup>. The profile of the foliate form above the *podium* (which derives ultimately from 6th cent. Persian art <sup>50</sup>) also has its suggestion at Didyma <sup>51</sup> but first begins to come into fashion in Roman statuary <sup>52</sup> about the first cent. B.C.E.

Nevertheless, the actual double-step motif as a candlestick *podium* rarely if ever appears in Roman statuary, again suggesting the accuracy of the copy. One of these steps may have been used for a place upon which to place the tongs and other instruments with which the lamps were cleaned and tended (see *Mishnah*,

<sup>47</sup> See note 44. The total height was 18 *tefahim* and from the bottom to the first span was 8.

<sup>48</sup> *Mishnah*, *Avodah Zarah* 3. 3. המוצא כלים ועליהם צורת חמה צורת לבנה צורת דרקון יוליכם לים המלח.

<sup>49</sup> TH. WIEGAND, *Didyma* (Berlin 1941), Vol. of plates, pl. 150 F352, pl. 151 F353, pl. 155 F358. Also pl. 156-158. See also M. KON in *PEQ*, 1950 p. 25 et seq.

<sup>50</sup> E.g. ARTHUR UPHAM POPE, *A Survey of Persian Art*, (1938) Vol 4, pl. 82, 85, 87 (5th cent. B.C.E.) and pl. 102 (4th cent. B.C.E.). In the British Museum there are some 5th cent. capitals from Taanek whose profile shows distinct similarities to ours.

<sup>51</sup> *Didyma*, *ibid.*, pl. 96 F112, F120.

<sup>52</sup> A random example (for there are many) though of a slightly later date, is to be seen in GEORG LIPPOLD, *Vatican Cat.* (Berlin, 1936) 3 part 2, pl. 167, 33. For eagle with swag motif, *ibid.*, 3 part 1, pl. 77, 561a. See also G. HENROIT, *Encyc. des Luminaires* (Paris, 1933) pl. 8, fig. 5.

*Tamid* 3, 9) or at least the motif may have been suggested by the three-stepped stone placed before the candelabrum and used in part for that purpose (*ibid.* and T. B. *Menahoth* 29a).

From all this we can clearly infer that the alteration was carried out under the auspices of someone distinctly Rome-orientated, and thus the motif of the two eagles is by no means fortuitous, but, on the contrary, is a pointed allusion to Roman sovereignty. Thus the symbols of Roman overlordship were brought into the very temple itself, and I would suggest that it was through Herod that this took place as part of his "westernizing" campaign<sup>53</sup>.

Moreover if we accept that the base in the time of Antigonus Mattathias had legs, we may state with a fair degree of certainty that this alteration took place before the time of Philo (c. 20 B.C.E.-40 C.E.). For had it had three legs in his time, he would certainly have cited this fact to support his (otherwise slightly forced) symbolic interpretation, that all hinged upon the number three<sup>54</sup>.

The fact that he does not do this suggests rather that he was basing himself on what he had seen when in the temple<sup>55</sup> (as was the case with Josephus, note 32), thus fixing the period within which the alteration might have taken place as being after the reign of Antigonus Mattathias and before Philo's writing (or temple visit). This would again point most clearly to the period of Herod.

It was he, we recall, who having been set up by the might of Rome, determined to establish Roman sovereignty. His coins bear distinct sign of such a policy, for most of the motifs are pagan. But among them one notes an emphasis upon symbols related to Apollo, e.g., the tripod<sup>56</sup>, the incense-bowl with date-palm<sup>57</sup> branches, the Macedonian shield with a sun-motif<sup>58</sup>, etc. These were no doubt motivated by the fact that Augustus, after the

<sup>53</sup> On his programme of hellenization, see note 75 end, and *ibid.* p. 57.

<sup>54</sup> *Quis Her.*, 218n. Loeb ed. vol. 4, p. 391 etc.

<sup>55</sup> *Horeb*, 3, Dec. 1958, p. 18 (New York, Hebrew).

<sup>56</sup> NARKISS, *ibid.*, p. 101, corp 25, pl. 3 fig. 8. *Brit. Mus. Cat.*, p. 222, Nos. 19, 25, 28, 35, pl. 24 figs 5-8. At the oracular shrine of Apollo in his temple at Delphi the priestess, called the Pythia, seated on a tripod over a fissure in the rock, would utter her oracles in divine ecstasy. Hence the association of the tripod with Apollo.

<sup>57</sup> NARKISS, *ibid.*, p. 102 corp. 29, pl. 3 fig. 12, p. 101 corp. 25, pl. 3 fig. 8. Apollo was born in Delos under a date-palm.

<sup>58</sup> F. W. MADDEN, *Coins of the Jews* (London, 1881) p. 109, 3.

battle of Actium (31 B.C.E.), attributing his victory to the beneficence of Apollo, had elected him to be his special patron, erecting to him a great temple on the Palatine<sup>59</sup>. (It may be noted that the chief centre of Apollo's cult for the Asian Greeks was Didyma<sup>60</sup>.)

More telling still is the eagle motif that also appears on his coins<sup>61</sup>, an overt symbol of Roman rule. This symbol he brought even to the temple itself, hanging a large golden eagle over the main gates<sup>62</sup>. No doubt he made another golden vine<sup>63</sup>, to hang over yet a different temple gate, because it was also connected with pagan gods. It was as a symbol of Liber, i.e. Bacchus that Tacitus knew of it<sup>64</sup>.

c. 37 B.C.E. We further recall that towards the end of Antigonus' reign the Parthians had conquered and "plundered all Jerusalem" (Josephus, *Ant.* xiv, 13, 9) and in all likelihood had damaged the candelabrum. When, therefore, Herod decided to rebuild the temple, he would naturally have restored it, but with the substitution of secular-pagan (*kêrê*) and clearly Roman motifs (eagles) in place of what had been. Thus, consistently with his general policy, he attempted to convert Antigonus' symbol of Jewish religious and political independence into his own one of secularism and subservience to Rome. The eagle over the temple gate proclaimed its message to the general populace; even the great golden vine was of ambiguous interpretation; whilst within the very sanctum the candelabrum-base was intended constantly to remind the priests that not God, but Rome, was their master.

<sup>59</sup> NARKISS, *ibid.*, p. 67 and 68. For other interpretations of the symbolism of Herod's coinage, see *Publ. of the Israel Numismatic Soc.*, 2, 1958 (Jerusalem) p. 34. GOODENOUGH, *Symbols* (N.Y. 8 vols 1953-1958) 1, p. 274. See J. MEYSHAN in *PEQ*, 1959, p. 109-121.

<sup>60</sup> There was, moreover, a personal connection between Herod and the Apollonian cult, as his grandfather, Herod of Ashkelon, was a hierodule of the temple of Apollo at Ashkelon. (Eusebius *Hist. Eccles.* i, 4, 2; 7, 11, on the authority of Africanus. See also Julius Africanus, *The Epistle to Aristides* iv, Justin Martyr's *Dialogue with Trypho*, 52. See *JQR* N.S., Vol. 53, 4, April, 1963 p. 288 and note 50.)

<sup>61</sup> NARKISS, *ibid.*, p. 101 corp. 24, pl. 3 fig. 7. REIFENBERG, *ibid.* 82, 2. *Brit. Mus. Cat.* p. 227 No. 69, pl. 24 fig. 14.

<sup>62</sup> Josephus, *Ant.* 17, 6, 2. *War* 1. 33. 2. S. W. BARON, *Social and Religious Hist. of the Jews* 1, p. 238, and p. 402 note 34.

<sup>63</sup> Josephus, *Ant.* 15. 11. 3, *War* 5. 5. 4. The earlier one had been given away by Aristobulus to Pompey a short time before (*Ant.* 14. 3. 1).

<sup>64</sup> Tacitus, *Histories* 5. 5. (Loeb ed. vol. 2, p. 183) . . . Sed quia sacerdotes eorum tibia tympanisque concinebant, hedera vinciebantur, vitisque aurea in templo reperta, Liberum patrem coli, dormitorem Orientis, quidam arbitrati sunt, nequaquam congruentibus institutis.

c. 19 B.C.E. This would have been no more than a small detail of his temple programme<sup>65</sup>, which included a great many things not altogether in keeping with Jewish tradition<sup>66</sup>. No doubt he had with him Roman-trained craftsmen, especially for the skilled sculpture such as the twisted columns and the corinthian capitals<sup>67</sup>. Craftsmen such as these would have executed the base (for from the stylistic evidence rendered by his coins<sup>68</sup> it would appear that there was very limited local artistic talent).

When we look again in yet greater detail at the base and compare it with its prototypes in Didyma, the results are most rewarding. For instance, the lower-centre panel with the twisting *kētē* is a direct quotation from a similar such panel at Didyma<sup>69</sup> (even to the pose, positioning and direction of the monster). But—and here it is the departure from the original that is most instructive—the nereid seated on the back of the *kētōs* at Didyma (a common motif)<sup>70</sup> is omitted from the candelabrum panel. Surely this is an example of a concession to the Jewish law which so strictly forbids the representation of the human figure<sup>71</sup>. The flanking panels with their pairs of bird-headed, winged fish-tailed creatures have not dissimilar prototypes at Didyma<sup>72</sup>. But, whereas at Didyma they have spiky rills growing out of their necks in accord-

<sup>65</sup> Described in Josephus, *Ant.* 15, 11, 2-5. *War* 1, 21, 1. See also T. B. *Bava Bathra* 5a.

<sup>66</sup> Josephus, *Ant.* 15, 11, 5 (line 416). As to Josephus' attitude towards images, see *Ant.* 3, 5, 5 (line 91), "The second commands us not to make any images of any living creature to worship it" (WHISTON'S translation). *Ant.* 8, 7, 5 (line 109), "He [Solomon] sinned and fell into error . . . when he made the images of brazen oxen that supported the brazen sea, and the images of lions about his own throne, for these he made although it was not agreeable to piety to do so" (WHISTON). Here Josephus is even stricter in his outlook. *Ant.* 15, 11, 5 (line 416), "Now the Law forbids those that propose to live according to it to erect images or representations of any living creatures" (WHISTON). Furthermore note *Ant.* 3, 6, 2 (line 113), 4 (line 126) and 5 (line 137). *Ant.* 15, 9, 5 (line 329). Also *War* 1. 33. 3; 5. 5. 4 (end). See also E. R. GOODENOUGH, *By Light, Light* (1935), p. 258 and E. BEVAN, *Holy Images* p. 48.

<sup>67</sup> Josephus, *Ant.* 15, 11, 5 (lines 413/414).

<sup>68</sup> NARKISS, *ibid.*, pl. 3 figs 5/12. But see also ref. at end of note 59.

<sup>69</sup> *Didyma, ibid.*, pl. 155 F358.

<sup>70</sup> KATHARINE SHEPPARD, *Fish-tailed Monsters in Greek and Etruscan Art* (N.Y. 1940, privately published).

<sup>71</sup> T. B. *Avodah Zarah* 42b. Furthermore a nereid, being a naked female form, would be yet more sharply opposed.

<sup>72</sup> *Didyma, ibid.* 219 F646 and F646a. 123 F277c, F279, F281, all spiky-necked. In pairs facing one another, 121 F288, F291a; 119 F273, F275; 116 F270, F291, etc. See also TH. WIEGAND'S *Baalbek* 1898-1905 (Berlin and Leipzig 1921) 1, pl. 112.





Jewish coins, perhaps because of its very "problematic" nature <sup>77</sup>.

On the whole, then, it would appear that the representation on the Arch of Titus is accurate. But whereas the internal proportions correspond to those given in the Talmud, the general impression would appear to be a little too small in comparison with the men bearing it <sup>78</sup>. One may, I think, conclude that the craftsmen worked not from the original but from drawings that were indeed accurate, but without a scale, and that their idea of general size was from memory. This would be consistent with the candelabrum's being already locked up in the temple of Peace built by Vespasian, and would thus be in accordance with Josephus who states that Vespasian himself caused the temple vessels to be placed there <sup>79</sup>.

c. 30 C.E. The Talmud tells us that forty years before the destruction of the temple (70 C.E.) the miracle by which the westerly light of the candelabrum remained alight throughout the day <sup>80</sup> ceased <sup>81</sup>. This was about the same time as the Sanhedrin moved out of the temple (the *lishkath ha-Gazith*) to the "shops" (*hamuyoth*) <sup>82</sup>, very likely on Pontius Pilate's edict that they might no longer exercise the death penalty <sup>83</sup>. The Sanhedrin was con-

<sup>77</sup> See also *Publ. of the Israel Numismatic Soc.* 1958 p. 13, "We know that the depiction of the *Menorah* in art was prohibited in the 1st. cent. B.C.E. and in most of the 1st. cent. C.E., and this is the reason why the *Menorah* was not used again as a coin emblem". This statement is presumably based on T. B. *Menahoth* 28b—no source is given—also found in *Rosh Ha-Shanah* 24a and *'Avodah Zarah* 43a. אבסדרא היכל, בית תבנית היכל, אבסדרא כנגד אולם, חצר כנגד עזרה, שלחן כנגד שלחן מנורה כנגד מנורה אבל עושה הוא של ה' ושל ו' ושל ח' אבל של ו' לא יעשה.

From the above it is quite clear that it is precise, three-dimensional copies only that were forbidden.

<sup>78</sup> The candelabrum was 18 *tefahim* (= T) high (note 44). The one on the Arch of Titus is approx. 2/9ths higher (the lower part being about 1/5th bigger than the upper part, whereas the Talmud describes them as being in a ratio of 8 (bottom): 10 (top) note 47) therefore 22T. One must add 1½T which is about the size of the *נרות*. The total is now 23½T, or about 71½ inches. But as the men carrying it are over 1½ times as tall as the candelabrum, they would have to be over 7 ft. each, which seems rather unlikely.

The table represented on the Arch of Titus is in itself very problematic, and cannot be cited as a means of size-comparison with the candelabrum. (The *tefah* (handbreadth) here could scarcely be less than about 3 inches. See *The Ancient Cubit* etc., CHARLES WARREN, London 1903, p. 120.)

<sup>79</sup> Josephus, *War.* 7, 5, 7.

<sup>80</sup> See note 9.

<sup>81</sup> T. B. *Yoma* 39b, *Rosh Ha-Shanah* 31b, T. J. *Yoma* 6, 3.

<sup>82</sup> T. B. *Shabbath* 15a, *'Avodah Zarah* 8b, *Sanhedrin* 41a, T. J. *Sanhedrin* 1, 1, 7, 2.

<sup>83</sup> T. J. *loc. cit.*, ZEEV YAAVETZ, *Toledoth Yisra'el* (Jerusalem, 1928-5688. 5, p. 82. YEHUDAH GREENWALD, *Letoledoth Ha-Sanhedrin Beyisra'el* (N.Y.)

sidered the light of the world, as was the temple<sup>84</sup> with its central light-symbol the candelabrum; and so, in the words of the Talmud, when their power was lessened, so was that of the temple vessels in sympathy. This also served as a portent of the impending doom—one of several<sup>85</sup>, for the decline in authority was in itself partly cause of the forthcoming disaster. It is interesting to note that much the same order of events is related as having taken place at the death of Simon the Just<sup>86</sup>, also shortly before the sack of Jerusalem by Antiochus Epiphanes. Here again the portents allegedly mourned the loss of a great personality and pointed forward to the imminent tragedy.

Just as in the time of Antigonus the candelabrum had been a symbol of Jewish religious and political independence, so in the later time of the Babylonian Talmud it was symbolically associated with the Sanhedrin, the central seat of Jewish religious and juridical authority. The political decline of Jewish religious independence was therefore accompanied by a decline in the mystic power vested in the candelabrum.

Nothing else is recorded as having happened to it, until the sack of Jerusalem and the destruction of the temple by Titus (70 C.E.).

1950-5710) p. 43. See also GRAETZ, *Geschichte der Juden*, 3, part 1, p. 553 note 25 (Leipzig, 1856). S. B. HOENIG has suggested an emended reading of 4 in the place of 40. His arguments have been thoroughly discussed by HUGO MANTEL in *Studies in the History of the Sanhedrin* (Harvard, 1961) p. 292-4. Such an emendation, if necessary, would in no way diminish the force of our argument, but rather support it. For a later change from 4 to 40, chronometrically identifying the two events, would clearly manifest their symbolic association.

<sup>84</sup> T. B. *Bava Bathra* 5a. See also GINZBERG, *Legends*, 3, p. 161, 6, p. 67, note 340. See also T. B. *Bava Bathra* 25b, where the candelabrum is stated to symbolise wisdom. The Sanhedrin could be said to be the supreme concentration of Jewish wisdom.

<sup>85</sup> See note 9. Note also that in T. B. *Gittin* 56b it is stated that for forty years Rabbi Zadok fasted in order that the temple might not be destroyed.

<sup>86</sup> T. J. *Yoma* 6, 3. Simon the Just is generally identified with Simon the High Priest (whose eulogy in *Ben Sira* we noted in note 9). In the text referred to above it is stated not that the light ceased to remain alight, but that sometimes it burned and that sometimes not.

Another possibility is that this change was said to have taken place when the new, paganised base was fitted to the candelabrum during the period when Simon the son of Boethos was High Priest (23-5 B.C.E.) and that later the two Simons were confused; and this was then added to the list of portents already traditionally associated with Simon the Just's death. Forty years before the destruction of the temple the miracle of the westerly light ceased completely. But there is no proof for such a suggestion, attractive though it may be, and the simple reading is equally acceptable. Cf. BÜCHLER, *Studies*, etc. pp. 32-44.

A little before the sack, Josephus records that "two candlesticks like to those that lay in the Holy Sanctum" (*War*, vi, 8, 3, Whiston's translation) were delivered to Titus. Bearing in mind that Pompey had seen only one, and that finally "the" candelabrum was borne through the streets of Rome in Titus' triumphal procession, these may have been some of the "extras" that were always in the Temple <sup>87</sup>.

70 C.E. When finally the Temple was destroyed, the golden candelabrum, the table of the shewbread and other temple vessels were taken as spoil <sup>88</sup>. According to later rabbinic tradition, they were gathered together by Titus and put into a net <sup>89</sup>, or into a "parokheth" as though it were a net <sup>90</sup>, and taken over sea to Rome <sup>91</sup>. There it was carried through the streets of Rome where it appears to have made a considerable impression upon the populace <sup>92</sup>.

It was then locked up in Vespasian's temple of Peace <sup>93</sup>, until the temple was burned by fire in 191 C.E., during the reign of Commodus. After that all traces of it seem to vanish.

It is unlikely that it perished during the fire, but it probably survived together with other temple relics to be taken by the Goths

<sup>87</sup> See note 10. Being large, they would be suitable as a bribe. Such an interpretation would invalidate the cornerstone of J. LEVY's theory in *Kedem* 2, 123-5, Jerusalem 1943 (Hebrew).

<sup>88</sup> Rabbi Eleazar ben Yosē, a *Tanna* of the 5th generation (2nd cent. C.E.), saw the צִיץ (T. B. *Sukkah* 5a) and the פְּרוֹכֶת (T. B. *Yoma* 57a and *Me'ilah* 17b). He saw them, presumably, in the royal palace of Hadrian when he went with Rabbi Simeon bar Yoḥai to Rome to plead against the Hadrianic persecutions.

This is borne out by Josephus' statement (*War*, 7, 5, 7) "that he (Vespasian) gave order that they (the Jews) should lay up their law and their purple veils —[פְּרוֹכֶת]; there were several] of the holy place in the palace itself and keep it there" (WHISTON). He could not have seen the original candelabrum which would still have been locked up in the temple; moreover, he would never have entered a place of idolatry. Concerning "The law" see *Bereshith Rabbathi*, ed. H. ALBECK (Jerusalem, 1940) p. 209 lines 13-15, and his notes *ibid*.

See also *Esther* R. 1, 2 (and cf. T. B. *Pesahim* 119a) and *Eccles. R.* 5. 9 with T. B. *Giṭṭin* 56b. W. BACHER (in *'Aggadoth Ha-Tanna'im*, Jerusalem and Berlin 5683, Vol. 2, part 2, p. 101 note 5) claims that both these texts are pseudepigraphic.

<sup>89</sup> *Lev. R.* 22, 3. *Eccles. R.* 5.

<sup>90</sup> T. B. *Giṭṭin* 65b.

<sup>91</sup> *Ibid*.

<sup>92</sup> Josephus, *War*, 7, 5, 5. This is not merely one of Josephus' usual exaggerations in favour of the Jews, but is borne out by the fact that these were the vessels chosen to be represented on Titus' triumphal arch. See also App. B.

<sup>93</sup> Josephus, *War*, 7, 5, 7.

## HISTORY OF THE MENORAH

at the sack of Rome. These were returned to Rome by Belisarius (534 C.E.) during the reign of Justinian, after he had overthrown the Gothic kingdom of Italy<sup>94</sup>. Its final destination and fate lie as yet shrouded in mystery<sup>95</sup>.

Nevertheless, as a symbol it continued to dominate Jewish (and, to a lesser extent, Christian<sup>96</sup>) thought if only through its carved representation on the arch of Titus, erected by the Emperor Domitian in the year 81 C.E.<sup>97</sup>, so that over the next seven centuries over two hundred candelabra appear in different parts of Europe and the Near East<sup>98</sup>. But they do not appear with the great Romano-pagan base on the Arch of Titus, but most usually with the traditional three-legged base<sup>99</sup>, thus once again proclaiming their traditional symbolic message, that of Jewish religious independence, even in the exile. The symbol of light, because enclosed in darkness, became the symbol of hope, and took on a new iconographic meaning, as it became one of the central symbols looking forward to the Messianic salvation<sup>100</sup>.

## APPENDIX A

### A) T. B. *Menahoth* 29a.

דאמר ר' יהודה אמר רב עשר מנורות עשה שלמה וכל אחד ואחד הביא לה אלף ככר זהב והכניסוהו אלף פעמים לכור והעמידוהו על ככר ... והתניא ר'

<sup>94</sup> Procopius 4, 9, 6-9. *Works*, 2, 280f.

<sup>95</sup> For further material on this subject see *A note on the fate of the sacred vessels of the Second Temple*, in *Kedem* 2, 123-5, Jerusalem, 1943 (Hebrew), to which we have referred in note 87.

Perhaps even more imaginative is the treatment by HEINRICH STRAUSS in the *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes*, 22, nos. 1-3, (1959), entitled *The History of the Seven-Branched Candlestick of the Hasmonean Kings*. See also PETER BLOCH, *Wallraf-Richartz Jahrbuch*, 23 (1961).

<sup>96</sup> JACOB LEVEEN, *The Hebrew Bible in Art* (London, 1944) p. 16, note 2. Also SIMON in *Revue Archéologique*, Ser. 4, 31-2 (1943) 971-80 (*Mélanges CHARLES PICARD*).

<sup>97</sup> See note 28.

<sup>98</sup> MUNKACSI, *ibid.*, p. 132.

<sup>99</sup> See note 30.

<sup>100</sup> This has been clearly demonstrated by ERNEST NAMENYI in *The Essence of Jewish Art* (N. Y. and London, 1960) in the chapter entitled *The Candlestick of Redemption*.

It is interesting to note that it turns up very frequently in connection with burial, e.g. at the catacombs at Monte Verde in 78 out of 83 of them (WISCHNITZER-BERNSTEIN, *Gestalten und Symbole der Jüdischen Kunst*, p. 67) and on gravestones (MUNKACSI, *ibid.*, p. 132). No doubt here it also represents salvation on a different level, i.e. the immortality of the soul, again paralleling (on the national level) the undying spirit of Judaism. (J. LEVEEN, *ibid.*, p. 16, also note 4.) See also GINZBERG, *Legends*, Vol. 3, p. 161, Vol. 6, p. 66 note 340.

יוסי בר יהודה אומר מעשה והיתה (מגורת) בית המקדש יתירה על של משה בדגור זהב והכניסוה פ' פעמים לכור והעמידוה על ככר כיון דקאי קאי.

Similarly Midrash *Cant. R.*, on iii: 13 עמודיו עשה כסף.

Midrash *Numbers R.* chap. 12.4 (Wilna Ed.) (*Yalqut Shim'oni, Terumah*, chap. 25).

B) T. J. *Yoma* 4, 4 (41d top)

כדתניא מעשה במגורת זהב שעשה משה במדבר והיתה יתירה דינר זהב והכניסוה לכור שמונים פעם ולא חסרה כלום.

Similarly T. J. *Sheqalim* 3, 3 in the name of Rabbi Yosē bar Judah.

C) See *Baraita di-mele'khet Ha-Mishkan*, chap. 10.

איסי בן עקביא אומר מעשה והיתה יתירה דינר זהב והכניסוה לכור שמונים פעמים.

M. FRIEDMANN'S edition (1908), where see his notes.

A) Rashi on T. B. *Menahoth* 29a (ד"ה כיון דקאי, שנשרף יפה) explains the *Baraita* of Rabbi Yosē bar Judah as referring to one of Solomon's *Menoroth*. This explanation seems unlikely, for the following three reasons.

1. Why was this discrepancy in weight suddenly noticed (מעשה) (והיתה), some considerable time after the *Menorah* had been made (כיון דקאי קאי)?

2. Why is it called *מגורת בית המקדש* if it were merely one of Solomon's?

3. If it was one of Solomon's, why just one of them?

Questions 2 and 3 would suggest that this took place after the Mosaic one had been lost and this was the only one to have survived. On examining it to find out whether it would serve in place of the Mosaic one (the answer to question 1) the discrepancy in weight was discovered.

Now if this difference in weight made the *Menorah* unfit for ritual use (see note 5), then the author of this text could not agree with the *Baraita di-mele'khet Ha-Mishkan* chap. 10, where it is clearly stated that all Solomon's *Menoroth* were fit to be used (note 5); if, on the other hand, this discrepancy made no difference, why put it in a furnace 80 times, or in other words go to such considerable inconvenience?

A far simpler explanation would surely be that this was a completely new *Menorah* and that it did not come out right first time. Moreover it was considered necessary to reduce it to the exact weight, presumably in order that it might be ritually suitable. Very possibly we have here a tradition concerning the golden candlestick that the Maccabeans finally made, but there is no real proof of this.

B) This is surely another story differing on two points:

1. It is referring to the *מנורת המדבר*.

2. After placing it in the furnace 80 times it was in no way reduced in weight (meaning that it was made out of purer gold, see e.g. *Ex. R.* chap. 35).

Again the fact that so much trouble was gone to in order to achieve a reduction in weight would suggest that this was needed for the suitability of the *Menorah*. If so they could presumably have finally achieved this by other means (as FRIEDMANN suggests in his notes on *Baraita di-mele'khet Ha-Mishkan*, *ibid.*).

It seems likely, though by no means certain, that both traditions A and B are in the name of Rabbi Yosē bar Judah (but note the readings in T. J. *Sheqalim*, *ibid.* and FRIEDMANN'S notes *ibid.*). He seems to have been an expert on *Menoroth*, and traditions are brought in his name concerning that of Moses (T. J. *Sheqalim*, *ibid.*), those of Solomon (*ibid.*) and those of the Maccabeans (T. B. *Menahoth* 28b).

C) This text presents difficulties for the following reasons.

1. It is no longer in the name of Rabbi Josē bar Judah (see L. GINZBERG'S *Genizah Studies etc.* (N.Y., 1928) v. 1 p. 383 line 27 for a reading: *איסי בן יהודה*).

2. It does not state which *Menorah* it refers to, whether the Mosaic one (tradition B), one of Solomon's (trad. A according to Rashi) or yet a third (the Maccabean one as we have suggested, trad. A).

3. It is not stated whether the putting into the furnace was effective in reducing its weight.

It is unlikely to be referring to one of Solomon's *Menoroth*, for clearly the attempts at reducing the weight suggest that this was necessary; but the *Baraita di-mele'khet Ha-Mishkan* itself (again in chap. 10) clearly states that all Solomon's candelabra

were כשירות לעבודה (note 5). Of course 'Isi ben 'Akabia may have been at variance with other views but nowhere is this stated to be the case. From the context it would appear to be the Mosaic one.

Two facts of general interest emerge from all these texts, namely that (A) it requires a great deal of gold to make a ritually suitable candelabrum and (B) it takes a considerable amount of time and skill to carry out its construction.

## APPENDIX B

Josephus, *War*, 7, 5, 5 (lines 148-150).

καὶ λυχνία χρυσοῦ μὲν ὁμοίως πεποιημένη, τὸ δ' ἔργον ἐξήλλακτο τῆς κατὰ τὴν ἡμετέραν (alternate reading ἡμέραν) χρῆσιν συνηθείας. ὁ μὲν γὰρ μέσος ἦν κίων ἐκ τῆς βάσεως πεπηγώς, λεπτοὶ δ' ἀπ' αὐτοῦ μεμήκυντο καυλίσκοι τριαίνης σχήματι παραπλησίαν τὴν θέσιν ἔχοντες λύχνον ἕκαστος αὐτῶν ἐπ' ἄκρον κεχαλκευμένος. ἐπτὰ δ' ἦσαν οὗτοι τῆς παρὰ τοῖς Ἰουδαίοις ἑβδομάδος τὴν τιμὴν ἐμφανίζοντες.

The Loeb translation of the first line: — “But constructed on a different pattern from that which we use in ordinary life” may well refer to the law forbidding Jews to make candlesticks similar to that of the temple. (See note 65. Also *PEQ*, 1950 p. 26. Also cf. *Mishnah*, *Kelim* 11, 7.)

Josephus further remarks upon the smallness of the branches (καυλίσκος, diminutive of καυλός), presumably in comparison with the heavy base. He further remarks that they are λεπτοί, which I would suggest not only means slender but wishes to convey the feeling of the fine subtle ornamentation. In fact they are quite slender and fragile looking at the ornamented joins (as is evident from the engraving in *RELAND*).

The reference to the trident cannot refer to the form of the branches, but perhaps to the manner in which they grow out of the central stem. For whereas quite clearly the branches of the candelabrum were rounded (as is evident from Antigonus's coins, the Arch of Titus and subsequent representations), tridents in the time of Josephus were almost exclusively square μ, and had in fact so been for more than 3 centuries.

(ANSON, *Numismata Graeca*, London 1910, part 5, pl. 22, 1121—a very rare example of a rounded trident form, dated 370-240 B.C.E. Otherwise see Text 4-6 p. 137, 134-141.

*Coins of the Roman Empire*, 1, p. 1, 2, 161.



HISTORY OF THE MENORAH

H. B. WALTERS, *Brit. Mus. Cat. of engraved gems etc.*, London, 1926, pl. 5, 210, p. 26, 4, 171. P. 334, 3553 fig. 68. But see also *ibid.* pl. 33, 3725.)

See WHISTON, Josephus, *War* p. 199, note 1. We have tried to deal with his remarks 1 and 2.

London

DANIEL SPERBER