



On the Term Phylacteries (Matt 23:5)

Jeffrey H. Tigay

The Harvard Theological Review, Vol. 72, No. 1/2. (Jan. - Apr., 1979), pp. 45-53.

Stable URL:

<http://links.jstor.org/sici?sici=0017-8160%28197901%2F04%2972%3A1%2F2%3C45%3AOTTP%282%3E2.0.CO%3B2-6>

The Harvard Theological Review is currently published by Cambridge University Press and Harvard Divinity School.

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

Please contact the publisher regarding any further use of this work. Publisher contact information may be obtained at <http://www.jstor.org/journals/cup.html>.

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

JSTOR is an independent not-for-profit organization dedicated to and preserving a digital archive of scholarly journals. For more information regarding JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

ON THE TERM PHYLACTERIES (MATT 23:5)*

Jeffrey H. Tigay

University of Pennsylvania
Philadelphia, PA 19104

Although it is widely agreed that the phylacteries mentioned in Matt 23:5 are *tēfillîn*, this equation has not gone entirely unquestioned. L. Blau stated that only the words *tēfillâ* (singular) and *tēfillîn* (plural) are used in Talmudic literature, and that conclusions based on the word phylacteries are without foundation, "since this name was not used in truly Jewish circles."¹ G. G. Fox argued that since Greek *phylaktēria* refers to charms or amulets, and since for the Pharisee the *tēfillîn* were truly spiritual symbols rather than magical amulets, Matthew's use of the term must be a misrepresentation, probably intentional, expressing his contempt for *tēfillîn*.² J. Bowman summed up both arguments thus: "One is all the more amazed when one knows the difference between phylacteries and *Tefillin*, that any Jew could ever think of calling *Tefillin* phylacteries."³ Bowman echoed an earlier objection voiced by I. Abrahams to the effect that Matthew's phrase "making broad" (*platynousin*) is not intelligible if the reference is to the "boxes [of the *tēfillîn*], which were cubical. One hardly widens a cube."⁴ However, Bowman considered implausible the view of Abrahams and others that the reference was to the straps⁵ rather than to the capsules. Bowman's own view, following a suggestion by M. Gaster, was that Matthew was not referring to *tēfillîn* at all, but, indeed, to amulets, of a type known among the Samaritans, made of parchment and worn directly on the

*This paper was completed at the Institute for Advanced Studies, The Hebrew University. I wish to record here my sincere thanks to the Institute's Director and staff for their many efforts in support of my research during the academic year 1978-79. Thanks also to my colleagues, Prof. Judah Goldin, who was kind enough to review a draft of this paper and to offer a number of helpful suggestions, and Prof. Robert E. A. Palmer, who kindly reviewed Latin patristic texts with me. Naturally, they are not responsible for the final product.

¹"Phylacteries: Historical View," *Jewish Encyclopedia* 10 (New York/London: Funk and Wagnalls, 1905) 26.

²"The Matthean Misrepresentation of *Tephillin*," *JNES* 1 (1942) 373-77.

³"Phylacteries," *TU* 73 (1959) 523-24.

⁴*Studies in Pharisaism and the Gospels* (2d Series: Cambridge: Cambridge University, 1924) 203-5.

⁵As actually read in some Syriac mss: ^ܥܩ^ܩ *diplyhwn*; see A. S. Lewis, *The Old Syriac Gospels* (London: Williams and Norgate, 1910) 62.

arm rather than held in a container. E. R. Goodenough even produced a fourth-century patristic writer, Epiphanius, who denied the usual interpretation and argued that the term in Matthew refers to “broad stripes of purple” on the scribes’ garments.⁶

These objections notwithstanding, the equation of phylacteries in Matthew with *tēfillin* has much in its favor:

1) It has the support of patristic writers as early as the mid-second century, including some who were in contact with Jews and knew their practices. Justin Martyr (d. ca. 165) describes the *phylaktērion* which the Jews were commanded to wear as “made up of very thin pieces of parchment upon which were inscribed what we consider truly sacred letters” (*Dialogue with Trypho* 46.5). Jerome (ca. 347–420), in his homily on Matt 23:5–6 (*PL* 26. 168), describes the phylacteries of that passage as *tēfillin* containing the Decalogue and says that “they called them phylacteries (*phylacteria vocabant*),” implying that this was really their name, not a misrepresentation.⁷

2) Furthermore, the interpretation of phylacteries as *tēfillin* fits the context, for the ostentation of which the scribes and Pharisees are accused requires that they be charged with flaunting symbols of learning and piety rather than superstition. Indeed, Matthew was not alone in recognizing that *tēfillin* (like any religious, national, or ideological symbol) could be worn in a false or arrogant show of piety and learning. Talmudic and Midrashic sources warn against such a danger and exemplify it with a case. In *Midrash Ecclesiastes Rabbah*, R. Benjamin interprets Eccl 4:1 as referring to

hypocrites in regard to the Torah. People suppose that they can read the Scriptures and the Mishnah, but they cannot; they wrap themselves in cloaks and put *tēfillin* on their heads. Of them it is written: “Behold, the tears of the oppressed, with no comforter” (Eccl 4:1). “It is mine to punish,” says God, as it is said: “Cursed be they

⁶*Jewish Symbols in the Greco-Roman Period* (New York: Pantheon, 1953–68), 2. 210; 9. 171–72. This interpretation was taken over from Epiphanius by the twelfth-century Syrian Orthodox writer Dionysios bar Šalibi in his treatise *Against the Jews*; see S. P. Brock, “Some Syriac Accounts of the Jewish Sects,” in *A Tribute to Arthur Vööbus* (ed. R. H. Fischer; Chicago: Lutheran School of Theology at Chicago) 272; reference courtesy of M. E. Stone.

⁷Cf. his commentary on Ezek 24:15, in *PL* 25. 230; similarly, John Chrysostom, Homily 72.2 on Matt 23:5: “which they called phylacteries (*ha phylaktēria ekaloun*)” (*PG* 58. 669). That at least some *tēfillin* contained the Decalogue (cf. also Theodore bar Qoni, cited by Brock [above, n. 6] and the sources cited in the Syriac dictionaries of Brockelmann and Payne-Smith s.v. *tp̄l*) is also reflected in Talmudic-Midrashic sources and has been confirmed by *tēfillin* discovered in the Judean Desert; see A. M. Habermann, “*hattēfillin bimē qedem*,” in *Eretz-Israel* 3 (1954) 175; *Megilloth Midbar Yehuda* (Israel: Machbaroth Lesifrut, 1959) 16; Y. Yadin, *Tefillin from Qumran* (Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 1969) 24 (Hebrew section), 34 (English section); J. T. Milik in *Qumrân Grotte 4. 2* (*DJD* 6; Oxford: Clarendon, 1977) Part 2.

who do the work of the Lord deceitfully" (Jer 48:10). (*Midr. Eccl. Rab.* 4:1; Vilna-Romm edition, 12b)⁸

A similar theme is struck in *Pesiq. R.* 22:5, interpreting the commandment against taking the Lord's name in vain to mean: "You are not to put on *tēfillin* and wrap yourself in your *ṭallit* and then go forth and commit transgressions."⁹ The *Pesiqta* and parallel sources mention the neglect of the practice of wearing *tēfillin*.¹⁰ They blame this on deceivers (*rammā²in*),¹¹ as illustrated by the case of a man who had money which he wished to entrust for safekeeping. He spotted a man wearing *tēfillin* and, concluding that the latter was trustworthy, left the money with him. When he later came to collect his money, the trustee denied that the transaction had ever taken place, to which the first rejoined: "It wasn't you that I trusted, but the holy name that was (variant: those [*tēfillin*] that were) upon your head."¹²

Legal sources of post-Talmudic times speak of two situations in which the wearing of *tēfillin* could appear pretentious or haughty (*yōhārā²*). In the Geonic period (ca. seventh through eleventh centuries), when the practice was widely neglected, some feared that the very act of observing the precept in the face of widespread neglect would make the wearer

⁸The translation in C. G. Montefiore and H. Loewe (*A Rabbinic Anthology* [Cleveland/New York: World; Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society of America, 1963] 404–5, no. 1110) adds interpretively after the phrase "on their heads": "and they oppress the poor." This fits the context in Ecclesiastes (cf. the commentaries of R. D. Luria [Radal] and Z. W. Einhorn [Maharzu] on this passage in *Ecclesiastes Rabbah*, and the similar homily in *Pesiqta Rabbati*, cited immediately). However, the text contains no such addition, and pretension to scholarship is in itself a form of hypocrisy.

Another abuse of *tēfillin* condemned in rabbinic sources is that by the foolish pious man (*hāsīd šōteḥ*): he sees a child drowning in the river and says: "As soon as I remove my *tēfillin* I'll save him"; while he is removing his *tēfillin*, the child dies (*b. Soṭa* 21b; *y. Soṭa* 3:4, 19a).

⁹Ed. M. Friedmann (Wien: Kaiser, 1880) 111b; English translation based on W. G. Braude, *Pesikta Rabbati* (Yale Judaica Series 18; New York/London: Yale University, 1968), I, 458–59. In the quotation or paraphrase of this passage by R. Menahem Hamiri, the last two words are replaced with: "and deceive people" (*Bēṭ habbēhīrā^c al Masseket Šōṭā*, ed. A. Liss; *Māḳōn hattalmūd hayyisrā²ēli hasšālēm*, 1963) 47. In *Midrās² Aggādā* (ed. S. Buber [Vienna: Panta, 1894] 152) to Exod 20:7 the wording is: "you are not to behave as if you are pious when you are not."

¹⁰Thus the passage is interpreted by L. Ginzberg, *A Commentary on the Palestinian Talmud* (Texts and Studies of the Jewish Theological Seminary of America, 10; New York: Jewish Theological Seminary, 1941), I, 257–63. Contrast Tosafot at *b. Šabb.* 49a s.v. *k²lyš^c*, and *Mar²eh Happānim* of Moses Margalith at *y. Ber.* 2:3, 4c.

¹¹The *Pēnē Mošeh* of Moses Margalith on *y. Ber.* 2:3, 4c s.v. *mpny hrm²yn* describes these as people "who would don *tēfillin* to create the presumption that they were honest, and deceive people." Similarly Tosafot on *b. Šabb.* 49a s.v. *k²lyš^c*.

¹²*Pesiq. R.* 22. 5.111b, and *Midrash Haggadol* on Exodus (ed. M. Margulies; Jerusalem: Mosad Haraw Kook, 1967) 410. The ultimate source of the account is *y. Ber.* 2:3, 4c.

appear holier-than-thou or as pretending to the prominence and scholarship of those who did wear them.¹³ Later, disagreement over the correct order in which the scriptural texts were to be arranged within the *tēfillîn* led some authorities to prescribe wearing two sets of *tēfillîn*, each arranged in accordance with one of the two main opinions, so that at least one set would be correct. Rabbinic authorities sought to restrict the public observance of this practice lest it be taken as a show of piety.¹⁴

In sum, *tēfillîn* are a type of religious symbol which could be exploited hypocritically, and which Matthew, like the Midrashic and Talmudic sources quoted, could mention in connection with such a charge.¹⁵ I doubt whether the same can be said about amulets. Nor would an intentional misrepresentation of *tēfillîn* as amulets fit the context. Phylacteries are but one of several practices criticized by Matthew, including long fringes, seeking the best seats in synagogues, and being called rabbi; none of the other practices is misrepresented as superstitious.

3) The coupling of *tēfillîn* with fringes or fringed cloaks, as in Matthew, is standard in Jewish sources, which often list these two symbols side by side, as in the passages from *Midrash Ecclesiastes Rabbah* and *Pesiqta Rabbati* quoted above.¹⁶

Justin's and Jerome's descriptions of Matthew's "phylacteries" as *tēfillîn* therefore deserve to be considered more seriously. Of the two objections mentioned at the outset, that based on the verb "making broad" may be eliminated first. The *tēfillîn* capsules discovered at Qumran and Murabbaat show that head *tēfillîn* around the turn of the era were not cubical but rectangular, with the breadth across the forehead varying much more than the length. The head capsule found at Murabbaat (*DJD* II, Pl. XIV, 4), the contents of which conform to rabbinic law, confirms that this shape was current in Pharisaic circles. In a group of head capsules from Qumran cave 4 now in the Rockefeller Museum (Box 1008; see photograph) the width varies from 1.65 cm. (not shown; see *DJD* VI, Pl. VI, 4) up to 2.8 cm.—one or two fingers—measured at the strap passage. One capsule, only three-quarters preserved, is 2.4 cm. wide; in its complete state it would have measured about 3.2 cm. wide and about half as long. Variations in length are in

¹³E.g., J. Müller, *Kurze geonäische Entscheidungen (Hālākôṭ pēsûqôṭ min haggē'ōnîm)* (Krakow: Fischer, 1893) 38, no. 63; S. Assaf, *Responsa Geonica (Tēšûbôt haggē'ōnîm)* (Jerusalem: Mekize Nirdamim, 1942) 6.

¹⁴See, e.g., *Šūlhān 'Ārûk, 'Orah Hayyim* 34:3 and *Bē'ēr Hēteb ad loc.*

¹⁵As noted by Str-B 4/1. 276; cf. G. F. Moore, *Judaism* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University, 1958–59), 2. 191–92.

¹⁶For other examples see *Ep. Arist.* 158–59; *t. Ber.* 6(7):25; *Mek., Širtâ'*, chap. 3, to Exod 15:2; *b. Pesah.* 113b; *Hul.* 88b–89a.

most cases less pronounced, and many capsules differ from others mainly in that they were made broader—in Matthew’s language, *platynousin*.¹⁷ Medieval Hebrew sources use just such a term in discussing the size of *tēfillīn* capsules. For example, R. Asher b. Yehiel discusses why “nowadays they do not make the capsules two fingers wide” (״ען ךֹּסין חבבא׳ין ר׳הב׳ין ש׳ת ׳עשב״ו).¹⁸ As for the connotations of large *tēfillīn*, note the following in a responsum of R. Hai Gaon (appointed in 998):

It was the custom in the academy for the students to make their *tēfillīn* small, no higher than a finger, and place a turban over them, whereas the great rabbis would make theirs some three fingers high, so that the students would not be equal to them.¹⁹

This practice illustrates how, at least in later times, the size of *tēfillīn* might be an indication of status.

The second objection, that the term “phylacteries” does not represent Jewish usage, can also be disproved. In modern times, A. T. Olmstead²⁰ maintained that Jesus himself must have used some term which was translatable by *phylaktēria*. The Semitic equivalent of the Greek term is *qēmiʿīn* (singular *qāmīaʿ*).²¹ This equivalence is indirectly indicated in medieval sources in Ephrem Syrus’ rendering of *kēsātōt* in Ezek 13:18, 20 as *qēmiʿē*, while the *hebraios* of the Hexapla renders *kēsātōt* as *phylaktēria*.²² In rabbinic sources *tēfillīn* are often mentioned side by side with *qēmiʿīn*²³ because of their similar appearance and location on

¹⁷Nine of the best-preserved capsules from 4Q are shown in the photograph (by Tsila Sagiv, published by courtesy of the Israel Department of Antiquities and Museums) against a background of millimeter paper to highlight the size (scale 1:1). Nos. 1–8 are head-*tēfillīn* capsules, no. 9 a hand-*tēfillīn* capsule. The small size of these capsules as compared to those of present-day *tēfillīn* is perhaps for the sake of comfort, since the *tēfillīn* were to be worn all day (e.g., *b. Menah.* 36a–b; *Tg. Yer. I* Exod 13:10; Maimonides, *Hilkōt Tēfillīn* 4:25–26).

¹⁸Asher b. Yehiel, *Hālākōt qēiʿānōt, hilkōt tēfillīn*, 123d (Hebrew pagination), printed in back of *b. Menahot* in the Romm-Vilna edition.

¹⁹*Tēšūbōt haggēʿōnīm*, ed. Y. Musafia (Lyck: Mekize Nirdamim, 1864; reprinted, Jerusalem, 1967) 6–7, no. 3. The wording may imply that the initiative for this differentiation in size came from the rabbis. Other versions of this responsum, or other accounts of the practice, seem to imply that it was an act of humility on the part of the students, who actually covered the head *tēfillā* so that it would not be noticeable at all (e.g., S. K. Mirsky, *Shibolei Haleket Completum* [Jerusalem/New York: Sura Institute, 1966] 91).

²⁰Cited by Fox, “Matthean Misrepresentation,” *JNES* 1 (1942) 376.

²¹For the vocalization see H. Torczyner in E. Ben Yehuda, *A Complete Dictionary of Ancient and Modern Hebrew* (Jerusalem: Ben-Yehuda Hozaa-La’Or, n.d. [1946]) 5987 n. 4.

²²W. R. Smith, “Divination and Magic in Deut. XVIII. 10, 11,” *Journal of Philology* 13 (1885) 286.

²³E.g., *m. Šabb* 6:2; *Šeqal.* 3:2; *Miqw.* 6:4; 10:2; *Kelim* 23: 1; *Sifrāʿ*, *Šēminī*, 8:6 (ed. Weiss, 53b).

the body. But much more important is that, contrary to what has been said about Jewish usage, in one rabbinic text the word *qāmīa*^c is used to refer to the *tēfillâ* (singular of *tēfillîn*). The “non-canonical” *Masseket Tēfillîn* uses the word in this way twice:

If one has put on the phylactery upside down (*hāpak*^c *et haqqāmīa*^c *millēma*^c *lâ*), he has not performed his duty (§12).

If one has written the four Biblical texts of the hand-*tēfillâ* on four separate pieces of parchment, it is fit. R. Judah says: One should have them sewed together and placed in the phylactery (*qāmīa*^c) (§9).²⁴

This appellation for the *tēfillîn* in a rabbinic source is obviously not intended as a misrepresentation. It undoubtedly reflects the physical similarity of *qēmī*^c*in* and *tēfillîn*. Although *Masseket Tēfillîn* disqualifies a *tēfillâ* made in the form of a *qāmīa*^c,²⁵ the two objects were nonetheless similar enough in appearance to present the possibility of confusion. Talmudic discussion of *m. Erub. 10:1* revolves around the possibility that what appear to be new *tēfillîn* may actually be *qēmī*^c*in* (*b. Erub. 96b–97a*).²⁶ Geonic responsa describe the *tēfillîn* as being manufactured “like a *qāmīa*^c.”²⁷ The etymology of *qāmīa*^c also lent it to use as a term for *tēfillîn*, since the noun is in form a *qātīl* adjective (a form “used substantivally with a passive meaning to denote duration in a state”)²⁸ and means basically something “tied.” Indeed, the verb *qm*^c is used in a passage describing the preparation of *tēfillîn*: “A woman was married to a *hābēr* and she used to fasten (*qōma*^c*at*) *tēfillîn* for him” (*t. Dem. 2:17*).²⁹ Since the woman’s action was described in the active voice as *qōma*^c*at*, the *tēfillîn* themselves could have been described in the passive voice as *qēmī*^c*in*, “fastened things.”³⁰

²⁴M. Higger, *Seven Minor Treatises* (New York: Bloch, 1930) 46, 45 (Hebrew section); translation based on English section, 27, 25.

²⁵§2; ed. Higger, Hebrew section, 42; English section, 24.

²⁶See the commentaries of Rashi, Maimonides, and R. Obadiah of Bertinoro on the Mishnah, and see S. Lieberman, *Tosefta Ki-fshuṭah. Part III, Order Mo^ced* (New York: Jewish Theological Seminary, 1962) 463. Features shared by at least some *qēmī*^c*in* with *tēfillîn* include their containing scriptural passages (*b. Šabb. 61b, 115b*; cf. Lieberman, 67), leather covers (*b. Šabb. 62a*), and being bound to the wearer (*b. Šabb. 61a*).

²⁷*Otzar ha-Geonim* 10 (ed. B. M. Lewin; Jerusalem: Mosad Harav Kook, 1941) Responsa section, 12, §26 (reference from Lieberman, *Tosefta Ki-fshuṭah. Order Zera^cim*, Part I [New York: Jewish Theological Seminary, 1955] 218 n. 38).

²⁸GKC, §84.1. For other names of ornaments formed on the same pattern cf. *šāmīd*, *šānīf*, *šābis*, *hārīt*, and *āgīl*.

²⁹The parallel text in *b. Abod. Zar. 39a* reads *qwšrt*, though *b. Bek. 30b* and a reading of the *Aboda Zara* passage quoted in the *Arūḳ* s.v. *qm*^c have *qwm*^c*t* (A. Kohut, *Aruch Completum* [Vienna, 1878–92; reprint, Tel Aviv: Shilo, 1960], 7. 123). The Geonic responsa cited in n. 27 also use *qm*^c in the same way.

³⁰Cf. *nqm*^c*t ktply* in R. Isaiah of Trani’s *Sēfer Hammakriā*^c, cited in Ben Yehuda 12. 5990.

It is not out of the question that superstitious veneration of *tēfillîn* facilitated their description as *qēmî^cîn* in the sense of amulets. It is true that the official understanding of *tēfillîn* was as educational and spiritual symbols, as indicated in their biblical source texts (Exod 13:9, 16; Deut 6:8; 11:18) and in numerous Talmudic exhortations.³¹ But there is no lack of evidence that *tēfillîn* were ascribed apotropaic properties and used as such.³² Not even scholars were above such an understanding, as illustrated in the case of R. Yoḥanan who wore his *tēfillîn* in the privy because, “since the rabbis have permitted this, they (the *tēfillîn*) will protect me” (*b. Ber.* 23a–b). This attitude does not indicate that *tēfillîn* first entered Judaism as amulets any more than the similar use of the Torah, the Gospels, and the Qur’an reflect their original significance; it is but another case of the superstitious veneration which commonly adheres to sacred objects and practices.³³ While rabbinic authorities sought to limit the amuletic use of *tēfillîn* (see

³¹“Whoever recites the Shema without *tēfillîn*, it is as if he testified falsely against himself [Rashi takes ‘himself’ as a euphemism in place of ‘God’]. . . . Whoever wishes to take the Yoke of the Kingship of Heaven upon himself completely should (first) relieve himself and wash his hands, and (then) don *tēfillîn* and recite the Shema and the Tefillah; this is the complete (acceptance of the) Kingship of heaven” (*b. Ber.* 14b–15a). “How does one honor Him ‘with your substance’ (Prov 3:9)? . . . Make a *sūkkā, lūlāb, sōfār tēfillîn*, and *šīšîṭ*” (*y. Qidd.* 1:7, 61b). “Is it then possible for flesh and blood to bestow glory on its Creator? Yes indeed! I bestow glory on him by means of the religious acts: I prepare for his sake a handsome lulab, a handsome sukkah, beautiful šīšit, beautiful tefillin” (*Mek. Sirtā²*, §3; trans. by Judah Goldin, *The Song at the Sea* [New Haven/London: Yale University, 1971] 113–14).

³²“If someone says: ‘Come and recite this verse over my child, who is frightened, place a scroll or *tēfillîn* on him so that he may sleep’—this is forbidden” (*y. Šabb.* 6:2, 8b; ^c*Erub.* 10:11, 26c; *Masseket Tēfillîn* § 5; cf. Maimonides *Hilkōt^c Akūm* 11:12. Cf. also *Tg. Cant.* 8:3; *Num. Rab.* 12:3. Jerome was aware of both understandings of *tēfillîn*: “Whoever has them, has them as a protection and reminder to himself” (*quasi ob custodiam et monumentum sui*; *PL* 26. 168); cf. also Letter LII, end of § 13, in *A Select Library of Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers* (2d series, 6 [ed. P. Schaff and H. Wace] 95).

Several modern scholars cite Jerome’s commentary to Matt 23:6 to the effect that superstitious Christian women used *tēfillîn* as amulets. These scholars refer to various columns in *PL* 26; they seem to have in mind col. 168, but there Jerome merely compares to *tēfillîn* the practice of superstitious Christian women in carrying miniature Gospels, fragments of the cross, and the like, as correctly understood by H. Lesêtre, “Phylactères,” in *Dictionnaire de la Bible* (ed. F. Vigouroux; Paris: Letouzey et Ané, 1912) 5/1. 353. The same comparison is made by John Chrysostom and Isidore Peleus; see E. von Dobschütz, “Charms and Amulets (Christian),” in *Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics* (henceforth *ERE*) (ed. J. Hastings; New York: Charles Scribner’s Sons, 1951), 3. 425c.

³³For the Torah see the reference to a scroll in the passage quoted at the beginning of the previous note; *b. Ber.* 23b; L. Blau, *Das Altjüdische Zauberwesen* (Budapest, 1898; reprint, Westmead, England: Gregg International) 150–51, n. 7; J. Trachtenberg, *Jewish Magic and Superstition* (Cleveland/New York: World; Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society, 1961) 104–6; E. A. Wallis Budge, *Amulets and Talismans* (New Hyde Park, NY: University Books, 1961) 235–36; S. Lieberman, *Hellenism in Jewish Palestine* (New York:

y. *Šabb.* and parallels cited in n. 31), they were presumably no more successful than religious authorities usually are in such attempts.³⁴

Whether the use of the word *qāmīa*^c for *tēfillīn* was due to the appearance of *tēfillīn*, to superstitious veneration of them, or to the etymology of *qāmīa*^c, the fact is that a Hebrew text referred to *tēfillīn* with the word *qāmīa*^c, the Hebrew equivalent of *phylaktērion*. What gives pause in explaining the Matthean use on the basis of *Masseket Tēfillīn* is the relative dating of the two documents, since the compilation of the seven minor tractates, of which *Masseket Tēfillīn* is one, is dated far later than any date proposed for Matthew. Proposed dates are: prior to the final redaction of the Palestinian Talmud (ca. 400), early post-Talmudic, and late Geonic.³⁵ However, these tractates consist primarily of tannaitic sayings.³⁶ The statement using *qāmīa*^c for *tēfillīn* in *Masseket Tēfillīn* § 9 is attributed to the mid-second century *tannā*² R. Judah (b. Ilai). The use of the verb *qm*^c in connection with *tēfillīn* in a statement of R. Simeon b. Elazar (late second century) quoting R. Meir (mid-second century) (*t. Dem.* 2:17, quoted above) further enhances the likelihood that the noun, too, was used for *tēfillīn* as early as the second century. In view of the evidence reviewed here, it seems fair to conclude that the use of *phylaktērion* in Matt 23:5 also reflects the use of *qāmīa*^c for *tēfillīn*.³⁷

Jewish Theological Seminary, 1962) 108, n. 50. On the Gospels see von Dobschütz in *ERE* 2. 611; 3. 425; *DACL* 1. 1788–89; E. Nestle, *ZNW* 7 (1906) 90. On the Qurʾān see Budge, *Amulets and Talismans*, 53; E. W. Lane, *An Account of the Manners and Customs of the Modern Egyptians* (3d edition; London: Charles Knight, 1846), 2. 66–67 = 5th edition; London: John Murray, 1871), 1. 312–13; cf. M. Mirkin, *Midrās Rabbā* (Tel Aviv: Yavneh, 1973), 8. 62n. For similar understanding of the Mezuzah see I. M. Casanowicz, “Mezuzah,” in *Jewish Encyclopedia* (New York/London: Funk and Wagnalls, 1905), 8. 532; y. *Peah* 1:1, 15d; cf. von Dobschütz in *ERE* 3. 425 for the use of the apocryphal *Epistle of Christ to Abgar* as an amulet on doors and city gates. The use of the Second Tithe or the coins into which it has been converted as amulets is reflected (and prohibited) in *l. Maʿas. Š.* 1:3 (Zuck. 86); see S. Lieberman, *Tosefta Ki-fshuṭah. Order Zeraʿim*, Part II (New York: Jewish Theological Seminary, 1955) 715.

³⁴Cf. J. Goldin, “The Magic of Magic and Superstition,” in *Aspects of Religious Propaganda in Judaism and Early Christianity* (ed. E. S. Fiorenza; Notre Dame, IN: Notre Dame, 1976) 115–47. Compare the persistent use of miniature Gospels (and extracts from them) as amulets (references in nn. 32 and 33 above).

³⁵See A. Rothkoff, “Minor Tractates,” *EJ* 12. 49–50; S. W. Baron, *A Social and Religious History of the Jews*, 6 (New York/London: Columbia University; Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society, 1958) 63 and 354–55, n. 70; Higger, *Seven Minor Treatises*, Hebrew section, 5–7; English section, 5.

³⁶Baron, *History*, 63; cf. Higger, *Seven Minor Treatises*, Hebrew section, 7.

³⁷This by no means indicates that *qāmīa*^c is the original term for *tēfillīn*. The singular *tplh* is attested, apparently with this meaning, in the third century B.C.E., in A. E. Cowley, *Aramaic Papyri of the Fifth Century B.C.* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1923) 192, no. 81:30: *tplh zy ksp* (cf. *m. Meg.* 4:5). For the possibly related Ugaritic *tply* see M. H. Pope and J. H. Tigay, “A Description of Baal,” *Ugarit-Forschungen* 3 (1971) 118, 124–26.

