

ELLEN G. WHITE ESTATE

THE LIFE AND
TIMES OF JESUS
THE MESSIAH
APPENDIX



ALFRED EDERSHEIM

**The Life and Times of
Jesus the
Messiah—Appendix**

**Copyright © 2018
Ellen G. White Estate, Inc.**

Information about this Book

Overview

This eBook is provided by the [Ellen G. White Estate](#). It is included in the larger free [Online Books](#) collection on the Ellen G. White Estate Web site.

About the Author

Ellen G. White (1827-1915) is considered the most widely translated American author, her works having been published in more than 160 languages. She wrote more than 100,000 pages on a wide variety of spiritual and practical topics. Guided by the Holy Spirit, she exalted Jesus and pointed to the Scriptures as the basis of one's faith.

Further Links

[A Brief Biography of Ellen G. White](#)
[About the Ellen G. White Estate](#)

End User License Agreement

The viewing, printing or downloading of this book grants you only a limited, nonexclusive and nontransferable license for use solely by you for your own personal use. This license does not permit republication, distribution, assignment, sublicense, sale, preparation of derivative works, or other use. Any unauthorized use of this book terminates the license granted hereby.

Further Information

For more information about the author, publishers, or how you can support this service, please contact the Ellen G. White Estate at mail@whiteestate.org. We are thankful for your interest and feedback and wish you God's blessing as you read.

Contents

Information about this Book	i
Appendix 1—Pseudepigraphic Writings	v
Appendix 2—Philo of Alexandria and Rabbinic Theology	xi
Appendix 3—Rabbinic Views as to the Lawfulness of Images, Pictorial Representations on Coins, etc.	xx
Appendix 4—An Abstract of Jewish History from the Reign of Alexander the Great to the Ascension of Herod (See Book I. ch. 8.)	xxii
Appendix 5—Rabbinic Theology and Literature (Book I. ch. 8.)	xlviii
Appendix 6—Pereq.-Months-Governors, Etc.	lxiv
Pereq I.	lxiv
Pereq II.	lxvi
Pereq III.	lxvii
Pereq IV.	lxviii
Pereq V.	lxix
Pereq VI.	lxx
Appendix 7—On the Date of the Nativity of Our Lord (Book II. ch. 3. and other passages).	lxxvii
Appendix 8—Rabbinic Traditions about Elijah the Forerunner of the Messiah	lxxx
Appendix 9—List of Old Testament Passages Messianically Applied in Ancient Rabbinic Writings (Book II. ch. 5.)	lxxxvi
Appendix 10—On the Supposed Temple-Synagogue. (Book II. ch. 10.)	cxxxvii
Appendix 11—On the Prophecy, Isaiah 40:3 (See Book II. ch. 11.)	cxl
Appendix 12—The Baptism of Proselytes (See Book II. ch. 11.)	cxlii
Appendix 13—Jewish Angelology and Demonology. The Fall of the Angels. (See Book III. ch. 1.)	cxlvii
I. ANGELOLOGY.	cxlvii
II. SATANOLOGY AND FALL OF THE ANGELS.	clix

III. Evil Spirits (Shedim, Ruchin, Rucoth, Lilin).	clxv
Appendix 14—The Law in Messianic Times. (See Book III. ch. 3.)	clxxii
Appendix 15—Location of Sychar, and the Date of our Lord’s Visit to Samaria. (See Book III, ch. 8.)	clxxvi
1. The Location of Sychar.	clxxvi
II. Time of our Lord’s Visit to Sychar.	clxxvii
Appendix 16—On The Jewish Views about Demons and the Demonised Together with some Notes on the Intercourse between Jews and Jewish Christians in the First Centuries. (See Book III. ch. 14.)	clxxx
Appendix 17—The Ordinances and Law of the Sabbath as Laid Down in the Mishnah and the Jerusalem Talmud. (See Book III. ch. 35.)	cxc
Appendix 18—Haggadah about Simeon Kepha (Legend of Simon Peter.) (pyk Nw (m#d)tdg—Book III. ch. 37.) .	ccvii
Appendix 19—On Eternal Punishment, according to the Rabbis and the New Testament (See Book V. ch. 6.) . .	ccxii
The End of the Second Volume.	ccxx

by Alfred Edersheim

Appendix 1—Pseudepigraphic Writings

[3]

Only the briefest account of these can be given in this place; barely more than an enumeration.

I. *The Book of Enoch*.—As the contents and the literature of this remarkable book, which is quoted by St. Jude (vv. 14, 15), have been fully described in Dr. Smith's and Wace's Dictionary of Christian Biography (vol. ii. pp. 124-128), we may here refer to it the more shortly.

It comes to us from Palestine, but has only been preserved in an Ethiopic translation (published by Archbishop *Laurence* [Oxford, 1838; in English transl. 3rd ed. 1821-1838; German transl. by A. G. *Hoffmann*], then from five different MSS. by Professor *Dillmann* [Leipzig, 1851; in German transl. Leipzig, 1853]). But even the Ethiopic translation is not from the original Hebrew or Aramaic, but from a Greek version, of which a small fragment has been discovered (ch 89:42-49; published by Cardinal *Mai*. Comp. also *Gildemeister*, Zeitschr. d. D. Morg. Ges. for 1855, pp. 621-624, and *Gebhardt*, Merx Arch. ii. 1872, p. 243).

As regards the contents of the work: An Introduction of five brief chapters, and the book (which, however, contains not a few spurious passages) consists of five parts, followed by a suitable Epilogue. The most interesting portions are those which tell of the Fall of the Angels and its consequences, of Enoch's rapt journeys through heaven and earth, and of what he saw and heard (ch 6.-xxxvi.); the Apocalyptic portions about the Kingdom of Heaven and the Advent of the Messiah (lxxxiii-xci.); and, lastly, the hortatory discourses (xci.-cv.). When we add, that it is pervaded by a tone of intense faith and earnestness about the Messiah, the last things and other doctrines specially brought out in the New Testament, its importance will be understood. Altogether the Book of Enoch contains 108 chapters.

From a literary point of view, it has been arranged (by *Schürer* and others) into *three parts*:—1. *The Original Work (Grundschrift)*,

ch 1.-xxxvi.; 72.-cv. This portion is supposed to date from about 175 b.c. 2. *The Parables*, ch 37.- liv. 6; 55:3-lix.; 61.-lxiv.; 69:26-lxxi. This part also dates previous to the Birth of Christ—perhaps from the time of Herod the Great. 3. *The so-called Noachian Sections*, ch 54:7-lv. 2; 60.; 65.-lxix. 25. To these must be added ch 106., and the later conclusion in ch 108. On the dates of all these portions it is impossible to speak definitely.

- [4] II. Even greater, though a different interest, attaches to the *Sibylline Oracles*, written in Greek hexameters. ¹ In their present form they consist of twelve books, together with several fragments. Passing over two large fragments, which seem to have originally formed the chief part of the introduction to Book III., we have (1) the two first Books. These contain part of an older and Hellenist Jewish Sibyl, as well as of a poem by the Jewish Pseudo-Phocylides, in which heathen myths concerning the first ages of man are curiously welded with Old Testament views. The rest of these two books was composed, and the whole put together, not earlier than the close of the second century, perhaps by a Jewish Christian. (2) The third Book is by far the most interesting. Besides the fragments already referred to, vv. 97-807 are the work of a Hellenist Jew, deeply imbued with the Messianic hope. This part dates from about 160 before our era, while vv. 49-96 seem to belong to the year 31 b.c. The rest (vv. 1-45, 818-828) dates from a later period. We must here confine our attention to the most ancient portion of the work. For our present purpose, we may arrange it into three parts. In the first, the ancient heathen theogony is recast in a Jewish mould—Uranus becomes Noah; Shem, Ham, and Japheth are Saturn, Titan, and Japetus, while the building of the Tower of Babylon is the rebellion of the Titans. Then the history of the world is told, the Kingdom of Israel and of David forming the centre of all. What we have called the second is the most curious part of the work. It embodies ancient heathen oracles, so to speak, in a Jewish recension, and interwoven with Jewish elements. The third part may be generally described as anti-heathen, polemical, and Apocalyptic. The Sibyl is thoroughly Hellenistic in spirit. She is loud and earnest

¹We have in the main accepted the learned criticism of Professor *Friedlieb* (*Oracula Sibyllina*, 1852.)

in her appeals, bold and defiant in the tone of her Jewish pride, self-conscious and triumphant in her anticipations. But the most remarkable circumstance is, that this Judaising and Jewish Sibyl seems to have passed—though possibly only in parts—as the oracles of the ancient Erythraean Sibyl, which had predicted to the Greeks the fall of Troy, and those of the Sibyl of Cumae, which, in the infancy of Rome, Tarquinius Superbus had deposited in the Capitol, and that as such it is quoted from by Virgil (in his 4th Eclogue) in his description of the Golden Age.

Of the other Sibylline Books little need be said. The 4th, 5th, 9th, and 12th Books were written by Egyptian Jews at dates varying from the year 80 to the third century of our era. Book VI. is of Christian origin, the work of a Judaising Christian, about the second half of the second century. Book VIII., which embodies Jewish portions, is also of Christian authorship, and so are Books X. and XI.

[5]

III. The collection of eighteen hymns, which in their Greek version bear the name of *The Psalter of Solomon*, must originally have been written in Hebrew, and dates from more than half a century before our era. They are the outcome of a soul intensely earnest, although we not unfrequently meet expressions of Pharisaic self-religiousness.² It is a time of national sorrow in which the poet sings, and it almost seems as if these Psalms had been intended to take up one or another of the leading thoughts in the corresponding Davidic Psalms, and to make, as it were, application of them to the existing circumstances.³ Though somewhat Hellenistic in its cast, the collection breathes ardent Messianic expectancy, and firm faith in the resurrection, and eternal reward and punishment (iii. 16; 13:9, 10; 14:2, 6, 7; 15:11 to the end).

IV. Another work of that class—*Little Genesis* or *The Book of Jubilees*—has been preserved to us in its Ethiopic translation (though a Latin version of part of it has lately been discovered) and is a Haggadic Commentary on Genesis. Professing to be a

²Comp. for example, 9:7, 9.

³This view which, so far as I know, has not been suggested by critics, will be confirmed by an attentive perusal of almost every Psalm in the collection (comp. the first three with the three opening Psalms in the Davidic Psalter). Is our Psalter of Solomon as it were, an historical commentary by the typical sage? And is our collection only a fragment?

revelation to Moses during the forty days on Mount Sinai, it seeks to fill *lacunae* in the sacred history, specially in reference to its chronology. Its character is hortatory and warning, and it breathes a strong anti-Roman spirit. It was written by a Palestinian in Hebrew, or rather Aramaean, probably about the time of Christ. The name, Book of Jubilees is derived from the circumstance that the Scripture-chronology is arranged according to Jubilee periods of forty-nine years, fifty of these (or 2,450 years) being counted from the Creation to the entrance into Canaan.

- [6] V. Among the Pseudepigraphic Writings we also include the *4th Book of Esdras*, which appears among our Apocrypha as 2 Esdras ch 3.-xiv. (the two first and the two last chapters being spurious additions). The work, originally written in Greek, has only been preserved in translation into five different languages (Latin, Arabic, Syriac, Ethiopic, and Armenian). It was composed probably about the end of the first century after Christ. From this circumstance, and the influence of Christianity on the mind of the writer, who, however, is an earnest Jew, its interest and importance can be scarcely exaggerated. The name of Ezra was probably assumed, because the writer wished to treat mainly of the mystery of Israel's fall and restoration.

The other Pseudepigraphic Writings are:—

VI. The *Ascension* (ch 1.-v.) and *Vision* (ch 6.-xi.) of *Isaiah*, which describes the martyrdom of the prophet (with a Christian interpolation [ch 3:14-iv. 22] ascribing his death to prophecy of Christ, and containing Apocalyptic portions), and then what he saw in heaven. The book is probably based on an older Jewish account, but is chiefly of Christian heretical authorship. It exists only in translations, of which that in Ethiopic (with Latin and English versions) has been edited by Archbishop *Laurence*.

VII. *The Assumption of Moses* (probably quoted in St. Jude ver. 9) also exists only in translation, and is really a fragment. It consists of twelve chapters. After an Introduction (ch 1.), containing an address of Moses to Joshua, the former, professedly, opens to Joshua the future of Israel to the time of Varus. This is followed by an Apocalyptic portion, beginning at ch 7. and ending with ch 10. The two concluding chapters are dialogues between Joshua and Moses. The book dates probably from about the year 2 b.c., or

shortly afterwards. Besides the Apocalyptic portions the interest lies chiefly in the fact that the writer seems to belong to the Nationalist party, and that we gain some glimpses of the Apocalyptic views and hopes—the highest spiritual tendency—of that deeply interesting movement. Most markedly, this Book at least is strongly anti-Pharisaic, especially in its opposition to their purifications (ch 7.). We would here specially note a remarkable resemblance between [2 Timothy 3:1-5](#) and this in Assump. Mos. vii. 3-10: (3) Et regnabunt de his homines pestilentiosi et impii, dicentes se esse iustos, (4) et hi suscitabunt iram animorum suorum, qui erunt homines dolosi, sibi placentes, ficti in omnibus suis et omni hora diei amantes convivium, devoratores gulae (5) ... (6) [pauperum] bonorum comestores, dicentes se haec facere propter misericordiam eorum, (7) sed et exterminatores, queruli et fallaces, celantes se ne possint cognosci, impii in scelere, pleni et iniquitate ab oriente usque ad occidentem, (8) dicentes: habebimus discubitiones et luxuriam edentes et bibentes, et potabimus nos, tamquam principes erimus. (9) Et manus eorum et dentes immunda tractabunt, et os eorum loquetur ingentia, et superdicent: (10) noli [tu me] tangere, ne inquines me ... But it is very significant, that instead of the denunciation of the Pharisees in vv. 9,10 of the *Assumptio*, we have in [2 Timothy 3:5](#). the words having the form of godliness, but denying the power thereof.

[7]

VIII. *The Apocalypse of Baruch*.—This also exists only in Syriac translation, and is apparently fragmentary, since the vision promised in ch 76:3 is not reported, while the Epistle of Baruch to the two and a half tribes in Babylon, referred to in lxxvii. 19, is also missing. The book had been divided into seven sections (i.-xii.; 13.-xx.; 21.-xxxiv.; 35.-xlvi.; 47.-lii.; 53.-lxxvi.; 77.-lxxxvii.). The whole is in a form of revelation to Baruch, and of his replies, and questions, or of notices about his bearing, fast, prayers, &c. The most interesting parts are in sections v. and vi. In the former we mark (ch 48:31-41) the reference to the consequence of the sin of our first parents (ver. 42; comp. also xvii. 3; 23:4; 54. 15, 19), and in ch 49. the discussion and information; with what body and in what form the dead shall rise, which is answered, not as by St. Paul in [1 Corinthians 15](#).—though the question raised ([1 Corinthians 15:35](#)) is precisely the same—but in the strictly Rabbinic manner, described by us in Vol. ii. pp. 398, 399. In—section vi. we specially mark (ch 69.-

lxxiv.) the Apocalyptic descriptions of the Last Days, and of the Reign and Judgment of Messiah. In general, the figurative language in that Book is instructive in regard to the phraseology used in the Apocalyptic portions of the New Testament. Lastly, we mark that the views on the consequences of the Fall are much more limited than those expressed in 4 Esdras. Indeed, they do not go beyond physical death as the consequence of the sin of our first parents (see especially liv. 19: Non est ergo Adam causa, nisi animae suae tantum; nos vero unusquisque fuit animae suae Adam). At the same time, it seems to use, as if perhaps the reasoning rather than the language of the writer indicated hesitation on his part (liv. 14-19; comp. also first clause of xlvi. 43). It almost seems as if liv. 14-19 were intended as against the reasoning of St. Paul, [Romans 5:12](#) to the end. In this respect the passage in Baruch is most interesting, not only in itself (see for ex. [ver. 16](#): Certo enim qui credit recipiet mercedem), but in reference to the teaching of 4 Esdras which, as regards original sin, takes another direction than Baruch. But I have little doubt that both allude to the—to them—novel teaching of St. Paul on that doctrine. Lastly, as regards the question when this remarkable work was written, we would place its composition *after* the destruction of Jerusalem. Most writers date it before the publication of 4 Esdras. Even the appearance of a Pseudo-Baruch and Pseudo-Esdras are significant of the political circumstances and the religious hopes of the nation.

For criticism and fragments of other Old Testament Pseudepigrapha, comp. *Fabricius*, *Codex Pseudepigraphus Vet. Test.*, 2 vols. (ed. 2, 1722). The Psalter of Sol., IV. Esdr. (or, as he puts it, IV. and V. Esd.), the Apocal of Baruch, and the Assumption of Mos., have been edited by *Fritzsche* (Lips. 1871); other Jewish (Hebrew) O. T. Pseudepigraphs—though of a later date—in *Jellinek's* *beth haMidrash* (6 vols.), *passim*. A critical review of the literature of the subject would here be out of place.

Appendix 2—Philo of Alexandria and Rabbinic Theology

[9]

(Ad. vol. i. p. 42, note 4.) In comparing the allegorical Canons of Philo with those of Jewish traditionalism, we think first of all of the seven exegetical canons which are ascribed to *Hillel*. These bear chiefly the character of logical deductions, and as such were largely applied in the Halakhah. These seven canons were next expanded by *R. Ishmael* (in the first century) into thirteen, by the analysis of one of them (the 5th) into six, and the addition of this sound exegetical rule, that where two verses seem to be contradictory, their conciliation must be sought in a third passage. The real rules for the Haggadah—if such there were—were the thirty-two canons of *R. José the Galilean* (in the second century). It is here that we meet so much that is kindred in form to the allegorical canons of *Philo*.¹ Only they are not rationalising, and far more brilliant in their application. Most taking results—at least to a certain class of minds—might be reached by finding in each consonant of a word the initial letter of another (*Notariqon*). Thus, the word MiSBeaCH (altar) was resolved into these four words, beginning respectively with M, S, B, CH: Forgiveness, Merit, Blessing, Life. Then there was *Gematria*, by which every letter in a word was resolved into its arithmetical equivalent. Thus, the two words Gog and Magog = 70, which was the supposed number of all the heathen nations. Again, in *Athbash* the letters of the Hebrew alphabet were transposed (the first for the last of the alphabet, and so on), so that SHeSHaKH ([Jeremiah 25:26](#); [51:41](#)) became B aB eL, while in *Albam*, the twenty-two Hebrew letters were divided into two rows, which might be exchanged (L for A, M for B, &c.).

¹The reader who will take our outline of Philo's views to pieces, and compare it with the XXV. Theses de modis et formulis quibus pr. Hebr. doctores SS. interpretari ect. soliti fuerunt (in *Surenhusius* *BiloV* *KatallaghV* pp. 57 to 88), will convince himself of the truth of this.

[10] In other respects also the Palestinian had the advantage of the Alexandrian mode of interpretation. There was at least ingenuity, if not always truth, in explaining a word by resolving it into two others,² or in discussing the import of exclusive particles (such as only but from), and inclusives (such as also with all) or in discovering shades of meaning from the derivation of a word, as in the eight synonyms for poor³—of which one (*Ani*), indicated simply the poor; another (*Ebhyon*, from *abhah*), one who felt both need and desire; a third (*misken*), one humiliated; a fourth (*rash* from *rush*), one who had been emptied of his property; a fifth (*dal*), one whose property had become exhausted; a sixth (*dakh*), one who felt broken down; a seventh (*makh*), one who had come down; and the eighth (*chelekh*), one who was wretched—or in discussing such differences as between *amar*, to speak gently, and *dabhar*, to speak strongly—and many others.³ Here intimate knowledge of the language and tradition might be of real use. At other times striking thoughts were suggested, as when it was pointed out that all mankind was made to spring from one man, in order to show the power of God, since all coins struck from the same machine were precisely the same, while in man, whatever the resemblance, there was still a difference in each.

2. (Ad vol. i. p. 45, and note 3.) The distinction between the unapproachable God and God as manifest and manifesting Himself, which lies at the foundation of so much in the theology of Philo in regard to the intermediary beings'—Potencies'—and the Logos, occurs equally in Rabbinic theology,⁴ though there it is probably

²As, for example, *Malqosh*, the latter rain =Mal-Qash, fill the stubble.

³Comp. generally, *Hamburger*, vol. ii. pp. 181-212, and the *History of the Jewish Nation* pp. 567-580, where the Rabbinic Exegesis is fully explained.

⁴Besides the designations of God to which reference is made in the text, Philo also applies to Him that of topoV, place in precisely the same manner as the later Rabbis (and especially the Kabbalah) use the word Mwqmaf. To Philo it implies that God is extramundane. He sees this taught in [Genesis 22:3, 4](#), where Abraham came unto the place of which God had told him; but, when he lifted up his eyes saw the place after off' Similarly, the Rabbis when commenting on [Genesis 28:11](#), assign this as the reason why God is designated Mw&qmaf that He is extramundane; the discussion being whether God is the place of His Word or the reverse, and the decision in favour of the former—[Genesis 28:11](#) being explained by [Exodus 33:21](#), and [Deuteronomy 33:27](#) by [Psalm 90:1](#) (Ber. R. 68, ed. Warsh. p. 125 b).

derived from a different source. Indeed, we regard this as explaining the marked and striking avoidance of all anthropomorphisms in the Targumim. It also accounts for the designation of God by two classes of terms, of which in our view, the first expresses the idea of God as revealed, the other that of God as revealing Himself; or, to put it otherwise, which indicate, the one a state, the other an act on the part of God. The first of these classes of designations embraces two terms: *yeqara*, the excellent glory, and *Shekhinah*, or *Shekhintha*, the abiding Presence.⁵ On the other hand, God, as in the act of revealing himself, is described by the term *Memra*, the Logos the word. A distinction of ideas also obtains between the terms *Yeqara* and *Shekhinah*. The former indicates, as we think, the inward and upward, the latter the outward and downward, aspect of the revealed God. This distinction will appear by comparing the use of the two words in the Targumim, and even by the consideration of passages in which the two are placed side by side (as for ex., in the Targum Onkelos on [Exodus 17:16](#); [Numbers 14:14](#); in Pseudo-Jonathan, [Genesis 16:13, 14](#); in the Jerusalem Targum, [Exodus 19:18](#); and in the Targum Jonathan, [Isaiah 6:1, 3](#); [Haggai 1:8](#)). Thus, also, the allusion in [2 Peter 1:17](#), to the voice from the excellent glory (thV megaloprepouV doxhV) must have been the *Yeqara*.⁶

[11]

The varied use of the terms *Shekhinah* and *Yeqara*, and then *Memra*, in the Targum of [Isaiah 6.](#), is very remarkable. In ver. 1 it is

[12]

⁵I think it is *Köster* (Trinitätslehre vor Christo) who distinguishes the two as God's Presence within and without the congregation. In general his *brochure* is of little real value. Dr. S. *Maybaum* (Anthropomorphien u. Anthropopathien ber Onkelos) affords a curious instance of modern Jewish criticism. With much learning and not a little ingenuity he tries to prove by a detailed analysis, that the three terms *Memra*, *Shekhinah*, and *Yeqara* have not the meaning above explained! The force of tendency-argumentation could scarcely go farther than his essay.

⁶Not as *Grimm* (Clavis N.T. p. 107 a) would have it, the *Shekhinah*, though he rightly regards the N.T. doxa in this signification of the word, as the equivalent of the Old Testament *yy dwbk*. Clear notions on the subject are so important that we give a list of the chief passages in which the two terms are used in the Targum Onkelos, viz. *Yeqara*: [Genesis 17:22](#); [18:33](#); [28:13](#); [35:13](#); [Exodus 3:1, 6](#); [16:7, 10](#); [17:16](#); [18:5](#); [20:17, 18](#); [24:10, 11, 17](#); [29:43](#); [33:18, 22, 23](#); [40:34, 38](#); [Leviticus 9:4, 6, 23](#); [Numbers 10:36](#); [12:8](#); [14:14, 22](#). *Shekhinah*: [Genesis 9:27](#); [Exodus 17:7, 16](#); [20:21](#); [25:8](#); [29:45, 46](#); [33:3, 5](#); [14-16, 20](#); [34:6, 9](#); [Numbers 5:3](#); [6:25](#); [11:20](#); [14:14, 42](#); [23:21](#); [35:34](#); [Deuteronomy 1:42](#); [3:24](#); [4:39](#); [6:15](#); [56:21](#); [12:5, 11, 21](#); [14:23, 24](#); [16:2, 6, 11](#); [23:15](#); [26:2](#); [32:10](#); [33:26](#).

the *Yeqara*, and its train—the heavenward glory—which fills the Heavenly Temple. In ver. 3 we hear the *Trishagion* in connection with the dwelling of His *Shekhintha*, while the splendour (*Ziv*) of His *Yeqara* fills the earth—as it were, falls down to it. In ver. 5 the prophet dreads, because he had seen the *Yeqara* of the Shekhinah, while in ver. 6 the coal is taken from before the Shekhintha (which is) upon the throne of the *Yeqara* (a remarkable expression, which occurs often; so especially in ix. xvii. 16). Finally, in ver. 8, the prophet hears the voice of the *Memra* of Jehovah speaking the words of vv. 9, 10. It is intensely interesting to notice that in St. John 12:40, these words are prophetically applied in connection with Christ. Thus St. John applies to the Logos what the Targum understands of the *Memra* of Jehovah.

But, theologically, by far the most interesting and important point, with reference not only to the Logos of Philo, but to the term *Logos* as employed in the Fourth Gospel, is to ascertain the precise import of the equivalent expression *Memra* in the Targumim. As stated in the text of this book (vol. i. p. 47), the term *Memra* as applied to God, occurs 176 times in the Targum Onkelos, 99 times in the Jerusalem Targum, and 321 times in the Targum Pseudo-Jonathan. We subjoin the list of these passages, arranged in three classes. Those in *Class I.* mark where the term does not apply to this, or where it is at least *doubtful*; those in *Class II.* where the *fair* interpretation of a passage shows; and *Class III.* where it is *undoubted* and unquestionable, that the expression *Memra* refers to God as revealing Himself, that is the Logos.

Classified List of all the Passages in which the term *Memra* occurs in the Targum Onkelos.

[13] (The term occurs 176 times. Class III., which consists of those passages in which the term *Memra* bears *undoubted* application to the Divine Personality as revealing Himself, comprises 79 passages).

7

⁷As these sheets are passing through the press for a second edition, the classic edition of the Targum Onkelos by Dr. *Berliner* (in 2 vols. berlin, 1884) has reached me. Vol. i. gives the text after the *editio Sabioneta* (of they 1557). Vol. ii. adds critical notes to the text (pp. 1-70), which are followed by very interesting *Prolegomena*, entering fully one all questions connected with this Targum, historical, exegetical, and critical, and treating them with equal learning and breadth and sobriety of judgment. On comparing

CLASS I. *Inapplicable or Doubtful*: Genesis 26:5; Exodus 2:25; 5:2; 6:8; 15:8, 10, 26; 16:8; 17:1; 23:21, 22; 25:22; 32:13; Leviticus 18:30; 22:9; 26:14, 18, 21, 27; Numbers 3:39, 51; 4:37, 41, 45, 49; 9:18 (bis), 19, 20 (bis), 23 quat; 10:13; 13:3; 14:11, 22, 30, 35; 20:12, 24; 23:19; 24:4, 16; 27:14; 33:2, 38; 36:5; Deuteronomy 1:26; 4:30; 8:3, 20; 13:5, 19 (in our Version 4, 18); 15:5; 26:15, 18; 27:10; 28:1, 2, 15, 45, 62; 30:2, 8, 10, 20.

An examination of these passages would show that, for caution's sake, we have sometimes put down as inapplicable or doubtful what, viewed in connection with other passages in which the word is used, appears scarcely doubtful. It would take too much space to explain why some passages are put in the *next* class, although the term *Memra seems* to be used in a manner parallel to that in Class I. Lastly, the reason why some passages appear in Class III., when others, somewhat similar are placed in Class II., must be sought in the context and connection of a verse. We must ask the reader to believe that each passage had been carefully studied by itself, and that our conclusions have been determined by careful consideration, and by the fair meaning to be put on the language of Onkelos.

CLASS II. *Fair*: Genesis 7:16; 20:3; 31:3, 24; Exodus 19:5; Leviticus 8:35; 26:23; Numbers 11:20; 23; 14:41; 22:9, 18, 20; 23:3, 4, 16; 27:21; 36:2; Deuteronomy 1:32; 4:24, 33, 36; 5:24, 25, 26; 23 (bis); 31:23; 34:5.

CLASS III. *Undoubted*: Genesis 3:8, 10; 6:6 (bis), 7; 8:21; 9:12, 13, 15, 16, 17; 15:1, 6; 17:2, 7, 10, 11; 21:20, 22, 23; 22:16; 24:3; 26:3, 24, 28; 28:15, 20, 21; 31:49, 50; 35:3; 39:2, 3, 21, 23; 48:21; 49:24, 25; Exodus 3:12; 4:12, 15; 10:10; 14:31; 15:2; 18:19; 19:17; 29:42, 43; 30:6; 31:13, 17; 33:22, Leviticus 20:23; 24:12; 26:9; 11, 30, 46; Numbers 14:9 (bis), 43; 17:19 (in our Version 5:4); 21:5; 23:21; Deuteronomy 1:30; 2:7; 3:22; 4:37; 5:5; 9:3; 18:16, 19; 20:1; 23:15; 31:6, 8; 32:51; 33:3, 27. [14]

Of most special interest is the rendering of *Onkelos* of Deuteronomy 33:27, where instead of underneath are the everlasting arms *Onkelos* has it: And by His *Memra* was the world made exactly as in St. John 1:10. This divergence of *Onkelos* from the Hebrew

our ordinary text with that published by Dr. *Berliner* I find that in the three passages italicised (Genesis 7:16, 6:6, once, and 28:21) the *ed. Sabion.* has not the word *Memra*. This is specially noteworthy as regards the very important passage, Genesis 28:21.

text is utterly unaccountable, nor has any explanation of it, as far as I know, been attempted. *Winer*, whose inaugural dissertation *De Onkeloso ejusque Paraphrasi chaldaica* (Lips. 1820), most modern writers have simply followed (with some amplifications, chiefly from *Luzatto's Philoxenus* rgh bhmakes no reference to this passage, nor do his successors, so far as I know. It is curious that, as our present Hebrew text has *three* words, so has the rendering of *Onkelos*, and that both end with the same word.

In classifying the passages in which the word *Memra* occurs in the Jerusalem Targum and the Targum Pseudo-Jonathan, we have reversed the previous order, and Class I. represents the passages in which the term *undoubtedly* applies to the Personal manifestation of God; Class II., in which this is the *fair* interpretation; Class III., in which application is, to say the most, *doubtful*.

Classified List of Passages (according to the above scheme) in which the term *Memra* occurs in the Targum Jerushalmi on the Pentateuch.

Class I. Of *undoubted* application to a Personal Manifestation of God: [Genesis 1:27; 3:9, 22; 5:24; 6:3; 8:16; 15:1; 16:3; 19:24; 21:33; 22:8, 14; 28:10; 30:22 \(bis\); 31:9; 35:9 \(quat.\); 38:25; 40:23; Exodus 3:14; 6:3; 12:42 \(quat.\); 13:18; 14:15, 24, 25; 15:12, 25 \(bis\); 19:5, 7, 8, 9 \(bis\); 20:1, 24; 25:4; 27:16; Deuteronomy 1:1; 3:2; 4:34; 26:3, 14, 17, 18; 28:27, 68; 33:15, 39, 51; 33:2, 7; 34:9, 10, 11.](#)

[15] Class II. Where such application is *fair*: [Genesis 5:24; 21:33; Exodus 6:3; 15:1; Leviticus 1:1; Numbers 23:15, 21; 24:4, 16; Deuteronomy 32:1, 40.](#)

Class III. Where such application is *doubtful*: [Genesis 6:6; 18:1, 17; 22:14 \(bis\); 30:22; 40:23; 49:18; Exodus 13:19; 15:2, 26; 17:19; 19:3; Deuteronomy 1:1; 32:18; 34:4, 5.](#)

Classified List of Passages in which the term *Memra* occurs in the Targum Pseudo-Jonathan on the Pentateuch.

Class I. *Undoubted*: [Genesis 2:8, 10, 24; 4:26; 5:2; 7:16; 9:12, 13, 15, 16, 17; 11:8; 12:17; 15:1; 17:2, 7, 10, 11; 18:5; 19:24 \(bis\); 20:6, 18; 21:22; 22, 23, 33; 22:1; 24:3; 26:3, 24, 28; 27:28, 31; 28:10, 15, 20; 29:12; 31:3, 50; 35:3, 9; 39:2, 3, 21, 23; 41:1; 46:4; 48:9, 21; 49:25, 1, 20; Exodus 1:21; 2:5; 3:12; 7:25; 10:10; 12:23, 29; 13:8, 15, 17; 14:25, 31; 15:25; 17:13, 15, 16 \(bis\); 18:19; 20:7;](#)

26:28; 29:42, 43; 30:6, 36; 31:13, 17; 32:35; 33:9, 19; 34:5; 36:33; Leviticus 1:1 (bis); 6:2; 8:35; 9:23; 20:23; 24:12 (bis); 26:11, 12, 30, 44, 46; Numbers 3:16, 39, 51; 4:37, 41, 45, 49; 9:18 (bis), 19, 20, (bis), 23 (ter); 10:13, 35, 36; 14:9, 41, 43; 16:11, 26; 17:4; 21. 5, 6, 8, 9, 34; 22:18, 19, 28; 23:3, 4, 8 (bis), 16, 20, 21; 24:13; 27:16; 31:8; 33:4; Deuteronomy 1:10, 30, 43; 2:7, 21; 3:22; 4:3, 7, (bis) 20, 24, 33, 36; 5:5 (bis), 11, 22, 23, 24 (bis), 25, 26; 6:13, 21, 22; 9:3; 11:23; 12:5, 11; 18:19; 20:1; 21:20; 24:18, 19; 26:5, 14, 18; 28:7, 9, 11, 13, 20, 21, 22, 25, 27, 28, 35, 48, 49, 59, 61, 63, 68; 29:2, 4; 30:3, 4, 5, 7; 31:5, 8, 23; 32:6, 9, 12, 36; 33:29; 34:1, 5, 10, 11.

Class II. *Fair*: Genesis 5:24; 15:6; 16:1, 13; 18:17; 22:16; 29:31; 30:22; 46:4; Exodus 2:23; 3:8, 17, 19; 4:12; 6:8; 12:27; 13:5, 17; 32:13; 33:12, 22; Leviticus 26:44; Numbers 14:30; 20:12, 21; 22:9, 20; 24:4, 16, 23; Deuteronomy 8:3; 11:12; 29:23; 31:2, 7; 32:18, 23, 26, 38, 39, 43, 48, 50, 51; 3:3, 27; 34:6.

Class III. *Doubtful*: Genesis 4:3, 6 (bis); 8:1, 21; 22:18; 26:5 (bis); Exodus 4:15; 5:2; 9:20, 21; 10:29; 14:7; 15:2, 8; 19:5; 25:22; Leviticus 18:30; 22:9; 26:40; Numbers 6:27; 9:8; 12:6; 14:11, 22, 35; 15:34; 20:24; 23:19; 27:14; 33:2, 38; 36:5; Deuteronomy 1:26, 32; 4:30; 5:5; 8:20; 9:23; 11:1; 13:18; 15:5; 19:15; 25:18; 26:17; 27:10; 28:1, 15, 45, 62; 30:2, 8, 9, 10; 31:12; 33:9.

[16]

(Ad vol. i. p. 53, note 4.) Only one illustration of *Philo's* peculiar method of interpreting the Old Testament can here be given. It will at the same time show how he found confirmation for his philosophical speculations in the Old Testament, and further illustrate his system of moral theology in its most interesting, but also most difficult, point. The question is, how the soul was to pass from its state of sensuousness and sin to one of devotion to reason, which was religion and righteousness. It will be remarked that the change from the one state to the other is said to be accomplished in one of three ways: by *study*, by *practice*, or through a *good natural disposition* (maqhsiV, askhsiV, eufuia) exactly as Aristotle put it. But Philo found a symbol for each, and for a preparatory state in each, in Scripture. The three Patriarchs represented this threefold mode of reaching the supersensuous: Abraham, study; Jacob, practice; Isaac, a good disposition; while Enos, Enoch, and Noah, represented the respective preparatory stages. Enos (hope), the first real ancestor of our race, represented the mind awakening to the

existence of a better life. *Abraham* (study) received command to leave the land (sensuousness). But all study was threefold. It was, first, *physical*—Abram in the land of Ur, contemplating the starry sky, but not knowing God. Next to the physical was that intermediate (mesh) study, which embraced the ordinary cycle of knowledge (egkuklioV paideia). This was Abram after he left Haran, and that knowledge was symbolised by his union with Hagar, who tarried (intermediately) between Kadesh and Bered. But this stage also was insufficient, and the soul must reach the third and highest stage, that of Divine philosophy (truly, the love of wisdom, filosofia) where eternal truth was the subject of contemplation. Accordingly, Abram left Lot, he became Abraham, and he was truly united to Sarah, no longer Sarai. Onwards and ever upwards would the soul now rise to the knowledge of virtue, of heavenly realities, nay, of the nature of God Himself.

[17] But there was yet another method than study by which the soul might rise—that of *askesis*, discipline, practice, of which Scripture speaks in Enoch and Jacob. Enoch—whom God took, and he was not ([Genesis 5:24](#))—meant the soul turning from the lower to the higher, so that it was no longer found in its former place of evil. From Enoch, as the preparatory stage, we advance to *Jacob*, first merely fleeing from sensuous entanglements (from Laban), then contending with the affections, ridding himself of five of the seventy-five souls with which he had entered Egypt ([Deuteronomy 10:22](#), comp. with [Genesis 46:27](#)), often nearly misled by the Sophists (Dinah and Hamor), often nearly failing and faint in the conflict (Jacob's wrestling), but holpen by God, and finally victorious, when Jacob became Israel.

But the highest of all was the spiritual life, which came neither from study nor discipline, but through a good disposition. Here we have, first of all, *Noah*, who symbolises only the commencement of virtue, since we read not of any special virtue in him. Rather is he *rest*—as the name implies—good, relatively to those around. It was otherwise with *Isaac*, who was perfect before his birth (and hence chosen), even as *Rebekah* meant constancy in virtue. In that state the soul enjoyed true rest (the Sabbath, Jerusalem) and joy, which Isaac's name implied. But true virtue, which was also true wisdom, was Paradise, whence issued the one stream (goodness), which again

divided into four branches (the four Stoic virtues):—*Pison*, prudence (fronhsiV); *Gihon*, fortitude (andria); *Tigris*, desire (epiqumia), and *Euphrates*, justice (dikaiosunh). And yet, though these be the Stoic virtues, they all spring from Paradise, the Garden of God—and all that is good, and all help to it, comes to us ultimately from God Himself, and is in God.

[18] **Appendix 3—Rabbinic Views as to the Lawfulness of Images, Pictorial Representations on Coins, etc.**

On this point, especially as regarded images, statues, and coins, the views of the Rabbis underwent (as stated in the text) changes and modifications according to the outward circumstances of the people. The earlier and strictest opinions, which absolutely forbade any representation, were relaxed in the Mishnah, and still further in the Talmud.

In tracing this development, we mark as a first stage that a distinction was made between *having* such pictorial representations and *making use of them*, in the sense of selling or bartering them; and again between *making* and *finding* them. The Mishnah forbids only such representations of human beings as carry in their hand some symbol of power, such as a staff, bird, globe, or as the Talmud adds, a sword, or even a signet-ring (Ab. Z. iii. 1). The Commentaries explain that this must refer to the making use of them, since their possession was, at any rate, prohibited. The Talmud adds (Ab. Z. 40 *b*, 41 *a*) that these were generally representations of kings, that they were used for purposes of worship, and that their prohibition applied only to villages, not to towns, where they were used for ornament. Similarly the Mishnah directs that everything bearing a representation of sun or moon, or of a dragon, was to be thrown into the Dead Sea (Ab. Z. iii. 3). On the other hand, the Talmud quotes (Ab. Z. 42 *b*) a proposition (*Boraita*), to the effect that all representations of the planets were allowed, except those of the sun and moon,¹ likewise all statues except those of man, and all pictures except those of a dragon, the discussion leading to the conclusion that in two, if not in all the cases mentioned, the Talmudic directions refer to finding, not making such. So stringent, indeed, was the law as regarded signet-rings, that it was forbidden to have raised work on

¹The Nasi R. Gamaliel made use of representations of the moon in questioning ignorant witnesses with a view of fixing (by the new moon) the beginning of the month. But this must be regarded as a necessary exception to the rule.

them, and only such figures were allowed as were sunk beneath the surface, although even then they were not to be used for sealing (Ab. Z. 43 *b*). But this already marks a concession, accorded apparently to a celebrated Rabbi, who had such a ring. Still further in the same direction is the excuse, framed at a later period, for the Rabbis who worshipped in a Synagogue that had a statue of a king to the effect that they could not be suspected of idolatry, since the place, and hence their conduct, was under the inspection of all men. This more liberal tendency had, indeed, appeared at a much earlier period, in the case of the Nasi Gamaliel II., who made use of a public bath at Acco in which there was a statue of Aphrodite. The Mishnah (Ab. Z. iii. 4) puts this twofold plea into his mouth, that he had not gone into the domain of the idol, but the idol came into his, and that the statue was there for ornament, not for worship. The Talmud endorses, indeed, these arguments, but in a manner showing that the conduct of the great Gamaliel was not really approved of (Ab. Z. 44 *b*). But a statue used for idolatrous purposes was not only to be pulverized, but the dust cast to the winds or into the sea, lest it might possible serve as manure to the soul! (Ab. Z. iii. 3.) This may explain how Josephus ventured even to blame King Solomon for the figures on the Brazen sea and on his throne (Ant. viii. 7, 5), and how he could excite a fanatical rabble at Tiberias, to destroy the palace of Herod Antipas because it contained figures of living creatures (Life 12).²

[19]

²Following the insufficient reasoning of *Ewald* (Gesch. d. Volkes Isr. vol. v. p. 83), *Schürer* represents the non-issue of coins with the image of Herod as a concession to Jewish prejudices, and argues that the coins of the Emperors struck in Palestine bore no effigy. The assertion is, however, unsupported, and St. [Matthew 22:20](#) proves that coins with an image of Caesar were in general circulation. *Wieseler* (Beitr. pp. 83-87) had shown that the absence of Herod's effigy on coins proves his inferior position relatively to Rome, and as this has an important bearing on the question of a Roman census during his reign, it was scarcely fair to simply ignore it. The Talmud (Baba K. 97 *b*) speaks of coins bearing on one side David and Solomon (? their effigies or their names), and on the other Jerusalem, the holy City. But if it be doubtful whether these coins had respectively the effigies of David or of Solomon, there can be no doubt about the coins ascribed in Ber. R. (Par. 39, ed. Warshau, p. 71 *b*) to Abraham, Joshua, David, and Mordecai—that of Abraham being described as bearing on one side the figures of an old man and an old woman (Abraham and Sarah), and on the other those of a young man and a young woman (Isaac and Rebekah). The coins of Joshua are stated to have borne on one side a bullock, on the other a ram, according to [Deuteronomy 33:17](#). There could, therefore, have been

[20] **Appendix 4—An Abstract of Jewish History from**
[21] **the Reign of Alexander the Great to the Ascension**
of Herod (See Book I. ch. 8.)

The political connection of Israel with the the Grecian world, and, with it, the conflict with Hellenism, may be said to have connected with the victorious progress of Alexander the Great through the then known world (333 b.c.). ¹ It was not only that his destruction of the Persian empire put an end to the easy and peaceful allegiance which Judaea had owned to it for about two centuries, but that the establishment of such a vast Hellenic empire, as was the aim of Alexander, introduced a new element into the world of Asia. Everywhere the old civilisation gave way before the new. So early as the commencement of the second century before Christ, Palestine was already surrounded, north, east, and west, with a girdle of Hellenic cities, while in the interior of the land itself Grecianism had its foothold in Galilee and was dominant in Samaria. But this is not all. After continuing the frequent object of contention between the rulers of Egypt and Syria, Palestine ultimately passed from Egyptian to Syrian domination during the reign of Seleucus IV. (187-175 b.c.). His successor was that Antiochus IV., Epiphanes (175-164), whose reckless determination to exterminate Judaism, and in its place to substitute Hellenism, led to the Maccabean rising. Mad as this attempt seems, it could scarcely have been made had

no such abhorrence of such coins, and if there had been Herod was scarcely the man to be deterred by it. On these supposed coins of David, &c., see the very curious remarks of *Wagenseil*, Sota, pp. 574, and following. The fullest and most accurate information on all connected with the coins of the Jews is contained in the large and learned work of Mr. *Madden*, *Coins of the Jews* (vol. ii. of *The International Numismata Orientalia* 1881). Comp. also the Review of this book in the *Journal of the Royal Archaeological Inst.* for 1882 vol. xxxix. pp. 203-206.

¹We do not here discuss the question, whether or not Alexander really entered Jerusalem. Jewish legend has much to tell of him, and reports many supposed inquiries on his part or discussions between him and the Rabbis, that prove at least the deep impression which his appearance had made, and the permanent results which followed from it.

Appendix 4—An Abstract of Jewish History from the Reign of Alexander the Great to the Ascension of Herod (See Book I, ch. 8.) xxiii
~~there not been in Palestine itself a party to favour his plans. In truth,~~
Grecianism, in its worst form, had long before made its way, slowly but surely, into the highest quarters. For the proper understanding of this history its progress must be briefly indicated.

After the death of Alexander, Palestine passed first under Egyptian domination. Although the Ptolemies were generally favourable to the Jews (at least of their own country), those of Palestine at times felt the heavy hand of the conqueror (*Jos. Ant.* xii. 1). Then followed the contests between Syria and Egypt for its possession, in which the county must have severely suffered. As *Josephus* aptly remarks (*Ant.* xii. 3. 3), whichever partly gained, Palestine was like a ship in a storm which is tossed by the waves on both sides. Otherwise it was a happy time, because one of the comparative independence. The secular and spiritual power was vested in the hereditary High-Priests, who paid for their appointment (probably annually) the sum of twenty (presumably Syrian) talents, amounting to five ordinary talents, or rather less than 1,200*l.* ² Besides this personal, the country paid a general tribute, its revenues being let to the highest bidder. The sum levied on Judaea itself has computed at 81,900*l.* (350 ordinary talents). Although this tribute appears by no means excessive, bearing in mind that in later times the dues from the balsam-district around Jericho were reckoned at upwards of 46,800*l.* (200 talents), the hardship lay in the mode of levying it by strangers, often unjustly, and always harshly, and in the charges connected with its collection. This cause of complaint was indeed, removed in the course of time, but only by that which led to far more serious evils.

The succession of the High-Priests, as given in *Nehem.* 12:10, 11, 22, furnishes the following names: Jeshua, Joiakin, Eliashib, Joiada, Johanan, ³ Jonathan, and Jaddua, who was the contemporary

²Comp. *Herzfeld*, *Gesch. d. Volkes Isr.*, vol. ii. *passim*, but specially pp. 181 and 211.

³I have placed Johanan (*Nehemiah 12:22*) before Jonathan, in accordance with the ingenious reasoning of *Herzfeld*, ii. p. 372. The chronology of their Pontificates is almost inextricably involved. In other respects also there are not a few difficulties. See *Zunz*, *Gottesd. Vortr.* p. 27, and the elaborate discussions of *Herzfeld*, whose work, however, is very faulty in arrangement.

[23] of Alexander the Great. After the death of Jaddua, we have the following list: ⁴ *Onias I.* (*Jos. Ant.* xi. 8. 7), *Simon I. the Just* ⁵ (*Ant.* xii. 2. 5), *Eleazar*, *Manasseh* (*Ant.* xii. 4. 1), *Onias II.*, *Simon II.* (*Ant.* xii. 4. 10), *Onias III.*, *Jason* (*Ant.* xii. 5. 1), *Menelaus*, and *Alcimus* (*Ant.* xii. 9. 7), with whom the series of the Pontiffs is brought down to the Maccabees. Internal peace and happiness ceased after the death of Simon the Just (in the beginning of the third century b.c.), one of the last links in that somewhat mysterious chain of personages, to which tradition has given the name of the Great Assemblage or Great Synagogue. ⁶

Jewish legend has much that is miraculous to tell of Simon the Just, and connects him alike with events both long anterior and long posterior to his Pontificate. Many of these traditions read like the outcome of loving, longing remembrance of a happy past which was never to return. Such a venerable form would never again be seen in the Sanctuary (*Ecclus.* 1. 1-4), nor would such miraculous attestation be given to any other ministrations ⁷ (*Yoma* 39 *a* and *b*; *Jer. Yoma* v. 2; 6:3). All this seems to point to the close of a period when the High-Priesthood was purely Jewish in spirit, just as the hints about dissensions among his sons (*Jer. Yoma* 43 *d*, at top) sound like faint reminiscences of the family—and public troubles which followed. In point of fact he was succeeded not by his *Onias* ⁸ who was under age, but by his brother *Eleazar*, and he, after a Pontificate of twenty years, by his brother *Manasseh*. It was only

⁴Happily no divergence exists as to their succession.

⁵Some Christian and all Jewish writers assign the designation of The Just to Simon II. This is directly contrary to the express statement of *Josephus*. *Herzfeld* (i. 377) appeals to *Abthoth* i. 2, 3, *Men.* 109 *b*, and *Jer. Yoma* vi. 3, but immediately relinquishes the two latter references as otherwise historically untenable. But surely no historical inference—for such it is—from *Ab.* i. 2, 3 is worth setting against the express statement of *Josephus*. Besides, *Zunz* has rightly shown that the expression *Qibbel* must not be too closely pressed, as indeed its use throughout the *Perek* seems to indicate (*Gottesd. Vortr.* p. 37, Note).

⁶Of this more in the sequel. He is called *hlwdgh tsnk yry#m* which however does not seem necessary to imply that he was actually a member of it.

⁷It deserves notice that in these same Talmudic passages reference is also made to the later entire cessation of the same miracles, as indicating the coming destruction of the Temple.

⁸Or as he is designated in the Talmud; *Chonyi*, *Nechunyah*, and even *Nechunyon*. *Onias* is a Grecianised form—itsself a significant fact.

Appendix 4—An Abstract of Jewish History from the Reign of Alexander the Great to the Ascension of Herod (See Book I. ch. 8.) xxv
twenty-seven years later, after the death of Manasseh, that Onias II.

became High-Priest. If Eleazar, and especially Manasseh, owned their position, or at least strengthened it, by courting the favour of the ruler of Egypt, it was almost natural that Onias should have taken the opposite or Syrian part. His refusal to pay the High-Priestly tribute to Egypt could scarcely have been wholly due to avarice, as *Josephus* suggests. The anger and threats of the king were appeased by the High-Priest's nephew Joseph, who claimed descent from the line of David. He knew how to ingratiate himself at the court of Alexandria, and obtained the lease of the taxes of Coele-Syria (which included Judaea), by offering for it double sum previously paid. The removal of the foreign tax-gatherer was very grateful to the Jews, but the authority obtained by Joseph became a new source of danger, especially in the hands of his ambitious son, Hyrcanus. Thus we already mark the existence of three parties: the Egyptian, the Syrian, and that of the sons of Tobias (*Ant.* xii. 5. 1), as the adherents of Joseph were called, after his father. If the Egyptian party ceased when Palestine passed under Syrian rule in the reign of Antiochus III. the Great (223-187 b.c.), and ultimately became wholly subject to it under Seleucus IV. (187-173), the Syrian, and especially the Tobias-party, had already become Grecianised. In truth, the contest now became one for power and wealth in which each sought to outbid the other by bribery and subserviency to the foreigner. As the submission of the people could only be secured by the virtual extinction of Judaism, this aim was steadily kept in view by the degenerate priesthood.

[24]

The storm did not, indeed, break under the Pontificate of Simon II., the son and successor of Onias II., but the times were becoming more and more troublous. Although the Syrian rulers occasionally showed favour to the Jews, Palestine was now covered with a network of Syrian officials, into whose hands the temporal power mainly passed. The taxation also sensibly increased, and, besides crown-money, consisted of a poll-tax, the third of the field-crops, the half of the produce of trees, a royal monopoly of salt and of the forests, and even a tax on the Levitical tithes and on all revenues of the Temple. ⁹

⁹In 1 Macc. x. 29-33; *Jos. And.* xii. 3. 3; 13:2. 3. In view of these express testimonies the statement of *Ewald* (*Gesch. d. V. Isr.* vol. iv. p. 373), to the effect that

[25] Matters became much more worse under the Pontificate of Onias II., the son and successor of Simon II. A dispute between him and one Simon, a priest, and captain of the temple-guard,¹⁰ apparently provoked by the unprincipled covetousness of the latter, induced Simon to appeal to the cupidity of the Syrians by referring to the untold treasures which he described as deposited in the Temple. His motive may have been partly a desire for revenge, partly the hope of attaining the office of Onias. It was ascribed to a supernatural apparition, but probably it was only superstition which arrested the Syrian general at that time. But a dangerous lesson had been learned alike by Jew and Gentile.

Seleucus IV. was succeeded by his brother Antiochus IV., Epiphanes (175-164). Whatever psychological explanation may be offered of his bearing—whether his conduct was that of a madman, or of a despot intoxicated to absolute forgetfulness of every consideration beyond his own caprice by the fancied possession of power uncontrolled and unlimited—cruelty and recklessness of tyranny were as prominently his characteristics as revengefulness and unbounded devotion to superstition. Under such a reign the precedent which Simon, the Captain of the—Temple—, had set, was successfully followed up by no less a person than the brother of the High-Priest himself. The promise of a yearly increase of 360 talents in the taxes of the country, besides a payment of 80 talents from another revenue (2 Macc. iv. 8, 9), purchased the deposition of Onias III.—the first event of that kind recorded in Jewish history—and the substitution of his brother Joshua, Jesus, or Jason (as he loved to Grecianise his name), in the Pontificate.¹¹ But this was not all. The necessities, if not the inclinations, of the new High-Priest, and his relations to the Syrian king, prescribed a Grecian policy at home. It seems almost incredible, and yet it is quite in accordance with the circumstances, that Jason should have actually paid to Antiochus a sum of 150 talents for permission to erect a Gymnasium in Jerusalem,

_____ Palestine, or at least Jerusalem, enjoyed immunity from taxation, seems strange indeed. *Schürer* (u. s. p. 71) passes rather lightly over the troubles in Judaea before Antiochus Epiphanes.

¹⁰*Herzfeld* rightly corrects Benjamin in 2 Macc. iii. 4. Comp. u. s. p. 218.

¹¹The notice in *Jos. Ant.* xii. 5. 1 must be corrected by the account in 2 Macc. Comp. *Herzfeld*, u. s.

that he entered citizens of Antioch on the registers of Jerusalem, and that on one occasion he went so far as to send a deputation to attend the games at Tyre, with money for purchasing offerings to Heracles! And in Jerusalem, and throughout the land, there was a strong and increasing party to support Jason in his plans, and to follow his lead (2 Macc. iv. 9, 19). Thus far had Grecianism already swept over the country, as not only to threaten the introduction of views, manners, and institutions wholly incompatible with the religion of the Old Testament, but even the abolition of the bodily mark which distinguished its professors (1 Macc. i. 15; *Jos. Ant.* xii. 5, 1).

[26]

But the favor which Antiochus showed Jason was not of long duration. One even more unscrupulous than he, Menelaus (or, according to his Jewish name, Onias), the brother of that Simon who had first excited the Syrian cupidity about the Temple treasure, outbade Jason with Antiochus by a promise of 300 talents in addition to the tribute which Jason had paid. Accordingly, Menelaus was appointed High-Priest. In the expressive language of the time: he came, bringing nothing worthy of the High-Priesthood, but having the fury of a cruel tyrant and the rage of a savage beast (2 Macc. iv. 25). In the conflict for the Pontificate, which now ensued, Menelaus conquered by the help of the Syrians. A terrible period of internal misrule and external troubles followed. Menelaus and his associates cast off every restraint, and even plundered the Temple of some of its precious vessels. Antiochus, who had regarded the resistance to his nominee as rebellion against himself, took fearful vengeance by slaughter of the inhabitants of Jerusalem and pillage of the Temple. But this was not all. When checked in his advance against Egypt, by the peremptory mandate of Rome, Antiochus made up for his disappointment by an expedition against Judaea, of which the avowed object was to crush the people and to sweep away Judaism. The horrors which now ensued are equally recorded in the Books of the Maccabees, by *Josephus*, and in Jewish tradition. ¹²

All sacrifices, the service of the Temple, and the observance of the Sabbath and of feast days were prohibited; the Temple at

[27]

¹²Besides Talmudic and Midrashic notices, we here refer to that most interesting and ancient *Megillath Taanith*, or Rolls of Fasts of which a translation is given in Appendix V. The passages bearing on this period are collected in *Derenbourg*, *Hist. de la Palestine*, pp. 59-63, although his reference to that on the 28th of Adar is at least open to controversy.

Jerusalem was dedicated to Jupiter Olympius; the Holy Scriptures were searched for and destroyed; the Jews forced to take part in heathen rites; a small heathen altar was reared on the great altar of burnt-offering—in short, every insult was heaped on the religion of the Jews, and its every trace was to be swept away. The date of the final profanation of the Temple was the 25th *Chislev* (corresponding to our December)—the same on which, after its purification by Judas Maccabee,¹³ its services were restored, the same on which the Christian Church celebrates the dedication of a better Temple, that of the Holy Ghost in the Incarnation of Jesus Christ.

But the relentless persecution, which searched for its victims in every part of the land, also called forth a deliverer in the person of *Mattathias*. The story of the glorious rising and final deliverance of the country under the *Maccabees* or *Asmonaeans*, as they are *always* called in Jewish writings,¹⁴ is sufficiently known. Only the briefest outline of it can here be attempted. Mattathias died before it came to any actual engagement with the Syrians, but victory after victory attended the arms of his son, *Judas the Maccabee*, till at last the Temple could be purified and its services restored, exactly three years after its desecration (25 Chislev, 165 b.c.). The rule of the Jewish hero lasted other five years, which can scarcely be described as equally successful with the beginning of his administration. The first two years were occupied in fortifying strong positions and chastising those hostile heathen border-tribes which harassed Judaea. Towards the close of the year 164 Antiochus Epiphanes died. [28] But his successor, or rather Lysias, who administered the kingdom during his minority, was not content to surrender Palestine without a further contest. No deeds of heroism, however great, could compensate for the inferiority of the forces under Judas command.¹⁵ The prospect was becoming hopeless, when troubles at home

¹³The designation Maccabee was originally given to *Judas* (1 Macc. ii. 4, 66; 3:1; 5. 24, 34). The name was, like that of Charles *Martel*, probably derived from *bqm*, or in Chaldee *bqm*, a hammer. Comp. *Josippon ben Gorion*, iii. 9. 7 (ed. *Breithaupt*, p. 200)—only that he writes the name with a *k*, and not a *q*.

¹⁴*My*nm#x. *Josephus* (Ant. xii. 6. 1) derives the word from *Asmon* [*U+009C*]us, the great grandfather of Mattathias. Others derive it from the word *Mynm#h* (princes in A.V. [Psalm 19:31](#)).

¹⁵The Syrian force is said to have amounted to 100,000 footmen, 20,000 horsemen, and 32 war-elephants (1 Macc. vi. 30).

Appendix 4—An Abstract of Jewish History from the Reign of Alexander the Great to the Ascension of Herod (See Book I. ch. 8.) xxix
recalled the Syrian army, and led to a treaty of peace in which the Jews acknowledged Syrian supremacy, but were secured liberty of conscience and worship.

But the truce was of short duration. As we have seen there were already in Palestine two parties—that which, from its character and aims, may generally be designated as the *Grecian*, and the *Chasidim* (Assideans). There can be little doubt that the latter name originally in the designation *Chasidim*, applied to the pious in Israel in such passages as [Psalm 30:5](#) (4 in our A.V.); [31:23](#) (A.V.24; [37:28](#)). Jewish tradition distinguishes between the earlier and the later *Chasidim* (*Ber. v. 1* and *32 b*; *Men. 40 b*). The descriptions of the former are of so late a date, that the characteristics of the party are given in accordance with views and practices which belong to a much further development of Rabbinical piety. Their fundamental views may, however, be gathered from the four opening sentences of the Mishnic Tractate *Abhoth* ¹⁶ of which the last are ascribed to Jose the son of Joezer, and Jose the son of Jochanan, who, as we know, still belonged to the earlier *Chasidim*. These flourished about 140 b.c., and later. This date throws considerable light upon the relation between the earlier and later *Chasidim*, and the origin of the sects of the Pharisees and Sadducees. Comparing the sentences of the earlier *Chasidim* (*Ab. i. 2-4*) with those which follow, we notice a marked simplicity about them, while the others either indicate a rapid development of Rabbinism, or are echoes of the political relations subsisting, or else seems to allude to present difficulties or controversies. We infer that the earlier *Chasidim* represented the pious in Israel—of course, according to the then standpoint—who, in opposition to the Grecian party, rallied around Judas Maccabee and his successor, Jonathan. The assumption of the High-Priestly [29] dignity by Jonathan the Maccabee, on the nomination of the Syrian king (about 152), was a step which the ultraorthodox party never forgave the Asmonaeans. From that period, therefore, we date the alienation of the *Chasidim*—or rather the cessation of the earlier *Chasidim*. Henceforth, the party, as such, degenerated, or, to speak more correctly, ran into extreme religious views, which made them

¹⁶We regard the opening sentence of *Abhoth* as marking out the general principles and aims of the so-called Great Assembly.

the most advanced section of the Pharisees. ¹⁷ The latter and the Sadducees henceforth represented the people in its twofold religious direction. With this view agrees the statement of *Josephus* (*Ant.* xiii. 5, 9), who first mentions the existence of Pharisees and Sadducees in the time of Jonathan, and even the confused notice in *Aboth de Rabbi Nathan* 5, which ascribes the origin of the Sadducees to the first or second generation of Zadok's disciples, himself a disciple of Antigonus of Socho, which would bring the date to nearly the same time as *Josephus*.

From this digression, necessary for the proper understanding of the internal relations in Judaea, we return to the political history. There was another change on the throne of Syria. Demetrius, the new king readily listened to the complaints of a Jewish deputation, and appointed their leader, Alcimus (Jakim or Eljakim) High-Priest. At first the Chasidin were disposed to support him, as having formerly filled a high post in the priesthood, and as the nephew of José the son of Jazer, one of their leaders. But they suffered terribly for their rashness. Aided by the Syrians, Alcimus seized the Pontificate. But Judas once more raised the national standard against the intruder and the allies. At first victory seemed to incline to the national side, and the day of the final defeat and slaughter of the Syrian army and of Nicanor their general was enrolled in the Jewish Calendar as one on which fasting and mourning were prohibited (the 13th Adar, or March). Still, the prospect was far from reassuring, the more so as division had already appeared in the ranks of the Jews. In these circumstances Judas directed his eyes towards the new Western power which was beginning to overshadow the East. It was a fatal step—the beginning of all future troubles—and, even politically, a grave mistake, to enter into a defensive and offensive alliance with Rome. But before even more temporary advantage could be derived from this measure, Judas the Maccabee had already succumbed to superior numbers, and heroically fallen in battle against the Syrians.

The war of liberation had lasted seven years, and yet when the small remnant of the Asmonaeon party chose Jonathan, the youngest

¹⁷A somewhat analogous change, at least of theological opinions, distinguishes the later from the earlier Puritans. Theological schools which are partly political in their early history often degenerate either into political partisans or else into extreme sectaries, as either one or the other of their *rationes vivendi* ceases.

brother of Judas, as his successor, their cause seemed more hopeless than almost at any previous period. The Grecian party were dominant in Judaea, the Syrian host occupied the land and Jonathan and his adherents were obliged to retire to the other side Jordan. The only hope, if such it may be called, lay in the circumstances that after the death of Alcimus the Pontificate was not filled by another Syrian nominee, but remained vacant for two years. During this time the nationalists must have gained strength, since the Grecian party now once more sought and obtained Syrian help against them. But the almost passive resistance which Jonathan successfully offered wearied out the Syrian general and led to a treaty of peace (1 Macc. ix. 58-73). In the period which followed, the Asmonaeon party steadily increased, so that when a rival king claimed the Syrian crown, both pretenders bade for the support of Jonathan. He took the side of the new monarch, Alexander Balas, who sent him a crown of gold and a purple mantle, and appointed him High-Priest, a dignity which Jonathan at once accepted. ¹⁸ The Jewish Pontiff was faithful to his patron even against a new claimant to the crown of Syria. ¹⁹ And such was his influence, that the latter, on gaining possession of the throne, not only forgave the resistance of Jonathan, but confirmed him in the Pontificate, and even remitted the taxation of Palestine on a tribute (probably annual) of 300 talents. But the faithlessness and ingratitude of the Syrian king led Jonathan soon afterwards to take the side of another Syrian pretender, an infant, whose claims were ostensibly defended by his general Trypho. In the end, however, Jonathan's resistance to Trypho's schemes for obtaining the crown for himself led to the murder of the Jewish High-Priest by treachery.

[31]

The government of Judaea could not, in these difficult times, have developed upon one more fitted for it than Simon, an elder brother of Judas Maccabee. His father had, when making his dying disposition, already designated him as the man of counsel among

¹⁸The Pharisees never forgave this. It is quite true that this plea for their opposition to the Asmonaeans is for the first time reported during a later reign—that of John Hyrcanus I.—and that it was then ostensibly based on the ground of Hyrcanus mother having been a captive of war. But see our remarks on this point further on.

¹⁹The story, however, differently told by *Josephus* (*Ant.* Xiii. 4. 3). I have followed the account in 1 Macc., which is generally regarded as the more trustworthy, though I am not without misgivings, since *Josephus* evidently had the Book of Maccabees before him.

his sons (1 Macc. ii. 65). Simon's policy lay chiefly in turning to good account the disputes in Syria, and in consolidating such rule as he had acquired (143-135 b.c.). After the murder of his brother by Trypho, he took part of the Syrian claimant (Demetrius) to whom Trypho was opposed. Demetrius was glad to purchase his support by a remission of all taxation for all time to come. This was the first great success, and the Jews perpetuated its memory by enrolling its anniversary (the 27th Iyar, or May) in their Calendar. An even more important date, alike in the Calendar (Meg. Taan. Per. 2) and in Jewish history (1 Macc. xiii. 51), was the 23rd Iyar, when the work of clearing the country of the foreigner was completed by the Syrian party. The next measures of Simon were directed to the suppression of the Grecian party in Judaea, and the establishments of peace and security to his own adherents. To the popular mind this Golden Age described in glowing language in 1 Macc. xiv. 8-14, seemed to culminate in an event by which the national vanity was gratified and the future safety of their country apparently ensured. This was the arrival of a Roman embassy in Judaea to renew the league which had already been made both by Judas Maccabee and by Jonathan. Simon replied by sending a Jewish embassy to Rome, which brought a valuable shield of gold in token of gratitude. In their intoxication the Jews passed a decree, and engraved it on tables of brass, making Simon their High-Priest and a Governor forever, [32] until there should arise a faithful prophet; in other words, appointing him to the twofold office of spiritual and secular chief, and declaring it hereditary (1 Macc. xiv. 41-45). The fact that he should have been appointed to dignities which both he and his predecessor had already held, and that offices which in themselves were hereditary should now be declared such in the family of Simon, as well as the significant limitation: until there should arise a faithful prophet sufficiently indicate that there were dissensions among the people and opposition to the Asmonaeans. In truth, as the Chasidim had already had been alienated, so there was a growing party among the Pharisees, their successors, whose hostility to the Asmonaeans increased till it developed into positive hatred. This antagonism was, however, not grounded on their possession of the secular power, but on their occupancy of the Pontificate, perhaps on their combination of the two offices. How far their enmity went, will appear in the

Appendix 4—An Abstract of Jewish History from the Reign of Alexander the Great to the Ascension of Herod (See Book I. ch. 8.) xxxiii
sequel. For a time it was repressed by the critical state of affairs.

For, the contest with the Syrians had to be once more renewed, and although Simon, or rather his sons, obtained the victory, the aged High-Priest and two of his sons, Mattathias and Judas, fell by the treachery of Ptolomaeus, Simon's son-in-law.

The Pontificate and the government now developed upon the only one of Simon's sons still left, known as John Hyrcanus I. (Jochanan Horkenos,²⁰ Jannai²¹), 135-105 b.c. His first desire naturally was to set free his mother, who was still in the power of Ptolomaeus, and to chastise him for his crimes. But in this he failed. Ptolemy purchased immunity by threatening to kill his captive, and afterwards treacherously slew her. Soon after this a Syrian army besieged Jerusalem. The City was reduced to great straits. But when at the Feast of Tabernacles the Syrian king not only granted a truce to the besieged, but actually provided them with what was needed for the services of the Temple, Hyrcanus sought and obtained peace, although the Syrian councillors urged their king to use the opportunity for exterminating Jerusalem. The conditions, though hard, were not unreasonable in the circumstances. But fresh troubles in Syria gave a more favourable turn to affairs in Judaea. First, Hyrcanus subjected Samaria, and then conquered Idumaea, whose inhabitants he made proselytes by giving them the alternative of circumcision or exile. Next, the treaty with the Romans was renewed, and finally Hyrcanus availed himself of the rapid decay of the Syrian monarchy to throw off his allegiance to the foreigner. Jewish exclusiveness was further gratified by the utter destruction of Samaria, of which the memorial day (the 25th Marcheshvan, November) was inserted

[33]

²⁰The derivation of the name Hyrcanus, or in Rabbinical writings *Horqenos*, proposed by Grätz (Geesch. d. Juden. vol. ii. p. 55), and supported by *Hamburger* (Real. Encycl. für Bibel u. Talmud, sect ii. p. 421, note 15) is untenable, in view of the fact, that not a few Rabbinical authorities bore the same name (comp. Ab. ii. 8; Sanh. 68 a). It could not, therefore, be the victory of Hyrcanus over *Cendeb [U+009C]us*, the Hyrcanian.

²¹The name *Jannai* is supposed to have been an abbreviation of Jochanan. Many Rabbinic teachers of that name are mentioned. *Derenbourg* (Hist. de la Palest. p. 95) regards it as an abbreviation of Jonathan, but his reasoning is not convincing.

in the festive Calendar (Meg. Taan. Per. 8).²² Nor was this the only date which his successors added to the calendar of national feasts.²³

[34] But his reign is of the deepest importance in our history as marking the first public contest between the great parties, the Pharisees and the Sadducees, and also as the turning point in the history of the Maccabees. Even the coins of that period are instructive. They bear the inscription: Jochanan, the High-Priest, and the *Chebher* of the Jews; or else, Jochanan the High-Priest, Chief, and the *Chebher* of the Jews.²⁴ The term *Chebher*, which on the coins occurs only in connection with High-Priest unquestionably refers, not to the Jewish people generally, but to them in their ecclesiastical *organisation*, and points therefore to the acknowledgment of an Eldership or representative body, which presided over affairs along with and under the High-Priest as Chief.²⁵ In this respect the presence or absence of the word *Chebher* or even mention of the Jews, might afford hints as to the relationship of a Maccabee chief to the ecclesiastical leaders of the people. It has already been explained that the Chasidim, viewed as the National party, had ceased, and that the leaders were now divided into Pharisees and Sadducees. By tradition and necessity Hyrcanus belonged to the former, by tendency and, probably, inclination to the later. His interference in religious affairs was by no means to the liking of the Pharisees, still less to that of their extreme sectaries, the Chasidim. Tradition ascribes to Hyrcanus no less than *nine* innovations, of which only *five* were afterwards continued as legal ordinances. *First*, the payment of tithes (both of the Levitical and the so-called poor's tithe) was declared no longer

²²According to Jer. Soath ix. 13, and Sot. 33 a, a *Bath Qol* or Heavenly Voice, issuing from the Most Holy Place, had announced to Hyrcanus, while officiating in the Temple, the victory of his sons at Samaria. *Josephus* (Ant. xiii. 10. 7), assigns on this ground to Hyrcanus the prophetic, as well as the priestly and royal, title.

²³These are the 15th and 16th Sivan, the 16th Adar, and the 7th Iyar. Comp. the Meg. Taan.

²⁴*Schürer* (Neutest. Zeitg. p. 113) does not give this inscription correctly. Comp. *Levy*, Gesch. d. Jud. Munzen, pp. 52, 53. See especially *Madden*. Coins of the Jews pp. 74-81, where all the varieties of inscription are given.

²⁵We dismiss the fanciful readings and explanations of the word *rbx* by *De Saulcy* and *Ewald*. But I cannot agree with *Schürer* in applying it to the people as a whole. Even the passage which he quotes (Ber. iv. 7, with which the corresponding *Gemara* should be compared), proves that the word is not used loosely for the people, but with reference to their ecclesiastical *nexus*. Comp. also Meg. 27 b.

Great to the Ascension of Herod, (See Book I. ch. 8.) xxxv
obligatory on a ~~seller, if he were one of the Am ha-Arets, or country~~
people, but on the buyer.²⁶ Complaints had long been made that this
heavy impost was not paid by the majority of the common people,
and it was deemed better to devote the responsibility on the buyer,
unless the seller were what was called *neeman* trusted; i.e., one
who had solemnly bound himself to pay tithes. In connection with
this, *secondly*, the declaration ordered in [Deuteronomy 26:3-10](#) was
abrogated as no longer applicable. *Thirdly*, all work that caused
noise was forbidden during the days intermediate between the first
and the last great festive days of the Passover and of the Feast of
Tabernacles. *Fourthly*, the formula: Awake, why sleepest Thou,
O Lord ([Psalm 44:23](#)), with which, since the Syrian persecution,
the morning service in the Temple had commenced, was abolished.
Fifthly, the cruel custom of wounding the sacrificial animals on the
head was prohibited and rings fastened in the pavement to which the
animals were attached (Jer. Maas. Sh. v. 9; Jer. Sot. ix. 11; Tos.
Sot. 13; Sotah 48 *a*). The *four* ordinances of Hyrcanus which were
abolished referred to the introduction in official documents, after the
title of the High-Priest, of the expression El Elyon'—the Most High
God; to the attempt to declare the Syrian and Samaritan towns liable
to tithes (implying their virtual incorporation) while according to
an old principle, this obligation only applied when a place could
be reached from Judea without passing over heathen soil; to the
abrogation by Hyrcanus of a former enactment by Jose ben Joezer,
which discouraged emigration by declaring all heathen soil defiled,
and which rendered social intercourse with Gentiles impossible by
declaring vessels of glass capable of contracting Levitical defile-
ment (Jer. Shabb. 1. 4; Shabb. 14 *b*)—and which was re-enacted;
and, lastly, to the easy terms on which the King had admitted the
Idumaeans into the Jewish community. [35]

From all this it is not difficult to form an idea of the relations
between Hyrcanus and the Pharisees. If Hyrcanus had not otherwise
known of the growing aversion of the Pharisees, a Sadducean friend
and councillor kept him informed, and turned it to account for his
party. The story of the public breach between Hyrcanus and the
Pharisees is told by *Josephus* (Ant. xiii. 10. 5, 6), and in the Talmud

²⁶Comp. Sketches of Jewish Social Life in the Time of Christ pp. 233, 234.

(Kidd. 66 *a*), with only variations of names and details. Whether from a challenge thrown out to the Pharisees (according to the Talmud), or in answer to a somewhat strange request by Hyrcanus, to point out any part of his conduct which was not in accordance with the law (so *Josephus*), one of the extreme section of the Pharisees, ²⁷ at a feast given to the party, called upon Hyrcanus to be content with secular power, and to resign the Pontificate, on the ground that he was disqualified for it, because his mother had been a captive of war. Even the Talmud admits that this report was calumnious, [36] while it offered a gratuitous insult to the memory of a really noble heroic woman, all the more unwarrantable that the Pontificate had, by public decree, been made the case if the charge now brought had been other than a pretext to cover the hostility of the Chasidim. The rash avowal was avenged on the whole party. In the opinion of Hyrcanus they all proved themselves accomplices, when, on being questioned, they declared the offender only guilty of stripes and bonds. Hyrcanus now joined the Sadducees, and although the statement of the Talmud about the slaughter of the leading Pharisees is incorrect, there can be no doubt that they were removed from power and exposed to persecution. The Talmud adds this, which, although chronologically incorrect, is significant, Jochanan the High-Priest served in the Pontificate eighty years, and at the end of them he became a Sadducee. But this was only the beginning of troubles to the Pharisaic party, which revenged itself by most bitter hatred—the beginning, also of the decline of the Maccabbes.

Hyrcanus left five sons. To the oldest of them, Aristobulus (in Hebrew Jehudah), he bequeathed the Pontificate, but appointed his own widow to succeed him in the secular government. But Aristobulus cast his mother into prison, where she soon afterwards perished—as the story went, by hunger. The only one of his brothers whom he had left at large, and who, indeed, was his favourite, soon fell also a victim to his jealous suspicions. Happily his reign lasted only one year (105-104 b.c.). He is described as openly favouring the

²⁷*Josephus* calls him Eleazar, but the Talmud (Kidd. 66 *a*) Jehudah ben Gedidim, for which *Hamburger* would read *Nedidim*, the sect of the solitaries which he regards as another designation for the extreme Chasidim.

Appendix 4—An Abstract of Jewish History from the Reign of Alexander the
Great to the Ascension of Herod (See Book I, ch. 8.) xxxvii
Grecian party, although, on conquering Ituraea, a district east of Lake
of Galilee,²⁸ he obliged its inhabitants to submit to circumcision.

On the death of Aristobulus. I., his widow, Alexandra Salome, released his brothers from prison, and apparently married the eldest of them, Alexander Jannaeus (or in Hebrew Jonathan), who succeeded both to the Pontificate and the secular government. The three periods of his reign (104-78 b.c.) seem indicated in the varying inscriptions on his coins.²⁹

The first period, which lasted eight or ten years, was that in which Jannai was engaged in those wars of conquest, which added the cities on the maritime coast to his possessions.³⁰ During the time Salome seems to have managed internal affairs. As she was devoted to the Pharisaic party—indeed one of their leaders, Simeon ben Shetach, is said to have been her brother (Ber. 18 *a*)—this was the time of their ascendancy. Accordingly, the coins of that period bear the inscription, Jonathan the High-Priest and the *Chebher* of the Jews. But on his return to Jerusalem he found the arrogance of the Pharisaic party ill accordant with his own views and tastes. The king now joined the Sadducees, and Simeon ben Shetach had to seek safety in flight (Jer. Ber. vii. 2 p. 11 *b*). But others of his party met a worse fate. A terrible tragedy was enacted in the Temple itself. At the Feast of Tabernacles Jannai, officiating as High Priest, set the Pharisaic custom at open defiance by pouring the water out of the sacred vessel on the ground instead of upon the altar. Such a high-handed breach of what was regarded as most sacred, excited the feelings of the worshippers to the highest pitch of frenzy. They pelted him with the festive *Ethrogs* (citrons), which they carried in their hands, and loudly reproached him with his descent from a captive. The king called in his foreign mercenaries, and no fewer than 6,000 of the people fell under their swords. This was an injury

[37]

²⁸By a curious mistake, *Schürer* locates Ituraea north instead of east of the Lake of Galilee, and speaks of Jewish tradition as drawing such a dark picture of Aristobulus. Dr. S. must refer to *Josephus*, since Jewish tradition never named Aristobulus (Neuest. Zeitg. p. 118).

²⁹For the coins of that reign comp. *Madden*, u. s. pp. 83-93. I have however arranged them somewhat differently.

³⁰According, on the second series of coins, which date from his return to Jerusalem, and breach with the Pharisees, we have on the reverse the device of an anchor with two crossbars.

which could neither be forgiven nor atoned for by conquests. One insurrection followed after the other, and 5,000 of the people are said to have fallen in these contests. Weary of the strife, Jannai asked the Pharisaic party to name their conditions of peace, to which they caustically replied, Thy death (*Jos. Ant.* xiii. 13. 5). Indeed, such was the embitterment that they actually called in, and joined the Syrians against him. But the success of the foreigner produced a popular revulsion in his favour, of which Jannai profited to take terrible vengeance of his opponents. No fewer than 800 of them were nailed to the cross, their sufferings being intensified by seeing their wives and children butchered before their eyes, while the degenerate [38] Pontiff lay feasting with abandoned women. A general flight of the Pharisees ensued. This closes the second period of his reign, marked on the coin by the significant absence of the words *Chebher* of the Jews. the words being on one side in Hebrew, Jonathan the king and on the other in Greek, Alexander the King.

The third period is marked by coins which bear the inscription Jehonathan the High Priest and the Jews. It was a period of outward military success, and of reconciliation with the Pharisees, or at least of their recall—notable of Simeon ben Shetach, and then of his friends—probably at the instigation of the queen (*Ber.* 48 *a*; [Jeremiah 7:2](#)). Jannai died in his fiftieth year, after a reign of twenty-seven years, bequeathing the government to his wife Salome. On his deathbed he is said to have advised her to promote the Pharisees, or rather such of them as made not their religiousness a mere pretext intrigue: Be not afraid of the Pharisees, nor of those of Zimri, and seek the reward of Phinehas (*Sot.* 22 *b*). But of chief interest to us is, that this period of the recall of the Pharisees marks a great internal change, indicated even in the coins. For the first time we now meet the designation *Sanhedrin*. The *Chebher*, or eldership, had ceased as a ruling power, and become transformed into a *Sanhedrin*, or ecclesiastical authority although the latter endeavoured, with more or less success, to arrogate to itself civil jurisdiction, at least in ecclesiastical matters. ³¹

³¹Jewish tradition, of course, vindicates a much earlier origin for the Sanhedrin, and assumes its existence not only in the time of Moses, David, and Solomon, but even in that of Mordecai! (*Comp. Buxtorf, Lex. Chald. Talmud col. 1514.*)

—The nine years of Queen Alexandra's (in Hebrew Salome) reign were the Golden Age of the Pharisees, when heaven itself smiled on a land that was wholly subject to their religious sway. In the extravagant language of the Talmud (Tann. 23 a, second line from top): In the days of Simeon ben Shetach, the rains came down in the nights of fourth days, ³²

and on those of the Sabbaths, so that the grains of corn became like kidneys, those of barley the stones of olives, and lentils like gold dinars, and they preserved a specimen (*dogma*) of them for future generations to show them what disastrous result may follow upon sin. That period of miraculous blessing was compared to the equally miraculous dispensation of heaven during the time that the Temple of Herod was building, when rain only fell at night, while the morning wind and heat dried all, so that the builders could continue their work without delay. ³³ Queen Salome had appointed her eldest son, Hyrcanus II., a weak prince, to the Pontificate. But, as *Josephus* puts it ([Amos 13:16](#). 2), although Salome had the title, the Pharisees held the real rule of the country, and they administered it with the harshness, insolence, and recklessness of a fanatical religious party which suddenly obtains unlimited power. The lead was, of course, taken by Simeon ben Shetach, whom even the Talmud characterises as having

³²In quoting this passage, *Derenbourg* (u. s. p. 111) and *Schürer* leave out these words. [They are omitted in the corresponding account of this story in Vayy. R. 35, ed. *Warsh.* p. 54 a; in Siphre, ed. *Friedmann*, p. 80 a; also in Siphra, ed. *Weiss*, p. 110 d, where the whole connected is very much as in Vavy. R.] Yet the words are, in one sense, most significant, since these fertilising rains, descending on these two nights when it was specially forbidden to go out, since on them innumerable demons haunted on the air (Pes. 112 b, line 10 from the bottom), indicated an exceptional blessing. The reason why these two nights are singled out as dangerous is, that Chanina b. Dosa, of whom Rabbinic tradition has so many miracles to relate, conceded them to the hurtful sway of *Agrath bath Machlath* and her 18 myriads of Angels. See App. xiii. In view of this, M. *Derenbourg's* explanatory note would seem to require to be modified. But, in general, rain even on the night before the Sabbath was regarded as a curse (Vayy. R. 35), and it has been ingeniously suggested that the twy(ykr in the Midrash must be taken in the sense in which that word is explained in Taan. 6 a, viz. as the ordinary time of rain. Why the night before Wednesday and Friday night are represented as left in the power of hurtful demons might open an interesting field for speculation.)

³³This notice is followed by the somewhat blasphemous story of the achievements of *Choni (Onias) hammeagel*, to which reference will be made in the sequel.

[40] hot hands (Jer. Sanh. vi. 5, ³⁴ p. 23 *b*). First, all who were suspected of Sadducean leaning were removed by intrigue or violence from the Sanhedrin. Next, previous ordinances differing from Pharisaical views were abrogated, and others breathing their spirit substituted. So sweeping and thorough was the change wrought, that the Sadducees never recovered the blow, and whatever they might teach, yet those in office were obligated in all time coming to conform to Pharisaic practice (*Jos. Ant.* xviii. 1, 4; *Tos. Yoma* i. 8).

But the Pharisaic party were not content with dogmatical victories, even though they celebrated each of them by the insertion in the Calendar of a commemorative feast day. Partly, to discourage the Sadducees partly from the supposed necessities of the time, and to teach others (to make an example; *Siphre* on *Deut.*), they carried their principles even beyond their utmost inferences, and were guilty of such injustice and cruelty, that, according to tradition, Simeon even condemned his own innocent son to death, for the sake of logical consistency. ³⁵ On the other hand, the Pharisaic party knew how to flatter the queen, by introducing a series of ordinances which protected the rights of married women and rendered divorce more difficult. ³⁶ The only ordinance of Simeon ben Shetach, which deserves permanent record, is that which enjoined regular school attendance by all children, although it may have been primarily intended to place the education of the country in the hands of the Pharisees. The general discontent caused by the tyranny of the Pharisees must have rallied most of the higher classes to the party of the Sadducees. It led at last to remonstrance with the queen, and was probably the first occasion of that revolt of Aristobulus, the younger son of Salome, which darkened the last days of her reign.

Salome died (in the beginning of 69 b.c.) before the measures proposed against Aristobulus could be carried out. Although Hyrcanus II. now united the royal office with the Pontificate, his claims were disputed by his brother Aristobulus II., who conquered, and obliged his brother to abdicate in his favour his twofold dignity. To cement their reconciliation, Alexander the son of Aristobulus married Alexandra the daughter of Hyrcanus. They little thought how

³⁴*Chammumoth.*

³⁵Comp. also *Sanh.* 46 *a*.

³⁶Comp. *Derenbourg*, pp. 108, 109.

~~ill-fated that union would prove. For already another power was in-~~
triguing to interpose in Jewish affairs, with which it was henceforth
to be identified. Alexander Hannai had appointed one Antipas, or [41]
Antipater—of whose origin the most divergent accounts are given ³⁷
—to the governorship of Idumaea. He was succeeded by a son of the
same name. The dissension between the two Asmonaeans seemed
to offer the opportunity for realising his ambitious schemes. Of
course, he took the part of the weak Hyrcanus as against the warlike
Aristobulus, and persuaded the former that he was in danger of his
life. Ultimately he prevailed on him to fly to Aretas, King of Arabia,
who, in consideration of liberal promises, undertook to reinstate
Hyrcanus in the government. The Arab army proved successful, and
was joined by a large proportion of the troops of Aristobulus, who
was not shut up within the fortified Temple-buildings. To add to
the horrors of war, a long famine desolated the land. It was during
its prevalence that Onias, reputed for his omnipotence in prayer,
achieved what procured for him the designation *hammeaggel*'—the
circle drawer. ³⁸ When his prayer for rain remained unanswered, he
drew a circle around him, declaring his determination not to leave
it till the Almighty had granted rain, and that not in drops, nor yet
in desolating floods (which successively happened), but in copious,
refreshing showers. It could serve no good purpose to reproduce the
realistic manner in which this supposed power of the Rabbi with God
is described (Taan. 23 a). But it were difficult to say whether this
is more repugnant to feelings of reverence, or the reported reproof
of Simeon ben Shetach, who forbore to pronounce the ban upon
him because he was like a spoilt child who might ask anything of
his father, and would obtain it. But this supposed power ultimately
proved fatal to Onias during the siege of Jerusalem by Hyrcanus and
Aretas. ³⁹ Refusing to intercede either for one or the other of the
rival brothers, he was stoned to death (Ant. xiv. 2. 1).

³⁷ According to some (Ant. xiv. 1. 3), he was of noble Jewish, according to others, or heathen and slave descent. The truth lies probably between these extremes.

³⁸ It almost seems as if this repugnant story were a sort of Jewish Imitation of the circle which Popilius Laenas drew around Antiochus Epiphanes, bidding him decide, ere he left it, whether or not he would comply with the demand of the Romans.

³⁹ Both *Josephus* and the Talmud (Sotah 49 b) give an account, though in different version, of the manner in which the besieged sought a supply of sacrifices from the besiegers.

[42] But already another power had appeared on the scene. Pompey was on his victorious march through Asia when both parties appeal to him for help. Scaurus, whom Pompey detached to Syria, was, indeed, bought by Aristobulus, and Aretas was ordered to raise the siege of Jerusalem. But Pompey quickly discovered that Hyrcanus might, under the tutelage of the cunning Idumaeen, Antipater, prove an instrument more likely to serve his ulterior purposes than Aristobulus. Three deputations appeared before Pompey at Damascus—those of the two brothers, and one independent of both, which craved the abolition of the Asmonaeen rule and the restoration of the former mode of government, as we understand it, by the Chebher or Eldership under the presidency of the High-Priest. It need scarcely be said that such a demand would find no response. The consideration of the rival claims of the Asmonaeans Pompey postponed. The conduct of Aristobulus not only confirmed the unfavourable impression which the insolent bearing of his deputies had made on Pompey, but sealed his own fate and that of the Jewish people. Pompey laid siege to Jerusalem. The adherents of Hyrcanus surrendered the City, but those of Aristobulus retired into the Temple. At last the sacred precincts were taken by storm amidst fearful carnage. The priests, who were engaged in their sacred functions,⁴⁰ and who continued them during this terrible scene, were cut down at the altar. No fewer than 12,000 Jews are said to have perished.

With the taking of Jerusalem by Pompey (63 b.c.) the history of the Maccabees as a reigning family, and, indeed, that of the real independence of Palestine, came to an end. So truly did Jewish tradition realise this, that it has left us not a single notice either of this capture of Jerusalem or of all the subsequent sad events to the time of Herod. It is as if their silence meant that for them Judaea, in its then state, had no further history. Still, the Roman conquerer had as yet dealt gently with his prostrate victim. Pompey had, indeed, penetrated into the most Holy Place in contemptuous outrage of the most sacred feelings of Israel; but he left the treasure of the Temple untouched, and even made provision for the continuance of its services. Those who had caused the resistance of Jerusalem

[43]

⁴⁰According to *Josephus*, it was on the Day of Atonement; according to *Dio Cassius*, apparently on a Sabbath. Comp. the remarks of *Derenbourg* on these conflicting statements (u. s. p. 117, note).

Appendix 4—An Abstract of Jewish History from the Reign of Alexander the Great to the Ascension of Herod (See Book I. ch. 8.) xliii
~~were executed, and the country made tributary to Rome. But Ju-~~

daea not only became subject to the Roman Governor of Syria, its boundaries were also narrowed. All the Grecian cities had their independence restored; Samaria was freed from Jewish supremacy; and the districts comprised within the so-called Decapolis (or ten cities) again obtained self-government. It was a sadly curtailed land over which Hyrcanus II., as High-Priest, was left Governor, without being allowed to wear the diadem (Ant. xx. 10). Aristobulus II. had to adorn as captive the triumphal entry of the conquerer into Rome.

41

The civil rule of Hyrcanus as Ethnarch must from the first have been very limited. It was still more contracted when, during the Proconsulate of Gabinius (57-55 b.c.),⁴² Alexander, a son of Aristobulus, who had escaped from captivity, tried to possess himself of the government of Judaea (Ant. xiv. 5. 2-4). The office of Hyrcanus was now limited to the Temple, and the Jewish territory, divided into five districts, was apportioned among five principal cities, ruled by a council of local notables (*aristoi*). Thus, for a short time, monarchical gave place to aristocratic government in Palestine. The renewed attempts of Aristobulus or of his family to recover power only led to fresh troubles, which were sadly diversified by the rapacity and severity of the Romans. The Triumvir Crassus, who succeeded Gabinius (55-53 b.c.), plundered the Temple not only of its treasures but of its precious vessels. A new but not much happier era began with Julius Caesar. If Aristobulus and his son Alexander had not fallen victims to the party of Pompey, the prospects of Hyrcanus and Antipater might now have been very unpromising. But their death and that of Pompey (whom they had supported) changed the aspect of matters. Antipater not only espoused the cause of the victor of Pharsalus, but made himself eminently useful to Caesar. In reward, Hyrcanus was confirmed as Pontiff and Ethnarch of Judaea, while Antipater was made a Roman citizen and nominated *Epitrophos*, or (Roman) administrator of the country. Of course, the real power was in the hands of the Idumaeen, who continued to hold it, despite the

[44]

⁴¹The captives then brought to Rome and sold as slaves became the nucleus of the Jewish community in the imperial city.

⁴²Comp. the masterly survey of the state of matters in Syria and Judaea in *Marquardt*, *Handb. d. Rom. Alterth.*, vol. iv. pp. 247-260.

attempts of Antigonus, the only surviving son of Aristobulus. And from henceforth Caesar made it part of his policy to favour the Jews (comp. the decrees in their favour, Ant. xiv. 10).

Meantime Antipater had, in pursuance of his ambitious plans, appointed his son Phasael Governor of Jerusalem, and Herod Governor of Galilee. The latter, although only twenty-five years of age, soon displayed the vigour and sternness which characterised his after-career. He quelled what probably was a nationalist rising in Galilee, in the blood of Ezekias, its leader, and of his chief associates. This indeed secured him the favour of Sextus Caesar, the Governor of Syria, a relative of the great *Imperator*. But in Jerusalem, and among the extreme Pharisaic party, it excited the utmost indignation. They foresaw the advent of a foe most dangerous to their interests and liberty, and vainly sought to rid themselves of him. It was argued that the government of the country was in the hands of the High-Priest, and that Herod, as Governor of Galilee, appointed by a foreign administrator, had no right to pronounce capital punishment without a sentence of the Sanhedrin. Hyrcanus yielded to the clamour; but Herod appeared before the Sanhedrin, not as a criminal, but arrayed in purple, surrounded by a bodyguard, and supported by the express command of Sextus Caesar to acquit him. The story which is related, though in different version, and with different names, in the Talmud (Sanh. 19 *a*), and by *Josephus* (Ant. xiv. 9. 3-5), presents a vivid picture of what passed in the Sanhedrin. The appearance of Herod had so terrified that learned body that none ventured to speak, till their president, Shemajah (Sameas), by his bold speech, rallied their courage. Most truly did he foretell the fate which overtook them ten years later, when Herod ruled in the Holy City. But Hyrcanus adjourned the meeting of the Sanhedrin, and persuaded Herod to withdraw from Jerusalem. His was, however, only a temporary humiliation. Sextus Caesar named Herod Governor of Coele-Syria, and he soon appeared with an army before Jerusalem, to take vengeance on Hyrcanus and the Sanhedrin. The entreaties of his father and brother induced him, indeed, to desist for the time, but ten years later alike Hyrcanus and the members of the Sanhedrin fell victims to his revenge.

[45] Another turn of affairs seemed imminent when Caesar fell under the daggers of the conspirators (15 March, 44), and Cassius

Appendix 4—An Abstract of Jewish History from the Reign of Alexander the Great to the Ascension of Herod (See Book I. ch. 8.) xlv
occupied Syria. But Antipater and Herod proved as willing and able to serve him as formerly Caesar. Antipater, indeed, perished through a court—or perhaps a Nationalist plot, but his murderers soon experienced the same fate at the hands of those whom Herod had hired for the purpose. And still the star of Herod seemed in the ascendant. Not only did he repel attempted inroads by Antigonus, but when Antonius and Octavianus (in 42 b.c.) took the place of Brutus and Cassius, he succeeded once more in ingratiating himself with the former, on whom the government of Asia devolved. The accusations made by Jewish deputation had no influence on Antony. Indeed, he went beyond his predecessors in appointing Phasaël and Herod tetrarchs of Judaea. Thus the civil power was now nominally as well as really in their hands. But the restless Antigonus was determined not to forego his claim. When the power of Antony was fast waning, in consequence of his reckless indulgences, Antigonus seized the opportunity of the incursion of the Parthians into Asia Minor to attend the great object of his ambition. In Jerusalem the adherents of the two parties were engaged in daily conflicts, when a Parthian division appeared. By treachery Phasaël and Hyrcanus were lured into the Parthian camp, and finally handed over to Antigonus. Herod, warned in time, had escaped from Jerusalem with his family and armed adherents. Of his other opponents Antigonus made sure. To unfit Hyrcanus for the Pontificate his ears were cut off, while Phasaël destroyed himself in prison. Antigonus was now undisputed High-Priest and king. His brief reign of three years (40-37 b.c.) is marked by coins which bear in Hebrew the device: Matthatjah the High-Priest, and in Greek: King Antigonus.

The only hope of Herod lay in Roman help. He found Antony in Rome. What difficulties there were, were removed by gold, and when Octavian gave his consent, a decree of the Senate declared Antigonus the enemy of Rome, and at the same time appointed Herod King of Judaea (40 b.c.). Early in the year 39 b.c. Herod was in Palestine to conquer his new kingdom by help of the Romans. But their aid was at first tardy and reluctant, and it was 38, or more probably 37, before Herod could gain possession of Jerusalem itself. Before that he had wedded the beautiful and unhappy Mariamme, the daughter of Alexander and granddaughter of Hyrcanus, to whom he had been betrothed five years before. His conquered capital was

desolate indeed, and its people impoverished by exactions. But Herod had reached the goal of his ambition. All opposition was put down, all rivalry rendered impossible. Antigonus was beheaded, as Herod had wished; the feeble and aged Hyrcanus was permanently disqualified for the Pontificate; and any youthful descendants of the Maccabees left were absolutely in the conqueror's power. The long struggle for power had ended, and the Asmonaeon family was virtually destroyed. Their sway had lasted about 130 years.

Looking back on the rapid rise and decline of the Maccabees, on their speedy degeneration, on the deeds of cruelty with which their history soon became stained, on the selfishness and reckless ambition which characterised them, and especially on the profoundly anti-nationalist and anti-Pharisaic, we had almost said anti-Jewish, tendency which marked their sway, we can understand the bitter hatred with which Jewish tradition had followed their memory. The mention of them is of the scantiest. No universal acclamation glorifies even the deeds of Judas the Maccabee; no Talmudic tractate is devoted to that feast of the dedication which celebrated the purging of the Temple and the restoration of Jewish worship. In fact such was the feeling, that the priestly course of Joiarib—to which the Asmonaeans belonged—is said to have been on service when the first and the second Temple were destroyed, because guilt was to be punished on the guilty. More than that, R. Levi saith: *Yehoyaribh* ["Jehovah will contend"], the man [the name of the man or family]; *Meron* ["rebellion," evidently a play upon Modin, the birthplace of the Maccabees], the town; *Mesarbey* ["the rebels," evidently a play upon Makkabey]—(*masar beitha*) He hath given up the Temple to the enemies. Rabbi Berachjah saith: *Yah heribh* [Jehoiarib], God contended with His children, because they revolted and rebelled against Him (Jer. Taan. iv. 8, p. 68 *d*, line 35 from bottom).⁴³ Indeed, the opprobrious designation of rebellion, and *Sarbaney El*, rebels against God, became in course of time so identified with the Maccabees, that it was used when its meaning was no longer understood. Thus *Origen* (Euseb. Hist. [Ecclesiastes 6:25](#)) speaks of the (Apocryphal) books of the Maccabees as inscribed *Sarbeth Sarbane El* (=tbrs l) ynbrs), the disobedience, or rebellion (resistance) of

[47]

⁴³Comp. *Geiger*, Urschrift, p. 204; *Derenbourg*, p. 119, note.

Appendix 4—An Abstract of Jewish History from the Reign of Alexander the Great to the Ascension of Herod (See Book I. ch. 8.) xlvii
~~the disobedient, or rebels, against God.~~⁴⁴ So thoroughly had these terms become identified in popular *parlance*, that even the tyranny and cruelty of a Herod could not procure a milder judgment on the sway of the Asmonaeans.

⁴⁴Comp. *Geiger*, u. s. p. 205, Note, *Hamburger*, u. s. p. 367. Various strange and most unsatisfactory explanations have been proposed of these mysterious words, which yet, on consideration, seem so easy of understanding. Comp. the curious explanations of *Grimm*, *Ewald*, and others, in *Grimm's Exeget. hand. zu d. Apokryphen*, 3te Lief. p. xvii. *Derenbourg* (*Hist. de la Palest.* pp. 450-452) regards *sarbhd* as a corruption for *safarbhd*, and would render the whole by Book of the family of the Chief (r) of the people of God.'

Appendix 5—Rabbinic Theology and Literature (Book I. ch. 8.)

1. *The Traditional Law*.—The brief account given in vol. i. p. 100, of the character and authority claimed for the traditional law may here be supplemented by a chronological arrangement of the Halakhoth in the order of their supposed introduction or promulgation.

In the *first* class, or Halakhoth of Moses from Sinai tradition enumerates *fifty-five*,¹ which may be thus designated: *religio-agrarian*, four;² *ritual*, including questions about clean and unclean twenty-three;³ concerning *women* and intercourse between the sexes, three;⁴ concerning *formalities* to be observed in the copying, fastening, &c., of the Law and the phylacteries, eighteen;⁵ *exegetical*, four;⁶ *purely superstitious*, one;⁷ *not otherwise included*, two.⁸ *Eighteen*

¹The numbers given by *Maimonides*, in his Preface to the Mishnah, and their arrangement, are somewhat different, but I prefer the more critical (sometimes even hypercritical) enumeration of *Herzfeld*. They are also enumerated in *Peiser's* Nachlath Shimoni, Part I. pp. 47-49 *b*.

²Peah ii. 6; Yad. iv. 3; Tos. Peah iii. 2; Orlah iii. 9.

³Erub. 4 *a*; Nidd. 72 *b*; Ab. d. R. N. 19, 25; Tos. Chall. 1:6; Shabb 70 *a*; Bekh. 16 *a*; Naz. 28 *b*; Chull. 27 *a*, 28 *a*; 42 *a*, 43 *a*; Moed Q 3 *b*. Of these, the most interesting to the Christian reader are about the 11 ingredients of the sacred incensed (Ker. 6 *b*); about the 26 kinds of work prohibited on the Sabbath (Shabb. 70 *a*); that the father, but not the mother, might dedicate a child under age to the Nazirate (Naz. 28 *b*); the 7 rules as to slaughtering animals; to cut the neck; to cut through the trachea, and, in the case of four-footed animals, also through the gullet; not to pause while slaughtering; to use a knife perfectly free of all notches, and quite sharp; not to strike with the knife; not to cut too near the head; and not to stick, the knife into the throat; certain determinations about the Feast of Tabernacles, such as about the pouring out of the water, &c.

⁴Ab. Z. 36 *b*; Niddah 45 *a*, 72 *b*.

⁵Jer. Meg. i. 9; Shabb. 28 *b*; Men. 32 *a*; 35 *a*.

⁶Ned. 37 *b*. These four Halakhoth are: as to the authoritative pronunciation of certain words in the Bible; as to the *Itur Sopherim*, or syntactic and stylistic emendation in the following five passages: [Genesis 18:5, 24:55](#); [Numbers 31:2](#); [Psalm 68:22](#) (A.V. 21); [36:7](#) (A.V. 6); about the *Qeri velo Kethibh*, words *read* but *not written* in the text; and the *Kethibh velo Qeri*, words *written* but *not read* in the text.

ordinances are ascribed to Joshua, of which only one is ritual, the other seventeen being agrarian and police regulations.⁹ The other traditions can only be briefly noted. Boaz, or else the tribunal of Samuel fixed, that [Deuteronomy 23:3](#) did not apply to alliances with Ammonite and Moabite *women*. Two ordinances are ascribed to David, two to Solomon, one to Jehoshaphat, and one to Jehoida. The period of Isaiah and of Hezekiah is described as of immense Rabbinic activity. To the prophets at Jerusalem three ritual ordinances are ascribed. Daniel is represented as having prohibited the bread, wine and oil of the heathen ([Daniel 1:5](#)). Two ritual determinations are ascribed to the prophets of the Exile.

After the return from Babylon traditionalism rapidly expanded, and its peculiar character more and more clearly developed. No fewer than twelve traditions are traced back to the three prophets who flourished at that period, while four other important legal determinations are attributed to the prophet Haggai individually. It will readily be understood that Ezra occupied a high place in tradition. Fifteen ordinances are ascribed to him, of which some are ritual. Three of his supposed ordinances have a general interest. They enjoin the general education of children, and the exclusion of Samaritans from admission into the Synagogue and from social intercourse. If only one legal determination is assigned to Nehemiah, the men of the great Synagogue are credited with fifteen, of which six bear on important critical and exegetical points connected with the text of the Scriptures, the others chiefly on questions connected with ritual and worship. Among the pairs (*Zugoth*) which succeeded the Great Synagogue three alleviating ordinances (of a very punctilious character) are ascribed to Jose, the son of Joezer,¹⁰ and two,

[50]

⁷Pes. 110 *b*. Not to eat two (even numbers) of an egg, a nut, or cucumber, &c.

⁸Eduy. viii. 7; Tanch. 60 *a*. The first of these *Halakhoth* speaks of the activity of Elijah in preparation for the coming of the Messiah ([Malachi 3:23, 24](#), A.V 4:5, 6), as directed to restore those of pure Israelitish descent who had been improperly extruded, and to extrude those who had been improperly admitted.

⁹Baba K. 81 *a*; Tos. Baba M. 11; Jer. Baba K. iii. 2. Among the police regulations is this curious one, that all were allowed to fish in the Lake of Galilee, but not to lay down nets, so as not to impede the navigation.

¹⁰According to tradition (Sot. 47 *a* and *b*) the *Eshkoloth*, or bunches of grapes ceased with José. The expression refers to the Rabbis, and *Herzfeld* ingeniously suggests this explanation of the designation, that after José they were no longer undivided like bunches

intended render all contact with heathens impossible, to him and his colleague. Under the Maccabees the feast of the dedication of the Temple was introduced. To Joshua the son of Perachya, one punctilious legal determination is ascribed. Of the decrees of the Maccabean High-Priest Jochanan we have already spoken in another place; similarly, of those of Simon the son of Shetach and of his learned colleague. Four legal determinations of their successors Shemayah and Abhtalion are mentioned. Next in order comes the prohibition of Greek during the war between the Maccabean brothers Hyrcanus and Aristobulus. This brings us to the time of Hillel and Shammai, that is, to the period of Jesus, to which further reference will have to be made in another place.

2. *The Canon of Scripture.*—Reference has been made in the text (vol. i. p. 107) to the position taken by Traditionalism in reference to the written as compared with what was regarded as the oral Revelation. Still, nominally, the Scriptures were appealed to by the Palestinians as of supreme authority. The views which *Josephus* expresses in this respect, although in a popular and Grecianised form, were substantially those entertained by the Rabbis and by his countrymen generally (comp. Ag. Apion, i. 7, 8).¹¹ A sharp distinction was made between canonical and non-canonical books. The test of the former was inspiration, which had ceased in the time of Artaxerxes, that is, with the prophet Malachi. Accordingly, the work of the elder Jesus the son of Sirach (Jeshua ben Sira, ben Eliezer) was excluded from the Canon, although it is not unfrequently referred to by Rabbinic authorities in terms with which ordinarily only Biblical quotations are introduced.¹² According to the view propounded by *Josephus*, not only were the very words inspired in which a prediction was uttered, but the prophets were unconscious and passive vehicles of the Divine message (Ant. iv. 6.

[51]

of grapes, but divided in their opinions. For other explanations comp. *Derenbourg*, u. s. pp. 88, 456-458.

¹¹For a detailed account of the views of *Josephus* on the *Canon* and on *Inspiration*, I take leave to refer to my article in *Smith's Dictionary of Christian Biography* vol. iii. pp. 453, 454.

¹²Comp. *Zunz*, Gottesd Vortr. pp. 101, 102, and *C. Seligmann*, d Buch d Weish d. Jesus Sirach. The Talmudic quotations from the work of the elder Jesus have been repeatedly collated I may here take leave to refer to my collection translation of them in *Append. II. to the History of the Jewish Nation.*

5, comp generally, Ant ii. 8. 1; 6:8, 2; 8:13, 3; 9:3, 2, 8, 6; 10:2, 2; 4, 3). Although pre-eminence in this respect was assigned to Moses (Ant. iv. 8, 49), yet Divine authority equally attached to the sayings of the prophets, and even, though perhaps in a still inferior degree, to the Hymns as the Hagiographa generally were called from the circumstance that the Psalter stood at the head of them (comp. *Philo*, De Vita contempl., ed. *Mangey*, voi. ii. p. 475; St. [Luke 24:44](#)). Thus the division of the Bible into three sections—the Law, the Prophets, and the other Writings⁷—which already occurs in the prologue to the work of Jesus the son of Sirach,¹³ seems to have been current at the time. And here it is of great interest, in connection with modern controversies, that Josephus seems to attach special importance to the prophecies of Daniel as still awaiting fulfilment (Ant. x. 10. 4; 11. 7).

That the Rabbis entertained the same views of inspiration, appears not only from the distinctive name of Holy Writings given to the Scriptures, but also from the directions that their touch defiled the hands,¹⁴

and that it was duty on the Sabbath to save them from conflagration, and to gather them up if accidentally scattered, and that it was not lawful for heirs to make division of a sacred roll (Comp. Shabb. xvi. 1; Erub. x. 3; Kel. xv. 6; Yad. iii. 2-5; 4:5 [where special reference is made to [Daniel 6](#)]). From what we know of the state of feeling, we might have inferred, even if direct evidence had not existed that a distinctive and superior place would be ascribed to

[52]

¹³Comp. also 2 Macc. ii. 13, 14.

¹⁴The general statement that this decree was intended to prevent a common or profane use of the Scripture does not explain its origin. The latter seems to have been as follows: At first the priests in the Temple were wont to deposit the *Terumah* near the copy of the Law there kept (Shabb 14 a). But as mice were thereby attracted, and damage to the Sacred roll was apprehended, it was enacted that the Sacred Roll in the Temple rendered all meat that touched it unclean. This decree gave rise to another, by way of further precaution, that even the hands which touched the Sacred Roll, or any other part of the Bible became unclean (so that, having touched the latter, they could not touch the *Terumah*). Then followed (in the course of development) a third decree, that such touch defiled also outside the Temple. Finally, the first decree was modified to the effect that the Sacred Roll in the Temple did *not* defile the hands, while all other Scriptures (anywhere else) defiled them (Chel 15:6) The explanation offered to the Sadducees by R. Jochanan b. Zakkai is evidently intended to mislead (Yad iv. 6), Comp. *Levy*, Neuhebr Wörterb. vol. ii. pp. 163, 164.

the Books of Moses. In point of fact, the other books of Scripture, alike the Prophets and the Hagiographa,¹⁵ are only designated as *Qabbalah* (received handed down, tradition), which is also the name given to oral tradition.¹⁶ It was said that the *Torah* was given to Moses (Jer. Sheq. vi. 1) in (letters of) white fire graven upon black fire although it was matter of dispute whether he received it volume by volume or complete as a whole (Gitt. 60 *a*). But on the question of its inspiration not the smallest doubt could be tolerated. Thus, to admit generally, that the *Torah* as a whole was from heaven, except this (one) verse, which the Holy One, blessed be He, did not speak, but Moses of himself was to become an infidel and a blasphemer [53] (Sanh. 99 *a*).¹⁷ Even the concluding verses in Deuteronomy had been dictated by God to Moses, and he wrote them down—not repeating them, however, as before, but weeping as he wrote. It will readily be understood in what extravagant terms Moses himself was spoken of. It is not only that the expression man of God was supposed to imply, that while as regarded the lower part of his nature Moses was man, as regarded the higher he was Divine, but that his glorification and exaltation amount to blasphemy.¹⁸ So far as inspiration or revelation is concerned, it was said that Moses saw in a clear glass, the prophets in a dark one’—or, to put it otherwise: he saw through one glass, they through seven. Indeed, although the opening words of [Psalm 75](#). showed, that the Psalms were as much revelation as the Law, yet, if Israel had not sinned, they would have only received the Pentateuch, and the Book of Joshua and, in the time to come, of all Scripture the Pentateuch alone would retain its place. It was somewhat contemptuously remarked, that the Prophets

¹⁵The difference in the degree of inspiration between the Prophetic and the Hagiographic books is not accurately defined. Later Jewish theologians rather evade it by describing the former as given by the spirit of prophecy the latter by the Holy Spirit. It must, however, be admitted that in Jewish writings the Holy Spirit is not only *not* a Personality, but an influence very inferior to what we associate with the designation.

¹⁶The proof-passages are quoted in *Zunz*, u. s. p. 44 note, also in *J. Delitzsch*, *De Inspir. Script.* S. pp. 7, 8.

¹⁷At the same time, in Meg. 31 *b* the formulation of the curses by Moses in [Leviticus 26](#). is said to have been hrwbgh ypm (from God directly), while that in [Deuteronomy 28](#). was ymc(ypm (from Moses himself).

¹⁸A more terribly repulsive instance of this can scarcely be conceived than in Debar R. 11, of which the worst parts are reproduced in *Yalkut* 304 *a, b, c*.

uttered nothing as regarded practice that had not already been told in the Pentateuch (Taan. 9 *a*). It was but natural for Rabbinism to declare that the Law alone fully explained its meaning (at least according to their interpretation of it), while the Prophets left much in obscurity. ¹⁹ To mark the distinction, it was forbidden to put the Law in the same wrapper with the Prophets, so as not to place perhaps the latter on the top of the former (Tos. Meg. iv. 20). Among the Prophets themselves there was a considerable difference, not only in style and training but even in substance (Sanh. 89 *a*), although all of them had certain common qualifications (comp. Ab. de R. Nathan, 37). Of all the prophets Isaiah was greatest, and stood next to Moses. Ezekiel saw all that Isaiah saw—but the former was like a villager, the latter like a townsman who saw the king (Chag. 13 *b*). Jeremiah and Amos were, so to speak, scolding, owing to the violence of their temperament, while Isaiah's was the book of consolation, especially in response to Jeremiah. [54]

The Hagiographa or Kethubhim also bear in the Talmud the general designation of Chokmah wisdom. It has been asserted that, as the Prophetic Books, so the Hagiographa, were distinguished into anterior (Psalms, Proverbs, Job) and posterior or else into great and small. But the statement rests on quite insufficient evidence. ²⁰ Certain, however, it is, that the Hagiographa, as we possess them, formed part of the Canon in the time of Jesus the son of Sirach—that is, even of the *latest* computation of his authorship, ²¹ about the year 130 b.c. ²² Even so, it would not be easy to vindicate, on historical grounds, the so-called Maccabean authorship of the Book of Daniel, which would fix its date about 105 b.c. For, if other considerations did not interfere, few students of Jewish history would be disposed

¹⁹Comp. generally *Hamburger's Real. Encycl.* vols. i. and ii. See also *Delitzsch's* work already quoted, and *Fürst*, *Kanon d. Alten Test. nach Talmud u. Midrasch.*

²⁰*Fürst*, u. s. pp. 57-59, quotes Ber. 57 *b* and Sot. 7 *b*, Ab. de R. Nathan 40. But no one who reads either Ber. 57 *b*, or Ab. de R. Nathan 40, would feel inclined to draw from passages so strange and repulsive any serious inference, while Sot. 7 *b* is far too vague to serve as a basis. In general, this is one of the many instances in which *Fürst*, as, indeed, many modern Jewish writers, propounds as matters of undoubted fact, what, on critical examination, is seen to rest on no certain historical basis—sometimes on no basis at all.

²¹Which in another place we have shown to be erroneous.

²²*Fürst*, p. 56. See also *Reuss*, *Gesch. d. Heil. Schr. A. T.* (p. 550), who gives its date as 132.

to assert that a book, which dated from 104 b.c., could have found a place in the Jewish Canon. ²³

[55] But, as explained in vol. i. p. 26, we would assign a much earlier date to the Book of Sirach. The whole question in its bearing on the New Testament is so important, that one or two further remarks may be allowed. Leaving aside most serious critical objections, and the unquestionable fact, that no amount of ingenuity can conciliate the Maccabean application of [Daniel 9:24-27](#) with the chronology of that period, ²⁴ while the Messianic interpretation fits in with it, ²⁵ other, and seemingly insuperable difficulties are in the way of the theory impugned. It implies, that the Book of Daniel was not an Apocryphal, but a Pseudepigraphic work; that of all such works it alone has come down to us in its Hebrew or Chaldee original; that a Pseudepigraphic work, nearly contemporary with the oldest portion of the Book of Enoch, should not only be so different from it, but that it should find admission into the Canon, while Enoch was excluded; that a Pseudepigraphon younger than Jesus the Son of Sirach should have been on the Khethubhim; and, finally, that it should have passed the repeated revision of different Rabbinic Colleges'—and that at times of considerable theological activity—without the suspicion being even raised that its authorship dated from so late a period as a century and a half before Christ. And we have evidence that since the Babylonish exile, at least *four* revisions of the Canon took place within periods sufficiently distant from each other.

The question hitherto treated has been exclusively of the *date* of the composition of the Book of Daniel, without reference to who may have been its author, whether its present is exactly the same as its original form, and finally, whether it ever belonged to those

²³ *Fürst*, who holds the Maccabean origin of the Book of Daniel, is so frequently inconsistent with himself in the course of his remarks on the subject, that it is sometimes difficult to understand him. Occasionally, when argument is wanting, he asserts that a thing is self-evident (es versteht sich von selbst). Such a self-evident assertion, for which, however, no historical evidence is offered—which, indeed, runs in the opposite direction—is summarized on page 100. But the word self-evident has no place in historical discussions, where only that is evident which rests on *historical* grounds.

²⁴ This is admitted even by Mr. *Drummond* (*Jewish Messiah* pp. 246, 245-257, 260). Mr. *Drummond's* book is quoted as representing the advocacy by a distinguished English scholar of the Maccabean theory of the authorship of Daniel.

²⁵ *Drummond*, u. s. p. 261.

books whose right to canonicity, though nor their age, was in controversy, that is, whether it belonged, so to speak, to the Old Testament antilegomena. As this is not the place for a detailed discussion of the canonicity of the Book of Daniel—or, indeed, of any other in the Old Testament canon—we shall only add, to prevent misunderstanding, that no opinion is here expressed as to possible, greater or less, interpolations on the Book of Daniel, or in any other part of the Old Testament. We must here bear in mind that the moral view taken of such interpolations, as we would call them, was entirely different in those times from ours; and it may perhaps be an historically and critically no unwarranted proposition, that such interpolations were, to speak moderately, not all unusual in ancient documents. In each case the question must be separately critically examined in the light of internal and (if possible) external evidence. But it would be a very different thing to suggest that there may be an interpolation, or, it may be, a re-arrangement in a document (although at present we make no assertions on the subject, one way or the other), and to pronounce a whole document a fabrication dating from a much later period. The one would, at any rate, be quite in the spirit of those times; the other implies, beside insuperable critical difficulties, a deliberate religious fraud, to which no unprejudiced student could seriously regard the so-called Pseudepigrapha as forming any real *analogon*. [56]

But as regards the Book of Daniel, it is an important fact that the right of the Book of Daniel to canonicity was never called in question in the ancient Synagogue. The fact that it was distinguished as visions (*Chezyonoth*) from the other prophecies has, of course, no bearing on the question, any more than the circumstance that later Rabbinism, which, naturally enough, could not find its way through the Messianic prophecies of the book, declare that even Daniel was mistaken in, and could not make anything of the predictions concerning the latter days (Ber. R. 98).²⁶ On the other hand,

²⁶And yet there are frequent indications that Rabbinism sought guidance on these very subjects in the prophecies of Daniel. Thus, in the *Pirqé de R. Eliezer* there are repeated references to the four monarchies—the Persian, Median, Macedonian, and Roman—when, in the time of the fifth monarchy, that of the children of Ishmael—after a terrible war against Rome, the Messiah would come (comp. *Pirqé de R. El.* 19, and especially 28, 30, and 48).

Daniel was elevated to almost the same pinnacle as Moses, while it was said that, as compared with heathen sages, if they were all placed in one scale, and Daniel in the other, he would outweigh them all. We can readily understand that, in times of national sorrow or excitement, these prophecies would be eagerly resorted to, as pointing to a glorious future.

[57] But although the Book of Daniel was not among the *Antilegomena*, doubts were raised, not indeed about the age, but about the right to canonicity of certain other portions of the Bible. Thus, certain expressions in the prophecies of Ezekiel were questioned as apparently incompatible with statements in the Pentateuch²⁷ (Men. 45 *a*), and although a celebrated Rabbi, Chananyah, the son of Chizkuyah, the son of Garon (about the time of Christ), with immense labour, sought to conciliate them, and thus preserved the Book of Ezekiel (or, at least, part of it) from being relegated among the Apocrypha, it was deemed safest to leave the final exposition of the meaning of Ezekiel, till Elijah come as the restorer of all things.

The other objections to canonicity apply exclusively to the third division of the Old Testament, the *Kethubhim* or Hagiographa. Here even the Book of Proverbs seems at one time to have been called in question (Ab. R. Nathan 1), partly on the ground of its secular contents, and partly as containing supposed contradictory statements²⁸ (Shabb. 30 *b*). Very strong doubts were raised on the Book of Ecclesiastes (Yad. iii. 5; Eduy. v. 3), first, on that ground of its contradiction to some of the Psalms²⁹ (Shabb. 30 *a*); secondly, on that of its inconsistencies³⁰ (Shabb. 30 *b*); and thirdly, because it seemed to countenance the denial of another life, and, as in [Ecclesiastes 11:1, 3, 9](#), other heretical views (Vayyikra R. 28, at the

²⁷ Among them the following may be mentioned (Chull. 37 *b*): [Ezekiel 4:14](#) &c., and (Mop 45 *a*), [Ezekiel 14:31](#) were regarded as suggesting that these prohibitions applied only to *priests*; (Moed. K. 5 *a*) [Ezekiel 44:19](#), seemed to imply that an ordinary Israelite might perform sacrificial service, while [Ezekiel 14:18](#) appeared to enjoin a sacrifice nowhere mentioned in the Pentateuch.

²⁸ For ex. [Proverbs 26:4, 5](#).

²⁹ As for ex. [Psalm 115:17](#) compared with [Ecclesiastes 4:2](#) and [9:4](#).

³⁰ For ex. [Ecclesiastes 2:2](#) comp. with vii. 3; and again, vii. 15, or iv. 2 comp. with ix.

beginning).³¹ But these objections were finally answered by great ingenuity, while an appeal to [Ecclesiastes 12:12, 13](#), was regarded as removing the difficulty about another life and future rewards and punishments. And as the contradictions in Ecclesiastes had been conciliated, it hopefully argued deeper study would equally remove those in the Book of Proverbs (Shabb. 30 *b*).³² Still, the controversy about the canonicity of Ecclesiastes continue so late as the second century of our era (comp. Yad. iii. 5). That grave doubts also existed about the Song of Solomon, appears even from the terms in which its canonicity is insisted upon (Yad. u. s.), not to speak of express statements in opposition to it (Ab. de. R. Nathan 1). Even when by an allegorical interpretation it was shown to be the wisdom of all wisdom the most precious gem, the holy of holies, tradition still ascribed its composition to the *early* years of Solomon (Shir haSh. R. 1). It had been his first work, and was followed by Proverbs, and finally by Ecclesiastes.³³ But perhaps the greatest objections were those taken to the Book of Esther (Meg. 7 *a*). It excited the enmity of other nations against Israel, and it was outside the canon. Grave doubts prevailed whether it was canonical or inspired by the Holy Spirit (Meg. u. s.; Yoma 29 *a*). The books of Ezra and Nehemiah were anciently regarded as one—the name of the latter author being kept back on account of his tendency to self-exaltation (Sanh. 93 *b*). Lastly, the genealogical parts of the Book of Chronicles were made the subject of very elaborate secret commentation (Pes. 62 *b*).

[58]

Two points still require brief mention. Even from a comparison of the LXX. Version with our Hebrew text, it is evident that there were not only many variations, but that spurious additions (as Daniel) were eliminated. This critical activity, which commenced with Ezra, whose copy of the Pentateuch was, according to tradition, placed

³¹The school of Shammai was *against*, that of Hillel in *favour* of the Canonicity of Ecclesiastes (Eduy. v. 3). In Tos. Yad. ii. Ecclesiastes is said to be uninspired, and to contain only the wisdom of Solomon.

³²But it must be admitted that some of these conciliations are sufficiently curious.

³³But on this subject opinion differ very widely (see Shir haSh. R. 1, ed. Warshan, pp. 3 *b* and 4 *a*) the only point on which all are agreed being that he wrote Ecclesiastes last—Rabbi Jonathan irreverently remarking that when a man is old he utters *dibhré hadhalim*—vain words!

in the Temple, that the people might correct their copies by it, must have continued for many centuries. ³⁴

- [59] There is abundant evidence of frequent divergences—though perhaps minute—and although later Rabbinism laid down the most painfully minute directions about the mode of writing and copying the rolls of the Law, there is such discrepancy, even where least it might be expected, ³⁵ as to show that the purification of the text was by no means settled. Considering the want of exegetical knowledge and historical conscientiousness, and keeping in view how often the Rabbis, for Haggadic purposes, alter letters, and thus change the meaning of words, we may well doubt the satisfactory character of their critical labours. Lastly, as certain omissions were made, and as the Canon underwent (as will be shown) repeated revision, it *may* have been certain portions were added as well as left out, and words changed as well as restored.

For, ancient tradition ascribes a peculiar activity to certain Colleges'—as they are termed—in regard to the Canon. In general, the well-known *Baraita* (Baba B. 14 *b*, 15 *a*) bears, that Moses wrote the Pentateuch, the book (Prophecies?) of Balaam, and Job; Joshua the work that bears his name, and the last eight verses of Deuteronomy; ³⁶ Samuel the corresponding books, Judges and Ruth; David with the ten Elders Adam, Melchisedek, Abraham, Moses, Heman, Jeduthun, Asaph, and the three sons of Korah, the Psalter; Jeremiah wrote his prophecies, Lamentations, and Kings; King Hezekiah and his Sanhedrin compiled, or edited, the Prophecies of Isaiah, Proverbs, the Song, and Ecclesiastes; and the men of the Great Synagogue the Prophecies of Ezekiel, of the twelve Minor Prophets, and the books

[60]

³⁴In Jer. Tann. 68 *a* we read three codices of the Pentateuch, respectively named after one word in each codex, the reading of which was either rejected or adopted on comparison with the others.

³⁵Thus, we have different notices about the number of verses in the Bible, the arrangement of the psalter, the medial letter and medial word in the Pentateuch, and the number of its sections and chapters (Kidd. 30 *a*; Yalkut i. § 855). But the sum total of verses in the Bible (23,199) differs by 99 from that in our present text. Similarly, one of the most learned Rabbinic critics of the third century declares himself at a loss about the exact medial letter, word, and verse of the Pentateuch, while in Palestine that Pentateuch seems to have been arranged into 1,085, in Babylonia into 378 chapters (comp. *Fürst*, Kultur-u. Liter. Gesch. p. 62).

³⁶But comp. and opinion, previously quoted, about the last verses in Deut.

of Daniel and Esther; Ezra wrote his own book and Chronicles, the work being completed by Nehemiah, the son of Chakaliah. The last verse of Joshua were written by Eleazar and Phinehas; the last chapters of Samuel by Gad and Nathan.³⁷

Loose and uncritical as these statements may appear, they so far help our investigations as to show that, according to tradition, certain portions of Scripture were compiled or edited by one or another Rabbinic College and that there were several Colleges which successively busied themselves with the codification and revision of the Canon. By these Colleges we are not to understand gatherings of certain members, who discussed and decided a question at one or more of their meetings. They rather indicate the learned activity of the authorities during a certain *period*, which are respectively designed by the generic names of the Sanhedrin of Hezekiah The men of the Synagogue the Legal Court of the Maccabees and finally, Chananayah and his College We have thus somewhat firmer historical ground. If in [Proverbs 25:1](#), we read of the activity about the Canon of the Men of Hezekiah and bear in mind the Scriptural account of the religious revival of that reign (for ex. [2 Chronicles 29:25-30](#); [2 Chronicles 30:1](#)), we scarcely required the frequent and elaborate glorification of tradition to lead us to infer that, if the collection of the Book of Proverbs was due to their activity, they must have equally collated the other portions of Scripture then existing, and fixed the Canon as their time. Again, if we are to credit the statement that they equally collected and edited the Prophecies of Isaiah, we are obliged to infer that the continuance of that College was not limited to the life of Hezekiah, since the latter died before Isaiah (Tos. Baba Bathra; Yeb. 49 *b*).

What has just been indicated is fully confirmed by what we know of the activity of Ezra ([Ezra 7:6, 10](#)), and of his successors in the great Synagogue. If we are to attach credit to the notice in 2 Macc. ii. 13,³⁸ it points to such literary activity as tradition indicates. That the revision and determination of the Canon must have been among the main occupations of Ezra and his successors of the Great

[61]

³⁷History of the Jewish Nation p. 418.

³⁸The expression the epistles of the kings concerning the holy gifts must refer to the official Persian documents concerning gifts to the Temple, &c.

institution—seems scarcely to require proof. The same remark applies to another period of religious reformation, that of the so-called Asmonaean College. Even if we had not the evidence of their exclusion of such works as those of Ben Sirach and others, there could be no rational doubt that in their time the Canon, as presently existing, was firmly fixed, and that no work of comparatively late date could have found admission into it. The period of their activity is sufficiently known, and too near what may be called the historical times of Rabbinism, for any attempt in that direction, without leaving traces of it. Lastly, we come to the indications of a critical revision of the text by Chananyah and his College³⁹ shortly before the time of our Lord. Thus we have, in all, a record of *four* critical revisions of the Canon up to time of Christ.

3. Any attempt to set forth in this place a detailed exposition of the *Exegetical Canon of the Rabbis*, or of their application, would manifestly be impossible. It would require almost a treatise of its own; and a cursory survey would neither be satisfactory to the writer nor instructive to the general reader. Besides, on all subjects connected with Rabbinic exegesis, a sufficient number of learned treatises exists, which are easily accessible to students, while the general reader can only be interested in such general results as have been frequently indicated throughout these volumes. Lastly, the treatment of certain branches of the subject, such as a criticism of the *Targumim*, really belongs to what is known as the science of Introduction either to the Old Testament, in manuals of which, as well as in special treatises, all such subjects are fully discussed. Besides these the student may be referred, for a general summary, to the labours of Dr. *Hamburger* (Real-Encycl.). Special works on various branches of the subject cannot here be named, since this would involve an analysis and critical disquisition. But for a knowledge of the Rabbinic statements in regard to the *Codices* and the text of the Old Testament, reference may here be made to the short but masterly analysis of Professor *Strack* (*Prolegomena Critica*), in which, first, the various codices of the Old Testament, and then the text as existing in Talmudical times, are discussed, and the literature of the subject fully and critically given. The various

[62]

³⁹Shabb. 13 *b*; Chag. 13 *a*; Men. 45 *a*.

passage are also mentioned in which the Biblical quotations in the Mishnah and Gemara differ from our present text.⁴⁰ Most of them are, however, of no exegetical importance. On the exegesis of the Rabbis generally, I would take leave to refer to sketch of it given in the History of the Jewish Nation ch 11., and especially in App. V., on Rabbinical Exegesis where all its canons are enumerated. Some brief notices connected with Rabbinic Commentaries quoted in this work will be found at the beginning of vol. i.

4. Somewhat similar observations must be made in regard to the mystical Theology of the Synagogue, or the so-called Kabbalah. Its commencement must certainly be traced to, and before, the times described in these volumes. For a discussion of its origin and doctrines I must once more take leave to refer to the account given in the History of the Jewish Nation (pp. 435, &c.). The whole modern literature of the subject, besides much illustrative matter, is given in the Italian text annexed to *David Castelli's* edition of *Sabbatai Donnolo's* Hebrew Commentary on the Book *Yetsirah*, or the Book of Creation. For, the Kabbalah busies itself with these two subjects: the History of the Creation (*Yetsirah*, perhaps rather formation than Creation), and the *Merkabah* or the Divine apparition as described by Ezekiel. Both refer to the great question, underlying all theosophic speculation: that of God's connection with His creature. They treat of the mystery of Nature and of Providence, with especial bearing on Revelation; and the question, how the Infinite God can have any connection or intercourse with finite creatures, is attempted to be

[63]

⁴⁰There are in the Mishnah sixteen variations: [Leviticus 11:33; 25:36; Numbers 28:5; 32:22; Deuteronomy 24:19; Joshua 8:33; 2 Samuel 15:6; Isaiah 10:13; Ezekiel 46:21; Amos 9:14; Malachi 3:16, 23 \(A. V 4:5\); Psalm 68:27; Job 1:1; Proverbs 22:28; 2 Chronicles 28:15.](#) In the Talmud 105 such variations occur, viz., [Genesis 7:8; 23; 15:2; 25:6, 35:18; Exodus 12:3, 6; 13:16; 24:5; 25:13; 31:1; Leviticus 4:25, 30, 34; 10:12; 15:10; 18:18; Numbers 5:19; 18:16; Deuteronomy 6:7, 9, 20; 23:1; 25:7; 33:27; 34:6; Joshua 3:17; 10:11; 14:7, 10; 16:6; 23:15; Judges 15:20; 16:31; 1 Samuel 2:24; 2 Samuel 3:25; 24:15; 2 Kings 17:31; 23:17; Isaiah 2:3; 38:16; 42:5; 59:7; Jeremiah 3:22; 29:11; Ezekiel 40:48; 44:9; 47:1; Hosea 4:11; Amos 4:6; 8:11; 9:14; Haggai 2:8; Mich. 4:2; Zechariah 12:10; Malachi 2:12; Psalm 5:5; 16:10 \(where the difference is important\); 26:5, 6; 37:32; 56:11; 62:12; 68:21; 95:5; 97. 7; 127:5; 139. 5; 6; 8; 13:4; 14. 16; 36:5, 11; Ruth 3:15; 4:11; Ecclesiastes 9:14, 15; 10:5; Daniel 2:29; 4:14; 6:18; 10:13; Ezra 4:3; Nehemiah 4:16; 8:8 \(bis\), 15, 17; 1 Chronicles 3:17; 4:10; 5:24; 65:5; 17:9; 26:8, 23; 27:34; 2 Chronicles 26:2; 31:5, 13.](#)

answered. Of the two points raised, that of Creation is of course the first in the order of thinking as well as of time—and the book *Yetsirah* is the oldest Kabbalistic document.

The *Sepher Yetsirah* is properly a monologue on the part of Abraham, in which, by the contemplation of all that is around him, he ultimately arrives at the conviction of the Unity of God.

We distinguish the substance and the form of creation; that which is, and the mode in which it is. We have already indicated that the original of all that exists is Divine. 1st, We have God; 2nd, God manifest, or the Divine entering into form; 3rd, That Divine in its form, from which in turn all original realities are afterwards derived. In the *Sepher Yetsirah*, these Divine realities (the substance) are represented by the ten numerals, and their form by the twenty-two letters which constitute the Hebrew alphabet—language being viewed as the medium of connection between the spiritual and the material; as the form in which the spiritual appears. At the same time, number and language indicate also the arrangement and the mode of creation, and, in general, its boundaries. “By thirty-two wonderful paths,” so begins the *Sepher Yetsirah*, “the Eternal, the Lord of Hosts, the God of Israel, the Living God, the King of the World, the merciful and gracious God, the glorious One, He that inhabiteth eternity, Whose Name is high and holy, has created the world.” But these ten numerals are in reality the ten *Sephiroth*, or Divine emanations, arranged in triads, each triad consisting of two opposites (flowing or emanating from a superior triad until the Divine Unity is reached), and being reconciled in a middle point of connection. These ten *Sephiroth*, in the above arrangement, recur everywhere, and the sacred number ten is that of perfection. Each of these *Sephiroth* flows from its predecessor, and in this manner the Divine gradually evolves. This emanation of the ten *Sephiroth* then constitutes the substance of word; we may add, it constitutes everything else. In God, in the world, in man, everywhere we meet these ten *Sephiroth*, at the head of which is God manifest, or the *Memra* (*Logos*, the Word). If the ten *Sephiroth* give the Substance, the twenty-two letters are the form of creation and of revelation. “By giving them form and shape, and by interchanging them, God has made the soul of everything that has been made, or shall be made.” “Upon those letters, also, has the Holy One, Whose Name be

praised, founded His holy and glorious Name.” These letters are next subdivided, and their application in all the departments of nature is shown. In the unit creation, the triad; world, time and man are found. Above all these is the Lord. Such is a very brief outline of the rational exposition of the Creation, attempted by the *Sepher Yetsirah*.⁴¹

We subjoin a translation of the book *Yetsirah*, only adding that much, not only as regards the meaning of the expressions but even their translation, is in controversy. Hence, not unfrequently, our rendering must be regarded rather as our interpretation of the mysterious original.

⁴¹History of the Jewish Nation pp. 435, 436.

Appendix 6—Pereq.-Months-Governors, Etc.

The Book Yetsirah

Pereq I.

Mishnah 1. In thirty-two wonderful paths of wisdom, Jah, Jehovah Tsebhaoth, the God of Israel, the Living God, and King of the World, God merciful and gracious, High and Exalted, Who dwelleth to Eternity, high and holy is His Name, hath ordered [established, created?] (the world) by three Sepharim [books]: by Sepher [the written Word], Sephar [number, numeral] and Sippur [spoken word]. Others, pointing the worlds differently, render these mysterious terms: Number, Word, Writing; others Number, Numberer, Numbered; while still other see in it a reference to the threefold division of the letters of the Hebrew alphabet, of which more afterwards.

Mishnah 2. *Ten Sephiroth* [emanations] *belimah*¹ [without anything, i.e. before these, the sole elements out of which all else evolved], *twenty-two letters of foundation* (these constitute the Hebrew Alphabet, and the meaning seems that the *Sephiroth* manifest themselves in that which is uttered): *three mothers* (*Aleph*, the first letter of *Avveyr*, air; *Mem*, the first letter of *Mayim*, water; and *Shin*, the last letter of *Esh*, fire—although this may represent only one mystical aspect of the meaning of the term mothers as applied to these letters), *seven duplex*² (Pronounced soft or hard viz. Beth, Gimel, Daleth, Kaph, Pe, Resh, Tau, which are, or where in Hebrew capable of modification by a Dagesh—but this also must be mystically understood) and *twelve simple ones*³ (the simple letters of the Hebrew Alphabet).

Mishnah 3. *Ten Sephiroth belimah* (the analogy is now further traced in God and in man), *the number of the ten fingers, five against*

¹The expression occurs already in [Job 26:7](#).

²Probably twofold might best express the meaning.

³Mark also the symbolical significance of the numbers 3, 7, 12 as the manifestation of God—the Archetype of all else.

five, and the covenant of the One Only (God) placed between them (the covenant relationship between God and man in the midst, even as it is symbolised in the person of man which is between the twice five fingers) by the word of the tongue (this, the relation Godward) and by the word of sexualness [nuditās] (the relation earthwards—the one has become dual.)

Mishnah 4. Ten Sephiroth belimah—ten and not nine, ten and not eleven—be informed in wisdom, and be wise in information; examine in them, search out from them, and put the thing in its reality (certitude, proper state?), and place again the Creator in His place. [66]

Mishnah 5. Ten Sephiroth belimah—their measurement ten, which have no end (limitation): depth of beginning (past) and depth of ending (future), depth of good and depth of evil, depth of height and depth of profundity (or, above and beneath), depth of east and depth of west, depth of north and depth of south—One only Lord, God, the true (approved) King, Who reigneth over all from His holy dwelling and unto all eternity.

Mishnah 6. Ten Sephiroth belimah—their appearance like the sheen of lightning (reference here to [Ezekiel 1:14](#)), and their outgoings (goal) that they have no end, His word is in them (the Logos manifest in the Sephiroth), in running and in returning, and at His word like storm-wind they pursue (follow), and before His throne they bend (in worship).

Mishnah 7. Ten Sephiroth belimah—their end is joined to their beginning, like the flame that is bound up with the coal, for the Lord is One only, and there is no second to Him, and before him what countest thou?

Mishnah 8. Ten Sephiroth belimah—shut thy mouth, that is speak not, and thy heart, that it think not, and if thy heart run away, bring it back to its place, for on this account is it said ([Ezekiel 1:14](#)) they run and return and on this condition has the Covenant been made.

Mishnah 9 and 10. Ten Sephiroth belimah—One: the Spirit of the living God, blessed and again blessed be the Name of Him Who liveth for ever—Voice and Spirit and Word, and this is the Holy Ghost.

Two: Wind (air, spirit?) from (out of) Spirit—thereby ordered and hewed He the twenty-two letters of foundation, three mothers, and 7 duplicate, and 12 simple ones, and one Spirit from (among) them. Three: Water from beneath (wind), He designed and hewed in them *tohu vavohu*, slime and dung—designed them like a bed (a garden bed), hewed them like a wall, covered them like pavement. Four: Fire from water, He designed it and hewed in it the throne of glory, the Ophanim and Seraphim, the sacred living creatures, and the angels of service, and of these three He founded His dwelling place, as it is said, He maketh His angels breaths (winds), and His ministers a flaming fire.

[67] Mishnah 11. *Five: Three letters from out the simple ones: He sealed spirit on the three, and fastened them in His Great Name why (Jehovah, of which these three letters are the abbreviation; what follows shows how the permutation of these three letters makes the varied relationship of God to creation in time and space, and at the same time, so to speak, the immanence of His manifestation in it). And He sealed with them six outgoings (ends, terminations): He turned upwards, and He sealed it with why. Six: He sealed below, turned downwards, and sealed it with hwy. Seven: He sealed eastward, He turned in front of Him, and sealed it with wyh. Eight: He sealed westward, and turned behind, and sealed it with ywh. Nine: He sealed southward, and turned to His right, and sealed it with hyw. Ten: He sealed northward, and turned to His left, and sealed it with yhw.*

Mishnah 12. These are the Sephiroth belimah—one: Spirit of the living God, and wind (air, spirit? the word *ruach* means all these), water, and fire; and height above and below, east and west, north and south.

Pereq II

Mishnah 1. Twenty-and-two letters of foundation: three mothers, seven duplex, and twelve simple ones—three mothers their foundation the scale of merit and the scale of guilt, and the tongue of statute trembling (deciding) between them. (This, to be mystically carried out, in its development, and application to all things: the elements, man, &c.)

Mishnah 2. Twenty-two letters of foundation: He drew them, hewed them, weighed them, and interchanged them, melted them together (showing how in the permutation of letters all words—viewed mystically as the designation of things—arose), He formed by them the nephesh of all that is formed (created), and the nephesh of everything that is to be formed (created).

Mishnah 3. *Two-and-twenty letters of foundation: drawn in the voice, hewn in the wind (air, spirit?) fastened on the mouth in five places: hx(the gutturals among the Hebrew letters), Pmwb (the labials), qkyg (the palatals), tnl+d (the linguals), Cr#sz (the dentals).*

Mishnah 4. *Twenty-two letters of foundation, fastened in a circle in 231 gates (marking how these letters are capable of forming, by the permutation of two of them, in all 231 permutations); and the circle turns forwards and backwards, and this is the indication of the matter: as regards what is good, there is nothing higher than gn(oneg), delight and nothing lower than hgn (negah), plague' (stroke). In such manner He weighed them and combined them, with them all, and them all with with them all, and them all with b with them all, and them all with b, and thus the rest, so that it is found that all that is formed and all that is spoken proceeds from one Name (the name of God being, as it were, the fundamental origin of everything).* [68]

Mishnah 5. He formed from Tohu that which has substance, and made that which is not into being, and hewed great pillars from the air, which cannot be handled; and this is the indication: beholding and speaking He made all that is formed and all words by one Name—and the indication of the matter: twenty-two numbers and one body.

Pereq III

Mishnah 1. Three mothers—m—their foundation, the scale of guilt and the scale of merit, and the tongue of the statue trembling (deciding) between them.

Mishnah 2. Three mothers—m—a great mystery, marvellous and hidden, and sealed with six signets, and from them go forth fire and water, and divide themselves into male and female. Three mothers, m—their foundation, and from them were born the fathers

(rerum naturae semina), from which everything is created (fire is regarded as the male principle, water as the female principle, and air as combining the two: is the first letter of the Hebrew word for air, m for that of water, the last for that of fire).

Mishnah 3. Three letters, m—in the world: air, water, fire; the heavens were created in the beginning from fire, and the earth was created from water, and the air trembles (the same word as that in regard to the tongue between the scales of the balance, indicating the intermediate, inclining to the one or the other) between the fire and the water.

Mishnah 4. Three mothers, m—in the year: fire, and water, and wind. Heat is created from fire, cold from water, and moderate from the wind (air) that is intermediate between them. Three mothers, m—in the nephesh: fire, water, and wind. The head was created from fire, and the belly from water, and the body from wind that is intermediate between them.

Mishnah 5. Three mothers, m)—He drew them, and hewed them, and melted them together, and sealed with them the three mothers in the world, the three mothers in the year, and three mothers in the nephesh—male and female.

(Now follows a further mystical development and application.)

[69] *The letter He made King in the Spirit, and bound upon him the crown (this refers to farther mystical signs indicated in the Kabbalistic figure drawn on p. 438 of the History of the Jewish Nation), and melted them one with the other, and sealed with them: in the world the air, in the soul life, and in the nephesh (living thing) body—the male with m the female with Mm He made King in the waters, and bound on it the crown, and melted them one with the other, and sealed: in the world earth, and in the year cold, and in the nephesh the belly—male and female, male in m, and female in m. He made King in the fire, and bound on it the crown, and melted them one with the other, and sealed with it: in the upper world the heavens, in the year heat, in the nephesh the head—male and female.*

Pereq IV

Mishnah 1. *Seven duplex letters, trpk dgb (it will here be noticed that we now proceed from the numeral 3 to the further mystic nu-*

meral 7), *accustomed* (habituated, adapted, fitted) *for two languages* (correlate ideas); *life, and peace, and wisdom, and riches, grace, and seed, and government* (the mystic number 7 will here be noted), *and accustomed* (fitted) *for two tongues* (modes of pronunciation) ‘bb ‘tt ‘rr ‘pp ‘kk ‘dd ‘gg,—*the formation of soft and hard, the formation of strong and weak* (the dual principle will here be observed); *duplicate, because they are opposites: the opposites—life and death; the opposites—peace and evil; the opposites—wisdom and folly; the opposites—riches and poverty; the opposites—grace and ugliness; the opposites—fertility and desolation; the opposites—rule and servitude.*

Mishnah 2. Seven duplex letters, trpk dgb; corresponding to the seven outgoings; from them seven outgoings: above and below, east and west, north and south, and the holy Temple in the middle, and it upbears the whole.

Mishnah 3. Seven duplex, trpk dgb; He drew them, and hewed them, and melted them, and from them, in the world the stars (the planets), in the year the days, in the nephesh the issues, and with them He drew seven firmaments, and seven earths, and seven Sabbaths, therefore He loves the seventh under all heavens.

Mishnah 4. Two letters build two houses (here the number of possible permutations are indicated). Three letters build six houses, four build twenty-four houses, five build 120 houses, six build 720 houses, and from thence go onward and think what the mouth is not able to speak, and the ear not able to hear. And these are the in the world—seven: the Sun, Venus, Mercury, the Moon, Saturn, Jupiter, Mars. And these are the days in the year; the seven days of creation; and the seven gates of issue in the nephesh: two eyes, two ears, and a mouth, and the two nostrils. And with them were drawn the seven above all that is delight under the heavens. [70]

Pereq V

Mishnah 1. The properties of the twelve simple letters (or their attributes)—y+xzwh qc(s Nl—their foundation: sight, hearing, smell, speech, eating, concubitus, working, walking, anger, laughter, thinking, sleep. Their measurement twelve boundaries in the hypotenuse (points in transverse lines), the boundary N. E., the boundary S.

E., the boundary E. upwards, the boundary E. downwards; the boundary N. upwards, the boundary N. downwards, the boundary S. W., the boundary N. W., the boundary W. upwards, the boundary W. downwards, the boundary S. upwards, the boundary S. downwards, and they extended and go on into the eternal (boundless space), and they are the arms of the world.

Mishnah 2. Twelve simple letters, qc (s Nl y+x zwh. He drew them, and melted them, and formed of them the twelve constellations in the world (sign of the Zodiac): Aries, Taurus, Gemini, Cancer, Leo, Virgo, Libra, Scorpio, Sagittarius, Capricornus, Aquarius, Pisces (these are expressed in the original in an abbreviated, contracted form). These are the twelve months of the year: Nisan, Iyar, Sivan, Tammuz, Abh, Elul, Tishri, Marcheshvan, Kislev, Teb-heth, Shebhat, Adar (thus the number twelve is marked, first in the functions of man, then in the points of the compass, then in the starry skies, and then in the year). And these are the twelve leaders in nephesh (living beings): two hands, and two feet, and two kidneys, the spleen, the liver, the gall, the intestine, the upper stomach, the lower stomach (perhaps gullet, stomach, and intestine—at any rate, three organs connected with deglutition and digestion). He made them like a land (province), and set them in order like war, and also—this as against that, ordered God. Three mothers, which are three fathers, because from them issue fire, wind, and water. Three mothers, and seven duplicate, and twelve simple ones.

Mishnah 3. These are the twenty-two letters with which the Holy One has founded (all), blessed be He, Jah, Jehovah Tsebhaoth, the living God of Israel, high and lifted up, dwelling eternally, and holy is His Name, exalted and holy is He.

[71]

Pereq VI

Mishnah 1. Three fathers and their generations, seven subduers and their hosts (planets?), seven boundaries of hypotenuse—and the proof of matter: faithful witnesses are the world, the year, and the nephesh. The law (statute, settled order) of the twelve, and of the seven, and of the three, and they are appointed over the heavenly dragon, and the cycle, and the heart. Three: fire, and water, and wind (air); the fire above, the water below, and the wind (air) the

statute intermediate between them. And the demonstration of the matter: the fire bears the water, is silent, hisses, and is the statute intermediate between them (all these have further mystic meaning and application in connection with words and ideas).

Mishnah 2. The dragon is in the world like a king on his throne; the cycle is in the year like a king in his land; the heart is in the nephesh like a king in war. Also in all that is pursued God has made the one against the other (opposite poles and their reconciliation): the good against the evil; good from good, and evil from evil; the good trying the evil, and the evil trying the good the good is kept for the good, and the evil is kept for the evil.

Mishnah 3. Three are one, that standeth alone; seven are divided, there as against three, and the statute intermediate between them. Twelve are in war: three loving, three hating, three giving life, three giving death. The three loving ones: the heart, the ears, and the mouth; the three hating ones: the liver, the gall, and the tongue—and God a faithful king reigning over all: one (is) over three, three over seven, seven over twelve, and they are all joined together, the one with the other.

Mishnah 4. And when Abraham our father had beheld, and considered, and seen, and drawn, and hewn, and obtained it, then the Lord of all revealed Himself to him, and called him His friend, and made a covenant with him and with his seed: and he believed in Jehovah, and it was imputed to him for righteousness. He made with him a covenant between the ten toes, and that is circumcision; between the ten fingers of his hand, and that is the tongue; and He bound two-and-twenty letters on his tongue, and showed him their foundation. He drew them with water, He kindled them with fire, He breathed them with (air); He burnt them in seven; He poured them forth in the twelve constellations.

The views expressed in the Book *Yetsirah* are repeatedly referred to in the Mishnah and in other of the most ancient Jewish writings. They represent, as stated at the outset, a direction long anterior to the Mishnah, and of which the first beginnings and ultimate principles are of deepest interest to the Christian student. The reader who wishes to see the application to Christian metaphysics and theology of the Kabbalah, of which *Yetsirah* is but the first word, is referred to a deeply interesting and profound work, strangely unknown to

[72]

English scholars: *Molitor*, Philosophie d. Gesch. oder uber d. Tradition, 4 vols. English readers will find much to interest them in the now somewhat rare work of the Rev. *John Oxley*: The Christian Doctrine of the Trinity and Incarnation (London, 1815, 2 vols.)

The principles laid down in the Book *Yetsirah* are further carried out and receive their fullest (often most remarkable) development and application in the book *Zohar* (Splendour'—the edition used by us is the 8vo. edition, Amsterdam, 1805, in 3 vols, with the Amsterdam edition of the *Tikkune Zohar*; other Kabbalistic books used by us need not here be mentioned). The main portion of the *Zohar* is in the form of a Commentary on the Pentateuch, but other tractates are interspersed throughout the volumes.

5. *Dogmatic Theology*.—This is fully treated of in the text of these volumes.

6. *Historic Theology*.—To describe and criticise the various works which come under this designation would require the expansion of this Appendix into a Tractate. Some of these compositions have been referred to in the text of these volumes. For a general account and criticism of them I must again refer to the History of the Jewish Nation (see especially the chapters on The Progress of Arts and Sciences among the Jews and Theological Science and Religious Belief in Palestine). For the historical and critical account of Rabbinic historical works the student is referred to Zunz, *Gottesd. Vortr. d. Juden*, ch 8. The only thing which we shall here attempt is a translation of the so-called *Megillath Taanith*, or Roll of Fast; rather, a Calendar of the days on which fasting and mourning was *prohibited*. The oldest part of the document (referred to in the *Mishnah*, *Taan.* ii. 8) dates from the beginning of the second century of our era, and contains elements of even much greater antiquity. That which has come down of it is here given in translation: ⁴

[73]

MEGILLATH TAANITH, OR ROLL OF FASTS.

⁴All the glosses on and in the text have been omitted. The edition of the Tractate in its *present* form used by us is that of Warshau, 1874, and consists (with comments) of 20 octavo (double) pages. For the criticism of the work see specially *Grätz*, *Gesch. d. Juden*, vol. iii. pp. 415-428, and *Derenbourg*, *Hist. de la Palest.* pp. 439-446. A special tractate on the subject is *Schmilg's* inaugural dissertation, Leipzig, 1874. It need scarcely be said that these writers entertain different views as to the historical dates specially commemorated in the *Megillath Taanith*, and the events to which they refer. Comp. also *Wolfius*, *Biblioth. Rabb.* vol. i. p. 385, vol. ii. p. 1325, vol. iii. p. 11963. My edition of

These are the days on which it is not lawful to fast, and during some of them mourning must also be intermitted.

I. Nisan.

1. From the 1st day of the month Nisan, and to the 8th of it, it was settled about the daily sacrifice (that it should be paid out of the Temple treasury)—mourning is prohibited.

2. And from the 8th to the end of the Feast (the 27th) the Feast of Weeks was re-established—mourning is interdicted.

II. Iyar.

1. On the 7th Iyar the dedication of the wall of Jerusalem—mourning is prohibited.

2. On the 14th is the day of the little (the second) Passover—mourning is prohibited.

3. On the 23rd the sons of Acra ⁵ issued from Jerusalem.

4. On the 27th the imposts were removed from Judaea and Jerusalem.

III. Sivan.

1. On the 17th Sivan the tower of Zur was taken.

2. On the 15th and 16th men of Bethshean and of the plain were exiled.

3. On the 25th the tax-gatherers were withdrawn from Judah and Jerusalem.

IV. Tammuz.

1. On the 14th Tammuz the Book of Decisions (aggravating ordinances) was abrogated—mourning is prohibited.

V. Abh.

1. On the 15th Abh the season of wood-offerings (for the Temple use) of priests (comp. Jos. War ii. 17. 6)—mourning is prohibited.

2. On the 24th we returned to our Law.

VI. Elul.

1. On the 7th of Elul the day of the Dedication of Jerusalem— [74]
mourning prohibited.

2. On the 17th the Romans withdrew from Judaea and Jerusalem.

3. On the 22nd we returned to kill the apostates.

Wolfius has the great advantage of the marginal notes and corrections by the great Jewish historian, the late Dr. *Jost*, who, many years ago, gave me his copy.

⁵We abstain from giving historical notes. For the different explanations of the commemorative dates the reader is referred to the books already mentioned.

VII. Tisri.

1. ON the 3rd Tishri the mention of the Divine Name was removed from public deeds.

VIII. Marcheshvan.

1. On the 23rd Marcheshvan the Sorigah (a partition wall in the Temple, supposed to have been erected by the heathen, comp. 1 Macc. iv. 43-46) was removed from the Temple court.

2. On the 25th the wall of Samaria was taken.

3. On the 27th the meat offering was again brought on the altar.

IX. Kislev.

1. On the 3rd the Simavatha (another heathen structure) was removed from the court or the Temple,

2. On the 7th is a feast day.

3. On the 21st is the day of Mount Garizim—mourning is prohibited.

4. On the 25th the eight days of the Feast of Lights (Chanukah) begin—mourning is prohibited.

X. Tebbeth.

1. On the 28th the congregation was re-established according to the Law. (This seems to refer to the restoration of the Sanhedrin after the Sadducean members were removed, under the rule of Queen Salome. See the historical notes in Appendix IV.)

XI. Shebhat.

1. On the 2nd a feast day ⁶—mourning is prohibited.

2. On the 22nd the work, of which the enemy said that it was to be in the Temple, was destroyed—mourning is interdicted. (This seems to refer to the time of Caligula, when, on the resistance of the Jews, the statute of the Emperor was at last not allowed to be in the Temple.)

3. On the 28th King Antiochus was removed from Jerusalem (supposed to refer to the day of the death of Antiochus, son of Antiochus Epiphanes, in his expedition against the Parthians).

XII. Adar.

1. On the 8th and the 9th, days of joy on account of rainfall.

2. On the 12th is the day of Trajan.

⁶This feast seems to refer to the death of King Herod; that on the 7th Kislev to the death of King Jannaeus.

3. On the 13th is the day of Nicanor (his defeat).

4. On the 14th and on the 15th are the days of Purim (Feast of Esther)—mourning is prohibited.

5. On the 16th was begun the building the wall of Jerusalem—mourning is prohibited.

6. On the 17th rose the heathens against the remnant of the Scribes in the country of Chalcis and of the Zabedaeans, and Israel was delivered.

7. On the 20th the people fasted for rain, and it was granted to them.

8. On the 28th the Jews received good tidings that they would no longer be hindered from the sayings of the Law—mourning is prohibited. [75]

On these days every one who has before made a vow of fasting is to give himself to prayer.

(In extenuation of the apparent harshness and literality of our renderings, it should be stated, that both the *Sepher Yetsirah* and the *Megillath Taanith* are here for the first time translated into English.)

III. LIST OF HIGH-PRIESTS FROM THE ACCESSION OF HEROD THE GREAT TO THE DESTRUCTION OF JERUSALEM.

Appointed by

Herod the Great ... 1. Ananel. 2. Aristobulus. 3. Jesus, son of Phabes. 4. Simon, son of Boethos. 5. Matthias, son of Theophilos. 6. Joazar, son of Boethos.

Archelaus ... 7. Eleazar, son of Boethos. 8. Jesus, son of Sie.

Quirinius ... 9. Ananos (Annas).

Valerius Gratus ... 10. Ishmael, son of Phabi. 11. Eleazar, son of Ananos. 12. Simon, son of Camithos. 13. Joseph (Caiaphas).

Vitellius ... 14. Jonathan, son of Ananos. 15. Theophilos, son of Ananos.

Agrippa I. ... 16. Simon Cantheras, son of Boethos. 17. Matthias, son of Ananos. 18. Elionaios, son of Cantheras.

Herod of Chalcis ... 19. Joseph, son of Camithos. 20. Ananias, son of Nedebaios.

Agrippa II. ... 21. Ishmael, son of Phabi. 22. Joseph Cabi, son of Simon. 23. Ananos, son of Ananos. 24. Jesus, son of Damnaios. 25. Jesus, son of Gamaliel. 26. Matthias, son of Theophilos.

The People during the last war ... 27. Phannias, son of Samuel.

IV. LIST OF PROCURATORS OF JUDAEA.

3 B.C. to 66 A.D. ... 1. Ethnarch Archelaus. 2. Coponius. 3. M. Ambivius. 4. Annius Rufus. 5. Valerius Gratus. 6. Pontius Pilate. 7. Marcellus. 8. King Agrippa. 9. Cuspius Fadus. 10. Tiberius Alexander. 11. Ventidius Cumanus. 12. Antonius Felix. 13. Porcius Festus. 14. Albinus. 15. Gessius Florus.

V. LIST OF ROMAN GOVERNORS OF SYRIA.

6 B.C. to 69 A.D. ... 1. P. Quinctilius Varus. 2. M. Lollius. 3. C. Marcius Censorinus (?) 4. L. Volusius Saturniuns. 5. P. Sulpic. Quirinius. 6. Qu. Caecilius Creticus Silanus. 7. Cn. Calpurn. Piso. 8. Cn. Sent. Staurinus (?) 9. Aelius Lamia. 10. L. Pompon. Flaccus. 11. L. Vitellius. 12. P. Petronius. 13. C. Vibius Marsus. 14. C. Cass. Longinus. 15. C. U. Quadratus. 16. [Domitius Corbulo. 17. C. Itius (conjoined).] 18. Cestius Gallus. 19. C. Lic. Mucianus.

Appendix 7—On the Date of the Nativity of Our Lord (Book II. ch. 3. and other passages).

[76]

So much, that is generally accessible, has of late been written on this subject, and such accord exists on the *general* question, that only the briefest statement seems requisite in this place, the space at our command being necessarily reserved for subjects which have either not been treated of by previous writers, or in a manner or form that seemed to make a fresh investigation desirable.

At the outset it must be admitted, that absolute certainty is impossible as to the exact date of Christ's Nativity—the precise year even, and still more the month and the day. But in regard to the year, we possess such *data* as to invest it with such probability, as almost to amount to certainty.

1. The first and most certain date is that of the death of Herod the Great. Our Lord was born *before* the death of Herod, and, as we judge from the Gospel history, very shortly before that event. Now the year of Herod's death has been ascertained with, we may say, absolute certainty, as shortly before the Passover of the year 750 A.U.C., which corresponds to about the 12th of April of the year 4 before Christ, according to our common reckoning. More particularly, shortly before the death of Herod there was a lunar eclipse (*Jos. Ant. xvii. 6. 4*), which, it is astronomically ascertained, occurred on the night from the 12th to the 13th of March of the year 4 before Christ. Thus the death of Herod must have taken place between the 12th of March and the 12th of April—or, say, about the end of March (*comp. Ant. xvii. 8. 1*). Again, the Gospel history necessitates an interval of, at the least, seven or eight weeks before that date for the birth of Christ (we have to insert the purification of the Virgin—at the earliest, six weeks after the Birth—The Visit of the Magi, and the murder of the children at Bethlehem, and, at any rate, some days more before the death of Herod). Thus the Birth of Christ could not have possibly occurred after the beginning of February 4 b.c., and most likely several weeks earlier. This brings us close to the

[77] ecclesiastical date, the 25th of December, in confirmation of which we refer to what has been stated in vol. i. p. 187, see especially note 3. At any rate, the often repeated, but very superficial objection, as to the impossibility of shepherds tending flocks in the open at that season, must now be dismissed as utterly untenable, not only for the reasons stated in vol. i. p. 187, but even for this, that if the question is to be decided on the ground of rainfall, the probabilities are in favour of December as compared with February—later than which it is impossible to place the birth of Christ.

2. No certain inference can, of course, be drawn from the appearance of the star that guided the Magi. That, and on what grounds, our investigations have pointed to a confirmation of the date of the Nativity, as given above, has been fully explained in vol. i. ch 6... (see specially p. 213).

3. On the taxing of Quirinius, see vol. i. pp. 181, 182.

4. The next historical *datum* furnished by the Gospels is that of the beginning of St. John the Baptist's ministry, which, according to St. Luke, was in the fifteenth year of Tiberius, and when Jesus was about thirty years old (St. [Luke 3:23](#)). The accord of this with our reckoning of the date of the Nativity has been shown in vol. i. p. 264.

5. A similar conclusion would be reached by following the somewhat vague and general indication furnished in St. [John 2:20](#).

6. Lastly, we reach the same goal if we follow the historically somewhat uncertain guidance of the date of the Birth of the Baptist, as furnished in this notice (St. [Luke 1:5](#)) of his annunciation to his father, that Zacharias officiated in the Temple as on of the course of Abia (see here vol. i. p. 135). In Taan. 29 *a* we have the notice, with which that of Josephus agrees (War vi. 4. 1. 5), that at the time of the destruction of the Temple the course of Jehoiarib which was the first of the priestly courses, was on duty. That was on the 9-10 *Ab* of the year 823 A.U.C., or the 5th August of the year 70 of our era. If this calculation be correct (of which, however, we cannot feel quite sure), then counting the courses of priests backwards, the course of Abia would, in the year 748 A.U.C. (the year before the birth of Christ) have been on duty from the 2nd to the 9th of October. This also would place the birth of Christ in the end of December of the following year (749), taking the expression sixth month in St.

Appendix 7—On the Date of the Nativity of Our Lord (Book II. ch. 3. and other passages). lxxix
~~Luke 1:26, 36~~, in the sense of the running month (from the 5th to the 6th month, comp. St. [Luke 1:24](#)). But we repeat that absolute reliance cannot be placed on such calculations, at least so far as regards month and day. (Comp. here generally *Wieseler*, *Synopse*, and his *Beiträge*.)

[78] **Appendix 8—Rabbinic Traditions about Elijah the Forerunner of the Messiah**

To complete the evidence, presented in the text, as to the essential difference between the teaching of the ancient Synagogue about the Forerunner of the Messiah and the history and mission of John the Baptist, as described in the New Testaments, we subjoin a full, though condensed, account of the earlier Rabbinic traditions about Elijah.

Opinions differ as to the descent and birthplace of Elijah. According to some, he was from the land of Gilead (Bemid. R. 14), and of the tribe of Gad (Tanch. on [Genesis 49:19](#)). Others describe him as a Benjamite, from Jerusalem, one of those who sat in the Hall of Hewn Stones (Tanch. on [Exodus 31:2](#)), or else as paternally descended from Gad and maternally from Benjamin.¹ Yet a third opinion, and to which apparently most weight attaches, represents him as a Levite, and a Priest—nay, as the great High-Priest of Messianic days. This is expressly stated in the Targum Pseudo-Jon. on [Exodus 40:10](#), where it also seems implied that he was to anoint the Messiah with the sacred oil, the composition of which was among the things unknown in the second Temple, but to be restored by Elijah (Tanch. on [Exodus 23:20](#), ed. Warsh. p. 91 a, lines 4 and 5 from the top). Another curious tradition identifies Elijah with Phinehas (Targum Pseudo-Jon. on [Exodus 6:18](#)). The same expression as in the Targum (Phinehas—that is Elijah) occurs in that great storehouse of Rabbinic tradition, Yalkut (vol. i. p. 245 *b*, last two lines, and col. *c*). From the pointed manner in which reference is made to the parallelism between the zeal of Phinehas and that of Elijah, and between their work in reconciling God and Israel, and bringing the

¹This question is fully discussed in Ber. R. 71 towards the close. Comp. also Shem. R. 40. For fuller details we refer to our remarks on [Genesis 49:19](#) in Appendix IX.

latter to repentance, we may gather alike the origin of this tradition and its deeper meaning.²

For (as fully explained in Book II. ch 5.) it is one of the principles frequently expressed by the ancient Synagogue, in its deeper perception of the unity and import of the Old Testament, that the miraculous events and Divine interpositions of Israel's earlier history would be re-enacted, only with wider application, in Messianic days. If this idea underlay the parallelism between Phinehas and Elijah, it is still more fully carried out in that between Elijah and Moses. On comparing the Scriptural account of these two messengers of God we are struck with the close correspondence between the details of their history. The Synagogue is careful to trace this analogy step by step (Yalkut, vol. ii. p. 32 *d*) the final deliverance of Israel of Egypt, so would the final deliverance by Elijah forever break the yoke of all foreign rule. The allusion here is to the part which Elijah was expected to take in the future wars of Gog and Magog (Seder Olam R. c. xvii.) Indeed, this parallelism is carried so far, that tradition has it, that, when Moses was commissioned by God to go to Pharaoh, he pleaded that God should rather send by him whom He designed to send for the far greater deliverance in the latter days. On this it was told him that Elijah's mission would be to Israel, while he (Moses) was sent to Pharaoh (Pirqé de R. Eliez. 40).³ Similarly, it is asserted that the cave from which Moses beheld the Divine Presence passing before him (Exodus 33:22) was the same as that in which Elijah stood under similar circumstances—that cave having been created with the rest of the world, but specially on the eve of the world's first Sabbath (Siphre on Deut. ed. Friedmann, p. 147 *a*, last line). Considering this parallelism between them, the occurrence of the somewhat difficult expression will scarcely surprise us, that in the

[79]

²I cannot agree with either of the explanations of this passage offered by *Castelli* (Il Messia, p. 199), whose citation is scarcely as accurate as usually. The passage quoted is in the Par. Pinchas, opening lines.

³*Castelli* writes: *Lo Prega a mandare in luogo suo Elic, già esistente almeno in ispirito; e Dio risponde, che è predestinato non a quella, ma alla finale redenzione.* But there are three inaccuracies here, for (1) Moses does not name Elijah; (2) there is not a hint that Elijah was pre-existing in spirit; while (3) God's reply to Moses is as in our text.

days of the Messiah Moses and Elijah would come together—as one (Debar. R. 3, at the end).⁴

[80]

It has been noted in the text that the activity of Elijah, from the time of his appearance in the days of Ahab to that of his return as the forerunner of the Messiah, is represented in Jewish tradition as *continuous*, and that he is almost constantly introduced on the scene, either as in converse with some Rabbi, or else as busy about Israel's welfare, and connected with it. Thus Elijah chronicles in heaven the deeds of man (Seder Olam R. xvii.), or else writes down the observances of the commandments by men, and then the Messiah and God seal it (Midrash on [Ruth 2:14](#), last line, ed. Warsh. p. 43 *b*). In general, he is ever interested in all that concerns Israel's present state or their future deliverance (Sanh. 98 *a*). Indeed, he is connected with the initiatory rite of the covenant, in acknowledgement of his zeal⁵ in the restoration of circumcision, when, according to tradition, it had been abrogated by the ten tribes after their separation from Judah. God accordingly had declared: Israel shall not make the covenant of circumcision, but thou shalt see it and the sages decreed that (at circumcision) a seat of honour shall be placed for the Angel of the Covenant ([Malachi 3:2](#); Pirqé de R. Eliez. 29, end). Tradition goes even further. Not only was he the only ambassador to whom God had delegated His three special keys: of birth, of the rainfall, and of waking the dead (Yalkut, vol. ii. 32 *c*), but his working was almost Divine (Tanch. Bereshith 7; ed. Warsh. p. 6 *b*, last line, and 7 *a*).

We purposely pass over the activity of Elijah in connection with Israel, and especially its Rabbis and saints, during the interval be-

⁴The question has been raised whether Jeremiah (or even Isaiah) was also to appear in Messianic days. In favour of this view 2 Macc. ii. 1-8 and xv. 14-16 afford, to say the least, presumptive evidence. We do not refer to 4 Esdras ii. 18, because the two first and the two last chapters of that book in our Apocrypha (2 Esdras) are spurious, being for much later, probably Christian authorship. *Gfrörer* thinks that 4 Esdras v. (2 Esdras vii. 28) refers to Jeremiah and Isaiah (Urchrist vol. ii. p. 230). But I cannot draw the same inference from it. On the other hand, there is a remarkable passage in Mechilta on [Exodus 16:33](#) (ed. Weiss, p. 59 *b*), which not only seems to conjoin Jeremiah with the Messiah (though the inaccurate rendering of *Wetstein*, Nov. Test. vol. i. p. 430 conveys an exaggerated and wrong impression of this), but reminds us of 2 Mac. ii. 1-18.

⁵In this passage also reference is made to the zeal of Phinehas as corresponding to that of Elijah.

tween the Prophet's death and his return as the Forerunner of the Messiah, such as Jewish legend describes it. No good purpose could be served by repeating what so frequently sounds not only utterly foolish and superstitious, but profane. In Jewish legend Elijah is always introduced as the guardian of the interests of Israel, whether theologically or personally—as it were the constant living *medium* between God and his people, the link that binds the Israel of the present—with its pursuits, wants, difficulties and interests—to the bright Messianic future of which he is the harbinger. This probably is the idea underlying the many, often grotesque, legends about his sayings and doings. Sometimes he is represented as, in his well-meant zeal, going so far as to bear false witness in order to free Rabbis from danger and difficulty (Berach. 58 *a*). In general, he is always ready to instruct, to comfort, or to heal, condescending even to so slight a malady as the toothache (Ber. R. 96, end). But most frequently is he the adviser and friend of the Rabbis, in whose meetings and studies he delighteth. Thus he was a frequent attendant in Rabh's Academy—and his indiscretion in divulging to his friends the secrets of heaven had once procured for him in heaven the punishment of fiery stripes (Babha Mets. 85 *b*). But it is useless to do more than indicate all this. Our object is to describe the activity of Elijah in connection with the coming of the Messiah.

When, at length, the time of Israel's redemption arrived—then would Elijah return. Of two things only are we sure in connection with it. Elijah will not come yesterday'—that is, he will be revealed the same day that he comes—and he will not come on the eve of either a Sabbath or feast day, in order not to interrupt the festive rest, nor to break the festive laws (Erub. 43 *b*, Shabb. 33 *a*). Whether he came one day (Er. 43 *b*) or three days before the Messiah (Yalkut, vol. ii. p. 53 *c*, about the middle) his advent would be *close* to that of that Messiah (Yalkut, vol. i. p. 310 *a*, line 21 from bottom).⁶ The account given of the three days between the advent of Elijah and of the Messiah is peculiar (Yalkut, vol. ii. p. 53 *c*). Commenting on [Isaiah 52:7](#), it is explained, that on the first of those three days Elijah would stand on the mountains of Israel, lamenting the desolateness

⁶*Schöttgen* (Horae Hebr. tomus ii. p. 534) has not correctly apprehended the meaning of this passage. It is not *statim cum ipso Messiae adventu* but *prope* or *proxime* (h)ybl Kwms.) *Schöttgen* writes inaccurately tybh.

of the land, his voice being heard from one end of the world to the other, after which he would proclaim: Peace cometh to the world; peace cometh to the world! Similarly on the second day he would proclaim, Good cometh to the world; good cometh to the world! Lastly, on the third day, he would, in the same manner as the two previous days, make proclamation: *Jeshuah*⁷ (salvation) cometh to the world; *Jeshuah* (salvation) cometh to the world which, in order to mark the difference between Israel and the Gentiles, would be further explained by this addition: Saying unto Zion—Thy King cometh!

The period of Elijah's advent would, according to one opinion (Pirqé de R. Eliez. 43), be a time of genuine repentance by Israel, although it is not stated that this change would be brought about by his ministry. On the other hand, his peculiar activity would consist in settling ceremonial and ritual questions, doubts, and difficulties, in making peace, in restoring those who by violence had been wrongfully excluded from the congregation and excluding those who by violence had been wrongfully introduced (Bab. Mets. i. 8; 2:8; 3. 4, 5; Eduy. vii. 7). He would also restore to Israel these three things which had been lost: the golden pot of Manna ([Exodus 16:33](#)), the vessel containing the anointing oil, and that with the waters of purification—according to some, also Aaron's rod that budded and bore fruit.⁸

[83] Again, his activity is likened to that of the Angel whom God had

⁷Of course this is the Hebrew word used in [Isaiah 52:7](#) (that published salvation). None the less significant, however, in this connection, is the fact that the word is pronounced like the Name of Jesus.

⁸The reader will find, in our remarks on Ps. ex. 2 in Append. IX. the curious traditions about this rod of Aaron, as given in Bemid. R. 18 and Yalkut on [Psalm 110:2](#). The story of the wonder-working rod is told somewhat differently in the Targum Pseudo-Jon. on [Exodus 2:20, 21](#) and [4:20](#); and again, with other variations, in Pirké de R. Eliez. 40. In the latter passage we are told, that this rod had passed from the possession of Joseph (after his death) into the palace of Pharaoh. Thence Jethro, who was one of the magicians of Egypt, had removed it to his own home. The ability of Moses to read the writing on the rod—according to other traditions, to uproot it out of the garden—indicated him to Jethro as the future deliverer of Israel, and determined him to give to Moses Zipporah for his wife (in preference to all other suitors). According to other traditions, Noses had been for many years imprisoned, and ministered to by Zipporah, who loved him. It may be added, that, according to very ancient tradition, the rod of Aaron was one of the things created on the eve of the world's first Sabbath (Siphre, ed. *Friedmann*, p. 147 a, last line).

sent before Israel to drive out and to vanquish the hostile nations (Tanch. on [Exodus 23:20](#), § 18 at the close; ed. Warsh. p. 106 *b*). For, Elijah was to appear, then to disappear, and to appear again in the wars of Gog and Magog ⁹ (Seder Olam R. xvii.). But after that time general peace and happiness would prevail, when Elijah would discharge his peculiar functions. Finally, to the ministry of Elijah some also ascribed the office of raising the dead (Sotah ix. 15, closing words). ¹⁰

Such is a summary of ancient Jewish tradition concerning Elijah as the forerunner of the Messiah. Comparing it with the New Testament description of John the Baptist, it will at least be admitted that, from whatever source the sketch of the activity and mission of the Baptist be derived, it cannot have been from the ideal of the ancient Synagogue, nor yet from popularly current Jewish views. And, indeed—*could* there be a greater contrast than between the Jewish forerunner of the Messiah and him of the New Testament?

⁹We have purposely omitted all reference to the connection between Elijah and the second Messiah, the son of Ephraim, because that line of tradition belongs to a later period than that of Christ.

¹⁰The view of the Apocrypha on the Mission of Elijah may be gathered from Ecclus. 68:1-12. Some additional Talmudic notices about Elijah will be found at the close of Append. IX. The *Sepher Eliyahu* (Apocalypse of Elijah), published in Jellinek's *Beth haMidr.* part ii. pp. 65-68, adds nothing to our knowledge. It professes to be a revelation by the Angel Michael to Elijah of the end and the last days, at the close of the fourth monarchy. As it is simply an Apocalyptic account of the events of those days, it cannot here find a place, however interesting the Tractate. I have purposely not referred to the abominable story about Elijah told in *Yoma 19 b*, last lines.

Appendix 9—List of Old Testament Passages Messianically Applied in Ancient Rabbinic Writings (Book II. ch. 5.)

The following list contains the passages in the Old Testament applied to the Messiah or to Messianic times in the most ancient Jewish writings. They amount in all to 456, thus distributed: 75 from the Pentateuch, 243 from the Prophets, and 138 from the Hagiographa, and supported by more than 558 separate quotations from Rabbinic writings. Despite all labour care, it can scarcely be hoped that the list is quite complete, although, it is hoped, no important passage has been omitted. The Rabbinic references might have been considerably increased, but it seemed useless to quote the same application of a passage in many different books. Similarly, for the sake of space, only the most important Rabbinic quotations have been translated *in extenso*. The Rabbinic works from which quotations have been made are: the *Targumim*, the two *Talmuds*, and the *most ancient Midrashim*, but neither the *Zohar* (as the date of its composition is in dispute), nor any other Kabbalistic work, nor yet the younger *Midrashim*, nor, of course, the writings of later Rabbis. I have, however, frequently quoted from the well-known work *Yalkut*, because, although of comparatively late date, it is really, as its name implies, a collection and selection from more than fifty older and accredited writings, and adduces passages now not otherwise accessible to us. And I have the more readily availed myself of it, as I have been reluctantly forced to the conclusion that even the *Midrashim* preserved to us have occasionally been tampered with for controversial purposes. I have quoted from the best edition of *Yalkut* (Frankfort a. M., 1687), but in the case of the other *Midrashim* I have been obliged to content myself with such more recent reprints as I possessed, instead of the older and more expensive editions. In quoting from the *Midrashim*, not only the *Parashah*, but mostly also the *folio*, the *page*, and frequently even

the lines are referred to. Lastly, it only remains to acknowledge in general that, so far as possible, I have availed myself of the labours of my predecessors—specially of those of *Schöttgen*. Yet, even so, I may, in a sense, claim these references also as the result of my own labours, since I have not availed myself of quotations without comparing them with the works from which they were adduced—a process in which not a few passages quoted had to be rejected. And if any student should arrive at a different conclusion from mine in regard to any of the passages hereafter quoted, I can at least assure him that mine is the result of the most careful and candid study I could give to the consideration of each passage. With these prefatory remarks I proceed to give the list of Old Testament passages Messianically applied in ancient Rabbinic writings. [85]

In [Genesis 1:2](#), the expression, Spirit of God is explained of the Spirit of the King Messiah with reference to [Isaiah 11:2](#), and the moving on the face of the deep of repentance according to [Lamentations 2:19](#). So in Ber. R. 2, and in regard to the first point also in Ber. R. 8, in Vayyik. R. 14, and in other places.

[Genesis 2:4](#): These are the generations—twdlwt—of the heavens and of the earth taken in connection with [Genesis 3:15](#) and [Ruth 4:18](#). Here we note one of the most curious Messianic interpretations in Ber. R. 12 (ed. Warsh. p. 24 *b*). It is noted that the word generations (twdlwt) is always written in the Bible without the w which is the equivalent for the numeral 6, except in [Genesis 2:4](#) and [Ruth 4:18](#). This to indicate that subsequent to [Genesis 2:4](#) the Fall took place, in which Adam lost w—six—things: his glorious sheen ([Job 14:20](#)); life ([Genesis 3:19](#)); his stature ([Genesis 3:8](#)—either by 100, by 200, by 300, or even by 900 cubits); the fruit of the ground; the fruits of the trees ([Genesis 3:17](#)); and the heavenly lights. We have now seen why in [Genesis 2:4](#)—that is, previous to the Fall—the w is still in twdlwt, since at that time these six things were not yet lost. But the w reappears in the word twdlwt in [Ruth 4:18](#), because these six things are to be restored to man by the son of Pharez’—or the Messiah (comp. for each of these six things: [Judges 5:31 b](#); [Isaiah 68:22](#); [Leviticus 26:13](#); [Zechariah 8:12](#); [Isaiah 30:26](#)). It is added that although—according to the literal rendering of [Psalm 49:12](#) (in Heb. ver. 13)—man did not remain unfallen one single night, yet, for the sake of the Sabbath, the heavenly lights were not extinguished

[86] till after the close of the Sabbath. When Adam saw the darkness, it is added, he was greatly afraid, saying: Perhaps he, of whom it is written, he shall bruise thy head, and thou shalt bruise his heel cometh to molest and attack me, and he said, Surely the darkness shall cover me. This curious extract at least shown in what context the Synagogue applied [Genesis 3:15](#). The same occurs substantially in Shem. R. 30.

[Genesis 3:15](#). This well-known passage is paraphrased, with express reference to the Messiah, in the Targum Pseudo Jonathan and the so-called Jerusalem Targum. *Schöttgen* conjectures that the Talmudic designation of heels of the Messiah (*Sot.* 49 *b*, line 2 from top) in reference to the near Advent of the Messiah in the description of the troubles of those days (comp. St. [Matthew 10:35, 36](#)) may have been chosen partly with a view to this passage.

[Genesis 4:25](#). The language of Eve at the birth of Seth: another seed is explained as meaning seed which comes from another place and referred to the Messiah in *Ber. R.* 23 (ed. Warsh. p. 45 *b*, lines 8, 7 from the bottom). The same explanation occurs twice in the Midrash on [Ruth 4:19](#) (in the genealogy of David, ed. Warsh. p. 46 *b*), the second time in connection with [Psalm 40:8](#) (in the volume of the book it is written of me'—*bim' gillath sepher*—Ruth belonging to the class *tlgm*).

In connection with [Genesis 5:1](#) it is noted in *Ber. R.* 24, that King Messiah will not come till all souls predestined for it have appeared in human bodies on earth.

In [Genesis 8:11](#) the Targum Pseudo-Jonathan notes that the olive leaf, brought by the dove, was taken from the Mount of the Messiah.

[Genesis 9:27](#). The promise, that Japhet shall dwell in the tents of Shem, is paraphrased in the Targum Pseudo-Jon. as meaning, that his descendants should become proselytes, and dwell in the school of Shem—which seems to refer to Messianic times.

In connection with [Genesis 14:1](#), we are reminded in *Ber. R.* 42, that when we see the nations warring together, we may expect the coming of the Messiah.

The promise in [Genesis 15:18](#) is expected to be finally fulfilled in the time of Messiah, in *Ber. R.* 44.

In connection with [Genesis 18:4, 5](#) it is noted (*Ber. R.* 48, ed. Warsh. p. 87 *b*) that the words of Abraham to his Angelic guests

were to be returned in blessing to Abraham's descendants, in the wilderness, in the land of Canaan, and in the latter (Messianic) days. Referring only to this last point, the words let a little water be fetched is paralleled with the living waters in [Zechariah 14:8](#); wash your feet with [Isaiah 4:4](#) (the washing away of the filth of the daughters of Zion); rest under the tree with [Isaiah 4:6](#): there shall be a tabernacle for a shadow in the daytime from the heat; I will fetch a morsel of bread with the provision, [Psalm 72:16](#): there shall be a handful of corn in the earth &c. So also the words: Abraham ran unto the herd are paralleled with [Isaiah 7:21](#) (which is most significantly here applied to Messianic times); and lastly, the words, he stood by them with [Micah 2:13](#): the breaker is come up before them.¹ The same interpretation occurs in Bemid. R. 14 (ed. Warsh. p. 55 a), the references to Messianic days there being to [Isaiah 14:2](#); [30:25](#); [41:18](#); [6:4](#); and iv. 6.

[87]

The last clause of [Genesis 19:32](#) is interpreted (Ber. R. 51, ed. Warsh. p. 95 a), as referring, like the words of Eve about Seth, to the Messiah—the sin of the daughters of Lot being explained on the ground of their believing that all mankind had been destroyed in the judgment that overthrew Sodom.

The promise in [Genesis 22:18](#) is also explained Messianically in Bemid. R. 2 (ed. W. P. 5 b), in connection with [Numbers 2:32](#) where it is somewhat curiously shown in what sense Israel is to be like the sand of the sea.

[Genesis 33:1](#). The Midrash conjoins this with [Isaiah 66:7](#), and notes that, before the first oppressor was born, the last Redeemer was already born.

In [Genesis 35:21](#) the Targum Pseudo-Jon. paraphrases the tower of Eder (at Bethlehem) as the place whence the Messiah would be revealed.

On [Genesis 38:1, 2](#) there are very remarkable Messianic comments in Ber. R. 85.

[Genesis 49:1](#). The Targum Pseudo-Jon. notes, that the end for which the Messiah would come was not revealed to Jacob. A similar statement is found in the Midrash on the passage (Ber. R. 98, ed.

¹Indeed, this Parashah in Bedr. R. contains other similar parallelisms between [Genesis 17](#). and Messianic times.

Warsh. p. 173 *a*), where it is said of Jacob and Daniel that they saw the end, and yet it was afterwards hid from them. The passage quoted in the case of Daniel is [Daniel 12:4](#).

[Genesis 49:9](#). The expression lion's whelp is explained of the Messiah in Yalkut 160 (vol. i. p. 49 *c*), no less than five times; while the term he couched is referred to the Messiah in Ber. R. 98.

[88] [Genesis 49:10](#). This well-known prediction (on which see the full and interesting discussion in *Raym. Martini*, Pugio Fidei) is in Yalkut, u. s., applied to the Messiah, with a quotation of [Psalm 2:9](#). This expression Shiloh is also applied to the Messiah, with the curious addition, that in the latter days all nations would bring gifts to Him. Alike the Targum Onkelos, Pseudo-Jonathan, and the Jerusalem Targum, as well as Sanh. 98 *b*, the Midrash on the passage, and that on [Proverbs 19:21](#), and on [Lamentations 1:16](#), where it is rendered *shelo*, whose it is refer the expression Shiloh and, indeed, the whole passage, to the Messiah; the Midrash Ber. R. (99, ed. Warsh. p. 178 *b*) with special reference to [Isaiah 11:10](#), while the promise with reference to the ass's colt is brought into connection with [Zechariah 9:9](#), the fulfilment of this prophecy being expected along with that in [Ezekiel 36:25](#) (I will sprinkle clean water). Another remarkable statement occurs in the Midrash on the passage (Ber. R. 98, ed. Warsh. p. 174 *b*), which applies the verse to the coming of Him of Whom it is written, [Zechariah 9:9](#). Then He would wash his garment in wine ([Genesis 49:11](#)), which is explained as meaning the teaching of the Law to Israel, and His clothes in the blood of grapes, which is explained as meaning that He would bring them back from their errors. One of the Rabbis, however, remarks that Israel would not require to be taught by the King Messiah in the latter days, since it was written ([Isaiah 11:10](#)), to it shall the Gentiles seek. If so, then why should the Messiah come, and what will He do to the congregation of Israel? He will redeem Israel, and give them thirty commandments, according to [Zechariah 11:12](#). The Targum Pseudo-Jon. and the Jer. Targum also apply *verse 11* to the Messiah. Indeed, so general was this interpretation, that, according popular opinion, to see a palm tree in one's dreams was to see the days of the Messiah (Berach. 57 *a*).

~~Genesis 49:12~~ is also applied to the Messiah in the Targum Pseudo-Jon. and the Jerusalem Targum. So also is *verse* 18, although not in express words.

In [Genesis 49:17](#), last clause, in its connection with [ver. 18](#), the Midrash (Ber. R. 98) sees a reference to the disappointment of Jacob in mistaking Samson for the Messiah.

In the prophecy of Gad in [Genesis 49:19](#) there is an allusion to Messianic days, as Elijah was to be of the tribe of Gad (Ber. R. 99, ed. Warsh. p. 179 *a*). There is, however, in Ber. R. 71, towards the close, a dispute whether he was of the tribe of Gad, or of the tribe of Benjamin, at the close of which Elijah appears, and settles the dispute in a rather summary manner.

[89]

On [Genesis 50:10](#) the Midrash, at the close of Ber. R., remarks that as they had mourned, so in Messianic days God would turn their mourning into joy, quoting [Jeremiah 31:13](#) and [Isaiah 51:3](#).

[Exodus 4:22](#) is referred to the Messiah in the Midr. on [Psalm 2:7](#).

On [Exodus 12:2](#), let this be the beginning of months it is remarked in Shem. R. 15 (ed. Warsh. p. 24 *b*) that God would make new ten things in the latter days, these being marked by the following passages: [Isaiah 60:19](#); [Ezekiel 47:9](#); [47:12](#); [Ezekiel 16:55](#); [Isaiah 54:11](#); [Isaiah 11:7](#); [Hosea 2:20](#); [Isaiah 65:19](#); [Isaiah 35:8](#); [Isaiah 35:10](#). Similarly on [Numbers 12:1](#) we have, in Shem. R. 51, a parallelism between Old Testament times and their institutions and those of the latter days, to which [Isaiah 49:12](#) and [60:8](#) are suppose to apply.

On [Exodus 12:42](#) the Jerus. Targum notes that there were 4 remarkable nights: those of creation, of the covenant with Abraham, of the first Passover, and of the redemption of the world; and that as Moses came out of the desert, so would the Messiah come out of Rome.

On [Exodus 15:1](#). It is noted in Mekhilta (ed. Weiss, p. 41 *a*) that this song would be taken up in Messianic days, only with far wide reach, as explained in [Isaiah 60:5](#); [58:8](#); [35:5, 6](#); [Jeremiah 31:13](#); and [Psalm 126:2](#).

[Exodus 16:25](#) is applied to the Messiah, it being said that, if Israel only kept one Sabbath according to the commandment, the Messiah would immediately come (Jer. Taan. 64 *a*).

Exodus 16:33. This manna, it is noted in Mechil. ed. Weiss, p. 59 *b*, was to be preserved for the days of the Messiah. **Isaiah 30:15** is similarly explained in Jer. Taan. i. 1.

Exodus 17:16 the Targum Pseudo-Jonathan refers to Messianic times.

Exodus 21:1. Shem. R. 30, ed. Warsh. p. 44. *b*, 45 *a*, notes on the word judgments a number of things connected with judgment, showing how Balaam could not have wished the advent of the future deliverance (**Numbers 24:17**), since he was to perish in it; but that Israel should cleave to the great hope pressed in **Genesis 49:18**; **Isaiah 56:1**; **59:16**; and especially **Zechariah 9:9**, of which a different rendering is proposed.

On **Exodus 40:9, 11** there is in the Targum Pseudo-Jon. distinct reference to the King Messiah, on whose account the anointing oil was to be used.

[90] The promise (**Leviticus 26:12**) is also referred to the latter, or Messianic, days in Yalkut 62 (vol. i. p. 17 *b*).

Leviticus 26:13 is applied to Messianic times. See our remarks on **Genesis 2:4**.

The promise of peace in the Aaronic benediction **Numbers 6:26** is referred to the peace of the Kingdom of David, in accordance with **Isaiah 9:7** (Siphre on Num. par. 42, ed. Friedmann, p. 12 *b*).

Numbers 7:12. In connection with this it is marked that the six blessings which were lost by the Fall are to be restored by the son of Nahshon, i.e. the Messiah (Bem. R. 13, ed. W. p. 51 *a*).

In the Jerusalem Targum on **Numbers 11:26** the prophecy of Eldad and Medad is supposed to have been with regard to the war of the later days against Jerusalem and to the defeat of Gog and Magog by the Messiah.

In **Numbers 23:21** the term King is expressly referred to the Messiah in Targum Pseudo-Jon. So also **Numbers 24:7** in the Jer. Targum.

In **Numbers 24:17** Balaam's prediction of the Star and Sceptre is referred to the Messiah in the Targum Onkelos and the Targum Pseudo-Jonathan, as well as in Jer. Taan. iv. 8; Deb. R. 1; Midr. on **Lamentations 2:2**. Similarly *verses 20 and 24* of that prophecy are ascribed in the Targum Pseudo-Jon. to the Messiah.

—[Numbers 27:16](#). In connection with this verse it is noticed that His one Spirit is worth as much as all other spirits, according to [Isaiah 11:1](#) (Yalkut, vol. i. p. 247 a).

[Deuteronomy 1:8](#) is applied to the days of the Messiah in Siphre, 67 a.

In the comments of Tanchuma on [Deuteronomy 8:1](#). (ed. Warsh. p. 104 b, 105 a) there are several allusions to Messianic days.

[Deuteronomy 11:21](#) is applied in Siphre Par. 47 (ed. Friedmann, p. 83 a) to the days of the Messiah.

In [Deuteronomy 16:3](#) the record of the deliverance from Egypt is supposed to be carried on to the days of the Messiah, in Siphre, Par. 130 (ed. Friedmann, p. 101 a). See, also, Ber. i. 5.

On [Deuteronomy 19:8, 9](#) it is noted, in Siphre on Deut., Par. 185 (ed. Friedm. p. 108 b), that as three of these cities were in territory never possessed by Israel, this was to be fulfilled in Messianic times. See also Jer. Macc. ii. 7.

In Tanchuma on [Deuteronomy 20:10](#) (Par. 19, ed. Warsh. p. 114 b) the offer of peace to a hostile city is applied to the future action of Messiah to the Gentiles, in accordance with [Zechariah 9:10](#); [Isaiah 2:4](#); and [Psalm 68:32](#); while, on the other hand, the resistance of a city to the offer of peace is likened to rebellion against the Messiah, and consequent judgment, according to [Isaiah 11:4](#).

[91]

[Deuteronomy 23:11](#) is typically applied to the evening of time, when God would wash away the filth of the daughters of Zion ([Isaiah 4:4](#)); and the words: when the sun is down to when King Messiah would come (Tanchuma on Par. Ki Thetse 3, ed. Warsh. p. 115 b).

[Deuteronomy 25:19](#) and [Deuteronomy 30:4](#) are referred by the Targum Pseudo-Jon. the Messianic times. In the latter passage the gathering of dispersed Israel by Elijah, and their being brought back by Messiah, are spoken of. Comp. also Bem. R., last three lines.

On [Deuteronomy 32:7](#) Siphre (Par. 210, ed. Friedm. p. 134 a) makes the beautiful observation, that in all Israel's afflictions they were to remember the good and comfortable things which God had promised them for the future world, and in connection with this there is special reference to the time of the Messiah.

On [Deuteronomy 32:30](#) Siphre (p. 138 a) marks its fulfilment in the days of the Messiah.

On [Deuteronomy 33:5](#) the Jer. Targum speaks of a king whom the tribes of Israel shall obey, this being evidently the King Messiah.

[Deuteronomy 33:17](#). Tanchuma on [Genesis 1](#). Par. 1 (ed. Warsh. p. 4 a) applies this to the Messiah. So also in Benidb. R. 14.

[Deuteronomy 33:12](#). The expression, he shall cover him is referred to this world; all the day long to the days of the Messiah; and he shall dwell between his shoulders to the world to come (Sebach. 118 b).

[Judges 5:31](#): let them that love Him be as the sun when he goeth forth in his might is applied to Messianic times in Ber. R. 12. See our remarks on [Genesis 2:4](#).

[92] On [Ruth 2:14](#): come hither at the time of meat the Midr. R. [Ruth 5](#) (ed. Warsh. p. 43 a and b), has a very remarkable interpretation. Besides the application of the word eat as beyond this present time, to the days of the Messiah, and again to the world to come, which is to follow these days, the Midrash applies the whole of it mystically to the Messiah, viz. Come hither that is, draw near to the kingdom, and eat of the bread that is, the bread of royalty, and dip thy morsel in vinegar'—these are the sufferings, as it is written in [Isaiah 53:5](#), He was wounded for our transgression. And she sat beside the reapers'—because His Kingdom would in the further be put aside from Him for a short time, according to [Zechariah 14:2](#); and he reached her parched corn'—because He will restore it to Him, according to [Isaiah 11:4](#). R. Berachiah, in the name of R. Levi, adds, that the second Redeemer should be like the first. As the first Redeemer (Moses) appeared, and disappeared, and reappeared after three months, so the second Redeemer would also appear, and disappear, and again become manifest, [Daniel 12:11, 12](#) being brought into connection with it. Comp. Midr. on Cant. ii. 9; Pesik. 49 a, b. Again, the words, she ate, and was sufficed, and left are thus interpreted in Shabb. 113 b: she ate—in this world; and was sufficed—in the days of the Messiah; and left—for the world to come.

Again, the Targum on [Ruth 1:1](#) speaks of the Messiah; and again on [Ruth 3:15](#) paraphrases the six measures of barley as referring to six righteous ones, of which the last was the Messiah, and who were each to have six special blessings.

— **Ruth 4:18**. The Messiah is called the son of Pharez who restores what had been lost to humanity through the fall of Adam. See our remarks on **Genesis 2:4**.

The Messianic interpretation of **Ruth 4:20** has already been given under **Genesis 4:25**.

1 Samuel 2:10. The latter clause of this promise is understood by the Targum (and also is some of the Medrashim) as applying to the Kingdom of the Messiah.

2 Samuel 22:28. In a Talmudic passage (Sanh. 98 *a*, line 19, &c., from the bottom), which contains many references to the coming of the Messiah, His advent is predicted in connection with this passage.

2 Samuel 23:1 is applied by the Targum to the prophecy of David concerning the latter Messianic days.

2 Samuel 23:3. The ruling in the fear of God is referred in the Targum to the future raising up of the Messiah.

In **2 Samuel 23:4** the morning light at sunrise is explained in the Midrash on the passage (par. 29, ed. Lemberg, p. 56 *b*, lines 7-9 from the top), as applying to the appearance of the Messiah.

The expression, **1 Kings 4:33**, that Solomon spoke of trees, is referred in the Targum to his prophecy concerning kings that were to reign in this age, and in that of the Messiah.

On the name Anani in **1 Chronicles 3:24**, the Targum remarks that this is the Messiah, the interpretation being that the word anani is connected with the word similarly written (not punctuated) in **Deuteronomy 7:13**, and there translated clouds of which the explanation is given in Tanchuma (Par. Toledoth 14, p. 27 *b*).

Psalms 2. as might be expected, is treated as full of Messianic references. To begin with, **Psalms 2:1** is applied to the wars of Gog and Magog in the Talmud (Berach. 7 *b* and Abhod. Zarah 3 *b*), and also in the Midrash on **Psalms 2**. Similarly, verse 2 is applied to the Messiah in Abhod. Zach, u. s., in the Midrash on **Psalms 92:11** (ed. Warsh. p. 70 *b*, line 8 from the top); in Pirqué de R. Eliez. c. 28 (ed. Lemberg, p. 33 *b*, line 9 from top). In Yalkut (vol. ii. par. 620, p. 90 *a*, line 12 from the bottom), we have the following remarkable simile on the words, against God, and His Messiah likening them to a robber who stands defiantly behind the palace of the king, and says, If I shall find the son of the king, I shall lay hold on him, and crucify him, and kill him with a cruel death. But the Holy Spirit

mocks at him, He that sitteth in the heavens shall laugh. On the same verse the Midrashon [Psalm 2](#). has a curious conceit, intended to show that each who rose against God and His people thought he was wiser than he who had preceded him. If Cain had killed his brother while his father was alive, forgetful that there would be other sons, Esau proposed to wait till after his father's death. Pharaoh, again, blamed Esau for his folly in forgetting that in the meantime Jacob would have children, and hence proposed to kill all the male children, while Haman, ridiculing Pharaoh's folly in forgetting that there were daughters set himself to destroy the whole people; and, in turn, Gog and Magog, ridiculing the shortsightedness of all, who had preceded them, in taking counsel against Israel so long as they had a Patron in heaven, resolved first to attack their heavenly Patron, and after that Israel. To which apply the words, against the Lord, and against His Anointed.

[94] But to return [Psalm 2:4](#) is Messianically applied in the Talmud (Abhod. Z. u. s.). [Psalm 2:6](#) is applied to the Messiah in the Midrash on [1 Samuel 16:1](#) (Par. 19, ed. Lemberg, p. 45 *a* and *b*), where it is said that of the three measures of sufferings² one goes to the King Messiah, of whom it is written ([Isaiah 53](#).) He was wounded for our transgression. They say to the King Messiah: Where dost Thou seek to dwell? He answers: Is this question also necessary? In Zion My holy hill ([Psalm 2:6](#)). (Comp. also Yalkut ii. p. 53 *c*.)

[Psalm 2:7](#) is quoted as Messianic in the Talmud, among a number of other Messianic quotations (Sukk. 52 *a*). There is a very remarkable passage in the Midrash on [Psalm 2:7](#) (ed. Warsh p. 5 *a*), in which the unity of Israel and the Messiah in prophetic vision seems clearly indicated. Tracing the decree through the Law, the Prophets, and the Hagiograph, the first passage quoted in [Exodus 4:22](#): Israel is My first-born son; the second, from the Prophets, [Isaiah 52:13](#): Behold My servants shall deal prudently and [Isaiah 42:1](#): Behold My servant, whom I uphold; the third, from the Hagiographa, [Psalm 110:1](#): The Lord said unto my Lord and again, [Psalm 2:7](#): The Lord said unto Me, Thou art My Son and yet this other saying ([Daniel 7:13](#)): Behold, one like the Son of Man came with the clouds of

²As to these three measures of sufferings, and the share falling to the age of the Messiah see also the Midrash on [Psalm 2:7](#).

heaven. Five lines further down, the same Midrash, in reference to the words Thou art My Son observes that, when that hour comes, God speaks to Him to make a new covenant, and thus He speaks: This day have I begotten Thee'—this is the hour in which He become His Son.

[Psalm 2:8](#) is applied in Ber. R. 44 (ed. Warsh. p. 80 *a*) and in the Midrash on the passage, to the Messiah, with the curious remark that there were three of whom it was said Ask of Me'—Solomon, Ahaz, ³ and the Messiah. In the Talmud (Shukk. 52 *a*) the same passage is very curiously applied, it being suggested that, when the Messiah, the Son of David, saw that the Messiah, the Son of Joseph, ⁴ would be killed, He said to the Almighty, I seek nothing of Thee except life. To which the reply was: Life before Thou hadst spoken, as David Thy father prophesied of Thee, [Psalm 21:4](#).

[Psalm 2:9](#) will be referred to in our remarks on [Psalm 120](#).

[Psalm 16:5](#) is discussed in Ber. R. 88, in connection with the cup which Pharaoh's butler saw in his dream. From this the Midrash proceeds to speak of the four cups appointed for the Passover night, and to explain their meaning in various manners, among others, contrasting the four cups of fury, which God would make the nations drink, with the four cups of salvation which He would give Israel in the latter days, viz. [Psalm 16:5](#); [Psalm 116:13](#); [Psalm 23:5](#). The expression, [Psalm 116:13](#), rendered in our A. V. the cup of salvation is in the original, the cup of salvations'—and is explained as implying on one for the days of the Messiah, and the other for the days of Gog. [95]

On *verse 9*, the Midrash on the passage says: My glory shall rejoice in the King Messiah, Who in the future shall come forth from me, as it is written in [Isaiah 4:5](#): “upon all the glory a covering.” And the Midrash continues my flesh also shall dwell in safety'—i.e. after death, to teach us that corruption and the worm shall not rule over it.

[Psalm 18:31](#) (in the Heb. verse 32). The Targum explains this in reference to the works and miracles of the Messiah.

³The Midrash gives two very curious explanations of his name.

⁴On the twofold Messiah, or rather the device of the Jews on this subject, see in the text of the chapter. I cannot but suspect that the words Son of Joseph in the Talmud are a later and clumsy emendation, since what follows evidently applies to the Son of David.

Psalm 18:50 is referred in Jer. Talmud (Ber. ii. 4, p. 5 *a*, line 11 from the top), and in the Midr. on **Lamentations 1:16**, to the Messiah, with this curious remark, implying the doubt whether He was alive or dead: The king Messiah, whether He belong to the living or the dead, His Name is to be David, according to **Psalm 18:50**.

Psalm 21:1 (2 in the Hebrew)—the King there spoken of is explained by the Targum to be King Messiah. The Midrash on the passage identifies him with **Isaiah 11:10**, on which Rabbi Chanina adds that the object of the Messiah is to give certain commandments to the Gentiles (not to Israel, who are to learn from God Himself), according to the passage in Isaiah above quoted, adding that the words his rest shall be glorious mean that God gives to the King Messiah from the glory above, as it is said: In Thy strength shall the king rejoice which strength is a little afterwards explained as the Kingdom (ed. Warsh. p. 30 *a* and *b*).

Verse 3 is Messianically applied in the Midrash on the passage.

Psalm 21:3 (4 in the Hebrew). Only a few lines farther down in the same Midrash, among remarkable Messianic applications, is that of this verse to the Messiah, where also the expression Jehovah is a man of war and Jehovah Zidkenu are applied to the Messiah.⁵ Comp. also Shemoth R. 8, where it is noted that God will crown Him with His own crown.

[96] *Verse 4* is Messianically applied in Sukk. 52 *a*.

Psalm 21:5 (6 in the Hebrew). The first clause of this verse. Yalkut on **Numbers 27:20** (vol. i. p. 248 *a*, line 10 from the bottom) applies to the glory of the King Messiah, immediately quoting the second clause in proof of its Messianic application. This is also done in the Midrash on the passage. But perhaps one of the most remarkable applications of it is in Bemidbar R. 15, p. 63 *b*, where the passage is applied to the Messiah.

Finally in **Psalm 21:7** (8 in the Hebrew), the expression king is applied in the Targum to the Messiah.

On the whole, then, it may be remarked that **Psalm 21**. was throughout regarded as Messianic.

⁵The idea of an organic connection between Israel and the Messiah seems also to underlie this passage.

—On **Psalm 22:7** (8 in the Hebrew) a remarkable comment appears in Yalkut on **Isaiah 60.**, applying this passage to the Messiah (the second, or son of Ephraim), and using almost the same words in which the Evangelists describe the mocking behaviour of the Jews at the Cross.

Psalm 22:15 (16 in the Hebrew). There is a similarly remarkable application to the Messiah of this verse in Yalkut.

The promise in **Psalm 23:5** is referred in Benid. R. 21 to the spreading of the great feast before Israel in the latter days.

Psalm 31:19 (20 in the Hebrew) is in the Midrash applied to the reward that in the latter days Israel would receive for their faithfulness. Also in Pesiqta, p. 149 *b*, to the joy of Israel in the presence of the Messiah.

The expression in **Psalm 36:9**, In Thy light shall we see light is applied to the Messiah in Yalkut on **Isaiah 60.** (vol. ii. p. 56 *c*, line 22 from the bottom).

The application of **Psalm 40:7** to the Messiah has already been noted in our remarks on **Genesis 4:25.**

Psalm 45. is throughout regarded as Messianic. To begin with; the Targum renders *verse 2* (3 in the Hebrew): Thy beauty, O King Messiah, is greater than that of the sons of men.

Verse 3 (4 in the Hebrew) is applied in the Talmud (Shabb 63 *a*) to the Messiah, although other interpretations of that verse immediately follow.

The application of *verse 6* (7 in the Hebrew), to the Messiah in a MS. copy of the Targum has already been referred to in another part of his book, while the words, Thy throne is forever and ever are brought into connection with the promise that the sceptre would not depart from Judah in Ber. R. 99, ed. Warsh. p. 178 *b*, line 9 from the bottom.

On *verse 7* the Targum though not in the Venice edition (1568), has: Thou O King Messiah because Thou lovest righteousness &c. Comp. *Levy*, Targum. Wörterb. vol. ii. p. 41 *a*. [97]

The Midrash on the Psalm deals exclusively with the inscription (of which it has several and significant interpretations) with the opening words of the Psalm, and with the words (*ver. 16*), Instead of thy fathers shall be thy children but at the same time it clearly indicates that the Psalm applies to the latter, or Messianic, days.

On [Psalm 50:2](#) Siphre (p. 143 *a*) notes that four times God would appear, the last being in the days of King Messiah.

[Psalm 60:7](#). Bemidbar R. on [Numbers 7:48](#), Parash. 14 (ed. Warsh p. 54 *a*) contains some very curious Haggadic discussion on this verse. But it also broaches the opinion of its reference to the Messiah.

[Psalm 61:6](#) (7 in the Hebrew). Thou shalt add days to the days of the king is rendered by the Targum: Thou shalt add days to the days of King Messiah. There is a curious gloss on this in Pirqé d. R. Eliez. c. 19 (ed. Lemberg, p. 24 *b*), in which Adam is supposed to have taken 70 of his years, and added them to those of King David. According to another tradition, this accounts for Adam living 930 years, this is, 70 less than 1,000, which constitute before God one day, and so the threatening had been literally fulfilled: In the day thou eatest thereof, thou shalt die.

[Psalm 61:8](#) (9 in the Hebrew). The expression, that I may daily perform my vows is applied in the Targum to the day in which the Messiah is anointed King.

[Psalm 68:31](#) (32 in the Hebrew). On the words Princes shall come out of Egypt there is a very remarkable comment in the Talmud (Pes. 118 *b*) and in Shemoth R. on [Exodus 26:15](#), &c. (ed. Warsh. p. 50 *b*), in which we are told that in the latter days all nations would bring gifts to the King Messiah, beginning with Egypt. And lest it be thought that He (Messiah) would not accept it from them, the Holy One says to the Messiah: Accept from them hospitable entertainment or it might be rendered, Accept it from them; they have given hospitable entertainment to My son.

[98] [Psalm 72](#). This Psalm also was viewed by the ancient Synagogue as throughout Messianic, as indicated by the fact that the Targum renders the very first verse: Give the sentence of Thy judgment to the King Messiah, and Thy justice to the Son of David the King which is re-echoed by the Midrash on the passage (ed. Warsh. p. 55 *b*) which applies it explicitly to the Messiah, with reference to [Isaiah 11:1](#). Similarly, the Talmud applies ver. 16 to Messianic times (in a very hyperbolic passage, Shabb. 30 *b*, line 4 from the bottom). The last clause of verse 16 is applied, in Keth. 111 *b*, line 21 from top,

Rabbinic Writings (Book II, ch. 5.) and again in the Midr. on [Ecclesiastes 1:9](#), to the Messiah sending down manna like Moses. ^{ci} ⁶

Verse 17. In Sanh. 98 *b*; Pes. 54 *a*; Ned. 39 *b*, the various names of the Messiah are discussed, and also in Ber. R. 1; in Midr. on [Lamentations 1:16](#), and in Pirqé de R. Eliez. c. 3. One of these is stated to be Jinnon, according to [Psalm 72:17](#).

Verse 8 is applied in Pirqé de R. El. c. 11, to the Messiah. Yalkut (vol. ii.) on [Isaiah 55:8](#) (p. 54 *c*), speaks of the other Redeemer as the Messiah, applying to him [Psalm 72:8](#).

In commenting on the meeting of Jacob and Esau, the Midr. Ber. R. (78, ed. Warsh. p. 141 *b*) remarks that all the gifts which Jacob gave to Esau, the nations of the world would return to the King Messiah—proving it by a reference to [Psalm 72:10](#); while in Midrash Bemidbar R. 13 it is remarked that as the nations brought gifts to Solomon, so they would bring them to the King Messiah.

In the same place, a little higher up, Solomon and the Messiah are likened as reigning over the whole world, the proof passages being, besides others, [Psalm 72:8](#), [Daniel 7:13](#), and [2:35](#).

On the application to the Messiah of *verse 16* we have already spoken, as also on that of *verse 17*.

[Psalm 80:17](#) (in the Hebrew 18). The Targum paraphrases the Son of Man by King Messiah.

[Psalm 89:22-25](#) (23-26 in the Hebrew). In Yalkut on [Isaiah 60:1](#) (vol. ii. p. 56 *c*) this promise is referred to the future deliverance of Israel by the Messiah.

Again, *verse 27* (28 in the Hebrew) is applied in Shemoth R. 19, towards the end, to the Messiah, special reference being made to [Exodus 4:22](#), Israel is My first-born son.

Verse 51 (52 in the Hebrew). There is a remarkable comment on this in the Midrash on the inscription of [Psalm 18](#). (ed. Warsh. p. 24 *a*, line 2 from the bottom), in which it is set forth that as Israel and David did not sing till the hour of persecution and reproach, so when the Messiah shall come—speedily, in our days’—the song will not be raised until the Messiah is put to reproach, according to [Psalm 89:52](#) (51), and till there shall fall before Him the wicked idolaters referred to in [Daniel 2:42](#), and the four kingdoms referred

[99]

⁶See the passage in Sanh. 96 *b* &c. given at the close of this Appendix.

to in [Zechariah 14:2](#). In that hour shall the song be raised, as it is written [Psalm 98:1](#).

In the Midr. on Cant. ii. 13 it is said: If you see one generation after another blaspheming, expect the feet of the King Messiah, as it is written, [Psalm 89:53](#).

[Psalm 90:15](#). The Midr. (ed. Warsh. p. 67 *b*) remarks: The days wherein Thou hast afflicted us—that is, the days of the Messiah. Upon which follows a discussion upon the length of days of the Messiah, R. Eliezer holding that they are 1,000 years, quoting the words as yesterday one day being 1,000 years. R. Joshua holds that they were 2,000 years, the words the days implying that there were two days. R. Berachiah holds that they were 600 years, appealing to [Isaiah 65:22](#), because the root of the tree perishes in the earth in 600 years. R. José thinks that they are 60 years, according to [Psalm 72:5](#), the words throughout all generations (*dor dorim*) being interpreted: Dor = 20 years; Dorim = 40 years: 20 + 40 = 60. R. Akiba says: 40 years, according to the years in the wilderness. The Rabbis say: 354 years, according to the days in the lunar year. R. Abahu thinks 7,000 years, reckoning the 7 according to the days of the bridegroom.

On [Psalm 90](#). the Midrash concludes by drawing a contrast between the Temple which men built, and which was destroyed, and the Temple of the latter or Messianic days, which God would build, and which would not be destroyed.

[Psalm 92.](#), *verses* 8, 11, and 13 (7, 10, and 12 in our A. V.), are Messianically interpreted in *Pirqé de R. El. c. 19*. In the Midrash on *verse* 13 (12 in our A. V.), among other beautiful applications of the figure of the Psalm, is that to the Messiah the Son of David. The note of the Midrash on the expression like a cedar of Lebanon as applied to Israel, is very beautiful, likening it to the cedar, which, although driven and bent by all the winds of heaven, cannot be rooted up from its place.

[100] [Psalm 95:7](#), *last clause*. In *Shem. R. 25* and in the Midrash on Cant. v. 2 (ed. Warsh. p. 26 *a*), it is noted that, if Israel did penitence only one day [or else properly observed even one Sabbath], the Messiah the Son of David would immediately come. [The whole passage from which this reference is taken is exceedingly interesting. It introduces God as saying to Israel: My son, open to Me a door of penitence only as small as a needle's eye, and I will open to

~~you doors through which carriages and wagons shall come in.~~ It almost seems a counterpart to the Saviour's words ([Revelation 3:20](#)): Behold, I stand at the door and knock; if any man hear My voice and open the door, I will come in to Him.'] Substantially the same view is taken in Sanh. 98 *a*, where the tokens of the coming of the Messiah are described—and also in Jer. Taan. 64 *a*.

[Psalm 102:16](#) (17 in the Hebrew) is applied in Bereshith R. 56 (ed. Warsh. p. 104 *b*) to Messianic times.

[Psalm 106:44](#). On this there is in the Midrash a long Messianic discussion, setting forth the five grounds on which Israel is redeemed: through the sorrows of Israel through prayer, through the merits of the patriarchs, through repentance towards God, and in the time of the end.

[Psalm 110](#). is throughout applied to the Messiah. To begin with, it evidently underlies the Targumic of [ver. 4](#). Similarly, it is propounded in the Midr. on [Psalm 2](#). (although there the chief application of it is to Abraham). But in the Midrash on [Psalm 18:36](#) (35 in our A. V.), Ps. cx. [verse 1](#), Sit thou at My right hand is specially applied to the Messiah, while Abraham is said to be seated at the left.

[Verse 2](#), The rod of Thy strength. In a very curious mystic interpretation of the pledges which Tamar had, by the Holy Ghost, asked of Judah, the seal is interpreted as signifying the Kingdom, the bracelet as the Sanhedrin, and the staff as the King Messiah, with special reference to [Isaiah 11](#). and [Psalm 110:2](#) (Beresh. R. 85, ed. Warsh. p. 153 *a*) Similarly in Bemid. R. 18, last line, the staff of Aaron, which is said to have been in the hands of every king till the Temple was destroyed, and since then to have been hid, is to be restored to King Messiah, according to this verse; and in Yalkut on this Psalm (vol. ii. Par. 869, p. 124 *c*) this staff is supposed to be the same as that of Jacob with which he crossed Jordan, and of Judah, and of Moses, and of Aaron, and the same which David had in his hand when he slew Goliath, it being also the same which will be restored to the Messiah.

[Verse 7](#) is also applied in Yalkut (u. s. col. *d*) to Messianic times, when streams of the blood of the wicked should flow out, and birds come to drink of that flood.

[Psalm 116:9](#) is in Ber. R. 96 supposed to indicate that the dead of Palestine would live first in the days of the Messiah.

[Psalm 116:13](#) has been already commented upon.

On [Psalm 119:33](#) the Midrash remarks that there were three who asked wisdom of God: David, Solomon, and the King Messiah, the latter according to [Psalm 72:1](#).

[Psalm 120:7](#) is applied to the Messiah in the Midrash (p. 91 *a*, ed. Warsh.), the first clause being brought into connection with [Isaiah 57:19](#), with reference to the Messiah's dealings with the Gentiles, the resistance being described in the second clause, and the result in [Psalm 2:9](#).

[Psalm 121:1](#) is applied in Tanchuma (Par. Toledoth 14, ed. Warsh. p. 37 *b*. See also Yalkut, vol. ii. 878, p. 127 *c*) to the Messiah, with special reference to [Zechariah 4:7](#) and [Isaiah 52:7](#).

[Psalm 126:2](#). In Tanchuma on [Exodus 15](#). i. (ed. Warsh. p. 87 *a*) this verse is applied to Messianic times in a rapt description, in which successively [Isaiah 60:5](#), [Isaiah 58:8](#), [Isaiah 35:5, 6](#), [Jeremiah 31:13](#), and [Psalm 126:2](#), are grouped together as all applying to these latter days.

The promise in [Psalm 132:18](#) is applied in Pirké de R. El. c. 28 to Messianic times, and *verse* 14 in Ber. R. 56.

So is [Psalm 133:3](#) in Ber. R. 65 (p. 122 *a*), closing lines.

The words in [Psalm 142:5](#) are applied in Ber. R. 74 to the resurrection of Israel in Palestine in the days of Messiah.

The words, When thou awakest in [Proverbs 6:22](#) are Messianically applied in Siphre on Deut. (ed. *Friedmann*, p. 74 *b*).

In Midr. on [Ecclesiastes 1:9](#) it is shown at great length that the Messiah would re-enact all the miracles of the past.

The last clause of Ecclesiastes 1:11. is applied to the days of the Messiah in the Targum.

[Ecclesiastes 7:24](#) is thus paraphrased in the Targum: Behold, it is remote from the sons of men that they should know what was done from the beginning of the world, but a mystery is the day of death—and the day when shall come King Messiah, who can find it out by his wisdom?

In the Midr. on [Ecclesiastes 11:8](#) it is noted that, however many years a man might study, his learning would be empty before the

Appendix 9—List of Old Testament Passages Messianically Applied in Ancient Rabbinic Writings (Book II. ch. 5.)^{cv}
teaching of Messiah. In the Midr. on [Ecclesiastes 12:1](#) it is noted that the evil days are those of the woes of Messiah.

Canticles. Here we have first the Talmudic passage (Sheb. 35 *b*) in which the principle is laid down, that whenever throughout that book Solomon is named, except in chap 8:12, it applies, not to Solomon, but to Him Who was His peace (there is here a play on these words, and on the name Solomon). [102]

To *Cant. i. 8* the Targum makes this addition: They shall be nourished in the captivity, until the time that I shall send to them the King Messiah, Who will feed them in quietness.

So also on *verse 17* the Targum contrasts the Temple built by Solomon with the far superior Temple to be built in the days of the Messiah, of which the beams were to be made of the cedars of Paradise.

Cant. ii. 8, although applied by most authorities to Moses, is by others referred to the Messiah (Shir haShirim R., ed. Warsh., p. 15 *a*, about the middle; Pesiqta, ed. Buber, p. 47 *b*). *Cant. ii. 9* is Messianically applied in Pesiqta, ed. Buber, p. 49, *a* and *b*.

The same may be said of *verse 10*; while in connection with *verse 12*, in similar application, [Isaiah 52:7](#) is quoted.

In connection with *verse 13*, in the same Midrash (p. 17 *a*), Rabbi Chija bar Abba speaks of a great matter as happening close to the days of the Messiah, viz., that the wicked should be destroyed, quoting in regard to it [Isaiah 4:3](#).

Cant. iii. 11, the day of his espousals. In Yalkut on the passage (vol. ii. p. 178 *d*) this is explained: the day of the Messiah, because the Holy One, blessed be His name, is likened to a bridegroom; “as the bridegroom rejoiceth over the bride”—and the day of the gladness of his heart as the day when the Sanctuary is rebuilt, and Jerusalem is redeemed.

On Cant. iv. 5 the Targum again introduces the twofold Messiah, the one the son of David, and the other the son of Ephraim.

Cant. iv. 16. According to one opinion in the Midrash (p. 25 *b*, line 13 from the bottom) this applies to the Messiah, Who comes from the north, and builds the Temple, which is in the south. See also Bemidbar R. 13, p. 48 *b*.

On *Cant. v. 10* Yalkut remarks that He is white to Israel, and red to the Gentiles, according to [Isaiah 63:2](#).

[103] On *Cant. vi. 10* Yalkut (vol. ii. p. 184 *b*) has some beautiful observations, first, likening Israel in the wilderness, and God's mighty deeds there, to the morning; and then adding that, according to another view, this morning light is the redemption of the Messiah: For as, when the morning rises, the darkness flees before it, so shall darkness fall upon the kingdoms of this world when the Messiah comes. And yet again, as the sun and moon appear, so will the Kingdom of the Messiah also appear—the commentation going on to trace farther illustrations.

Cant. vii. 6. The Midrash thus comments on it (among other explanations): How fair in the world to come, how pleasant in the days of the Messiah!

On *Cant. vii. 13*, the Targum has it: When it shall please God to deliver His people from captivity, then shall it be said to the Messiah: The time of captivity is past, and the merit of the just shall be sweet before Me like the odour of balsam.

Similarly on *Cant. viii. 1*, the Targum has it: And at that shall the King Messiah be revealed to the congregation of Israel, and the children of Israel shall say to Him, Come and be a brother to us, and let us go up to Jerusalem, and there suck with thee the meaning of the Law, as an infant its mother's breast.

On *Cant. viii. 2* the Targum has it: I will take Thee, O King Messiah, and make thee go up into my Temple, there Thou shalt teach me to tremble before the Lord, and to walk in His ways. There we shall hold the feast of leviathan, and drink the old wine, which has been kept in its grapes from the day the world was created, and of the pomegranates and of the fruits which are prepared for the just in the Garden of Eden.

On *verse 4* the Targum says: The King Messiah shall say: I adjure you, My people, house of Israel, why should you rise against the Gentiles, to go out of captivity, and why should you rebel against the might of Gog and Magog? Wait a little, till those nations are consumed which go up to fight against Jerusalem, and then shall the Lord of the world remember you, and it shall be His good will to set you free.

Chap. viii. 11 is applied Messianically in the Talmud (*Shebhu. 35 b*), and so is *verse 12* in the Targum.

Appendix 9—List of Old Testament Passages Messianically Applied in Ancient Rabbinic Writings (Book II, ch. 5.) cvii
—(It should, however, be remarked that there are many other Messianic references in the comments on the Song of Solomon.)

[Isaiah 1:25, 26](#), is thus explained in the Talmud (Sanh. 98 *a*): The Son of David shall not come till all the judges and rulers in Israel shall have ceased.

Similarly [Isaiah 2:4](#) is Messianically interpreted in Shabb. 63 *a*.

[Isaiah 4:2](#) the Targum distinctly applies to the times of the Messiah.

[Isaiah 4:4](#) has been already commented upon in our remarks on [Genesis 18:4, 5](#), and again on [Deuteronomy 23:11](#). [104]

Verses 5 and 6 are brought into connection with Israel's former service in contributing to, and making the Tabernacle in the wilderness, and it is remarked that in the latter days God would return it to them by covering them with a cloud of glory. This, in Yalkut (vol. i. p. 99 *c*), and in the Midrash on [Psalm 13.](#), as also in that on [Psalm 16:9](#).

[Isaiah 6:13](#) is referred in the Talmud (Keth. 112 *b*) to Messianic times.

The reference of [Isaiah 7:21](#) to Messianic times has already been discussed in our notes on [Genesis 18:7](#).

[Isaiah 8:14](#) is also Messianically applied in the Talmud (Sanh. 38 *a*).

[Isaiah 9:6](#) is expressly applied to the Messiah in the Targum, and there is a very curious comment in Debarim R. 1 (ed. Warsh., p. 4 *a*) in connection with a Haggadic discussion of [Genesis 43:14](#), which, however fanciful, makes a Messianic application of this passage—also in Bemidbar R. 11.

Verse 7, Of the increase of his government and peace there shall be no end has already been referred to in our comments on [Numbers 6:26](#).

[Isaiah 10:27](#) is in the Targum applied to the destruction of the Gentiles before the Messiah. [Isaiah 10:34](#), is quoted in the Midrash on [Lamentations 1:16](#), in evidence that somehow the birth of the Messiah was to be connected with the destruction of the Temple.

[Isaiah 11.](#), as will readily be believed, is Messianically interpreted in Jewish writings. Thus, to begin with in the Targum on *verses 1 and 6*; in the Talmud (Jer. Berach. 5 *a* and Sanh. 93 *b*); and in a number of passages in the Midrashim. Thus, *verse 1* in

Bereshith R. 85 on [Genesis 38:18](#), where also [Psalm 110:2](#) is quoted, and in Ber. R. 99, ed. Warsh., p. 178 *b*. In Yalkut (vol. i. p. 247 *d*, near the top), where it is described how God had shown Moses all the spirits of the rulers and prophets in Israel, from that time forward to the Resurrection, it is said that all these had one knowledge and one spirit, but that the Messiah had one spirit which was equal to all the others put together, according to [Isaiah 11:1](#).

On the *2nd verse* see our remarks on [Genesis 1:2](#), while in Yalkut on [Proverbs 3:19, 20](#) (vol. ii. p. 133 *a*) the verse is quoted in connection with Messianic times, when by wisdom, understanding, and knowledge the Temple will be built again. On that verse see also pirq. d. R. El. 3.

[105] On [Isaiah 11:3](#) the Talmud (Sanh. 93 *b*, lines 21 &c. from the top) has a curious explanation. After quoting ch 11:2 as Messianic, it makes a play on the words, of quick understanding or scent as it might be rendered, and suggest that this word *wxyrhw* is intended to teach us that God has laden Him with commandments and sufferings like *millstones* (*Myxyrk*). Immediately afterwards, from the expression He shall not judge after the sight of His eyes, but reprove with equity for the meek of the earth it is inferred that the Messiah knew the thoughts of the heart, and it is added that, as Bar Kokhabh was unable to do this, he was killed.

Verse 4, he shall smite the earth with the rod of his mouth is Messianically applied in the Midrash on [Psalm 2:2](#), and in that on [Ruth 2:14](#)—also in Yalkut on [Isaiah 60](#).

Verse 7 has been already noticed in connection with [Exodus 12:2](#).

On *verse 10* see our remarks on [Genesis 49:10](#) and [Psalm 21:1](#).

Verse 11 is Messianically applied in Yalkut (vol. i. p. 31 *b* and vol. ii. 38 *a*), as also in the Midrash on [Psalm 107:2](#).

Verse 12 is Messianically applied in that curious passage in the Midrash on [Lamentations 1:2](#), where it is indicated that, as the children of Israel sinned from to so God would in the latter days comfort them from to (i.e. through the whole alphabet), Scripture passages being in each case quoted.

The Messianic application of [Isaiah 12:3](#) is sufficiently established by the ancient symbolic practice of pouring out the water on the Feast of Tabernacles.

—In connection with [Isaiah 11:5](#) the Midrash on [Psalm 118:23](#) first speak of the wonderment of the Egyptians when they saw the change in Israel from servitude to glory of their Exodus, and then adds, that the words were intended by his Holy Ghost to apply to the wonders of the latter days (ed. Warsh. p. 85 *b*).

On [Isaiah 14:2](#), see our comments on [Genesis 18:4, 5](#).

[Isaiah 14:29](#), *xv. 2*, *xvi. 1*, and *xvi. 5* are Messianically applied in the Targum.

[Isaiah 18:5](#) is similarly applied in the Talmud (*Sanh. 98 a*); and [Isaiah 23:15](#) in *Sanh. 99 a*.

[Isaiah 21:11, 12](#) is in *Jer. Taan. 64 a*, and in *Shem. R. 18*, applied to the manifestation of Messiah.

[Isaiah 23:8](#) the Midr. on [Ecclesiastes 1:7](#) sees a curious reference to the return of this world's wealth to Israel in Messianic days.

[Isaiah 23:15](#) is Messianically applied in the Talmud (*Sanh 99 a*) where the expression a king is explained as referring to the Messiah.

[Isaiah 24:23](#) is Messianically applied in the curious passage in *Bemidbar R.* quoted under [Genesis 22:18](#); also in *Bemidbar R. 13* (ed. Warsh. p. 51 *a*).

[106]

The remarkable promise in [Isaiah 25:8](#) is applied to the times of the Messiah in the Talmud (*Moed Q. 28 b*), and in that most ancient commentary *Siphra*, (*Yalkut i. p. 190 d* applies the passage to the world to come). But the most remarkable interpretation is that which occurs in connection with [Isaiah 60:1](#) (*Yalkut ii. 56 c*, line 16 from the bottom), where the passage ([Isaiah 25:8](#)) is after an expostulation on the part of Satan with regard to the Messiah, applied to the casting into Gehenna of Satan and of the Gentiles. See also our remarks on [Exodus 12:2](#). In *Debar. R. 2*, [Isaiah 25:8](#) is applied to the destruction of the *Jetser ha-Ra* and the abolishing of death in Messianic days; in *Shem. R. 30* to the time of the Messiah.

Verse 9. *Tanchuma* on Deuteronomy opens with a record of how God would work all the miracles, which He had shown in the wilderness, in a fuller manner for Zion in the latter days, the last passage quoted in that section being [Isaiah 25:9](#). (*Tanchuma* on *Deut.* ed. Warsh. p. 99 *a*, line 5 from the bottom).

Of [Isaiah 26:19](#) there is Messianic application in the Midrash on [Ecclesiastes 1:7](#).

Of [Isaiah 27:10](#) Shem. R. 1, and Tanchuma on [Exodus 2:5](#) (ed. Warsh. p. 64 *b*) remark that, like Moses, the Messiah, Who would deliver His own from the worshippers of false gods, should be brought up with the latter in the land.

Verse 13 is quoted in the Talmud (Rosh. haSh. 11 *b*) in connection with the future deliverance. So also in Yalkut, i. p. 217 *d*, and Pirqé de R. El. c. 31.

[Isaiah 28:5](#) is thus paraphrased in the Targum: At that time shall the Messiah of the Lord of hosts be a crown of joy.

[Isaiah 28:16](#) the Targum apparently applies to the Messiah. At least, so Rashi (on the passage) understands it.

[Isaiah 30:18](#) is Messianically applied in Sanh 97 *b*; *verse 15* Jer. Taan. i. 1.

The expression in [Isaiah 30:19](#), he shall be very gracious unto thee is applied to the merits of the Messiah in Yalkut on [Zephaniah 3:8](#) (p. 84 *c*).

On *verse 25* see our remarks on [Genesis 18:4](#).

Verse 26 is applied to Messianic times in the Talmud (Pes. 68 *a*, and Sanh. 91 *b*), and similarly in Pirqé de R. El. 51, and Shemoth R. 50. So also in Ber. R. 12. see our remarks on [Genesis 2:4](#).

[107]

[Isaiah 32:14, 15](#). On this passage the Midrash of [Lamentations 3:49](#) significantly remarks that it is one of the three passages in which mention of the Holy Ghost follows upon mention of redemption, the other two passages being [Isaiah 22](#), followed by lxi. 1, and [Lamentations 3:49](#).

[Isaiah 32:20](#). The first clause is explained by Tanchuma (Par. 1. ed. Warsh. p. 4 *a*, first three lines) to apply to the study of the Law, and the second to the two Messiahs, the son of Joseph being likened to the ox, and the son of David to the ass, accordingly to [Zechariah 9:9](#); and similarly the verse is Messianically referred to in Deb. R. 6 (ed. Warsh. Vol. iii. p. 15 *b*), in a very curious play on the words in [Deuteronomy 22:6, 7](#), where the observance of that commandment is supposed to hasten the coming of King Messiah.

[Isaiah 35:1](#). This is one of the passages quoted in Tanchuma on [Deuteronomy 1:1](#). (ed. Warsh. p. 99 *a*) as among the miracles which God would do to redeem Zion in the latter days. So also is *verse 2* in this chapter.

Appendix 9—List of Old Testament Passages Messianically Applied in Ancient
— ^{Rabbinic Writings (Book II, ch. 5;)} ^{cxi}
[Isaiah 35:5, 6](#) is repeatedly applied to Messianic times. Thus, in
Yalkut i. 78 c, and 157 a; in Ber. R. 95; and in Midrash on [Psalm](#)
[146:8](#).

[Verse 10](#) is equally applied to Messianic times in the Midrash on [Psalm 107:1](#), while at the same time it is noted that this deliverance will be accomplished by God Himself, and not either by Elijah, nor by the King Messiah. ⁷ A similar reference occurs in Yalkut (vol. ii. p. 162 d), at the close of the Commentary on the Book of Chronicles, where it is remarked that in this world the deliverance of Israel was accomplished by man, and was followed by fresh captivities, but in the latter or Messianic days their deliverance would be accomplished by God, and would no more be followed by captivity. See also Shemoth R. 15 and 23.

[Isaiah 40:1](#) is one of the passages referred to in our note on [Isaiah 11:12](#), and also on [Isaiah 35:1](#).

The same remark applies to *verses 2 and 3*.

[Verse 5](#) is also Messianically applied in Vayyikra R. 1; Yalk. ii. 77 b about the middle.

On [verse 10](#) Yalkut, in discussing [Exodus 32:6](#) (vol. i. p. 108 c) [108] broaches the opinion, that in the days of the Messiah Israel would have a double reward, on account of the calamities which they had suffered, quoting [Isaiah 40:10](#).

[Isaiah 41:18](#) has been already noted in our remarks on [Genesis 18:4, 5](#).

[Verse 25](#) is Messianically applied in Bem. R. 13, p. 48 b.

The expression The first in *ch 41. 27*, is generally applied to the Messiah; in the Targum, according to Rashi; in Bereshith R. 63; in Vayyikra R. 30; and in the Talmud (Pes. 5 a); so also in Pesiqta (ed. Buber) p. 185 b.

[Isaiah 42:1](#) is applied in the Targum to the Messiah, as also in the Midrash or [Psalm 2](#).; and in Yalkut ii. p. 104 d. See also our comments on [Psalm 2:7](#).

⁷Signor *Castelli* remarks in his learned treatise (*Il Messia*, p. 164) that redemption is always ascribed to God, and not to the Messiah. But the distinction is of no importance, seeing that this is indeed the work of God, but carried out by the Messiah, while, on the other hand, Rabbinic writings frequently refer Israel's deliverance to the agency of the Messiah.

On [Isaiah 43:10](#), the Targum renders My servant by My servant the Messiah.

The promise in [Isaiah 45:22](#) is also among the future things mentioned in the Midrash on Lamentations, to which we have referred in our remarks on [Isaiah 11:12](#).

[Isaiah 49:8](#). There is a remarkable comment on this in Yalkut on the passage, to the effect that the Messiah suffers in every age for the sins of that generation, but that God would in the day of redemption repair it all (Yalk. ii. p. 52 *b*).

[Isaiah 49:9](#) is quoted as the words of the Messiah in Yalkut (vol. ii. p. 52 *b*).

Verse 10 is one of the passages referred to in the Midrash on Lamentations, quoted in connection with [Isaiah 11:12](#).

Verse 12 has already been noticed in our remarks on [Exodus 12:2](#).

From the expression comfort in *verse 13*, the Messianic title Menachem is derived. Comp. the Midrash on [Proverbs 19:21](#).

Verse 14 is Messianically applied in Yalkut ii. p. 52 *c*.

Verse 21 is also one of the passages referred to in the Midrash of Lamentations, quoted under [Psalm 11:12](#).

On *verse 23* it is remarked in Vayyikra R. 27 (ed. Warsh. p. 42 *a*), that Messianic blessings were generally prefigured by similar events, as for example, the passage here quoted in the case of Nebuchadnezzar and Daniel.

A Messianic application of the same passage also occurs in Par. 33 and 36, as a contrast to the contempt that Israel experiences in this world.

The second clause of *verse 23* is applied to the Messiah in the Midrash on [Psalm 2:2](#), as to be fulfilled when the Gentiles shall see the terrible judgements.

Verse 26 is similarly applied to the destruction of the Gentiles in Vayyikra R. 33 (end).

[109] [Isaiah 51:12](#) is one of the passages referred to in the Midrash of Lamentations, quoted in our comments in [Isaiah 11:12](#).

[Isaiah 51:12](#) and 17 are among the passages referred to in our remarks on [Isaiah 25:9](#).

Appendix 9—List of Old Testament Passages Messianically Applied in Ancient Rabbinic Writings (Book II. ch. 5.) cxiii
— [Isaiah 52:3](#) is Messianically applied in the Talmud (Sanh. 97 *b*), while the last clause of *verse 2* is one of the passages quoted in the Midrash on Lamentations (see [Isaiah 11:12](#)).

The well-known Evangelic declaration in [Isaiah 52:7](#) is thus commented upon in Yalkut (vol. ii. p. 53 *c*): In the hour when the Holy One, blessed be His Name, redeems Israel, three days before Messiah comes Elijah, and stands upon the mountains of Israel, and weeps and mourns for them, and says to them: Behold the land of Israel, how long shall you stand in a dry and desolate land? And his voice is heard from the world's end to the world's end, and after that it is said to them: Peace has come to the world, peace has come to the world, as it is said: How beautiful upon the mountains, &c. And when the wicked hear it, they rejoice, and they say one to the other: Peace has come to us. On the second day he shall stand upon the mountains of Israel, and shall say: Good has come to the world, good has come to the world, as it is written: That bringeth good tidings of good. On the third day he shall come and stand upon the mountains of Israel, and say: Salvation has come to the world, salvation has come to the world, as it is written: That publisheth salvation.

Similarly, this passage is quoted in Yalkut on [Psalm 121:1](#). See also our remarks on Cant. ii. 13.

Verse 8 is one of the passages referred to in the Midrash on Lamentations quoted above, and frequently in other places as Messianic.

Verse 12 is Messianically applied in Shemoth R. 15 and 19.

Verse 13 is applied in the Targum expressly to the Messiah. On the words He shall be exalted and extolled we read in Yalkut ii. (Par. 338, p. 53 *c*, lines 7 &c. from the bottom): He shall be higher than Abraham, to whom applies [Genesis 14:22](#); higher than Moses, of whom [Numbers 11:12](#) is predicated; higher than the ministering angels, of whom [Ezekiel 1:18](#) is said. But to Him there applies this in [Zechariah 4:7](#): Who art thou, O great mountain? And He was wounded for our transgressions, and bruised for our iniquities, and the chastisement of our peace was upon Him, and with His stripes we are healed. R. Huma says, in the name of R. Acha: All

Israel), and the third to the King Messiah, as it is written ([Psalm 2:7](#)), Yet have I set My King upon My holy hill of Zion. Then follows a curious quotation from the Midrash on Samuel, in which the Messiah indicates that His dwelling is on Mount Zion, and that guilt is connected with the destruction of its walls.

In regard to [Isaiah 53](#). we remember, that the Messianic name of Leprous (*Sanh. 98 b*) is expressly based upon it. [Isaiah 53:10](#) is applied in the Targum on the passage to the Kingdom of the Messiah.

Verse 5 is Messianically interpreted in the Midrash on Samuel (ed. Lemberg, p. 45 *a*, last line), where it is said that all sufferings are divided into three parts, one of which the Messiah bore—a remark which is brought into connection with [Ruth 2:14](#). (See our comments on that passage.)

[Isaiah 54:2](#) is expected to be fulfilled in Messianic times (*Vayyikra R. 10*).

[Isaiah 54:5](#). In *Shemoth R. 15* this is expressly applied to Messianic days.

[Isaiah 54:11](#) is repeatedly applied to the Messianic glory, as, for example, in *Shemoth R. 15*. (See our comments on [Exodus 12:2](#).)

So is *verse 13*, as in *Yalkut* (vol. i. 78 *c*); in the Midrash on [Psalm 21:1](#); and in other passages.

[Isaiah 55:12](#) is referred to Messianic times, as in the Midrash on [Psalm 13](#).

[Isaiah 56:1](#). See our comments on [Exodus 21:1](#).

Verse 7 is one of the passages in the Midrash on Lamentations which we have quoted under [Isaiah 11:12](#).

On [Isaiah 57:14](#) *Bemidhar R. 15* (ed. Warsh. p. 64 *a*) expresses a curious idea about the stumbling-block, as mystically the evil inclination, and adds that the promise applies to God's removal of it in the world to come, or else it may be in Messianic days.

Verse 16 receives in the Talmud (*Yeb. 62 a* and *63 b*) and in the Midr. on *Exxl. 1:6* the following curious comment: The Son of David shall not come till all the souls are completed which are in the Guph'—(i.e. the pre-existence of souls is taught, and that they are kept in heaven till one after another appears in human form, and that the Messiah is kept back till all these shall have appeared), proof of this being derived from [Isaiah 57:16](#).

Appendix 9—List of Old Testament Passages Messianically Applied in Ancient
—Similarly ^{Rabbinic Writings (Book II. ch. 5.)} chap 59. 15 is applied to Messianic times in Sanh. ^{CXV} 97
a, and Midr. on Cant. 2:13; and verse 19 in Sanh. 98 a.

Verse 17 is applied to Messianic times in Pesiqta, ed. Buber, p. 149 a. [111]

Verse 20 is one of the passages mentioned in the Midrash on Lamentations quoted above. (See [Isaiah 11:12](#).)

[Isaiah 59:19, 20](#), is applied to Messianic times in Sanh. 98 a. In Pesiqta 166 b it is similarly applied, the peculiar form (*plene*) in which the word *Goel* (Redeemer) is written being taken to indicate the Messiah as the Redeemer in the full sense.

[Isaiah 60:1](#). This is applied in the Targum to Messianic times. Similarly, it is explained in Ber. R. i. with reference to [Daniel 2:2](#); in Ber. R. 2; and also in Bemidbar R. 15 and 21. In Yalkut we have some very interesting remarks on the subject. Thus (vol. i. Par. 363, p. 99 c), commenting on [Exodus 25:3](#) &c., in a very curious description of how God would in the world to come return to Israel the various things which they had offered for the Tabernacle, the oil is brought into connection with the Messiah, with reference to [Psalm 132:17](#) and [Isaiah 60:1](#). Again, on p. 215 c (at the commencement of the Parashah Behaalothekha) we have, first, a very curious comparison between the work of the Tabernacle and that of the six days of Creation, after which the question is put: Why Moses made seven lights, and Solomon seventy? To this the reply is given, that Moses rooted up seven nations before Israel, while Solomon reigned over all the seventy nations which, according to Jewish ideas, constitute the world. Upon this it is added, that God had promised, that as Israel had lighted for His glory the lights in the Sanctuary, so would He in the latter days fill Jerusalem with His glory, according to the promise in [Isaiah 60:1](#), and also set up in the midst of it lights, according to [Zephaniah 1:12](#). Still more clearly is the Messianic interpretation of [Isaiah 60](#). brought out in the comments in Yalkut on that chapter. One part of it is so curious that it may here find a place. After explaining that this light for which Israel is looking is the light of the Messiah, and that [Genesis 1:4](#) really referred to it, it is added that this is intended to teach us that God looked forward to the age of the Messiah and His works before the Creation of the world, and that He hid that light for the Messiah and His generation under His throne of glory. On Satan's

[112] questioning Him for whom that light was destined, the answer is: For Him Who in the latter days will conquer thee, and cover thy face with shame. On which Satan requests to see Him, and when he is shown Him, falls on his face and says: I confess that this is the Messiah Who will in the latter days be able to cast me, and all the Gentiles, into Gehenna, according to [Isaiah 25:8](#). In that hour all the nations will tremble, and say before God: Who is this into Whose hand we fall, what is His Name, and what is His purpose? On which God replies: This is Ephraim, the Messiah [the second Messiah, the son of Joseph]; My Righteousness is His Name. And so the commentation goes on to touch on [Psalm 89:23, 24, and 26](#), in a manner most deeply interesting, but which it would be impossible here fully to give (Yalkut, vol. ii. Par. 359, p. 56 *c*). In col. *d* there are farther remarkable discussions about the Messiah, in connection with the wars in the days when Messiah should be revealed, and about Israel's final safety. But the most remarkable passage of all, reminding us almost of the history of the Temptation, is that which reads as follows (line 22 &c. from the top): It is a tradition from our Rabbis that, in the hour when King Messiah comes, He stands on the roof of the Temple, and proclaims to them, that the hour of their deliverance has come, and that if they believed they would rejoice in the light that had risen upon them, as it is written ([Isaiah 60:1](#)), Arise, shine, for thy light is come. This light would be for them alone, as it is written ([ver. 2](#)), For darkness shall cover the earth. In that hour also would God take the light of the Messiah and of Israel, and all should walk in the light of Messiah and of Israel, as it is written ([ver. 3](#)), The Gentiles shall come to thy light, and kings to the brightness of thy rising. And the kings of the nations should lick the dust from under the feet of the Messiah, and should all fall on their faces before Him and before Israel, and say: Let us be servants to Thee and to Israel. And so the passage goes on to describe the glory of the latter days. Indeed, the whole of this chapter may be said to be full of Messianic interpretations.

After this it will scarcely be necessary to say that [verses 2, 3, and 4](#) are similarly applied in the Midrashim. But it is interesting to notice that [verse 2](#) is specifically applied to Messianic times in the Talmud (Sanh. 99 *a*), in answer to the question when the Messiah should come.

—On ~~verse 4~~ the Midrash on Cant. i. 4, on the words we will be glad and rejoice in thee has the following beautiful illustration. A Queen is introduced whose husband and sons and sons-in-law go to a distant country. Tidings are brought to her: Thy sons are come back. On which she says: Cause for gladness have I, my daughters-in-law will rejoice. Next, tidings are brought her that her sons-in-law are coming, and she is glad that her daughters will rejoice. Lastly, tidings are brought: The king, thy husband, comes. On which she replies: This is indeed perfect joy, joy upon joy. So in the latter days would the prophets come, and say to Jerusalem: Thy sons shall come from far (*verse 4*), and she will say: What gladness is this to me!—and thy daughters shall be nursed at thy side and again she will say: What gladness is this to me! But when they shall say to her ([Zechariah 9:9](#)): Behold, thy king cometh unto thee; he is just, and having salvation then shall Zion say: This indeed is perfect joy, as it is written ([Zechariah 9:9](#)), Rejoice greatly, O daughter of Zion and again ([Zechariah 2:10](#)), Sing and rejoice, O daughter of Zion. In that hour she will say ([Isaiah 61:10](#)): I will greatly rejoice in the Lord, my soul shall be joyful in my God.

[113]

Verse 7 is Messianically applied in the Talmud (Abod. Sar. 24 *a*).

Verse 8 is Messianically applied in the Midrash on [Psalm 47:13](#).

In connection with *verse 19* we read in Yalkut (vol. i. p. 103 *b*) that God said to Israel: In this world you are engaged (or busied) with the light for the Sanctuary, but in the world to come, for the merit of this light, I send you the King Messiah, Who is likened to a light, according to [Psalm 132:17](#) and [Isaiah 60:19](#), the Lord shall be unto thee an everlasting light.

Verse 21 is thus alluded to in the Talmud (Sanh. 98 *a*): Rabbi Jochanan said, The Son of David shall not come, until all be either just or all be unjust: the former according to [Isaiah 60:21](#), the latter according to [Isaiah 59:16](#).

Verse 22 is also Messianically applied in the Talmudic passage above cited.

[Isaiah 61:1](#) has already been mentioned in our remarks on [Isaiah 32:14, 15](#).

On *verse 5* there is a curious story related (Yalkut, vol. i. Par. 212, p. 64 *a*, lines 23-17 from the bottom) in which, in answer

[114] to a question, what was to become of the nations in the days of the Messiah, the reply is given that every nation and kingdom that had persecuted and mocked Israel would see, and be confounded, and have no share in life; but that every nation and kingdom which had not so dealt with Israel would come and be husbandmen and vinedressers to Israel in the days of the Messiah. A similar statement to this is found in the Midrash on [Ecclesiastes 2:7](#).

Verse 9 is also applied to Messianic times.

Verse 10 is one of the passages referred to in Tanchuma on [Deuteronomy 1:1](#) quoted under [Isaiah 25:9](#). In Pesiqta, ed. Buber, p. 149 *a*, the verse is explained as applying to the glory of Messiah's appearance.

[Isaiah 62:10](#) has already been referred to in our remarks on [Isaiah 57:14](#).

[Isaiah 63](#). is applied to the Messiah, Who comes to the land after having seen the destruction of the Gentiles, in Pirqé de R. Eliez. c. 30.

Verse 2 has been referred to in our comments on Cant. v. 10. It is also quoted in reference to Messianic days in Pesiqta, ed. *Buber*, p. 149 *a*.

Verse 4 is explained as pointing to the days of the Messiah, which are supposed to be 365 years, according to the number of the solar days (Sanh. 99 *a*); while in other passages of the Midrashim, the destruction of Rome and the coming of the Messiah are conjoined with the day of vengeance. See also the Midr. on [Ecclesiastes 12:10](#).

[Isaiah 64:4](#) (3 in the Hebrew). In Yalkut on [Isaiah 60](#). (vol. ii. p. 56 d, line 6, &c., from the bottom) Messianic application is made of this passage in a legendary account of the seven tabernacles which God would make for the Messiah, out of each of which proceed four streams of wine, milk, honey, and pure balsam. Then God is represented as speaking of the sufferings which Messiah was to undergo, after which the verse in question is quoted.

[Isaiah 65:17](#) is quoted in the Midrash on Lamentations, referred to in our remarks on [Isaiah 11:12](#).

Verse 19 is one of the passages referred to in Tanchuma on [Deuteronomy 1:1](#). See [Isaiah 25:9](#).

To *verse 25* we have the following curious illustrative reference in Ber. R. 20 (ed. Warsh. p. 38 *b*, line 6 from the bottom)

in connection with the Fall: In the latter days everything shall be healed again (restored again) except the serpent ([Isaiah 65:25](#)) and the Gibeonites ([Ezekiel 48:19](#)). But a still more strange application of the verse occurs in the same Midrash (Par. 95, ed. Warsh. p. 170 *a*), where the opening clauses of it are quoted with this remark: Come and see all that the Holy One, blessed be His Name, has smitten in this world, He will heal in the latter days. Upon which a curious disquisition follows, to prove that every man would appear after death exactly as he had been in life, whether blind, dumb, or halting, nay, even in the same dress, as in the case of Samuel when Saul saw him—but that afterwards God would heal the diseased. [115]

[Isaiah 66:7](#) is applied to Messianic times in Vayyikra R. 14 (last line), and so are some of the following verses in the Midrashim, notably on [Genesis 33:1](#).

[Isaiah 68:22](#) is applied to Messianic times in Ber. R. 12. See our remarks on [Genesis 2:4](#).

[Jeremiah 3:17](#) is applied to Messianic days in Yalkut on [Joshua 3:9](#) &c. (vol. ii. p. 3 c, line 17 from the top), and so is *verse* 18 in the commentation on the words in Cant. i. 16 our bed is green the expression being understood of the ten tribes, who had been led captive beyond the river Sabbayon; but when Judah's deliverance came, Judah and Benjamin would go to them and bring them back, that they might be worthy of the days of the Messiah (vol. ii. p., 176 *d*, line 9 &c. from the bottom).

[Jeremiah 5:19](#) is mentioned in the Introd. to Echa R. as one of three passages by which to infer from the apostasy of Israel the near advent of Messiah.

The expression speckled bird in [Jeremiah 12:9](#) is applied to the Messiah in Pirqé de R. Eliez. c. 28.

The last word in [Jeremiah 16:13](#) is made the basis of the name *Chaninah*, given to the Messiah in the Talmud (Sanh. 98 *b*), and in the Midr. on [Lamentations 1:16](#).

On *verse* 14 Mechilta has it, that in the latter days the Exodus would no more be mentioned on account of the greater wonders then experienced.

On [Jeremiah 23:5, 6](#), the Targum has it: And I will raise up for David the Messiah the Just. This is one of the passages from which according to Rabbinic views, one of the Names of the Messiah is

derived, viz: Jehovah our Righteousness. So in the Talmud (Babba Bathra 75 *b*), in the Midrash on [Psalm 21:1](#), [Proverbs 19:21](#), and in that on [Lamentations 1:16](#).

On *verse 7* see our remarks on [Jeremiah 16:14](#). In the Talmud (Ber. 12 *b*) this verse is distinctly applied to Messianic days. [Jeremiah 30:9](#) is Messianically applied in the Targum on the passage.

[Jeremiah 30:21](#) is applied to the Messiah in the Targum, and also in the Midrash on [Psalm 21:7](#).

[116] On [Jeremiah 31:8](#), *3rd clause*, Yalkut has a Messianic interpretation, although extremely far-fetched. In general, the following verses are Messianically interpreted in the Midrashim.

Verse 20 is Messianically applied in Yalkut (ii. p. 66 *c*, end), where it is supposed to refer to the Messiah when imprisoned, when all the nations mock and shake their heads at Him. A more remarkable interpretation still occurs in the passage on [Isaiah 60:1](#), to which we have already referred. Some farther extracts from it may be interesting. Thus, when the enemies of the Messiah flee before Him. God is supposed to make an agreement with the Messiah to this effect: The sins of those who are hidden with Thee will cause Thee to be put under an iron yoke, and they will do with Thee as with this calf, whose eyes are covered, and they will choke Thy spirit under the yoke, and on account of their sins Thy tongue shall cleave to Thy mouth. On which the Messiah inquires whether these troubles are to last for many years, and the Holy replies that He has decreed a week, but that if His soul were in sorrow, He would immediately dispel these sorrows. On this the Messiah says: Lord of the world, with gladness and joy of heart I take it upon Me, on condition that not one of Israel should perish, and that not only those alone should be saved who are in My days, but also those who are hid in the dust; and that not only the dead should be saved who are in My days, but also those who have died from the days of the first Adam till now; and not those, but also those who have been prematurely born. And only these, but also those who have come into Thy knowledge to create them, but have not yet been created. Thus I agree, and thus I take all upon Me. In the hebdomad when the Son of David comes, they shall bring beams of iron, and shall make them a yoke to His neck, until His stature is bent down. But He cries and weeps, and lifts up His voice on high, and says before Him: Lord of the world,

what is My strength, My spirit, and My soul, and My members? Am I not flesh and blood? In that honor David (the Son of David) weeps, and says: My strength is dried up like a potsherd. In that hour the Holy One, blessed be His Name, says: Ephraim the Messiah, My righteous one, Thou hast already taken this upon Thee before the six days of the world, now Thy anguish shall be like My anguish; for from the time that Nebuchadnezzar, the wicked one, has come up and destroyed My house, and burned My Sanctuary, and I have sent into captivity My children among the children of the Gentiles, by My life, and by the life of Thy head, I have not sat down on My throne. And if Thou wilt not believe Me, see the dew which is on My head, as it is said (Cant. v. 2) My head is filled with dew. In that hour the Messiah answers Him: Lord of the world, now I am quieted, for it is enough for the servant that he is as his Master (his reminding us of our Lord's saying, St. [Matthew 10:25](#)). R. Isaac then remarks that in the year when the King Messiah shall be revealed, all nations shall rise up against each other (we have already quoted this passage in another place, as also that about the Messiah standing upon the roof of the Temple). Then follows this as a tradition of the Rabbis: In the latter days the Fathers shall stand up in the month of Nisan, and say to Him: Ephraim, the Messiah, our Righteousness, though we are Thy Fathers, yet Thou art better than we, because Thou hast borne all the sins of our sons, and hard and evil measure has passed upon Thee, such as has not been passed either upon those before or upon those after. And Thou hast been for laughter and derision to the nations for the sake of Israel, and Thou hast dwelt in darkness and in mist, and Thine eyes have not seen light, and Thy light clung to Thee alone, and Thy body was dried up like wood, and Thine eyes were darkened through fasting, and Thy strength was dried up like a postsherd. And all this on account of the sins of our children. Is it Thy pleasure that our sons should enjoy the good thing which God had displayed to Israel? Or perhaps on account of the anguish which Thou hast suffered for them, because they have bound Thee in the prison-house, wilt Thou not give unto them thereof? He says to them: Fathers of the world, whatever I have done I have done for your sakes, and for the sake of your children, that they may enjoy that goodness which the Holy One, blessed be He, has displayed to Israel. Then say to Him the Fathers of the world: Ephraim, Messiah,

[118] our Righteousness, be Thou reconciled to us, because Thou hast reconciled Thy Maker and us. R. Simeon, the son of Pasi. In that hour the Holy One, blessed be His Name, exalts the Messiah to the heaven of heavens, and spreads over Him the splendour of His glory, because of the nations of the world, and because of the wicked Persians. Then the Fathers of the world say to Him: Ephraim, Messiah, our Righteousness, be Thou their judge, and do to them what Thy soul desireth. For unless mercies had been multiplied on Thee, they would long ago have exterminated Thee suddenly from the world, as it is written ([Jeremiah 31:20](#)) Is Ephraim my dear son? And why is the expression: I will surely have mercy [in the Hebrew reduplicated: having mercy I will have mercy'], but that the first expression mercy refers to the hour when He was bound in prison, when day by day they gnashed with their teeth, and winked with their eyes, and nodded with their heads, and wide opened their mouths, as it is written in [Psalm 22:7](#) [8 in Hebrew]; while the second expression I will have mercy refers to the hour when He came out of the prison-house, when not only one kingdom, not two, came against Him, but 140 kingdoms came round about Him, and the Holy One, blessed be His Name, says to Him: Ephraim, Messiah, My righteous one, be not afraid, for all these shall perish by the breath of Thy mouth, as it is written ([Isaiah 11:4](#)). Long as this quotation may be, its interest seems sufficient to warrant its insertion.

[Jeremiah 31:31, 33, and 34](#) are applied to Messianic times in Yalkut (vol. i. p. 196 *c*; 78 *c*; and in vol. ii. p. 54 *b*, and p. 66 *d*).

[Jeremiah 33:13](#). The close of the verse is thus paraphrased in the Targum: The people shall yet learn by the hands of the Messiah while in Yalkut (vol. i. p. 105 *d*) mention is made of a tenfold gathering of Israel, the last—in connection with this verse—in the latter days.

On [Lamentations 1:16](#) there is in the Midrash R. (ed. Warsh. p. 64 *b*) the curious story about the birth of the Messiah in the royal palace of Bethlehem, which also occurs in the Jer. Talmud.

[Lamentations 2:22](#), *first clause*. The Targum here remarks: Thou wilt proclaim liberty to Thy people, the house of Israel, by the hand of the Messiah.

—**Lamentations 4:22**, *first clause*. The Targum here remarks: And after these things thy iniquity shall cease, and thou shalt be set free by the hands of the Messiah and by the hands of Elijah the Priest.

Ezekiel 11:19 is applied to the great spiritual change that was to take place in Messianic days, when the evil desire would be taken out of the heart (Deb. R. 6, at the end; and also in other Midrashic passages).

Ezekiel 16:55 is referred to among the ten things which God would renew in Messianic days—the rebuilding of ruined cities, inclusive of Sodom and Gomorrah, being the fourth (Shem. R. 15, ed. Warsh. p. 24 *b*). [119]

Ezekiel 17:22 and 23 is distinctly and very beautifully referred to the Messiah in the Targum.

Ezekiel 25:14 is applied to the destruction of all the nations by Israel in the days of the Messiah in Bemidbar R. on **Numbers 2:32** (Par. 2, ed. Warsh. p. 5 *b*).

Ezekiel 29:21 is among the passages applied to the time when the Messiah should come, in Sanh. 98 *a*.

So is **Ezekiel 32:14**.

Ezekiel 36:25 is applied to Messianic times alike in the Targum and in Yalkut (vol. i. p. 235 *a*), as our in the Talmud (Kidd. 72 *b*).

On *verse 27* see our remarks on chap 11:19.

Ezekiel 39:2 is Messianically applied in Bemidbar R. 13, Warsh. p. 48 *b*.

Ezekiel 47:9 and 12 are quoted as the second and the third things which God would renew in the latter days (Shem. R. 15)—the second being, that living waters should go forth out of Jerusalem, and the third, that trees should bear fruit every month, and the sick be healed by them.

On **Ezekiel 48:19** the Talmud (Baba B. 122 *a*) has the following curious comment, that the land of Israel would be divided into thirteenth tribes, the thirteenth belonging to the Prince, and this verse is quoted as proof.

Daniel 2:22 is Messianically applied in Ber. R. 1, and in the Midr. on **Lamentations 1:16**, where it gives rise to another name of the Messiah: the Lightgiver.

Verse 35 is similarly applied in the Pirqé de R. Eliez. c. 11, and *verse 44* in c. 30.

Daniel 7:9. This passage was interpreted by R. Akiba as implying that one throne was set for God, and the other for the Messiah (Chag. 14 *a*).

Daniel 7:13 is curiously explained in the Talmud (Sanh. 98 *a*), where it is said that, if Israel behaved worthily, the Messiah would come in the clouds of heaven; if otherwise, humble, and riding upon an ass.

Daniel 7:27 is applied to Messianic times in Bem. R. 11.

Daniel 8:13, 14. By a very curious combination these verses are brought into connection with **Genesis 3:22** (man has become like one of us), and it is argued, that in Messianic days man's primeval innocence and glory would be restored to him, and he become like one of the heavenly beings, Ber. R. 21 (ed. Warsh. p. 41 *a*).

[120] **Daniel 9:24.** In Naz. 32 *b* it is noted as that referred to the time when the second Temple was to be destroyed. So also in Yalkut, vol. ii. p. 79 *d*, lines 16 &c. from the bottom.

Daniel 12:3 is applied to Messianic times in a beautiful passage in Shem. R. 15 (at the end).

Daniel 12:11, 12. These two verses receive a peculiar Messianic interpretation, and that by the authority of the Rabbis. For it is argued that, as Moses, the first Redeemer, appeared, and was withdrawn for a time, and then reappeared, so would the second Redeemer; and the interval between His disappearance and reappearance is calculated at 45 days, arrived at by deducting the 1,290 days of the cessation of the sacrifice (**Daniel 12:11**) from the 1,335 days of **Daniel 12:12** (Midr. on **Ruth 2:14**, ed. Warsh. p. 43 *b*).

Hosea 2:2 is explained in the Midr. on **Psalm 45:1** as implying that Israel's redemption would be when they were at the lowest.

Hosea 2:13 is one of the three passages referred to on **Jeremiah 5:19**.

Hosea 2:18 is quoted in Shem. R. 15 (on **Exodus 12:2**) as the seventh of the ten things which God would make new in Messianic days.

Hosea 3:5 is applied to the Messiah in the Targum, and from it the Jer. Talm. (Ber. 5 *a*) derives the name David as one of those given to the Messiah.

Hosea 6:2 is Messianically applied in the Targum.

—[Hosea 13:14](#) is applied to the deliverance by the Messiah of those of Israel who are in Gehinnom, whom He sets free;—the term Zion being understood of Paradise. See Yalk. on Is. Par. 269, comp. Maas. de R. Joshua in Jellinek's Beth ha-Midr. ii. p. 50.

[Hosea 14:7](#) is Messianically applied in the Targum.

[Joel 2:28](#) is explained in the Midrashim as referring to the latter days, when all Israel will be prophets (Bemidbar R. 15; Yalkut i. p. 220 c, and other places).

[Joel 3:18](#) is similarly applied in the Midrashim, as in that on [Psalm 13](#). and in others. The last clause of this verse is explained in the Midr. on [Ecclesiastes 1:9](#) to imply that the Messiah would cause a fountain miraculously to spring up, as Moses did in the wilderness.

[Amos 4:7](#) is in Midr. on Cant. ii. 13 applied to the first of the seven years before Messiah come.

[Amos 5:18](#) is one of the passages adduced in the Talmud (Sanh. 98 b) to explain why certain Rabbis did not wish to see the day of the Messiah.

[Amos 8:11](#) is applied to Messianic times in Ber. R. 25.

[Amos 9:11](#) is a notable Messianic passage. Thus, in the Talmud (Sanh. 96 b) where the Messiah is called the Son of the Fallen the name is explained by a reference to this passage. Again, in Ber. R. 88, last three lines (ed. Warsh. p. 157 a) after enumerating the unexpected deliverances which Israel had formerly experienced, it is added: Who could have expected that the fallen tabernacle of David should be raised up by God, as it is written ([Amos 9:11](#)) and who should have expected that the whole world should become one bundle (be gathered into one Church)? Yet it is written [Zephaniah 3:9](#). Comp. also the long discussion in Yalkut on this passage (vol. ii. p. 80 a and b).

[Obadiah](#) verses 18 and 21 are applied to the Kingdom and time of the Messiah in Deb. R. 1.

[Micah 2:13](#). See our remarks on [Genesis 18:4, 5](#). The passage is also Messianically quoted in the Midrash on [Proverbs 6](#). (ed. Lemberg, p. 5 a, first two lines).

The promise in [Micah 4:3](#) is applied to the times of the Messiah in the Talmud (Shabb. 63 a).

So is the prediction in *verse 5* in Shemoth R. 15; while *verse 8* is thus commented upon in the Targum: And thou Messiah of Israel,

Who shalt be hidden on account of the sins of Zion, to thee shall the Kingdom come.

The well-known passage, [Micah 5:2](#), is admittedly Messianic. So in the Targum, in the Pirqé de R. Eliez. c. 3, and by later Rabbis.

Verse 3 is applied in the Talmud to the fact that the Messiah was not to come till the hostile kingdom had spread for nine months over the whole world (Yoma 10 *a*), or else, over the whole land of Israel (Sanh. 98 *b*).

Similarly [Micah 7:6](#) is applied to Messianic times in Sanh. 97 *a*, and in Sotah 49 *b*; also in the Midr. on Cant. ii. 13. And so is *verse 15* in Yalkut (vol. ii. p. 112 *b*.)

In [Micah 7:8](#), the expression, Jehovah shall be light to me, is referred to the days of the Messiah in Deb. R. 11, ed. Warsh. vol. v. p. 22 *a*.

[Nahum 2:1](#). See our remarks on [Isaiah 52:7](#).

[Habakkuk 2:3](#). This is applied to Messianic times in a remarkable passage in Sanh. 97 *b*, which will be quoted in full at the close of this Appendix; also in Yalkut, vol. ii. p. 83 *b*.

[Habakkuk 3:18](#) is applied to Messianic times in the Targum.

[Zephaniah 3:8](#). The words rendered in our A.V. the day that I rise up to the prey are translated for testimony and applied to God's bearing testimony for the Messiah (Yalkut, vol. ii. p. 84 *c*, line 6 from the top).

[122] *Verse 9* is applied to the voluntary conversion of the Gentiles in the days of the Messiah in the Talmud (Abhod. Zarah, 24 *a*); and in Ber. R. 88; and *verse 11* in Sanh. 98 *a*.

[Haggai 2:6](#) is expressly applied to the coming redemption in Deb. R. 1 (ed. Warsh. p. 4 *b*, line 15 from the top).

[Zechariah 1:20](#). The four carpenters there spoken of are variously interpreted in the Talmud (Sukk. 52 *b*), and in the Midrash (Bemidbar R. 14). But both agree that one of them refers to the Messiah.

[Zechariah 2:10](#) is one of the Messianic passages to which we have referred in our remarks on [Isaiah 60:4](#). It has also a Messianic cast in the Targum.

[Zechariah 3:8](#). The designation Branch is expressly applied to King Messiah in the Targum. Indeed, this is one of the Messiah's peculiar names.

—Verse 10 is quoted in the Midrash on [Psalm 72](#). (ed. Warsh. p. 56 a, at the top) in a description of the future time of universal peace.

[Zechariah 4:7](#) is generally applied to the Messiah, expressly in the Targum, and also in several of the Midrashim. Thus, as regards both clauses of it, in Tanchuma (Par. Toledoth 14, ed. Warsh. p. 37 b and 38 a).

Verse 10 is Messianically explained in Tanchuma (u. s.).

[Zechariah 6:12](#) is universally admitted to be Messianic. So in the Targum, the Jerusalem Talmud (Ber. 5 a), in the Pirqué de R. Eliez. c. 48, and in the Midrashim.

[Zechariah 7:13](#) is one of the three passages supposed to mark the near advent of Messiah. See our remarks on [Jeremiah 5:19](#).

[Zechariah 8:12](#) is applied to Messianic times in *Ber. R.* 12. See our remarks on [Genesis 2:4](#).

[Zechariah 8:23](#) is one of the predictions expected to be fulfilled in Messianic days, it being however noted that it refers to instruction in the Law in that remarkable passage on [Isaiah 60:1](#) in Yalkut ii. p. 56 d, to which we have already referred.

In [Zechariah 9:1](#) the name Chadrakh is mystically separated into Chad sharp, and rakh gentle, the Messiah being the one to the Gentiles and the other to the Jews (Siphre on [Deuteronomy 65 a](#), Yalkut i. p. 258 b).

Verse 9. The Messianic application of this verse in all its parts has already repeatedly been indicated. We may here add that there are many traditions about this ass on which the Messiah is to ride; and so firm was the belief in it, that, according to the Talmud, if anyone saw an ass in his dreams, he will see salvation (*Ber.* 56 b). The verse is also Messianically quoted in *Sanh.* 98 a, in Pirqué de R. Eliez. c. 31, and in several of the Midrashim. [123]

On verse 10 see our remarks on [Deuteronomy 20:10](#).

[Zechariah 10:4](#) is Messianically applied in the Targum.

[Zechariah 11:12](#) is Messianically explained in *Ber. R.* 98, but with this remark, that the 30 pieces of silver apply to 30 precepts, which the Messiah is to give to Israel.

[Zechariah 12:10](#) is applied to the Messiah the Son of Joseph in the Talmud (*Sukk.* 52 a), and so is verse 12, there being, however, a difference of opinion whether the mourning is caused by the death

of the Messiah the Son of Joseph, or else on account of the evil concupiscence (Yetser haRa).

[Zechariah 14:2](#) will be readily understood to have been applied to the wars of Messianic times, and this in many passages of the Midrashim, as, indeed, are *verses 3, 4, 5, and 6*.

Verse 7. The following interesting remark occurs in Yalkut on [Psalm 139:16, 17](#) (vol. ii. p. 129 d) on the words none of them. This world is to last 6,000 years; 2,000 years it was waste and desolate, 2,000 years mark the period under the Law, 2,000 years that under the Messiah. And because our sins are increased, they are prolonged. As they are prolonged, and as we make one year in seven a Sabbatic year, so will God in the latter days make one day a Sabbatic year, which day is 1,000 years—to which applies the verse in Zechariah just quoted. See also Pirqé de R. Eliez. c. 28.

Verse 8 is Messianically applied in Ber. R. 48. See our remarks on [Genesis 18:4, 5](#).

Verse 9 is, of course, applied to Messianic times, as in Yalkut i. p. 76 c, 266 a, and vol. ii. p. 33 c, Midr. on Cant. ii. 13, and in other passages.

[Malachi 3:1](#) is applied to Elijah as forerunner of the Messiah in Pirqé de R. Eliez. c. 29.

Verse 4. In Bemidbar R. 17, a little before the close (ed. Warsh. p. 69 a), this verse seems to be applied to acceptable sacrifices in Messianic days.

On *verse 16* Vayyikra R. 34 (ed. Warsh. p. 51 b, line 4 from the bottom) has the following curious remark: If any one in former times did the Commandment, the prophets wrote it down. But now when a man observes the Commandment, who writes it down? Elijah and the King Messiah and the Holy One, blessed be His Name, seal it at their hands, and a memorial book is written, as it is written [Malachi 3:16](#).

[124] The promise in *verse 17* is extended to Messianic days in She-moth R. 18.

On [Malachi 4:1](#) (in Hebrew 3:19) the following curious comment occurs in Bereshith R. 6 (p. 14 b, lines 15 &c. from the bottom): The globe of the sun is encased, as it is said, He maketh a tabernacle for the sun ([Psalm 19](#)). And a pool of water is before it. When the sun comes out, God cools its heat in the water lest it should burn

Rabbinic Writings (Book II. ch. 5.) cxxxix
up the world. But in the latter days the Holy One takes it out of its sheath, and with it burns up the wicked, as it is written [Malachi 4:1](#).

Verse 2 (iii. 20 in Hebrew) is in Shemoth R. 31 quoted in connection with [Exodus 22:26](#), and explained till the Messiah comes.

Verse 5 is, of course, applied to the forerunner of the Messiah. So in many places, as in the Pirqé de R. Eliez. c. 40; Debarm R. 3; in the Midrash on Cant. i. 1; in the Talmud, and in Yalkut repeatedly.
8

To the above passages we add some from the Apocryphal Books, partly as indicating the views concerning the Messiah which the Jews had derived from the Old Testament, and partly because of their agreement with Jewish traditionalism as already expounded by us. These passages must therefore be judged in connection with the Rabbinical ideas of the Messiah and of Messianic days. It is in this sense that we read, for example, the address to Jerusalem, *Tobit xiii. 9 to the end*. Comp. here, for example, our quotations on [Amos 9:11](#).

Similarly *Tobit xiv. 5-7* may be compared with our quotations on [Psalm 90](#), [Isaiah 60:3](#), and especially on [Zechariah 8:23](#), also on [Genesis 49:11](#).

Wisdom of Solomon iii. 7, 8 may be compared with our remarks on [Isaiah 61:1](#).

Ecclus. xliv. 21 &c. and xlvii. 11 may be compared with our quotations on [Psalm 89:22-25](#); [Psalm 132:18](#); [Ezekiel 29:21](#).

Ecclus. xlviii. 10, 11. See the comments on [Isaiah 52:7](#), also our references on [Malachi 3:1](#); [Malachi 4:5](#); [Deuteronomy 25:19](#) and [30:4](#); [Lamentations 2:22](#). In Sotah ix. 15 Elijah is represented as raising the dead.

Baruch ii. 34, 35; iv. 29 &c.; and ch 5. are so thoroughly in accordance with Rabbinic, and, indeed, with Scriptural views, that it is almost impossible to enumerate special references.

The same may be said of 1 *Macc. ii. 57*; while such passages as *iv. 46* and *xiv. 41* point forward to the ministry of Elijah as resolving

[125]

⁸From the above review of Old Testament passages, all reference to sacrifices has been omitted, because, although the Synagogue held the doctrine of the vicariousness and atoning character of these sacrifices, no mention occurs of the Messiah in connection with them.

doubts, as this is frequently described in the Talmud (Shekalim ii. 5; Men. 45 *a*, Pes. 13 *a*; and in other places).

Lastly, *2 Macc. ii. 18* is fully enlarged on in the Rabbinic descriptions of the gathering of Israel.

Perhaps it may be as well here to add the Messianic discussion in the Talmud, to which such frequent reference has been made (Sanhedrin, beginning at the two last lines of p. 96 *b*, and ending at p. 99 *a*). The first question is that asked by one Rabbi of the other, whether he knew when the Son of the Fallen would come? Upon which follows an explanation of that designation, based on [Amos 9:11](#), after which it is added that it would be a generation in which the disciples of the sages would be diminished, and the rest of men consume their eyes for sorrow, and terrible sorrows so follow each other, that one had not ceased before the other began. Then a description is given of what was to happen during the hebdomad when the Son of David would come. In the first year it would be according to [Amos 4:7](#); in the second year there would be darts of famine; in the third year great famine and terrible mortality, in consequence of which the Law would be forgotten by those who studied it. In the fourth year there would be abundance, and yet no abundance; in the fifth year great abundance and great joy, and return to the study of the Law; in the sixth year voices (announcements); in the seventh wars, and at the end of the seventh the Son of David would come. Then follows some discussion about the order of the sixth and seventh year, when [Psalm 89:51](#) is referred to. Next we have a description of the general state during those days. Sacred places (Academies) would be used for the vilest purposes, Galilee be desolated, Gablan laid waste, and the men of Gebul wander from city to city, and not find mercy. And the wisdom of the scribes would be corrupted, and they who fear sin be abhorred, and the face of that generation would be like that of a dog, and truth should fail, according to [Isaiah 59:15](#). (Here a side issue is raised.) The Talmud then continues in much the same terms to describe the Messianic age as one, in which children would rebel against their parents, and as one of general lawlessness, when Sadduceeism should universally prevail, apostasy increase, study of the Law decrease; and, generally, universal poverty and despair of redemption prevail, the growing disregard of the Law being pointed out as specially characterising

Rabbinic Writings (Book II, ch. 5.) cxxxix
the last days. R. Kattina said: The world is to last 6,000 years, and during one millennium it is to lie desolate, according to [Isaiah 2:17](#). R. Abayi held that this state would last 2,000 years, according to [Hosea 6:2](#). The opinion of R. Kattian was however, regarded as supported by this, that in each period of seven there is a Sabbatic year, the day here = 1,000 years of desolateness and rest—the appeal being to [Isaiah 2:17](#); [Psalm 92:1](#), and xc. 4. According to another tradition the world was to last 6,000 years: 2,000 in—a state of chaos, 2,000 under the Law, and 2,000 being the Messianic age. But on account of Israel’s sins those years were to be deducted which had already passed. On the authority of Elijah it was stated that the world would not last less than eighty-five jubilees, and that in the last jubilee the Son of David would come. When Elijah was asked whether at the beginning or at the end of it, he replied that he did not know. Being further asked whether the whole of that period would first elapse or not, he similarly replied, his meaning being supposed to be that until that term people were not to hope for the Advent of Messiah, but after that term they were to look for it. A story is related of a man being met who had in his hands a writing in square Hebrew characters, and in Hebrew, which he professed to have got from the Persian archives, and in which it was written that after 4,290 years from the Creation the world would come to an end. And then would be the wars of the great sea monsters, and those of Gog and Magog, and the rest of the time would be the time of the Messiah, and that the Holy One, blessed be His Name, would only renew His world after the 7,000 years; to which, however, one Rabbi objects, making it 5,000 years. Rabbi Nathan speaks of [Habakkuk 2:3](#) as a passage so deep as to go down to the abyss, reproving the opinion of the Rabbis who sought out the meaning of [Daniel 7:25](#), and of Rabbi Samlai, who similarly busied himself with [Psalm 80:5](#), and of Rabbi Akiba, who dwelt upon [Haggai 2:6](#). But the first kingdom (Babylonian?) was to last seventy years; the second (Asmonaeon) fifty-two years; and the rule of the son of Kozebah (Bar Kakhah, the false Messiah) two and a half years. According to Rabbi Samuel, speaking in the name of Rabbi Jonathan: Let the bones of those be broken who calculate the end, because they say, The end has come, and the Messiah has not come, therefore He will not come at all. But still expect Him, as it is said ([Habakkuk 2:3](#)), Though it

tarry, wait for it. Perhaps thou wilt say: We wait for Him, but He does not wait for it. On this point read [Isaiah 30:18](#). But if so, what hinders it? The quality of judgment. But in that case, why should we wait? In order to receive the reward, according to the last clause of [Isaiah 30:18](#). On which follows a further discussion. Again, Rabh maintains that all the limits of time as regards the Messiah are past, and that it now only depends on repentance and good works when He shall come. To this Rabbi Samuel objected, but Rabh's view was supported by Rabbi Eliezer, who said that if Israel repented they would be redeemed, but if not they would not be redeemed. To which Rabbi Joshua added, that in the latter case God would raise over them a King whose decrees would be hard like those of Haman, when Israel would repent. The opinion of Rabbi Eliezer was further supported by [Jeremiah 3:22](#), to which Rabbi Joshua objected by quoting [Isaiah 52:3](#), which seemed to imply that Israel's redemption was not dependent on their repentance and good works. On this Rabbi Joshua retorted by quoting [Malachi 3:7](#), to which again Rabbi Joshua replied by quoting [Jeremiah 3:14](#), and Rabbi Eliezer by quoting [Isaiah 30:15](#). To this Rabbi Joshua replied from [Isaiah 49:7](#). Rabbi Eliezer then urged [Jeremiah 4:1](#), upon which Rabbi Joshua retorted from [Daniel 12:7](#), and so effectually silenced Rabbi Eliezer. On this Rabbi Abba propounded that there was not a clearer mark of the Messianic term than that in [Isaiah 36:8](#). To which Rabbi Eliezer added [Zechariah 8:10](#). On this the question is raised as to the meaning of the words neither was there any peace to him that went out or came in. To this Rabh gave answer that it applied to the disciples of the sages, according to [Psalm 119:165](#). On which Rabbi Samuel replied that at that time all the entrances would be equal (i.e. that all should be on the same footing of danger). Rabbi Chanina remarked that the Son of David would not come till after fish had been sought for the sick and not found, according to [Ezekiel 32:14](#) in connection with [Ezekiel 29:21](#). Rabbi Chamma, the son of Rabbi Chaina, said that the Son of David would not come until the vile dominion over Israel had ceased, appealing to [Isaiah 18:5, 7](#). R. Seira said that Rabbi Chanina said: The Son of David would not come till the proud had ceased in Israel, according to [Zephaniah 3:11, 12](#). Rabbi Samlai, in the name of Rabbi Eliezer the son of Rabbi Simeon, said that the Son of David would not come till

[128]

all judges and rulers had ceased in Israel, according to [Isaiah 1:26](#). Ula said Jerusalem is not to be redeemed, except by righteousness, according to [Isaiah 1:27](#). We pass over the remarks of Rabbi Papa, as not adding to the subject. Rabbi Jochanan said: If thou seest a generation that increasingly diminishes, expect Him, according to [2 Samuel 22:28](#). He also added: If thou seest a generation upon which many sorrows come like a stream, expect Him, according to [Isaiah 59:19, 20](#). He also added: The son of David does not come except in a generation where all are either righteous, or all guilty—the former idea being based on [Isaiah 60:21](#), the latter on [Isaiah 59:16](#) and [48:11](#). Rabbi Alexander said, that Rabbi Joshua the son of Levi referred to the contradiction in [Isaiah 60:22](#) between the words in his time and again I will hasten it and explained it thus: If they are worthy, I will hasten it, and if not, in His time. Another similar contradiction between [Daniel 7:13](#) and [Zechariah 9:9](#) is thus reconciled: if Israel deserve it, He will come in the clouds of heaven; if they are not deserving, He will come poor, and riding upon an ass. Upon this it is remarked that Sabor the King sneered at Samuel, saying: You say that the Messiah is to come upon an ass: I will send Him my splendid horse. To which the Rabbi replied: Is it of a hundred colours, like His ass? Rabbi Joshua, the son of Levi, saw Elijah, who stood at the door of Paradise. He said to him: When shall the Messiah come? He replied: When that Lord shall come (meaning God). Rabbi Joshua, the son of Levi, said: I saw two (himself and Elijah), and I heard the voice of three (besides the former two the Voice of the son of Jochai, and said to him: Shall I attain the world to come? Elijah replied: If it pleaseth the Lord. Upon which follows the same remark: I have seen the Messiah come? To which the answer is: Go and ask Him thyself. And where does He abide? At the gate of the city (Rome). And what is His sign? He abides among the poor, the sick and stricken. And all unbind, and bind up again the wounds at the same time, but He undoes (viz. the bandage) and rebinds each separately, so that if they call for Him they may not find him engaged. ⁹ He went to meet Him and said: peace be to Thee, my Rabbi and my Lord. He replied to him: Peace be to thee, thou son of Levi. he said to Him: When wilt Thou come, my Lord?

[129]

⁹The Vienna edition of the Talmud has several lacunae on this page (98 a).

He replied to him: To-day. Then he turned to Elijah, who said to him: What has He said to thee? He said to me: Son of Levi, peace be to thee. Elijah said to him: He has assured thee and thy Father of the world to come. He said to him: But He has deceived me in that He said: I come to-day, and he has not come. He said to him that by the words to-day He meant: To-day if ye will hear My voice ([Psalm 95:7](#)). Rabbi José was asked by his disciples: When will the Son of David come? To this he replied: I am afraid you will ask me also for a sign. Upon which they assured him they would not. On this he replied: When this gate (viz. of Rome) shall fall, and be built, and again fall, and they shall not have time to rebuild it till the Son of David comes. They said to him: Rabbi, give us a sign. He said to them: Have ye not promised me that ye would not seek a sign? They said to him: Notwithstanding do it. He said to them: If so, the waters from the cave of Pamiyas (one of the sources of the Jordan) shall be changed into blood. In that moment they were changed into blood. Then the Rabbi goes on to predict that the land would be overrun by enemies, every stable being filled with their horses. Rabh said that the son of David would not come till the kingdom (i.e. foreign domination) should extend over Israel for nine months, according to [Micah 5:3](#). Ula said: Let Him come, but may I not see Him, and so said Raba. Rabbi Joseph said: Let Him come, and may I be found worthy to stand in the shadow of the dung of His ass (according to some: the tail of his ass). Abayi said to Raba: Why has this been the bearing of your words? If on account of the sorrows of the Messiah, we have the tradition that Rabbi Eliezer was asked by his disciples, what a man should do to be freed from the sorrows of the Messiah; on which they were told: By busying yourselves with the Torah, and with good works. And you are a master of the Torah, and you have good works. He answered: Perhaps sin might lead to occasion of danger. To this comforting replies are given from Scripture, such as [Genesis 28:15](#), and other passages, some of them being subjected to detailed commentation.

[130]

Rabbi Jochanan expressed a similar dislike of seeing the days of the Messiah, on which Resh Lakish suggested that it might be on the ground of [Amos 5:19](#), or rather on that of [Jeremiah 30:6](#). Upon this, such fear before God is accounted for by the consideration that what is called service above is not like what is called service below

Rabbinic Writings (Book II. ch. 5.) cxxxv
(the family above is not like the family below), so that one kind may outweigh the other. Rabbi Giddel said, that Rabh said, that Israel would rejoice in the years of the Messiah. Rabbi Joseph said: Surely, who else would rejoice in them? Chillak and Billak? (two imaginary names, meaning no one). This, to exclude the words of Rabbi Hillel, who said: There is no Messiah for Israel, seeing they have had Him in the time of Hezekiah. Rabh said: The world was only created for David; Samuel, for Moses; and Rabbi Jochanan, for the Messiah. What is His Name? The school of Rabbi Shila said: Shiloh is His Name, according to [Genesis 49:10](#). The school of Rabbi Jannai said: Jinnon, according to [Psalm 72:17](#). The school of Rabbi Chanina said: Chaninah, according to [Jeremiah 16:13](#). And some say Menachem, the son of Hezekiah, according to [Lamentations 1:16](#). And our Rabbis say: The Leprous One of the house of Rabbi, is His Name, as it is written [Isaiah 53:4](#). Rabbi Nachman said: If He is among the living, He is like me, according to [Jeremiah 30:21](#). Rabh said: If He is among the living, He is like Rabbi Jehudah the Holy, and if among the dead he is like Daniel, the man greatly beloved. Rabbi Jehudah said, Rabh said: God will raise up to them another David, according to [Jeremiah 30:9](#), a passage which evidently points to the future. Rabbi Papa said to Abaji: But we have this other Scripture [Ezekiel 37:25](#), and the two terms (Messiah and David) stand related like Augustus and Caesar. Rabbi Samlai illustrated [Amos 5:18](#), by a parable of the cock and the bat which were looking for the light. The cock said to the bat: I look for the light, but of what use is the light to thee? So it happened to a Sadducee who said to Rabbi Abahu: When will the Messiah come? He answered him: When darkness covers this people. He said to him: Dost thou intend to curse me? He replied: It is said in Scripture [Isaiah 60:2](#). Rabbi Eliezer taught: The days of the Messiah are forty years according to [Psalm 95:10](#). Rabbi Eleazar, the son of Asariah, said: Seventy years, according to [Isaiah 23:15](#), according to the days of a King the King there spoken of being the unique king, the Messiah. Rabbi said: Three generations, according to [Psalm 72:5](#). Rabbi Hillel said: Israel shall have no more Messiah, for they had him in the days of Hezekiah. Rabbi Joseph said: May god forgive Rabbi Hillel: when did Hezekiah live? During the first Temple. And Zechariah prophesied during the second Temple, and said [Zechariah 11:9](#). We have the tradition

that Rabbi Eliezer said: The days of the Messiah are forty years. it is written [Deuteronomy 8:3, 4](#), and again in [Psalm 90:15](#) (showing that the days of rejoicing must be like those of affliction in the wilderness). Rabbi Dosa said: Four hundred years quoting [Genesis 15:13](#) in connection with the same Psalm. Rabbi thought it was 365 years, according to the solar year, quoting [Isaiah 63:4](#). He asked the meaning of the words: The day of vengeance is in My heart Rabbi Jochanan explained them: I have manifested it to My heart, but not to My members, and Rabbi Simon benLakish: To My heart, and not to the ministering angels. Abimi taught that the days of the Messiah were to last for Israel 7,000 years (a Divine marriage-week), according to [Isaiah 62:5](#). Rabbi Jehudah said, that Rabbi Samuel said, that the days of the Messiah were to be as from the day that the world was created until now, according to [Deuteronomy 11:21](#). Rabbi Nacham said: As from the days of Noah till now, according to [Isaiah 54:9](#). Rabbi Chija said, that Rabbi Jochanan said: All the prophets have only prophesied in regard of the days of the Messiah; but in regard to the world to come, eye has not seen, O God, beside Thee, what He hath prepared for him that waiteth for Him ([Isaiah 64:4](#)). And this is opposed to what Rabbi Samuel said, that there was no differences between this world and the days of the Messiah, except that foreign domination would cease. Upon which the Talmud goes off to discourse upon repentance, and its relation to perfect righteousness.

Lengthy as this extract may be, it will at least show the infinite differences between the Rabbinic expectation of the Messiah, and the picture of him presented in the New Testament. Surely the Messianic idea, as realised in Christ, could not have been derived from the views current in those times!

Appendix 10—On the Supposed Temple-Synagogue. [132] (Book II. ch. 10.).

Putting aside, as quite untenable, the idea of a regular *Beth ha-Midrash* in the Temple (though advocated even by *Wünche*), we have to inquire whether any historical evidence can be adduced for the existence of a Synagogue within the bounds of the Temple buildings. The notice (Sot. vii. 8) that on every Sabbatic year lection of certain portions was made to the people in the Court and that a service was conducted there during public fasts on account of dry weather (Taan. ii. 5), can, of course, not be adduced as proving the existence of a regular Temple-Synagogue. On the other hand, it is expressly said in Sanh. 88 *b*, lines 19, 20 from top, that on the Sabbaths and feast days the members of the Sanhedrin went out upon the *Chel* of Terrace of the temple, when questions were asked of them and answered. It is quite true that in Tos. Sanh. vii. (p. 158, col. *d*) we have an inaccurate statement about the second of the Temple-Sanhedrin as sitting on the *Chel* (instead of at the entrance of the Priests Court, as in Sanh. 88 *b*), and that there the Sabbath and festive discourses are loosely designated as a *Beth haMidrash* which was on the Temple-Mount.¹ But since exactly the same description—indeed, in the same words—of what took place is given in the Tosephta as in Talmud itself, the former must be corrected by the latter, or rather the term *Beth ha-Midrash* must be taken in the wider and more general sense as the place of Rabbinic exposition and not as indicating any permanent Academy. But even if the words in the Tosephta were to be taken in preference to those in the Talmud itself, *they contain no mention of any Temple-Synagogue.*

Equally inappropriate are the other arguments in favor of this supposed Temple-Synagogue. The first of them is derived from a notice in Tos. Sukkah. iv. 4, in which R. Joshua explains how, during the first night of the Feast of Tabernacles, the pious never

¹So also by *Maimonides*, *Yad ha-Chas.* vol. iv. p. 241 *a* (*Hilc. Sanc.* ch 3.)

[133]

saw sleep since they went, first to the Morning Sacrifice, thence of the Synagogue, thence the Beth ha-Midrash, thence to the Evening Sacrifice, and thence to the “joy of the house of water drawing” (the night-feast and services in the Temple-Courts). The only other argument is that from Yoma vii. 1, 2 where we read that while the bullock and the goat were burned the High-Priest read to the people certain portions of the Law, the roll of which was handed by the *Chazzan* of the Synagogue (it is not said which Synagogue) to the head of the Synagogue, by him to the Sagan, and by the Sagan to the High-Priest.² How utterly inconclusive inference from these notices are, need not be pointed out. More than this—the existence of a Temple-Synagogue seems entirely incompatible with the remark in Yoma vii. 2, that it was impossible for anyone present at the reading of the High-Priest to witness the burning of the bullock and goat—and that, *not* because the former took place in a regular Temple-Synagogue, but because the way was far and the two services were exactly at the same time. Such, so far as I know, are all the Talmudical passages from which the existence of a regular Temple-Synagogue has been inferred, and with what reason, the reader may judge for himself.

It is indeed easy to understand that Rabbinism and later Judaism should have wished to locate a Synagogue and a Beth ha-Midrash within the sacred precincts of the Temple itself. But it is difficult to account for the circumstance that such Christian scholars as *Re-land*, *Carpzov*, and *Lightfoot* should have been content to repeat the statement without subjecting its grounds to personal examination. *Vitringa* (Synag. p. 30) almost grows indignant at the possibility of any doubt—and that, although he himself quotes passages from *Maimonides* to the effect *that the reading of the Law by the High-Priest on the Day of Atonement took place in the Court of the Women*, and hence not in any supposed Synagogue. Yet commentators generally, and writers on the Life of Christ have located the

²A similar arrangement is described in Sot. vii. 8 as connected with the reading of the Law by the kings of Israel to the people according to Duet xxxi. 10. Will it be argued from this that there was a Synagogue in the temple in the early days of the kings?

sitting of our Lord among the Doctors in the Temple in this supposed Temple-Synagogue. ³

³In a former book (*Sketches of Jewish Life in the Time of our Lord*) I had expressed hesitation and misgivings on the subject. These (as explained in the text), a fuller study has converted into absolute certitude against the popularly accepted hypothesis. And what, indeed, could have been the meaning of a Synagogue—which, after all, stood as substitute for the Temple and its Services, within the precincts of the Temple; or how could the respective services be so arranged as not to clash; or, lastly, have not the prayers of the Synagogue, admittedly, taken the place of the Services and Sacrifices of the Temple?

[134] **Appendix 11—On the Prophecy, [Isaiah 40:3](#) (See**
[135] **Book II. ch. 11.)**

According to the Synoptic Gospels, the public appearance and preaching of John was the fulfilment of the prediction with which the second part of the prophecies of Isaiah opens, called by the Rabbis, the book of consolations. After a brief general preface ([Isaiah 40:1, 2](#)), the words occur which are quoted by St. Matthew and St. Mark ([Isaiah 40:3](#)), and more fully by St. Luke ([Isaiah 40:3-5](#)). A more appropriate beginning of the book of consolations could scarcely be conceived.

The quotation of [Isaiah 40:3](#) is made according to the LXX., the only difference being the change of paths of our God into His paths. The divergences between the LXX. and our Hebrew text of [Isaiah 40:4, 5](#) are somewhat more numerous, but equally unimportant—the main difference from the Hebrew original lying in this, that, instead of rendering all flesh shall see it together we have in the LXX. and the New Testament, all flesh shall see the salvation of God. As it can scarcely be supposed that the LXX. read w(#y for wdx y, we must regard their rendering as *Targumic*. Lastly, although according to the accents in the Hebrew Bible we should read, The Voice of one crying: In the wilderness prepare &c., yet, as alike the LXX., the Targum, and the synoptists render, The Voice of one crying in the wilderness: Prepare their testimony must be regarded as outweighing the authority of the accents, which are of so much later date.

But the main question is, whether [Isaiah 40:3](#), &c., refers to Messianic times or not. Most modern interpreters regard it as applying to the return of the exiles from Babylon. This is not the place to enter on a critical discussion of the passage; but it may be remarked that the insertion of the word salvation in v. 5 by the LXX. seems to imply that they had viewed it as Messianic. It is, at any rate, certain that the Synopists so understood the rendering of the LXX. But this is not all. The quotation from [Isaiah 40](#). was regarded by the Evangelists as fulfilled, when John the Baptist announced

the coming Kingdom of God. We have proof positive that, on the supposition of the correctness of the announcement made by John, they only took the view of their contemporaries in applying [Isaiah 60:3](#), &c., to the preaching of the Baptist. The evidence here seems to be indisputable, for the *Targum renders the close of v. 9* (say unto the cities of Judah, Behold your God!) *by the words: Say to the cities of the House of Judah, the Kingdom of your God shall be manifested.* [136]

In fact, according to the Targum, the good tidings are *not* brought by Zion nor by Jerusalem, but *to* Zion and *to* Jerusalem.

[137] **Appendix 12—The Baptism of Proselytes (See Book II. ch. 11.)**

Only those who have made study of it can have any idea how large, and sometimes bewildering, is the literature on the subject of Jewish Proselytes and their Baptism. Our present remarks will be confined to the Baptism of Proselytes.

1. Generally, as regards proselytes (*Gerim*) we have to distinguish between the *Ger ha-Shaar* (proselyte of the gate) and *Ger Toshabh* (sojourner settled among Israel), and again the *Ger hatsedeq* (proselyte of righteousness) and *Ger habberith* (proselyte of the covenant). The former are referred to by *Josephus* (*Ant.* xiv. 7. 2), and frequently in the New Testament, in the Authorised Version under the designation of those who fear God [Acts 13:16, 26](#); are religious [Acts 13:43](#); devout [Acts 13:50](#); [17:4, 17](#); worship God [Acts 16:14](#); [18:7](#). Whether the expression devout and feared God in [Acts 10:2, 7](#) refers to proselytes of the gates is doubtful. As the proselytes of the gate only professed their faith in the God of Israel, and merely bound themselves to the observance of the so-called seven Noachic commandments (on which in another place), the question of baptism need not be discussed in connection with them, since they did not even undergo circumcision.

2. It was otherwise with the proselytes of righteousness who became children of the covenant perfect Israelites in every respect, both as regarded duties and privileges. All writers are agreed that three things were required for the admission of such proselytes: *Circumcision* (*Milah*), *Baptism* (*Tebhilah*), and a *Sacrifice* (*Qorban*, in the case of women: baptism and sacrifice)—the latter consisting of a burnt-offering of a heifer, or of a pair of turtle doves or of young doves (*Maimonides*, *Hilkh. Iss. Biah* xiii. 5). After the destruction of the Temple promise had to be made of such a sacrifice when the services of the Sanctuary were restored. On this and the ordinances about circumcision it is not necessary to enter further. That *baptism* was absolutely necessary to make a proselyte is so frequently stated

as not to be disputed (See *Maimonides*, u. s.; the tractate *Massekhet Gerim* in *Kirchheim's* Septem Libri Talm. Parvi, pp. 38-44 [which, however, adds little to our knowledge]; Targum on [Exodus 12:44](#); Ber. 47 b; Kerith. 9 a; Jer. Yebam. p. 8 d; Yebam. 45 b, 46 a and b, 48 b, 76 a; Ab. Sar. 57 a, 59 a, and other passages). There was, indeed a difference between Rabbis Joshua and Eliezer, the former maintaining that baptism alone without circumcision, the latter that circumcision alone without baptism, sufficed to make a proselyte, but the sages decided in favour of the necessity of both rites (Yebam. 46 a and b). The baptism was to be performed in the presence of three witnesses, ordinarily Sanhedrists (Yebam. 47 b), but in case of necessity others might act. The person to be baptized, having cut his hair and nails, undressed completely, made fresh profession of his faith before what were the fathers of the baptism (our Godfathers, Kethub. 11 a; Erub. 15 a), and then immersed completely, so that every part of the body was touched by the water. The rite would, of course, be accompanied by exhortations and benedictions (*Maimonides*, Hilkh. Milah iii. 4; Hilkh. Iss. Biah xiv. 6). Baptism was not to be administered at night, nor on a Sabbath or feast day (Yebam. 46 b). Women were attended by those of their own sex, the Rabbis standing at the door outside. Yet unborn children of proselytes did not require to be baptized, because they were born in holiness (Yebam. 78 a). In regard to the little children of proselytes opinions differed. A person under age was indeed received, but not regarded as properly an Israelite till he had attained majority. Secret baptism, or where only the mother brought a child, was not acknowledged. In general, the statements of a proselyte about his baptism required attestation by witnesses. But the children of a Jewess or of a proselyte were regarded as Jews, even if the baptism of the father was doubtful. [138]

It was indeed a great thing when, in the words of *Maimonides*, a stranger sought shelter under the wings of the Shekhinah, and the change of condition which he underwent was regarded as complete. The waters of baptism were to him in very truth, though in a far different from the Christian sense, the bath of regeneration ([Titus 3:5](#)). As he stepped out of these waters he was considered as born anew'—in the language of the Rabbis, as if he were a little child just born (Yeb. 22 a; 48 b; 97 b), as a child of one day (Mass. Ger. c. ii.).

[139] But this new birth was not a birth from above in the sense of moral or spiritual renovation, but only as implying a new relationship to God, to Israel, and to his own past, present, and future. It was expressly enjoined that all the difficulties of his new citizenship should first be set before him, and if, after that, he took upon himself the yoke of the law, he should be told how all those sorrows and persecutions were intended to convey a greater blessing, and all those commandments to redound to greater merit. More especially was he to regard himself as a new man in reference to his past. Country, home, habits, friends, and relation were all changed. The past, with all that had belonged to it, was past, and he was a new man—the old, with its defilements, was buried in the waters of baptism. This was carried out with such pitiless logic as not only to determine such questions as those of inheritance, but that it was declared that, except, for the sake of not bringing proselytism into contempt, a proselyte might have wedded his own mother or sister (comp. *Yeb. 22 a*; *Sanh. 58 b*). It is a curious circumstance that marriage with a female proselyte was apparently very popular (*Horay. 13 a*, line 5 from bottom; see also *Shem. R. 27*), and the Talmud names at least three celebrated doctors who were the offspring of such unions (comp. *Derenbourg, Hist. de la Palest.*, p. 223, note 2). The praises of proselytism are also sung in *Vayy. R. 1*.

If anything could have further enhanced the value of such proselytism, it would have been its supposed antiquity. Tradition traced it up to Abraham and Sarah, and the expression ([Genesis 12:5](#)) the souls that they had gotten was explained as referring to their proselytes, since every one that makes a proselyte is as if he made (created) him (*Ber. R. 39*, comp also the Targums *Pseudo-Jon.* and *Jerus.* and *Midr. on Cant. i. 3*). The Talmud, differing in this from the Targumim, finds in [Exodus 2:5](#) a reference to the baptism of Pharaoh's daughter (*Sotah 12 b*, line 3; *Megill. 13 a*, line 11). In *Shem. R. 27* Jethro is proved to have been a convert, from the circumstances that his original name had been Jethor ([Exodus 4:18](#)), an additional letter (Jethro), as in the case of Abraham, having been added to his name when became a proselyte (comp. also *Zebhach. 116 a* and Targum *Ps.-Jon.* on [Exodus 18:6, 27](#), [Numbers 24:21](#)). To pass over other instances, we are pointed to Ruth (Targum on [Ruth 1:10, 15](#)). and to Nebuzaradan, who is also described as a

[140]

proselyte (Sanh. 96 *b*, line 19 from the bottom). But it is said that in the days of David and Solomon proselytes were not admitted by the Sanhedrin because their motives were suspected (Yeb. 76 *a*), or that at least they were closely watched.

But although the baptism of proselytes seems thus far beyond doubt, Christian theologians have discussed the question, whether the rite was practised at the time of Christ, or only introduced after the destruction of the Temple and its Services, to take the place of the Sacrifice previously offered. The controversy, which owed its origin chiefly to dogmatic prejudices on the part of Lutherans, Calvinists, and Baptists, has since been continued on historical or quasi-historical grounds. The silence of Josephus and Philo can scarcely be quoted in favour of the later origin of the rite. On the other hand, it may be urged that, as Baptism did not take the place of sacrifices in any other instance, it would be difficult account for the origin of such a rite in connection with the admission of proselytes.

Again, if a Jew who had become Levitically defiled, required immersion, it is difficult to suppose that a heathen would have been admitted to all the services of the Sanctuary without a similar purification. But we have also positive testimony (which the objections of *Winer*, *Keil*, and *Leyrer*, in my opinion do not invalidate), that the baptism of proselytes existed in the time of Hillel and Shammai. For, whereas the school of Shammai is said to have allowed a proselyte who was circumcised on the eve of the Passover, to partake after baptism of the Passover,¹ the school of Hillel forbade it. This controversy must be regarded as providing that at that time (previous to Christ) the baptism of proselytes was customary²

¹The case supposed by the school of Shammai would, however, have been impossible, since, according to Rabbinic directions, a certain time must have elapsed between circumcision and baptism.

²The following notice from *Josephus* (Ant. xviii. 5. 2) is not only interesting in itself, but for the view which it presents of baptism. It shows what views rationalising Jews took of the work of the Baptist, and how little such were able to enter into the real meaning of his baptism. But to some of the Jews it appeared, that the destruction of Herod's army came from God, and, indeed, as a righteous punishment on account of what had been done to John, who was surnamed the Baptist, for Herod ordered him to be killed, a good man, and who commanded the Jews to exercise virtue, both as to righteousness towards one another, and piety towards God, and so to come to baptism. For that the baptizing would be acceptable to Him, if they made use of it, not for the putting away

[141] (Pes. viii. 8, Eduy. v. 2).

(remission) of some sins, but for the purification of the body, after that the soul had been previously cleansed by righteousness. And when others had come in crowds, for they were exceedingly moved by hearing these words, Herod, fearing lest such influence of his over the people might lead to some rebellion, for they seemed ready to do any thing by his council, deemed it best, before anything new should happen through him, to put him to death, rather than that, when a change should arise in affairs, he might have to repent &c. On the credibility of this testimony see the Article on *Josephus*, in *Smith's Dictionary of Christian Biography* vol. iii. pp. 441-460 (see especially pp. 458, 459).

Appendix 13—Jewish Angelology and Demonology. [142]

The Fall of the Angels. (See Book III. ch. 1.)

Without here entering on a discussion of the doctrine of Angels and devils as presented in Holy Scripture, the Apocrypha, and the Pseudepigrapha, it will be admitted that considerable progression may be marked as we advance from even the latest Canonical to Apocryphal, and again from these to the Pseudepigraphic Writings. The same remark applies even more strongly to a comparison of the later with Rabbinic literature. There we have comparatively little of the Biblical in its purity. But, added to it, we now find much that is the outcome of Eastern or of prurient imagination, of national conceit, of ignorant superstition, and of foreign, especially Persian, elements. In this latter respect it is true—not, indeed, as regards the doctrine of good and evil Angels, but much of its Rabbinic elaboration—that the names of the Angels (and of the months) were brought from Babylon (Jer. Rosh. haSh. 56 *d*; Ber. r. 48), and with the names not a few of the notions regarding them. At the same time, it would be unjust to deny that much of the symbolism which it is evidently intended to convey is singularly beautiful.

I. ANGELOLOGY.

1. *Creation, Number, Duration and Location of the Angels.* We are now considering, not the *Angel-Princes* but that vast unnumbered Host generally designated as the ministering Angels (tr#h yk)lm). Opinions differ (Ber. R. 3) whether they were created on the second day as being spirit winds ([Psalm 104:4](#)), or on the fifth day ([Isaiah 6:2](#)) in accordance with the words of Creation on those days. Viewed in reference to God's Service and Praise, they are a flaming fire: in regard to their office, winged messengers (Pirqé de R. El. 4). But not only so: every day ministering Angels are created, whose apparent destiny is only to raise the praise of God, after which they pass away

[143] into the fiery stream (*Nahar deNur*) whence they originally issued ¹ (Chag. 14 *a*; Ber. R. 78). More than this—a new Angel is created to execute to every behest of God, and then passeth away (Chag. u. s.). This continual new creation of Angels, which is partly a beautiful allegory, partly savours of the doctrine of emanation is Biblical supported by an appeal to [Lamentations 3:23](#). Thus it may be said that daily a *Kath*, or company, of Angels is created for daily service of God, and that every word which proceedeth from His mouth becomes an Angel [Messenger—mark here the ideal unity of Word and Deed], (Chang. 14 *a*).

The vast number of that Angelic Host, and the consequent safety of Israel as against its enemies, was described in the most hyperbolic language. There were 12 *Mazzaloth* (signs of the Zodiac), each having 30 chiefs of armies, each chief with 30 legions, each legion with 30 leaders, each leader with 30 captains, each captain with 30 under him, and each of these things with 365,000 stars—and all were created for the sake of Israel! (Ber. 32. *b*.) Similarly, when Nebuchadnezzar proposed to ascend into heaven, and to exalt his throne above the stars, and be like the Most High, the Bath Qol replied to this grandson of Nimrod that man's age was 70, or at most 80 years, while the way from earth to the firmament occupied 500 years, ² a thickness of the firmament was 500 years, the feet of the living creatures were equal to all that had preceded, and the joints of their feet to as many as had preceded them, and so on increasingly through all their members up to their horns, after which came the Throne of Glory, the feet of which again equalled all that had preceded, and so on (Chag. 13 *a* ³). ⁴ In connection with this we read in Chag. 12 *b* that there are seven heavens: the *Vdon*, in which there is the sun; *Riqia*, in which the sun shines, and the moon, stars, and planets are fixed; *Shechaqim*, in which are the millstones to make the manna for the pious; *Zebhul*, in which the Upper Jerusalem, and the Temple and the Altar, and in which Michael, the chief Angel-Prince, offers sacrifices; *Maon*, in which the Angels of the Ministry

¹This stream issued from under the throne of God, and is really the sweat of the living creatures in their awe at the glory of God (Ber. R. 78).

²In Jer. Ber 2 *c* it is 50 years.

³See also Pes. 94 *b*.

⁴Some add the Cherubim as another and separate class.

are, who sing by night and are silent by day for the sake of the honour of Israel (who now have their services); *Machon*, in which are the treasuries of snow, hail, the chambers of noxious dews, and of the receptacles of water, the chamber of wind, and the cave of mist, and their doors are of fire; lastly, *Araboth*, wherein Justice, Judgment and Righteousness are, the treasures of Life, of Peace and of Blessing, the soul of the righteous, and the spirits and souls of those who are to be born in the future, and the dew by which the dead are to be raised. There also are the Ophanim, and the Seraphim, and the living creatures and the ministering Angels, and the Throne of Glory and over them is enthroned the Great King. [For a description of this Throne and of the Appearance of its King, see Pirqué de R. Eliez. 4.] On the other hand, sometimes every power and phenomenon in Nature is hypostatized into an Angel—such as hail, rain, wind, sea &c.; similarly, every occurrence, such as life, death, nourishment, poverty, nay, as it is expressed: there is not stalk of grass upon earth but it has its Angels in heaven (Ber R. 10). This seems to approximate the views of Alexandrian Mysticism. So also, perhaps, the idea that certain Biblical heroes became after death Angels. But as this may be regarded as implying their service as messengers of God, we leave it for the present.

[144]

2. *The Angel-Princes, their location, names, and offices.* Any limitation, as to duration or otherwise, of the Ministering Angels does not apply either to the Ophanim (or wheel-angels), the Seraphim, the Cayoth (or living creatures), nor to the Angel-Princes (Ber. R. 78).⁵ In Chag. 13 *a, b* the name *Chashamal* is given to the living creatures. The word is explained as composed of two others which mean silence and speech—it being beautifully explained, that they keep silence when the Word proceeds out of the mouth of God, and speak when He has ceased. It would be difficult exactly to state the number of the Angel-Princes. The 70 nations, of which the world is composed, had each their Angel-Prince (Targ. Jer. on [Genesis 11:7, 8](#); comp. Ber. R. 56; Shem. R. 21; Vayyi. R. 29; Ruth R. ed. Warsh. p. 36 *b*), who plead their cause with God. Hence these Angels are really hostile to Israel, and may be regarded as not quite

⁵According to Jer Ber. ix. 1, the abode of the living creatures was to an extent of 515 years journey, which is proved from the numerical value of the word *hr#y* straight ([Ezekiel 1:7](#)).

[145]

good Angels, and are cast down when the nationality which they represent is destroyed. It may have been as a reflection on Christian teaching that Israel was described as not requiring any representative with God, like the Gentiles. For, as will soon appear, this was not the general view entertained. Besides these Gentile Angel-Princes there were other chiefs, whose office will be explained in the sequel. Of these 5 are specially mentioned, of whom four surrounded the Throne of God: Michael, Gabriel, Rephael, and Uriel. But the greatest of all is Metatron, who is under the Throne, and before it. These Angels are privileged to be within the *Pargod*, or cloudy veil, while the others only hear the Divine commands or counsels outside this curtain (Chag. 16 *a*, Pirqé d. R. El. iv.). It is a slight variation when the Targum Pseudo-Jonathan on [Deuteronomy 34:6](#) enumerates the following as the 6 principal Angels: Michael, Gabriel, Metatron, Yopheil, Uriel, and Yophyophyah. The Book of Enoch (ch 20.) speaks also of 6 principal Angels, while Pirqé d. R. Eliez. iv. mentions seven. In that very curious passage (Berakhoth 51 *a*) we read of three directions given by Suriel, Prince of the Face, to preserve the Rabbis from the Techaspith (company of Evil Angels), or according to others, from Istalganith (another company of Evil Angels). In Chag. 13 *b* we read of an Angel called Sandalpon, who stands upon the earth, while his head reaches 500 years way beyond the living creatures. He is supposed to stand behind the Merkabah (the throne-chariot), and make crowns for the Creator, which rise of their own accord. We also read of Sagsagel, who taught Moses the sacred Name of God, and was present at his death. But, confining ourselves to the five principal Angel-chiefs, we have,

*a. Metaron,*⁶ who appears most closely to correspond to the Angel of the Face, or the Logos. He is the representative of God. In the Talmud (Sanh. 38 *b*) a Christian is introduced as clumsily starting a controversy on this point, that, according to the Jewish contention, [Exodus 24:1](#) should have read, Come up to Me. On this R. Idith explained that the expression referred to the Metatron ([Exodus 33:21](#)), but denied the inference that Metatron was either to be adored, or had power to forgive sins, or that he was to be

⁶On the controversy on the meaning of the name Metatron, whether it means under the throne, or behind the throne, or is the same as Metator, divider, arranger, representative, we will not enter.

Book III. ch. 1.) ^{cli}
regarded as a Mediator. In continuation of this controversy we are told (Chag. 15 *a, b*) that, when an apostate Rabbi had seen Metatron sitting in heaven, and would have interfered from it that there were two supreme powers, Metatron received from another Angel 60 fiery stripes so as to prove his inferiority! In Targ. Ps.-Jon. on [Genesis 5:24](#) he is called the Great Scribe, and also the Prince of this world. He is also designated as the Youth and in the Kabbalah as the Little God who had 7 names like the Almighty, and shared His Majesty. he is also called the Prince of the Face and described as the Angel who sits in the innermost chamber (Chag. 5 *b*), while the other Angels hear their commands outside the Veil (Chag. 16 *a*). He is represented as showing the unseen to Moses (Siphre, p. 141 *a*), and as instructing infants who have died without receiving knowledge (Abhod. Zar. 3 *b*). In the Introduction to the Midrash on Lamentations there is a revolting story in which Metatron is represented as proposing to shed tears in order that God might not have to weep over the destruction of Jerusalem, to which, however, the Almighty is made to refuse His assent. We hesitate to quote further from the passage. In Siphre on Deut. (ed. *Freidm.* p. 141 *a*) Metatron is said to have shown Moses the whole of Palestine. He is also said to have gone before Israel in the Wilderness.

[146]

b. Michael (who is like God?), or the Great Prince (Chag. 12 *b*). He stands at the right hand of the throne of God. According to Targ. Ps.-Jon. on [Exodus 24:1](#), he is the Prince of Wisdom. According to the Targum on [Psalm 137:7, 8](#), the Prince of Jerusalem, the representative of Israel. According to Sebach. 62 *a* he offers upon the heavenly Altar; according to some, the soul of the pious; according to others, lambs of fire. But, although Michael is the Prince of Israel, he is not to be invoked by them (Jer. Ber. ix. 13 *a*). In Yoma 77 *a* we have an instance of his ineffectual advocacy for Israel before the destruction of Jerusalem. The origin of his name as connected with the Song of Moses at the Red Sea is explained in Bemidb. R. 2. Many instances of his activity are related. Thus, he delivered Abraham from the fiery oven of Nimrod, and afterwards, also, the Three Children out of the fiery furnace. He was the principal or middle Angel of the three who came to announce to Abraham the birth of Isaac, Gabriel being at his right, and Rephael at his left. Michael also saved Lot. Michael and Gabriel wrote down that the

[147]

primogeniture belonged to Jacob, and God confirmed it. Michael and Gabriel acted as friends of the bridegroom in the nuptials of Adam. Yet they could not bear to look upon the glory of Moses. Michael is also supposed to have been the Angel in the bush (according to others, Gabriel). At the death of Moses, Michael prepared his bier, Gabriel spread a cloth over the head of Moses, and Sagsagel over his feet. In the world to come Michael would pronounce the blessing over the fruits of Eden, then hand them to Gabriel, who would give them to the patriarchs, and so on to David. The superiority of Michael over Gabriel is asserted in Ber. 4 *b*, where, by an ingenious combination with [Daniel 10:13](#), it is shown that [Isaiah 6:6](#) applies to him (both having the word *dx*, one). It is added that Michael flies in one flight, Gabriel in two, Elijah in four, and the Angel of Death in eight flights (no doubt to give time for repentance).

c. Gabriel (the Hero of God) represents rather judgment, while Michael represents mercy. Thus he destroyed Sodom (Bab. Mez. 86 *b*, and other places). He restored to Tamar the pledges of Judah, which Sammael had taken away (Sot. 10 *b*). He struck the servants of the Egyptian princess, who would have kept their mistress from taking Moses out of the water (Sot. 12 *b*); also Moses, that he might cry and so awaken pity. According to some, it was he who delivered the Three Children; but all are agreed that he killed the men that were standing outside the furnace. He also smote the army of Sennacherib. The passage in [Ezekiel 10:2, 7](#) was applied to Gabriel, who had received from the Cherub two coals, which, however, he retained for six years, in the hope that Israel might repent.⁷ He is supposed to be referred to in [Ezekiel 9:4](#) as affixing the mark on the forehead which is a *t*, drawn, in the wicked, in blood (Shabb. 55 *a*). We are also told that he had instructed Moses about making the Candlestick, on which occasion he had put on an apron, like a goldsmith; and that he had disputed with Michael about the meaning of a word. To his activity the bringing of fruits to maturity is ascribed—perhaps because he was regarded as made of fire, while Michael was made of snow (Deb. R. 5). These Angels are supposed to stand beside each other, without the fire of the one

⁷Gabriel was also designated *Itmon*, because he stops up the sins of Israel (Sanh. 45 *b*).

injuring the snow of the other. The curious legend is connected with him (Shabb. 56 *b*, Sanh. 21 *b*), that, when Solomon married the daughter of Pharaoh, Gabriel descended into the sea, and fixed a reed in it, around which a mudbank gathered, on which a forest sprang up. On this site imperial Rome was built. The meaning of the legend—or perhaps rather allegory—seems (as explained in other parts of this book) that, when Israel began to decline from God, the punishment through its enemies was prepared, which culminated in the dominion of Rome. In the future age Gabriel would hunt and slay Leviathan. This also may be a parabolic representation of the destruction of Israel's enemies.

[148]

d. Of *Uriel* (God is my light) and *Rephael* (God heals) it need only be said, that the one stands at the left side of the Throne of glory, the other behind it. ⁸

3. *The Ministering Angels and their Ministry.* The ministry of the Angels may be divided into two parts, that of praising God, and that of executing His behests. In regard to the former, there are 684,000 myriads who daily praise the Name of God. From sunrise to sundown they say: Holy, holy, holy, and from sundown to sunrise: Blessed be the Glory of God from its place. In connection with this we may mention the beautiful allegory (Shem. R. 21) that the Angel of prayer weaves crowns for God out of the prayer of Israel. As to the execution of the Divine commands by the Angels, it is suggested (Aboth d. R. Nathan 8) that their general designation as ministering Angels might have led to jealousy among them. Accordingly, their names were always a composition of that of God with the special commission entrusted to them (Shem. r. 29), so that the name of each Angel depended in Yalkut (vol. ii. Par. 797), where we are told that each Angel has a tablet on his heart, in which the Name of God and that of the Angel is combined. This change of names explained the answer of the Angel to Manoah (Bemidb. R. 10). It is impossible to enumerate all the instances of Angelic activity recorded in Talmudic writings. Angels had performed the music at the first sacrifice of Adam; they had announced the consequences of his punishment; they had cut off the hands and feet of the serpent;

⁸The names of the four Angel-Princes—Michael, Gabriel, Uriel, and Raphael—are explained in Bemid. R. 2.

[149] they had appeared to Abraham in the form of a baker, a sailor, and an Arab. 120,000 of them had danced before Jacob when he left Laban; 4,000 myriads of them were ready to fight for him against Esau; 22,000 of them descended on Sinai and stood beside Israel when, in their terror at the Voice of God, they fled for twelve miles. Angels were directed to close the gates of heaven when the prayer of Moses with the All-powerful, Ineffable Name in it, which he had learn from Sagsagel, would have prevented his death. Finally, as they were pledged to help Israel, so would they also punish every apostate Israelite. Especially would they execute that most terrible punishment of throwing souls to each other from one world to another. By the side of these debasing superstitions we come upon beautiful allegories, such as that a good and an evil Angel always accompanied man, but especially on the eve of the Sabbath when he returned from the Synagogue, and that for every precept he observed God sent him a protecting Angel. This is realistically developed in Pirké d. R. El. 15, where the various modes and time which the good Angels keep man from destruction are set forth.

It is quite in accordance with what we know of the system of Rabbinism, that the heavenly host should be represented as forming a sort of consultative Sanhedrin. Since God never did anything without first taking counsel with the family above (Sanh. 38 *b*),⁹ it had been so when He resolved to create man. Afterward the Angels had interceded for Adam, and, when God pointed to his disobedience, they had urged that thus death would also come upon Moses and Aaron, who were sinless, since one fate must come to the just and the unjust. Similarly, they had interceded for Isaac, when Abraham was about to offer him and finally dropped three tears on the sacrificial knife, by which its edge became blunted. And so through the rest of Israel's history, where on all critical occasions Jewish legend introduces the Angels on the scene.

4. *Limitation of the power of the Angels.* According to Jewish ideas, the faculties, the powers, and even the knowledge of Angels were limited. They are, indeed, pure spiritual beings (Vayyikra R.

⁹According to Jer. Ber. ix. 7 (p. 14 *b*), God only takes counsel with His Sanhedrin when He takes away, not when He giveth (Job 1:21)—and it is argued that, wherever the expression and Jehovah occurs, as in the last clause of 1 Kings 22:23, it means God His Sanhedrin.

Appendix 13—*Jewish Angelology and Demonology. The Fall of the Angels.* (See *Book III. ch. 1.*)

24), without sensuous requirements (Yoma 75 b), without hatred,^{clv} envy, or jealousy (Chag. 14), and without sin (Pirqé d. R. El. 46). They know much, notably the future (Ab. d. R. Nath. 37), and have part in the Divine Light. They live on the beams of the Divine Glory (Bem. R. 21), are not subject to our limitations as to movement, see but are not seen (A b. d. R. Nath. u. s.), can turn their face to any side (Ab. d. R. Nath. 37), and only appear to share in our ways, such as in eating (Bar. R. 48). Still, in many respects they are inferior to Israel, and had been employed in ministry (Ber. R. 75). They were unable to give names to the animals, which Adam did (Pirqé d. R. El. 13). Jacob had wrestled with the Angel and prevailed over him when the Angel wept (Chull. 92 a). Thus it was rather their nature than their powers or dignity which distinguished them from man. No angel could do two messages at the same time (Ber. R. 50). In general they are merely instruments blindly to do a certain work, not even beholding the Throne of Glory (Bemidb. R. 14), but needed mutual assistance (Vayyikia R. 31). They are also liable to punishments (Chag. 16 a). Thus, they were banished from their station for 138 years, because they had told Lot that God would destroy Sodom, while the Angel-Princes of the Gentiles were kept in chains till the days of Jeremiah. As regards their limited knowledge, with the exception of Gabriel, they do not understand Chaldee or Syriac (Sot. 33 a). The realistic application of their supposed ignorance on this score need not here be repeated (see Shabb. 12 b). As the Angels are inferior to the righteous, it follows that they are so to Israel. God had informed the Angels that the creation of man was superior to theirs, and it had excited their envy. Adam attained a place much nearer to God than they, and God loved Israel more than the Angels. And God had left all the ministering Angels in order to come to Moses, and when He communicated with him it was directly, and the Angels standing between them did not hear what passed. In connection with this ministry of the Angels on behalf of Biblical heroes a curious legend may here find its place. From a combination of [Exodus 18:4](#) with [Exodus 2:15](#) the strange inference was made that Moses had actually been seized by Pharaoh. Two different accounts of how he escaped from his power are given. According to the one, the sword with which he was to be executed rebounded from the neck of Moses, and was broken, to which Cant.

[150]

[151]

vii. 5 was supposed to refer, it being added that the rebound killed the would-be executioner. According to another account, an Angel took the place of Moses, and thus enabled him to fly, his flight being facilitated by the circumstances that all the attendants of the king were miraculously rendered either dumb, deaf, or blind, so that they could not execute the behest of their master. Of this miraculous interposition Moses is supposed to have been reminded in [Exodus 4:11](#), for his encouragement in undertaking his mission to Pharaoh. In the exaggeration of Jewish boastfulness in the Law, it was said that the Angels had wished to receive the Law, but that they had not been granted this privilege ([Job 28:21](#)). And sixty myriads of Angels had crowned with two crowns every Israelite who at Mount Sinai had taken upon himself the Law (Shabb. 88 *a*). In view of all this we need scarcely mention the Rabbinic prohibition to address to the Angels prayers, even although they bore them to heaven (Jer. Ber. ix. 1), or to make pictorial representations of them (Targ. Ps-Jon. on [Exodus 20:23](#); Mechilta on the passage, ed. Weiss, p. 80 *a*).

5. *The Angels are not absolutely good.* Strange as it may seem, this is really the view expressed by the Rabbis. Thus it is said that, when God consulted the Angels, they opposed the creation of man, and that, for this reason, God had concealed from them that man would sin. But more than this—the Angels had actually conspired for the fall of man (the whole of this is also related in Pirqué d. R. El. 13). Nor had their jealous and envy been confined to that occasion. They had accused Abraham, that, when he gave a great feast at the weaning of Isaac, he did not even offer to God a bullock or a goat. Similarly, they had laid charges against Ishmael, in the hope that he might be left to perish of thirst. They had expostulated with Jacob, because he went to sleep at Bethel. But especially had they, from envy, opposed Moses ascension into heaven; they had objected to his being allowed to write down the Law, falsely urging that Moses would claim the glory of it for himself, and they are represented, in a strangely blasphemous manner, as having been with difficulty appeased by God. In Shabb. 88 *b* we have an account of how Moses pacified the Angels, by showing that the Law was not suitable for them, since they were not subject to sinful desires, upon which they became the friends of Moses, and each taught him some secret, among others the Angel of death how to arrest the pestilence. Again,

it is said, that the Angels were wont to bring charges against Israel, and that, when Manasseh wished to repent, the Angels shut the entrance to heaven, so that his prayer might not penetrate into the presence of God.

Equally profane, though in another direction, is the notion that Angels might be employed for magical purposes. This had happened at the siege of Jerusalem under Nebuchadnezzar, when, after the death of that mighty hero Abika, the son of Gaphteri, Chananeel, the uncle of Jeremiah, had conjured up ministering Angels, who affrighted the Chaldees into flight. On this God had changed their names, when Chananee, unable any longer to command their services, had summoned up the Prince of the World by using the Ineffable Name, and lifted Jerusalem into the air, but God had trodden it down again, to all which [Lamentations 2:1](#) referred (Yalk. vol. ii. p. 166 *c* and *d*, Par. 1001). The same story is repeated in another place (p. 167, last line of col. *c*, and col. *d*), with the addition that the leading inhabitants of Jerusalem had proposed to defend the city by conjuring up the Angels of Water and Fire, and surrounding their city with walls of water, of fire, or of iron; but their hopes were disappointed when God assigned to the Angel names different from those which they had previously possessed, so that when called upon they were unable to do what was expected of them.

6. *The Names of the Angels.* Besides those already enumerated, we may here mention,¹⁰ the *Sar ha-Olam*, or Prince of the World (Yeb. 16 *b*); the *Prince of the Sea*, whose name is supposed to have been *Rahab*, and whom God destroyed because he had refused to receive the waters which had covered the world, and the smell of whose dead body would kill every one if it were not covered by water. *Dumah* is the Angel of the realm of the dead (Ber. 18 *b*). When the soul of the righteous leaves the body, the ministering Angels announce it before God, Who deposes them to meet it. Three hosts of Angels then proceed on this errand, each quoting successively one clause of [Isaiah 57:2](#). On the other hand, when the wicked

[153]

¹⁰*Akhtariel*—perhaps the crown of God’—seems to be a name given to the Deity (Ber. 7 *a*).

[Ezekiel 32:19](#) (Keth. 104 *a*). Then the souls of all the dead, good or bad, are handed over to Dunah. *Yorqemi* is the Prince of hail. He had proposed to cool the fiery furnace into which the Three Children were cast, but Gabriel had objected that this might seem a deliverance by natural means, and being himself the Prince of the fire, had proposed, instead of this, to make the furnace cold within and hot without, in order both to deliver the Three Children and to destroy those who watched outside (Pes. 118 *a* and *b*)¹¹ *Ridya*, or *Rayda* is the Angel of rain. One of the Rabbis professed to describe him from actual vision as like a calf whose lips were open, standing between the Upper and the Lower Deep, and saying to the Upper Deep, Let your waters run down, and to the Lower, Let your waters spring up. The representation of this Angel as a calf may be due to the connection between rain and ploughing, and in connection with this may it be noticed that *Ryda* means both a plough and ploughing (Taan. 25 *b*). Of other Angels we will only name the *Ruach Pisqonith*, or Spirit of decision, who is supposed to have made most daring objection to what God had said, [Ezekiel 16:3](#), in which he is defended by the Rabbis, since his activity had been on behalf of Israel (Sanh. 44 *b*); *Naqid*, the Angel of Food; *Nabhel*, the Angel of Poverty; the two *Angels of Healing*; the *Angel of Dreams*, *Lailah*; and even the *Angel of Lust*.¹²

[154] It is, of course, not asserted that all these grossly materialistic superstitious and profane views were entertained in Palestine, or at the time of our Lord, still less that they are shared by educated Jews in the West. But they certainly date from Talmudic times; they embody the only teaching of Rabbinic writings about the Angels which we possess, and hence, whencesoever introduced, or however developed, their roots must be traced back to far earlier times than those when they were propounded in Rabbinic Academies. All the

¹¹It is said that Gabriel had proposed in this manner of deliver Abraham when in similar danger at the hands of Nimrod. And, although God had by His own Hand delivered the patriarch, yet Gabriel had obtained this as the reward of his proposal, that he was allowed to deliver the Three Children from the fiery furnace.

¹²See also the names of the five angels of destruction of whom Moses was afraid on his descent from the mount. Against three of them the three Patriarchs were to fight, God Himself being asked, or else proposing, to combat along with Moses against the other two (Sanh. R. 41; 44).

more that modern Judaism would indignantly repudiate them, do they bear testimony against Rabbinic teaching. And one thing at least must be evident, for the sake of which we have undertaken the task of recording at such length views and statements repugnant to all reverent feeling. The contention of certain modern writers that the teaching about Angels in the New Testament is derived from, and represents Jewish notions must be perceived to be absolutely groundless and contrary to fact. In truth, the teaching of the New Testament on the subject of Angels represents, as compared with that of the Rabbis, not only a return to the purity of Old Testament teaching, but, we might almost say, a new revelation.

II. SATANOLOGY AND FALL OF THE ANGELS.

The difference between the Satanology of the Rabbis and of the New Testament is, if possible, even more marked than that in their Angelology. In general we note that, with the exception of the word *Satan*, none of the names given to the great enemy in the New Testament occurs in Rabbinic writing. More important still, the latter *contain no mention of a Kingdom of Satan*. In other words, the power of the evil is not contrasted with that of good, nor Satan with God. The devil is presented rather as the enemy of man, than of God and of good. This marks a fundamental difference. The New Testament sets before us two opposing kingdoms, or principles, which exercise absolute sway over man. Christ is the Stronger one who overcometh the strong man armed and taken from him not only his spoils, but his armour (St. [Luke 11:21, 22](#)). It is a *moral contest* in which Satan is vanquished, and the liberation of his subjects is the consequence of his own subdual. This implies the deliverance of man from the power of the enemy, not only externally but internally, and substitution of a new principle of spiritual life for the old one. It introduces a moral element, both as the ground and as the result of the contest. From this point of view the difference between the New Testament and Rabbinism cannot be too much emphasised, and it is no exaggeration to say that this alone—the question here being one of principle not of details—would mark the doctrine of Christ as fundamentally divergent from, and incomparably superior to, that

of Rabbinism. Whence hath this Man this wisdom? Assuredly, it may be answered, not from His contemporaries.

Since Rabbinism viewed the great enemy only as the envious and malicious opponent of man, the spiritual element was entirely eliminated.¹³ Instead of the personified principle of Evil, to which there is response in us, and of which all have some experience, we have only a clumsy and—to speak plainly—often a stupid hater. This holds equally true in regard to the threefold aspect under which Rabbinism presents the devil: as *Satan* (also called *Sammael*); as the *Yetser haRa*, or evil impulse personified; and as the *Angel of Death*—in other words, as the Accuser, Tempter, and Punisher. Before explaining the Rabbinic views on each of these points, it is necessary to indicate them in regard to -

1. *The Fall of Satan and of his Angels.* This took place, not antecedently, but *subsequently to the creation of man*. As related in Pirqé de R. Eliezer, ch. 13, the primary cause of it was jealousy and envy on the part of the Angels.¹⁴

[156] Their opposition to man's creation is also described in Ber. R. 8, although there the fall of man is not traced to Satanic agency. But we have (as before stated) a somewhat blasphemous account of the discussions in the heavenly Sanhedrin, whether or not man should be created. While the dispute was still proceeding God actually created man, and addressed the ministering Angels: Why dispute any longer? Man is already created. In the Pirqé de R. Eliezer,

¹³An analogous remark would apply to Jewish teaching about the good angels, who are rather Jewish elves than the high spiritual beings of the Bible.

¹⁴As a curious illustration how extremes meet, we subjoin the following from *Jonathan Edwards*. After describing how Satan, before his fall, was the chief of all the angels ... nay, ... the Messiah or Christ (!), as he was the Anointed, so that in the respect, Jesus Christ is exalted unto his place in heaven; and that Lucifer or Satan, while a holy angel ... was a type of Christ the great American divine explains his fall as follows: But when it was revealed to him, high and glorious as he was, that he must be a ministering spirit to the race of mankind which he had seen newly created, which appeared so feeble, mean, and despicable, of vastly inferior not only to him, the prince of the angels, and head of the created universe, but also to the inferior angels, and that he must be subject to one of that race which should hereafter be born, he could not bear it. This occasioned his fall (Tractate on The Fall of the Angels Works, vol. ii. pp. 608, 609, 610). Could *Jonathan Edwards* have heard of the Rabbinic legends, or is this only a strange coincidence? The curious reader will find much quaint information, though, I fear, little help, in Prof. *W. Scott's* vol. *The Existence of Evil Spirits* London, 1843.

~~we are only told that the Angels had in vain attempted to oppose~~ the creation of man. The circumstance that his superiority was evidenced by his ability to give names to all creatures, induced them to lay a plot against Adam so that by his fall they might obtain supremacy. Now of all Angel-Princes in heaven Sammael was the first—distinguished above. Taking the company of Angels subject to him, he came down upon earth, and selected as the only fit instrument for his designs the serpent, which at that time had not only speech, but hands and feet, and was in stature and appearance like the camel. In the language of the Pirqé de R. Eliezer, Sammael took complete possession of the serpent, even as demoniacs act under the absolute control of evil spirits. Then Sammael, in the serpent, first deceived the woman, and next imposed on her by *touching* the tree of life (although the tree cried out), saying, that he had actually touched the tree, of which he pretended the touch had been forbidden on pain of death ([Genesis 3:3](#))¹⁵ —and yet he had not died! Upon this Eve followed his example, and touched the tree when she immediately saw the Angel of Death coming against her. Afraid that she would die and God give another wife to Adam, she led her husband into sin of disobedience. The story of the Fall is somewhat differently related in Ber. R. 18, 19. No mention is there earlier of Sammael or of his agency, and the serpent is represented as beguiling Eve from a wish to marry her, and for that purpose to compass the death of Adam.

Critical ingenuity may attempt to find a symbolic meaning in many of the details of the Jewish legend of the Fall, although, to use moderate language, they seem equally profane and repulsive. But this will surely be admitted by all, that the Rabbinic account of the fall of the Angels, as connected with fall of man, equally contrasts with the reverent reticence of the Old Testament narrative and the sublime teaching of the New Testament about sin and evil.

[157]

2. *Satan, or Sammael, as the accuser of man.* And clumsy, indeed, are his accusations. Thus the statement ([Genesis 22:1](#)) that God tempted Abraham is, in Jewish legend, transformed (Sanh. 89

¹⁵The Rabbis point out, how Eve had *added* to the words of God. He had only commanded them not to *eat* of the tree, while Eve added to it, that they were not to *touch* it. Thus adding to the words of God had led to the first sin with all the terrible consequences connected with it.

b) into a scene, where, in the great upper Sanhedrin (Ber. R. 56), Satan brings accusation against the Patriarch.¹⁶ All his previous piety had been merely interested; and now when, at the age of one hundred, God had given him a son, he had made a great feast and not offered aught to the Almighty. On this God is represented as answering, that Abraham was ready to sacrifice not only an animal but his own son; and this had been the occasion of the temptation of Abraham. That this legend is very ancient, indeed *pre-Christian* (a circumstance of considerable importance to the student of this history) appears from its occurrence, though in more general form, in the Book of Jubilees, ch 17. In Ber. R. 55 and in Tacchuma (ed. Warsh p. 29 *a* and *b*), the legend is connected with a dispute between Isaac and Ishmael as to their respective merits, when former declares himself ready to offer up his life unto God. In Tanchuma (u. s.) we are told that this was one of the great merits of man, to which the Almighty and pointed when the Angels made objection to his creation.

3. *Satan, or Sammael, as the seducer of man.* This statement in Baba B. 16 *a* which identifies *Satan* with the *Yetser haRa*, or evil impulse in man, must be regarded as a rationalistic attempt to gloss over the older teaching about Sammael, by representing him as a personification of the evil inclination within us. For, the Talmud not only distinguishes between a personal Satan without, and evil inclination within man, but expressly ascribes to God the creation of the *Yetser haRa* in man as he was *before the Fall*, the occurrence of two ‘y ‘y in the word *rcyyw* (and He formed [Genesis 2:7](#)) being supposed to indicate the existence of two impulses in us—the *Yetser Tobh* and the *Yetser haRa* (Ber. 61 *a*). And it is stated that this existence of evil in man’s original nature was infinite comfort in the fear which would otherwise beset us in trouble (Ber. R. 14). More than this (as will presently be shown), the existence of this evil principle within us was declared to be absolutely necessary for the continuance of the world (Yoma 69 *b*, Sanh. 64 *a*)

Satan, or Sammael, is introduced as the seducer of man in all the great events of Israel’s history. With varying legendary additions the story of Satan’s attempts to prevent the obedience of Abraham

¹⁶In Ber R. 56 the accusation is stated to have been brought by the ministering angels.

Book III. ch. 1.) and the sacrifice of Isaac is told in Sanh. 89 *b*, Ber. R. 56, and Tanchuma, p. 30 *a* and *b*. Yet there is nothing even astute, only a coarse realism, about the description of the clumsy attempts of Satan to turn Abraham from, or to hinder him in, his purpose; to influence Isaac; or to frighten Sarah. Nor are the other personages in the legend more successfully sketched. There is a want of all higher conception in the references to the Almighty, a painful amount of downright untruthfulness about Abraham, lamentable boastfulness and petty spite about Isaac, while the Sarah of the Jewish legend is rather a weak old Eastern woman than the mother in Israel. To hold perversions of the Old Testament by the side of the New Testament conception of the motives of lives of the heroes of old, or the doctrinal inferences and teaching of the Rabbis by those of Christ and His Apostles, were to compare darkness with light.

The same remarks apply to the other legends in which Satan is introduced as seducer. Anything more childish could scarcely be invented than this, that, when Sammael could not otherwise persuade Israel that Moses would not return from Mount Sinai, he at last made his bier appear before them in the clouds (Shab. 89 *a*), unless it be this story, that when Satan would seduce David he assumed the form of a bird, and that, when David shot at it, Bath-Sheba suddenly looked up, thus gaining the king by her beauty (Sanh. 107 *a*). In both these instances the obvious purpose is to palliate the guilt whether of Israel or of David, which, indeed, is in other places entirely explained away as not due to disobedience or to lust (Comp. Ab. Zar. 4 *b*, 5 *a*).

4. *As the Enemy of man, Satan seeks to hurt and destroy him; and he is the Angel of Death.* Thus, when Satan had failed in shaking the constancy of Abraham and Isaac, he attacked Sarah (Yalkut, i. Par. last lines p. 28 *b*). To his suggestions, or rather false reports, her death had been due, either from fright at being told that Isaac had been offered (Pirqé de R. El. 32, and Targum Ps.-Jon.), or else from the shock, when after all she learned that Isaac was not dead (Ber. R. 58). Similarly, Satan had sought to take from Tamar the pledges which Judah had given her. He appeared as an old man to show Nimrod how to have Abraham cast into the fiery oven, at the same time persuading Abraham not to resist it, &c. Equally puerile are the representations of Satan as the Angel of Death. According to

Abod. Zar. 20 *b*, the dying sees his enemy with a drawn sword, on the point of which a drop of gall trembles. In his fright he opens his mouth and swallows this drop, which accounts for the pallor of the face and the corruption that follows. According to another Rabbi, the Angel of Death really uses his sword, although, on account of the dignity of humanity, the wound which he inflicts is not allowed to be visible. It is difficult to imagine a narrative more repulsive than that of the death of Moses according to Deb. R. 11. Beginning with the triumph of Sammael over Michael at the expected event, it tells how Moses had entreated rather to be changed into a beast or a bird than to die; how Gabriel and Michael had successively refused to bring the soul of Moses; how Moses, knowing that Sammael was coming for the purpose, had armed himself with the Ineffable Name; how Moses had in boastfulness recounted to Sammael all his achievements, real and legendary; and how at last Moses had pursued the Enemy with the Ineffable Name, and in his anger taken off one of his horns of glory and blinded Satan in one eye. We must be excused from following this story through its revolting details.

But, whether as the Angel of Death or as the seducer of man, Sammael has not absolute power. When Israel took the Law upon themselves at Mount Sinai, they became entirely free from his sway, and would have remained so, but for the sin of the Golden Calf. Similarly, in the time of Ezra, the object of Israel's prayer ([Nehemiah 7](#).) was to have Satan delivered to them. After a three day's fast it was granted, and the Yetser haRa of idolatry, in the shape of a young lion, was delivered up to them. It would serve no good purpose to repeat the story of what was done with the bound enemy, or how his cries were rendered inaudible in heaven. Suffice it that, in view of the requirements of the present world, Israel liberated him from the ephah covered with lead ([Zechariah 5:8](#)), under which, by advice of the prophet Zechariah, they had confined him, although for precaution they first put out his eyes (Yoam, 69 *b*). And yet, in view, or probably, rather, in ignorance, of such teaching, modern criticism would derive the Satanology of the New Testament and the history of the Temptation from Jewish sources!

Over these six persons—Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, Moses, Aaron, and Miriam, with whom some apparently rank Benjamin—the Angel of Death, had no power (Baba. B. 17 *a*). Benjamin, Amram, Jesse,

and Chileb (the son of David) are said to have died (only) through the sin of the serpent. In other cases, also, Sammael may not be able to exercise his sway till, for example, he has by some ruse diverted a theologian from his sacred study. Thus he interrupted the pious meditations of David by going up into a tree and shaking it, when, as David went to examine it, a rung of the ladder, on which he stood, broke, and so interrupted David's holy thoughts. Similarly, Rabbi Chasda, by occupation with sacred study, warded off the Angel of Death till the crackling of a beam diverted his attention. Instances of the awkwardness of the Enemy are related (Kethub. 77 *b*), and one rabbi—Joshua, actually took away his sword, only returning it by direct command of God. Where such views of Satan could even find temporary expression, superstitious fears may have been excited; but the thought of moral evil and of a moral combat with it could never have found lodgment.

III. Evil Spirits (Shedim, Ruchin, Rucoth, Lilin).

Here also, as throughout, we mark the presence of Parsee elements of superstition. In general, these spirits resemble the *gnomes*, *hobgoblins*, *elves*, and *sprites* of our fairy tales. They are cunning and malicious, and contact with them is dangerous; but they can scarcely be described as absolutely evil. Indeed, they often prove kind and useful; and may at all times be rendered innocuous, and even made serviceable.

1. *Their origin, nature, and numbers.* Opinions differ as to their origin, in fact, they variously originated. According to Ab. 12 *b*, Ber. R. 7, they were created on the eve of the first Sabbath. But since that time their numbers have greatly increased. For, according to Erub. 18 *b*, Ber. R. 20 (ed. Warsh. p. 40 *b*), multitudes of them were the offspring of Eve and of male spirits, and of Adam with female spirits, or with Lilith (the queen of the female spirits), during the 130 years that Adam had been under the ban, and before Seth was born (Genesis 5:3): ¹⁷ comp. Erub. 18 *b*. Again, their number can scarcely be limited, since they propagate themselves (Chag. 16 *a*), resembling men in this as well as in their taking of nourishment

[161]

¹⁷From the expression a son in his own likeness &c., it is inferred that his previous offspring during the 138 years was *not* in his likeness.

and dying. On the other hand, like the Angels they have wings, pass unhindered through space, and know the future. Still further, they are produced by a process of transformation from vipers, which, in the course of four times seven years, successively pass through the forms of vampires, thistles and thorns, into *Shedim* (Bab. K. 16 *a*)—perhaps a parabolic form of indicating the origination of *Shedim* through the fall of man. Another parabolic idea may be implied in the saying that *Shedim* spring from the backbone of those who have not bent in worship (u.s.).

Although *Shedim* bear, when they appear, the form of human beings, they may assume any other form. Those of their number who are identified with dirty places are represented as themselves black (Kidd. 72 *a*). But the reflection of their likeness is not the same as that of man. When conjured up, their position (whether with the head or the feet uppermost) depends on the mode of conjuring. Some of the *Shedim* have defects. Thus, those of them who lodge in the caper bushes are blind, and an instance is related when one of their number, in pursuit of a Rabbi, fell over the root of a tree and perished (Pes. 111 *b*). Trees, gardens, vineyards, and also ruined and desolate houses, but especially dirty places, were their favourite habitation, and the night-time, or before cock-crowing, their special time of appearance.¹⁸

[162] Hence the danger of going alone into such places (Ber. 3 *a, b*; 62 *a*). A company of two escaped the danger, while before three the Shed did not even appear (Ber. 43 *b*). For the same reason it was dangerous to sleep alone in a house (Shabb. 151 *b*), while the man who went out before cock-crow, without at least carrying for protection a burning torch (though moonlight was far safer) had his blood on his own head. If you greeted anyone in the dark you might unawares bid Godspeed to a Shed (Sanh. 44 *a*). Nor was the danger of this inconsiderable, since one of the worst of these *Shedim*, especially hurtful to Rabbis, was like a dragon with

¹⁸The following Haggadah will illustrate both the power of the evil spirits at night and how amenable they are to reasoning. A Rabbi was distributing his gifts to the poor at night when he was confronted by the Prince of the *Ruchin* with the quotation [Deuteronomy 19:34](#) (Thou shalt not remove thy neighbour's landmark), which seemed to give the spirit a warrant for attacking him. But when the Rabbi replied by quoting [Proverbs 21:14](#) (a gift in secret appeaseth wrath), the spirit fled in confusion (Jer. Peah viii. 9, p. 21 *b*).

seven heads, each of which dropped off with every successive lowly bending during Rabbi Acha's devotions (Kidd. 29 *b*). Specially dangerous times were the days of Wednesday and of the Sabbath. But it was a comfort to know that the Shedim could not *create* or produce anything; nor had they power over that which had been counted, measured, tied up and sealed (Chull. 105 *b*); they could be conquered by the Ineffable Name; and they might be banished by the use of certain formulas, which, when written and worn, served as amulets.

The number of these spirits was like the earth that is thrown up around a bed that is sown. Indeed, no one would survive it, if he saw their number. A thousand at your right hand and ten thousand at your left, such crowding in the Academy or by the side of a bride; such weariness and faintness through their malignant touch, which rent the very dress of the wearers! (Ber. 6 *a*) The queen of the female spirits had no less a following than 180,000 (Pes. 112 *b*). Little as we imagine it, these spirits lurk everywhere around us: in the crumbs on the floor, in the oil in the vessels, in the water which we would drink, in the diseases which attack us, in the even-numbered cups of our drinking, in the air in the room, by day and by night.

2. *Their arrangement.* Generally, they may be arranged into *male* and *female* spirits, the former under their king *Ashmedai*, the latter under their queen *Lilith* probably the same as *Agrath bath Machlath*—only that the latter may more fully present hurtful aspect of the demoness. The hurtful spirits are specially designated as *Ruchin*, *Mazziqin* (harmers), *Malakhey Chabbalath* (angels of damage), &c. From another aspect they are arranged into *four* classes (Targ. Pseudo-Jon. [Numbers 6:24](#)): the *Tsaphriré*, or morning spirits (Targ. on [Psalm 121:6](#); Targ. Cant. iv. 6); the *Tiharé*, or midday spirits (Targ. Pseudo-Jon. [Deuteronomy 32:24](#); Targ. Cant. iv. 6); the *Telané*, or evening spirits (Targ. Cant. iii. 8; 4:6; Targ. Eccles 2:5); and the *Lilin*, or night spirits (Targ. Pseudo-Jon. on [Deuteronomy 32:34](#); Targ. [Isaiah 34:14](#)). (According to 2 Targ. [Esther 2:1, 3](#), Solomon had such power over them, that at his bidding they executed dances before him.)

[163]

a. Ashmedai (perhaps a Parsee name), *Ashmodi*, *Ashmedon*, or *Shamdon*, the king of the demons (Gitt. 68 *a, b*; Pes. 110 *a*). It deserves notice, that this name does *not* occur in the Jerusalem

Talmud nor in older Palestinian sources.¹⁹ He is represented as of immense size and strength, as cunning, malignant, and dissolute. At times, however, he is known also to do works of kindness—such as lead the blind, or to show the road to a drunken man. Of course, he foreknows the future, can do magic, but may be rendered serviceable by the use of the Ineffable Name and especially by the signet of King Solomon, on which it was graven. The story of Solomon's power over him is well known and can here only be referred to in briefest outline. It is said, that as no iron was to be used in the construction of the Temple, Solomon was anxious to secure the services of the worm *Shamir*, which possessed the power of cutting stones (see about him *Ab. z. 12 a*; *Sot. 48 b*; *Gitt. 68 a, b*). By advice of the Sanhedrin, Solomon conjured up for this purpose a male and a female *Shed*, who directed him to *Ashmedai*. The latter lived at the bottom of a deep cistern on a high mountain. Every morning on leaving it to go into heaven and hear the decrees of the Upper Sanhedrin, he covered the cistern with a stone, and sealed it. On this *Benayah*, armed with a chain, and Solomon's signet with the Ineffable Name, went and filled the cistern with wine, which *Ashmedai*, as all other spirits, hated. But as he could not otherwise quench his thirst, *Ashmedai* became drunk, when it was easy, by means of the magical signet, to secure the chain around him. Without entering on the story of his exploits, or how he indicated the custody of *Shamir*, and how ultimately the worm (which was in the custody of the moor-cock²⁰) was secured, it appears that, by his cunning, *Ashmedai* finally got released, when he immediately hurled Solomon to a great distance, assumed his form, and reigned in his stead; till at last, after a series of adventures, Solomon recovered his signet, which *Ashmedai* had flung away, and a fish swallowed. Solomon was recognised by the Sanhedrin and *Ashmedai* fled at sight of the signet. [Possibly the whole of this is only a parabolic form for the story of Solomon's spiritual declension, and final repentance.]

¹⁹*Hamburger* ascribes this to the anxiety of the Palestinians to guard Judaism from Gnostic elements. We are, however, willing to recognise in it an indirect influence of Christianity.

²⁰The *Tarnegol Bera*—a mythical animal reaching from earth to heaven (*Targ. on Psalm 1, 11*)—also called *Naggat Tura* (*Gitt. 68 b*) from his activity in cleaving mountains.

—*b. Lilith*, the queen of female spirits^{Book III. ch. 1.)}—to be distinguished from^{clxix} the *Lilin* or night-spirits, and from *Lela* or *Laila*, an Angel who accompanied Abraham on his expedition against Chedorlaomer (Sanh. 96 *a*). Here we recognise still more distinctly the Parsee elements. Lilith is the queen of Zemargad (Targ. on Job 1:15)—Zemargad representing all green crystals, malachite, and emerald—and the land of Zemargad being Sheba. Lilith is described as the mother of Hormiz or Hormuz²¹ (Baba B. 73 *a*). Sometimes she is represented as a very fair woman, but mostly with long, wild-flowing hair, and winged (Nidd. 24 *b*; Erub. 100 *b*). In Pes. 111 *a* we have a formula for exorcising Lilith. In Pes. 112 *b* (towards the end) we are told how Agrath bath Machlath (probably the Zend word Agra—smiting, very wicked’—bath Machlath the dancer) threatened Rabbi Chanina with serious mischief, had it not been that his greatness had been proclaimed in heaven, on which the Rabbi would have shown his power by banning her from all inhabited places, but finally gave her liberty on the eve of the fourth day and of the Sabbath, which nights accordingly are the most dangerous seasons.

3. *Character and habits of the Shedim.* As many of the Angels, so many of the Shedim, are only personifications. Thus, as diseases were often ascribed to their agency, there were Shedim of certain diseases, as of asthma, croup, canine rabies, madness, stomachic diseases, &c. Again, there were local *Shedim*, as of Samaria, Tiberias, &c. On the other hand, Shedim might be employed in the magic cure of diseases (Shabb. 67 *a*). In fact, to conjure up and make use of demons was considered lawful although dangerous (Sanh. 101 *a*), while a little knowledge of the subject would enable a person to avoid any danger from them. Thus, although Chamath, the demon of oil, brings eruptions on the face, yet the danger is avoided if the oil is used out of the hollow of the hand, and not out of a vessel. Similarly, there are formulas by which the power of the demons can be counteracted. In these formulas, where they are not Biblical verses, the names of the demons are inserted. This subject will be further treated in another Appendix.

[165]

²¹*Hamburger* renders it *Ahriman*, but it seems rather like *Hormuzd*. Perhaps the Rabbis wished to combine both. *Ahriman* is written *Ahurmin*, Sanh. 39 *a*, in that very curious notice of a controversy with a Mage.

In general, we may expect to find demons on water, oil, or anything else that has stood uncovered all night; on the hands before they have been washed for religious purposes, and on the water in which they have been washed; and on the breadcrumbs on the floor. Demons may imitate or perform all that the prophets or great men of old had wrought. The magicians of Egypt had imitated the miracles of Moses by demoniacal power (Shem. R. 9). So general at the time of our Lord was the belief in demons and in the power of employing them, that even *Josephus* (Ant. viii. 2. 5) contended that the power of conjuring up, and driving out demons, and of magical cures had been derived from King Hezekiah, to whom God had given it. *Josephus* declares himself to have been an eye witness of such a wonderful cure by the repetition of a magical formula. This illustrates the contention of the Scribes that the miraculous cures of our Lord were due to demoniac agency.

[166] Legions of demons lay in waiting for any error or falling on the part of man. Their power extended over all even numbers.²² Hence, care must be had not to drink an even number of cups (Ber. 51 *b*), except on the Passover night, when the demons have no power over Israel (Pes. 109 *b*). On the other hand, there are demons who might almost be designated as familiar spirits, who taught the Rabbis, Shed Joseph (Pes. 110 *a*) and the Shed Jonathan (Yeb. 122 *a*). Rabbi Papa had a young Shed to wait upon him (Chull. 105 *b*). There can, however, be no difficulty in making sure of their real existence. As Shedim have cock's feet, nothing more is required than to strew ashes by the side of one's bed, when in the morning their marks will be perceived (Ber. 6 *a*; Gitt. 68 *b*). It was by the shape of his feet that the Sanhedrin hoped to recognise, whether Ashmedai was really Solomon, or not, but it was found that he never appeared with his feet uncovered. The Talmud (Ber. 6 *a*) describes the following as an infallible means for actually seeing these spirits: Take the afterbirth of a black cat which is the daughter of a black cat—both mother and daughter being firstborn—burn it in the fire, and put some of the ashes in your eyes. Before using them, the ashes must be put into an iron tube, and sealed with an iron signet. It is added, that Rabbi Bibi

²²The superstition There's luck in odd numbers has passed to all nations.

Appendix 13—Jewish Angelology and Demonology. The Fall of the Angels. (See
Book III. ch. 1.) clxxi
successfully tried this experiment, but was hurt by the demons, on
which he was restored to health by the prayers of the Rabbis. ²³

Other and kindred questions, such as those of amulets, &c., will be treated under demoniac possessions. But may we not here once more and confidently appeal to impartial students whether, in view of this sketch of Jewish Angelology and Satanology, the contention can be sustained that the teaching of Christ on this subject has been derived from Jewish sources?

²³Dr. Kohut's comparison of Rabbinic Angelology and Demonology with Parseeism (Ueber d. jud. Angelol u. Damonol. in ihrer Abhang. vom Parsismus) is extremely interesting, although not complete and its conclusions sometimes strained. The negative arguments derived from Jewish Angelology and Satanology by the author of *Supernatural Religion* are based on inaccurate and uncritical information, and do not require detailed discussion.

Appendix 14—The Law in Messianic Times. (See Book III. ch. 3.)

The question as to the Rabbinic views in regard to the binding character of the Law, and its imposition on the Gentiles, in Messianic times, although, strictly speaking, not forming part of this history, is of such vital importance in connection with recent controversies as to demand special consideration. In the text to which this Appendix refers it has been indicated, that a new legislation was expected in Messianic days. The ultimate basis of this expectancy must be sought in the Old Testament itself—not merely in such allusions as to the intrinsic worthlessness of sacrifices, but in such passages as [Deuteronomy 18:15, 18](#), and its prophetic commentary in [Jeremiah 31:31](#), &c. It was with a view to this that the Jewish deputation inquired whether John the Baptist was that Prophet. For, as has been shown, Rabbinism associated certain reformatory and legislative functions with the appearance of the Forerunner of the Messiah (*Eduy. viii. 7*).

There were, indeed, in this, as in most respects, diverging opinions according to the different standpoints of the Rabbis, and, as we infer, not without controversial bearing on the teaching of Christianity. The strictest tendency may be characterised as that which denied the possibility of any change in the ceremonial Law, as well as the abrogation of festivals in the future. Even the destruction of the Temple, and with it the necessary cessation of sacrifices—if, indeed, which is a moot question, all sacrifices did at once and absolutely cease—only caused a gap; just as exile from the land could only free from such laws as attached to the soil of Israel. ¹ The reading of the sacrificial sections in the Law (*Meg. 31 b*; *Ber. R. 44*)—at any rate, in conjunction with prayers (*Ber. 2 b*), but especially study of the

¹In the Book *Cusari* (ii. 49 ed. *Cassel*, p. 274) an inference somewhat inconvenient to Rabbinism is drawn from this. If, as it asserts Levitical uncleanness and holiness are correlative terms, the one implying the other, would it not follow that with the cessation of the Jewish economy the whole ceremonial Law would also cease? See *Cassel's* note.

Law (Men. 110 *a*), took in the meantime the place of the sacrifices. And as regarded the most sacred of all sacrifices, that of the Day of Atonement, it was explained that the day rather than the sacrifices brought reconciliation (Sifra c. 8). This party held the principle that not only those Divine, but even those Rabbinic, ordinances, which apparently had been intended only for a certain time or for a certain purpose, were of eternal duration (Bezah 5 *b*). The law is never to cease; there are the commandments—since there is no prophet who may change a word in them. ²

[168]

So far were these views carried, that it was asserted: Israel needs not the teaching of the King Messiah but that He only comes to gather the dispersed, and to give to the Gentiles thirty commandments, as it is written ([Zechariah 11:12](#)), “they weighed me my price, thirty pieces of silver” (Ber. R. 98). But even these extreme statements seem to imply that keen controversy had raged on the subject. Besides, the most zealous defenders of the Law admitted that the Gentiles were to receive laws in Messianic times. The smallest and most extreme section held that, the laws, as Israel observed them, would be imposed on the Gentiles (*Chull.* 92 *a*); others that only thirty commandments, the original Noachic ordinances supposed to be enumerated in [Leviticus 19.](#), would become obligatory, ³ while some held, that only *three* ordinances would be binding on the new converts: two connected with the Feast of Tabernacles, the third, that of the phylacteries (Midr. on [Psalm 31:1](#), ed. Warsh, p. 30 *b*). On the other hand, we have the most clear testimony that the prevailing tendency of teaching was in a different direction. In a very curious passage (*Yalkut* ii. 296, p. 46 *a*), in which the final restitution of the sinners of Israel and of the righteous of the Gentiles who are all in Gehinnom, is taught in very figurative language, we are told of a *new* Law which God will give by the Messiah in the age to come—thanksgiving for which calls forth that universal *Amen*,

²For further particulars I refer to *Stein*, *Schrift des Lebens*, i. pp. 319-336 (ch. on The Messiah), to the article on the Messiah in *Hamburger's Real-Encycl.* ii. pp. 747, 748, and especially to that most interesting *brochure* of Rabbi *Holdheim*, *Das Ceremonialges. im Messias-Reich*. I have not read a more clear demonstration of the impossibility of Rabbinism, nor—strange as it may sound—a fuller vindication of the fundamental positions of Christianity.

³*Stein*, u.s. pp. 327, 328.

[169] not only on earth but in Gehinnom, which leads to the deliverance of those who are in the latter. But as this may refer to the time of the final consummation, we turn to other passages. The Midrash on Song ii. 13, applying the passage in conjunction with [Jeremiah 31:31](#), expressly states that the Messiah would give Israel a new law, and the Targum, on [Isaiah 12:3](#), although perhaps not quite so clearly, also speaks of a new instruction. It is needless to multiply proofs (such as Vayyikra R. 13). But the Talmud goes even further, and lays down the two principles, that in the age to come the whole ceremonial Law and all the feasts were to cease.⁴ And although this may be regarded as merely a general statement, it is definitely applied to the effect, that all sacrifices except the thank-offering, and all fasts and feasts except the Day of Atonement, or else the Feast of Esther, were to come to an end—nay (in the Midr. on the words the Lord looseth the bound [Psalm 146:7](#)), that what had formerly been bound or forbidden would be loosed or allowed, notably that the distinctions between clean and unclean animals would be removed.

There is the less need for apology for any digression here, that, besides the intrinsic interest of the question, it casts light on two most important subjects. For, first, it illustrates the attempt of the narrowest Judaic party in the Church to force on Gentile believers the yoke of the whole Law; the bearing of St. Paul in this respect; his relation to St. Peter; the conduct of the latter; and the proceedings of the Apostolic Synod in Jerusalem ([Acts 15](#)). St. Paul, in his opposition to that party, stood even on Orthodox Jewish ground. But when he asserted, not only a new law of liberty but the typical and preparatory character of the whole Law, and its fulfillment in Christ, he went far beyond the Jewish standpoint. Further, the favorite modern theory as to fundamental opposition in principle between Pauline and Petrine theology in this respect, has, like many kindred theories, no support in the Jewish views on that subject, unless we suppose that Peter had belonged to the narrowest Jewish school, which his whole history seems to forbid. We can also understand, how the Divinely granted vision of the abrogation of the distinction between clean and unclean animals ([Acts 10:9-16](#)) may, though

[170] coming as a surprise, have had a natural basis in Jewish expectancy,⁵

⁴Comp. on this *Holdheim*, *Das Ceremonialges*, p. 46.

and it explains how the Apostolic Synod, when settling the question,⁶ ultimately fell back on the so-called Noachic commandments, though with very wider-reaching principles underlying their decision ([Acts 15:13-21](#)). Lastly, it seems to cast even some light on the authorship of the Fourth Gospel; for, the question about that prophet evidently referring to the possible alteration of the Law in Messianic times, which is reported only in the Fourth Gospel, shows such close acquaintance with the details of Jewish ideas on this subject, as seems to us utterly incompatible with its supposed origination as The Ephesian Gospel towards the end of the second century, the outcome of Ephesian Church-teaching—an esoteric and eclectic book, designed to modify the impressions produced by the tradition previously recorded by the Synoptists.

⁵The learned reader will find a very curious illustration of this in that strange Haggadah about the envy of the serpent being excited on seeing Adam fed with meat from heaven—where another equally curious Haggadah is related to show that nothing is unclean which cometh down from heaven.

⁶Yalkut i. 15, p. 4, *d*, towards the middle. A considerable part of vol. iii. of Supernatural Religion is devoted to argumentation on this subject. But here also the information of the writer on the subject is neither accurate nor critical, and hence his reasoning and conclusions are vitiated.

[171] **Appendix 15—Location of Sychar, and the Date of our Lord’s Visit to Samaria. (See Book III, ch. 8.)**

1. The Location of Sychar.

Although modern writers are now mostly agreed on this subject, it may be well briefly to put before our readers the facts of the case.

Till comparatively lately, the Sychar of St. [John 4](#). was generally as representing the ancient Shechem. The first difficulty here was the *name*, since Shechem, or even Sichem, could scarcely be identified with Sychar, which is undoubtedly the correct reading. Accordingly, the latter term was represented as one of opprobrium, and derived from *Shekhar* (in Aramaean *Shikhra*), as it were, drunken town or else from *Sheqer* (in Aramaean *Shiqra*), lying town. But, not to mention other objections, there is no trace of such as alteration of the name Sychar in Jewish writings, while its employment would seem wholly incongruous in such a narrative as St. [John 4](#). Moreover, all the earliest writers distinguished Sychar from Shechem. Lastly, in the Talmud the name of *Sokher*, also written *Sikhra*, frequently occurs, and that not only as distinct from Shechem, but in a connection which renders the hypothesis of an opprobrious by-name impossible. Professor *Delitzch* (*Zeitschrift für Luther. Theol.* for 1856, ii pp. 242, 243) has collected seven passages from the Babylon Talmud to that effect, in five of which *Sikhra*, is mentioned as the birthplace of celebrated Rabbis—the town having at a later period apparently been left by the Samaritans, and occupied by Jews (*Baba Mez.* 42 *a*, 83 *a*, *Pes.* 31 *b*, *Nidd.* 36 *a*, *Chull.* 18 *b*, and, without mention of Rabbis, *Baba K* 82 *b* *Menach.* 64 *b*. See also *Men.* x. 2, and *Jer. Sheq.* p. 48 *d*). If further proof were required, it would be sufficient to say that a woman would scarcely have gone a mile and a half from Shechem to Jacob’s well to fetch water, when there are so many springs about the former city. In these circumstances, later writers have generally fixed upon the village of Askar, half a mile from Jacob’s Well, and within sight of it, as the Sychar of the New

Testament, one of the earliest to advocate this view having been the late learned Canon Williams. Little more than a third of a mile from Askar is the reputed tomb of Joseph. The transformation of the name Sychar into Askar is explained, either by a contraction of *Ain Askar* the well of Sychar or else by the fact that in the Samaritan Chronicle the place is called Iskar, which seems to have been the vulgar pronunciation of Sychar. A full description of the place is given by Captain Conder (*Tent-Worker in Palestine*, vol. i. pp. 71 &c., especially pp. 75 and 76), and by M. Guérin, *La Samarie* vol. i. p. 371, although the later writer, who almost always absolutely follows tradition, denies the identity of Sychar and Askar (pp. 401, 402).

[172]

II. Time of our Lord's Visit to Sychar.

This question, which is of such importance not only for the chronology of this period, but in regard to the unnamed Feast at Jerusalem to which went up (St. [John 5:1](#)), has been discussed most fully and satisfactorily by Canon Westcott (*Speaker's Commentary*, vol. ii. of the New Testament, p. 93) The following data will assist our inquires.

1. Jesus spent some time after the Feast of Passover (St. [John 2:23](#)) in the province of Judaea. But it can scarcely be supposed that this was a long period, for -

2ndly, in St. [John 4:45](#) the Galileans have evidently a fresh remembrance of what had taken place at the Passover in Jerusalem, which would scarcely have been the case if a long period and other festivals had intervened. Similarly, the King's Offer (St. [John 4:47](#)) seems also to act upon a recent report.

3rdly, the unnamed Feast of St. [John 5:1](#) forms an important element in our computations. Some months of Galilean ministry must have intervened between it and the return of Jesus to Galilee. Hence it could not have been Pentecost. Nor could it have been the Feast of Tabernacles, which was in autumn, nor yet the feast of the Dedication, which took place in winter, since both are expressly mentioned by their names (St. [John 7:2](#), [10:22](#)). The only other feasts were: the Feast of Wood-Offering (comp. *The Temple &c.*,

p. 295), the Feast of Trumpets, or New Year's Day, the Day of Atonement, and the feast of Esther, or Purim.

[173] To begin with the latter, since of late it has found most favor. The reasons against Christ's attendance in Jerusalem at Purim seem to me irresistible. Canon Westcott urges that the discourse of Christ at the unnamed Feast has not, as is generally the case, any connection with the thoughts of that festival. To this I would add, that I can scarcely conceive our Lord going up to a feast observed with such boisterous merriment as Purim was, while the season of the year in which it falls would scarcely tally with the statement of St. [John 5:3](#), that a great multitude of sick people were laid down in the porches of Bethesda. ¹

But if the unnamed Feast was not Purim, it must have been one of these three, the Feast of the Ingathering of Wood, the Feast of Trumpets, or Day of Atonement. In other words, it must have taken place late in summer, or in the very beginning of autumn. But if so, then the Galilean ministry intervening between the visit to Samaria and this Feast leads to the necessary inferences that the visit to Sychar had taken place in early summer, probably about the middle or end of May. This would allow ample time for Christ's stay in Jerusalem during the Passover and for His Judaeian ministry.

As we are discussing the date of the unnamed Feast, it may be as well to bring the subject here to a close. We have seen that the only three Feasts to which reference could have been are to the Feast of Wood Offering, the Feast of Trumpets, and the Day of Atonement. But the last of those could not be meant, since it is designated, not only by Philo, but in [Acts 27:9](#), as the fast not the feast *nhsteia*, not *eorth* (comp. LXX., [Leviticus 14:29](#) &c., xxiii. 27 &c). As between the Feast of the Wood Offering and that of Trumpets I feel at considerable loss. Canon Westcott has urged on behalf on the latter reasons which I confess are very weighty. On the other hand, the Feast of Trumpets was not one of those on which people generally resorted to Jerusalem, and as it took place on the 1st of Tishri (about the middle of September), it is difficult to believe that anyone going up to it would not rather have chosen,

¹I must here correct the view expressed in my book on The Temple p. 291, due to a misunderstanding of St. [John 4:35](#). Of course, if latter had implied that Jesus was at Sychar in December, the unnamed feast must have been *Purim*.

Appendix 15—Location of Sychar, and the Date of our Lord's Visit to Samaria.

(See Book III, ch. 8.)

or at least remained over, the Day of Atonement and the Feast of Tabernacles, which followed respectively, on the 10th and 15th days of that month. Lastly, the Feast of Wood Offering, which took place on the 15th Ab (in August), was a popular and joyous festival, when the wood needed for the altar was brought up from all parts of the country (comp. on that feast *The Temple and its Services &c.*, pp. 295, 296) As between these two feasts, we must leave the question undecided, only noticing that barely six weeks intervened between the one and the other feast. clxxix

[174] **Appendix 16—On The Jewish Views about Demons and the Demonised Together with some Notes on the Intercourse between Jews and Jewish Christians in the First Centuries. (See Book III. ch. 14.)**

It is not, of course, our purpose here to attempt an exhaustive account of the Jewish views on demons and the demonised. A few preliminary strictures were, however, necessary on a work upon which writers on this subject have too implicitly relied. I refer to *Gfrörer's* *Jahrhundert des Heils* (especially vol. i. pp. 378-424). Gfrörer sets out by quoting a passage in the Book of Enoch on which he lays great stress, but which critical inquiries of *Dillmann* and other scholars have shown to be of no value on the argument. This disposes of many pages of negative criticism on the New Testament which Gfrörer founds on this quotation. Similarly, 4 Esdras would not in our days be adduced in evidence of pre-Christian teaching. As regards Rabbinic passages, Gfrörer uncritically quotes from Kabbalistic works which he mixes with quotations from the Talmud and from writings of a later date. Again, as regards the two quotations of Gfrörer from the Mishah (Erub. iv. 1; Gitt. vii. 1), it has already been stated (vol. i. p. 481, note 4) that neither of these passages bears any reference to demoniac possessions. Further, Gfrörer appeals to two passages in Sifré which may here be given *in extenso*. The first of these (ed. *Friedmann*, p. 107 *b*) is on Duet. xviii. 12, and reads thus: He who joins himself (cleaves) to uncleanness, on him rests the spirit of uncleanness; but he who cleaves to the Shechinah, it is meet that the Holy Spirit should rest on him. The second occurs in explanation of [Deuteronomy 32:16](#), and reads as follows (u. s. p. 136 *b*): What is the way of a "demon" (*Shed*)? He enters into a man and subjects him. It will be observed that in both these quotations reference is made to certain moral, not to a physical effects, such as in the case of the demonised. Lastly, although one passage from the Talmud which Gfrörer adduces (though not quite exactly) applies,

Appendix 16—On The Jewish Views about Demons and the Demonised Together
with some Notes on the Intercourse between Jews and Jewish Christians in the
indeed, to demonical possessions, but is given in an exaggerated and
embellished form. First Centuries. (See Book III. ch. 14.) clxxxI

If from these incorrect references we turn to what Jewish authorities really state on the subject, we have: -

1. To deal with the *Writings of Josephus*. in Aniq. vi. 8. 2, *Josephus* ascribes Saul's disorder to demonic influence, which brought upon him such suffocations as were ready to choke him. In An-
tiq. viii. 2. 5, *Josephus* describes the wisdom, learning, and achievements of Solomon, referring specially to his skill in expelling demons who caused various diseases. According to Josephus Solomon had exercised this power by incantations, his formulae and words of exorcism being still known in Josephus's days. In such manner a certain Eleazar had healed a demoniac in the presence of Vespasian, his officers, and troops, by putting to his nostrils a ring that held a root of one of those mentioned by Solomon by which the demon was drawn out amidst convulsions of the demoniac, when the demon was further adjured not to return by frequent mention of the name of Solomon, and by incantations which he [Solomon] had composed. To show the reality of this, a vessel with water had been placed at a little distance, and the demon had, in coming out, overturned it. It is probably to this root that Josephus refers in War. vii. 6. 3, where he names it *Baaras*, which I conjecture to be the equivalent of the form raf(a:w\$b@, *boara*, the burning since he describes it as of colour like a flame, and as emitting at even a ray like lightning, and which it would cost a man's life to take up otherwise than by certain magical means which Josephus specifies. From all this we infer that Josephus occupied the later Talmudical standpoint, alike as regards exorcism, magical cures, and magical preventions. This is of great importance as showing that these views prevailed in New Testament times. But when Josephus adds, that the demons expelled by *Baaras* were the spirits of the wicked he represents a superstition which is *not* shared by the earlier Rabbis, and may possibly be due to a rationalising attempt to account for the phenomenon. It is, indeed, true that the same view occurs in comparatively late Jewish writings, and that in Yalkuat on [Isaiah 46 b](#) there appears to be a reference to it, at least in connection with the spirits of those who had perished in the flood; but this seems to belong to a different cycle of legends.

[175]

[176] 2. *Rabbinic views.*¹ Probably the nearest approach to the idea of Josephus that demons were the souls of the wicked, is the (perhaps allegorical) statement that the backbone of a person who did not bow down to worship God became a *Shed*, or demon (Baba K. 16 *a*; Jer. Shabb. 3 *b*). The ordinary names for demons are evil spirits or unclean spirits (*ruach raah*,² *ruach tumeah*), *Seirim* (lit. goats). *Shedim* (*Sheyda*, a demon, male or female, either because their chief habitation is in desolate places, or from the word to fly about or else from to rebel), and *Mazzikin* (the hurtful ones). A demoniac is called *Gebher Shediya* (Ber. R. 65). Even this, that demons are supposed to eat and drink, to propagate themselves, and to die, distinguishes them from the demons of the New Testament. The food of demons consists of certain elements in fire and water, and of certain odours. Hence the mode of incantation by incense made of certain ingredients. Of their origin, number, habitation, and general influence, sufficient has been said in the Appendix on Demonology. It is more important here to notice these two Jewish ideas: that demons entered into, or took possession of, men; and that many diseases were due to their agency. The former is frequently expressed. The evil spirit constrains a man to do certain things, such as to pass beyond the Sabbath-boundary (Erub. 41 *b*), to eat the Passover-bread, &c. (Rosh ha-Sh. 28 *a*). But it reads more like a caustic than a serious remark when we are informed that these three things deprive a man of his free will and make him transgress: the Cuthaeans, an evil spirit, and poverty (Erub. u.s.). Diseases—such as *rabies*, *angina*, *asthma*, or accidents—such as an encounter with a wild bull, are due to their agency, which, happily, is not unlimited. As stated in App. XIII. the most dangerous demons are those of dirty (secret) places (Shabb. 67 *a*). Even numbers (2, 4, 6, &c.) are always dangerous, so is anything that comes from unwashed hands. For such, or similar oversights, a whole legion of demons is on the watch (Ber. 51 *a*). On the evening of the Passover the demons are bound, and, in general, their power has now been restricted, chiefly to the eves of Wednesday and of the Sabbath (Pes. 109 *b* to 112 *b*,

¹I would here generally acknowledge my obligations to Dr. *Brecher's* tractate on the subject.

²Erub. 41 *b*; Pes. 112 *a*. The more common designation is *r. tumeah*; but there are others.

Appendix 16—On The Jewish Views about Demons and the Demonised Together with some Notes on the Intercourse between Jews and Jewish Christians in the passim). Yet there are, as we shall see, circumstances in which it would be foolhardiness to risk their encounter. Without here entering on the views expressed in the Talmud about prophecy, visions, and dreams, we turn to the questions germane to our subject.

A. *Magic and Magicians.* We must here bear in mind that the practice of magic was strictly prohibited to Israelites, and that—as a matter of principle at least—witchcraft, or magic, was supposed to have no power over Israel, if they owned and served their God (Chull. 7 *b*; Nedar. 32 *a*). But in this matter also—as will presently appear—theory and practice did not accord. Thus, under certain circumstances, the repetition of magical formulas was declared lawful even on the Sabbath (Sanh. 101 *a*). Egypt was regarded as the home of magic (Kidd. 49 *b*; Shabb. 75 *a*). In connection with this, it deserves notice that the Talmud ascribes the miracles of Jesus to magic, which He had learned during His stay in Egypt having taken care, when He left, to insert under His skin its rules and formulas, since every traveller, on quitting the country, was searched, lest he should take to other lands the mysteries of magic (Shabb. 104 *b*).

Here it may be interesting to refer to some of the strange ideas which Rabbinism attached to the early Christians, as showing both the intercourse between the two parties, and that the Jews did not deny the gift of miracles in the Church, only ascribing its exercise to magic. Of the existence of such intercourse with Jewish Christians there is abundant evidence. Thus, R. Joshua, the son of Levi (at the end of the second century), was so hard pressed by their quotations from the Bible that, unable to answer, he pronounced a curse on them, which, however, did not come. We gather, that in the first century Christianity had widely spread among the Jews, and R. Ishmael, the son of Elisha, the grandson of that High-Priest who was executed by the Romans (Josephus, War. i. 2. 2), seems in vain to have contended against the advance of Christianity. At last he agreed with R. Tarphon that nothing else remained but to burn their writings. It was this R. Ishmael who prevented his nephew Ben Dama from being cured of the bite of a serpent by a Christian, preferring that he should die rather than be healed by such means (Abod. Zar. 27 *b*, about the middle). Similarly, the great R. Eliezer ben Hyrcanus, also in the first century, was so suspected of the prevailing heresy that he was actually taken up as a Christian in the

[178] persecution of the later. Though he cleared himself of the suspicion, yet his contemporaries regarded him for a time doubtfully, and all agreed that the troubles which befell him were in punishment for having listened with pleasure to the teaching of the heretics (Ab. Z. 16 *b*, 17 *a*.)³ The following may be mentioned as instances of the magic practiced by these heretics. In Jer. Sanh. 25 *d*, we are told about two great Rabbis who were banned by a heretic to the beam of a bath. In return the Rabbis, by similar means, fastened the heretic to the door of the bath. Having mutually agreed to set each other free, the same parties next met on board a ship. Here the heretic by magical means clave the sea, by way of imitating Moses. On this the Rabbis called upon him to walk through the sea, like Moses, when he was immediately overwhelmed through the ban of R. Joshua! Other stories of a similar and even more absurd character might be quoted. But if such opinions were entertained of Jewish Christians, we can scarcely wonder that all their books were ordered to be burnt (Bemid. R. 9), that even a roll of the Law written by a heretic was to be destroyed (Gitt. 45 *b*), and that Jewish Christians were consigned to eternal punishment in Gehinnon (Rosh. haSh. 17 *a*), from which even the token of circumcision should not deliver them since an Angel would convert it into uncircumcision (Shem R. 19⁴).

But to return. Talmudic writings distinguishing several classes of magicians. The *Baal Obh*, or conjuror of the dead, evoked a voice from under the armpit, or from other members of the dead body, the arms or other members being struck together, for the purpose of eliciting the sound. Necromancy might be practised in two different ways. The dead might be called up (by a method which scarcely bears description), in which case they would appear with the feet upwards. But this must not be practised on the Sabbath. Or again, a skull might, by magical means, be made to answer. This might be done on the Sabbath also (Sanh. 65 *a* and *b*). Or a demon might

³See more on this subject in vol. ii. pp. 193, 194.

⁴We have here only been able to *indicate* this most interesting subject. Much more remains to be said concerning Eliezer b. Hyrecanus, and others. There seem even to have been regular meeting-places for discussion between Jews and Christians. Nay, the practice of some early Christians to make themselves eunuchs is alluded to in the Talmud (Shabb. 152 *a*).

Appendix 16—On The Jewish Views about Demons and the Demonised Together
 with some Notes on the Intercourse between Jews and Jewish Christians in the
 be conjured up by a certain kind of incense, and then employed ^{First Centuries. (See Book III. ch. 14.)} ^{clxxxv} in magic. A second class of magicians (called *Yideoni*) uttered oracles by putting a certain bone into their mouth. Thirdly, there was the *Chabar*, or serpent charmer, a distinction being made between a great and small Chabar, according as larger or smaller serpents were charmed. Fourthly, we have the *Meonen*, who could indicate what days or hours were lucky and unlucky. Fifthly, there was the *searcher after the dead* who remained fasting on graves in order to communicate with an unclean spirit; and, lastly, the *Menadesh*, who knew what omens were lucky and what unlucky (Sanh. 66 a). And if they were treated only as signs and not as omens, the practice was declared lawful (Chull. 95 b).

[179]

In general the black art might be practised either through demons, or else by the employment of magical means. Among the latter we reckon, not only incantations, but magic by means of the thumb, by a knife with a black handle, or by a glass cup (Sanh. 67 b), or by a cup of incantation (Baba Mets. 29 b). But there was danger here, since, if all proper rules and cautions were not observed the magician might be hurt by the demon. Such an instance is related, although the Rabbi in question was mercifully preserved by being swallowed by a cedar, which afterwards burst and set him free (Sanh. 101 a). Women were specially suspected of witchcraft (Jer. Sanh. vii. 25 d), and great caution was accordingly enjoined. Thus, it might even be dangerous to lift up loaves of bread (though not broken pieces) lest they should be bewitched (Erub. 64 b). A number of instances are related in which persons were in imminent danger from magic, in some of which they suffered not only damage but death, while in others the Rabbis knew how to turn the impending danger against their would-be assailants. (Comp. for examples Pes. 110 b; Sot. 22 a; Gitt. 45 a; Sanh. 67 b). A very peculiar idea is that about the Teraphim of Scripture. It occurs already in the Targum Ps.-Jon. on [Genesis 31:19](#), and is found also in the Pirqé de R. Eliez. c. 36. It is stated that the Teraphim were made in the following manner: a first-born was killed, his head cut off, and prepared with salt and spices, after which a gold plate, upon which magical formulas had been graven, was placed under his tongue, when the head was supposed to give answer to whatever questions might be addressed to it.

B. After this we can scarcely wonder, that so many diseases

[180]

should have been imputed to magical or else demoniac influences, and cured either by magical means or by exorcism. For our present purpose we leave aside not only the question, whether and what diseases were regarded as the punishment of certain sins, but also all questions as to their magical causes and means of cure. We confine our remarks to the supposed power of evil spirits in the production of diseases. Four things are mentioned as dangerous on account of demons, of which we shall only mention three: To walk between two palm trees,⁵ if the space is wider than four cubits; to borrow drinking-water; and to walk over water that has been poured out, unless it have been covered with earth, or spat upon, or you have taken off your shoes (Pes. 111 *a*). Similarly, the shadow of the moon, of certain trees, and of other objects, is dangerous, because demons love to hide there. Much caution must also be observed in regard to the water with which the hands are washed in the morning, as well as in regard to oil for anointing, which must never be taken from a strange vessel which might have been bewitched.

Many diseases are caused by direct demoniac agency. Thus, leprosy (Horay. 10 *a*), rabies (Yoma 83 *b*), heart disease (Gitt. 67 *b*), madness, asthma (Bechor. 44 *b*), croup (Yoma 77 *b*; Taan. 20 *b*), and other diseases, are ascribed to special demons. And although I cannot find any notices of demoniac possession in the sense of permanent indwelling, yet an evil spirit may seize and influence a person. The nearest approach to demoniac possession is in a legend of two Rabbis who went to Rome to procure the repeal of a persecuting edict, when they were met on board ship by a demon, *Ben Temalion*, whose offer of company they accepted, in hope of being able to do some miracle through him. Arrival in Rome, the demon took possession of the daughter of Caesar. On this he was exorcised by the Rabbis (Ben Temalion, come out! Ben Temalion, come out), when they were rewarded by the offer of anything they might choose from the Imperial Treasury, on which they removed from it the hostile decree (Meilah 17 *b*, about the middle).

As against this one instance, many are related of cures by magical means. By the latter we mean the superstitious and irrational

⁵In general palm trees and their fruit are dangerous, and you should always wash your hands after eating dates.

Appendix 16—On The Jewish Views about Demons and the Demonised Together
with some Notes on the Intercourse between Jews and Jewish Christians in the
application of means which could in no way affect any disease,
First Centuries. (See Book III, ch. 14.) [181]

although they might sometimes be combined with what might be called domestic remedies. Thus, for a bad cold in the head this remedy is proposed: Pour slowly a quart of the milk of a white goat over three cabbage stalks, keep the pot boiling and stir with a piece of Marmehon-wood (Gitt. 69 *a*, *b*). The other remedy proposed is the excrement of a white dog mixed with balsam. It need scarcely be said, that the more intractable the disease, the more irrational are the remedies proposed. Thus against blindness by day it is proposed to take of the spleen of seven calves and put it on the basin used by surgeons for bleeding. Next, some one outside the door is to ask the blind man to give him something to eat, when he is to reply: How can I open the door—come in and eat—on which the latter obeys, taking care, however, to break the basin, as else the blindness might strike him. We have here an indication of one of the favourite modes of healing disease—that by its transference to another. But if the loss of the power of vision is greater at night than by day, a cord is to be made of the hair of some animal, one end of which is to be tied to the foot of the patient the other to that of a dog. The children are to strike together pieces of crockery behind the dog, while the patient repeats these words: The dog is old and the cock is foolish. Next seven pieces of meat are to be taken from seven different houses, and hung up on the doorposts, and the dog must afterwards eat the meat on a dunghill in an open place. Lastly, the cord is to be untied when one is to repeat: Let the blindness of M. the son of N. leave M. the son of N. and pierce the eyeballs of the dog! (Gitt, 69 *a*).

We have next to refer to strictly magical cures. These were performed by amulets—either preventive, or curative or disease—or else by exorcism. An amulet was regarded as *probate*, if three cures had been performed by it. In such case it might be put on even on the Sabbath. It consisted either of a piece of parchment (the *Pithqa*, Sanh. 78 *b*), on which certain magical words were written, or of small bundles of certain plants or herbs (also designated as *Qemia*, an amulet, Shabb. 61 *a*; Kidd. 73 *b*). However, even *probate* amulets might fail, owing to the adverse constellation under which a person was. In any case the names and numbers of the demons, whose power it was wished to counteract, required to be expressly stated. Sometimes the amulet contained also a verse from the Bible. It need

[182]

scarcely be said, that the other words written on the amulet had—at least, in their connection—little if any sensible meaning. But those learned in these arts and the Rabbis had the secret of discovering them, so that there was at least no mystery about them, and the formulas used were well known. If the mischief to be counteracted was due to demoniac agency, it might be prevented or removed by a kind of incantation, or by incantation along with other means, or in difficult cases by exorcism. As instances of the first we may quote the following. To ward off any danger from drinking water on a Wednesday or Sabbath-Evening, when evil spirits may rest on it, it is advised either to repeat a passage of Scripture in which the word *Qol* (Voice) occurs seven times ([Psalm 29:3-9](#)), or else to say this: Lul, Shaphan, Anigran, Anirdaphin—between the stars I sit, betwixt the lean and the fat I walk! (Pes. 112 *a*). Against flatulence, certain remedies are recommended (such as drinking warm water), but they are to be accompanied by the following formula: *Qapa, Qapa*, I think of thee, and of thy seven daughters, and eight daughters-in-law! (Pes. 116 *a*). Many similar prescriptions might be quoted. As the remedy against blindness has been adduced to point the contrast to the Savior's mode of treatment, it may be mentioned that quite a number of remedies are suggested for the cure of a bloody flux—of which perhaps wine in which Persian onions, or anise and saffron, or other plants have been boiled, seem the most rational—the medicament being, however, in each case accompanied by this formula: Be cured of thy flux!

Lastly, as regards incarnation and exorcism, the formulas to be used for the purpose are enumerated. These mostly consist of words which have little if any meaning (so far as we know), but which form a rhyme or alliteration when a syllable is either omitted or added in successive words. The following, for example, is the formula of incantation against boils: Baz, Baziyah, Mas, Masiya, Kas, Kasiyah, Sharlai and Amarlai—ye Angels that come from the land of Sodom to heal painful boils! Let the colour not become more red, let it not farther spread, let its seed be absorbed in the belly. As a mule does not propagate itself, so let not this evil propagate itself in the body of M. the son of M. (Shabb, 67 *a*). In other formulas the demons are not invoked for the cure, but threatened. We have the following as against another cutaneous disease: A sword drawn, and

Appendix 16—On The Jewish Views about Demons and the Demonised Together with some Notes on the Intercourse between Jews and Jewish Christians in the

a sling outstretched! His name is not Yokhabh, and the disease stand still! ^{First Centuries. (See Book III. ch. 14.)} ~~Against danger from the demon of foul places we have the~~ ^{clxxxix} following: On the head of the cast him into a bed of cresses, and beat him with the jawbone of an ass (Shabb 67 *a*). On the other hand, it is recommended as a precaution against the evil eye to put one's right thumb into the left hand and one's left thumb into the right hand, and to say: I, M. N. belong to the house of Joseph over whom the evil eye has no power (Ber. 55 *b*). A certain Rabbi gave this as information derived from one of the chief of the witches, by which witchcraft might be rendered harmless. The person in danger should thus address the witches: Hot filth into your mouths from baskets with holes, ye witching women! Let your head become bald, and the wind scatter your breadcrumbs. Let it carry away your spices, let the fresh saffron which you carry in your hands be scattered. Ye witches, so long as I had grace and was careful, I did not come among you, and now I have come, and you are not favorable to me (Pes. 110 *a*, *b*). To avoid the danger of two or more persons being separated by a dog, a palm tree, a woman, or a pig, we are advised to repeat a verse from the Bible which begins and ends with the word *El* (Almighty). Or in passing between women suspected of witchcraft it may be well to repeat this formula: Agrath, Azelath, Asiya, Belusiya are already killed by arrows. Lastly, the following may be quoted as a form of exorcism of demons: Burst, curst, dashed, banned be Bar-Tit, Bar-Tema, Bar-Tena, Chashmagoz, Merigoz, and Isteaham!

It has been a weary and unpleasant task to record such abject superstitions, mostly the outcome of contact with Parsee or other heathen elements. Brief though our sketch has been, we have felt as if it should have been even more curtailed. But it seemed necessary to furnish these unwelcome details in order to remove the possibility of comparing what is reported in the New Testament about the demonised and demons with Jewish notions on such subjects. Greater contrast could scarcely be conceived than between what we read in the New Testament and the views and practices mentioned in Rabbinic writings—and if this, as it is hoped, has been firmly established, even the ungrateful labor bestowed on collecting these unsavory notices will have been sufficiently repaid.

Appendix 17—The Ordinances and Law of the Sabbath as Laid Down in the Mishnah and the Jerusalem Talmud. (See Book III. ch. 35.)

The terribly exaggerated views of the Rabbis, and their endless, burdensome rules about the Sabbath may best be learned from a brief analysis of the *Mishnah*, as further explained and enlarged in the Jerusalem Talmud. ¹ For this purpose a brief analysis of what is, confessedly, one of the most difficult tractates may here be given.

The Mishnic tractate *Sabbath* stands at the head of twelve tractates which together form the second of the six sections into which the Mishnah is divided, and which treats of Festive Seasons (*Seder Moed*). Properly to understand the Sabbath regulations, it is, however, necessary also to take into account the second tractate in that section, which treats of what are called commixtures or connections (*Erubin*). Its object is to make the Sabbath Laws more bearable. For this purpose, it is explained how places, beyond which it would otherwise have been unlawful to carry things, may be connected together, so as, by a legal fiction, to convert them into a sort of private dwelling. Thus, supposing a number of small private houses to open into a common court, it would have been unlawful on the Sabbath to carry anything from one of these houses into the other. This difficulty is removed if all the families deposit before the Sabbath some food in the common court, when a connection is established between the various houses, which makes them one dwelling. This was called the Erubh of Courts. Similarly, an extension of what was allowed as a Sabbath journey might be secured by another commixture the Erubh or connection of boundaries. An ordinary Sabbath day's journey extended 2,000 cubits beyond one's dwelling. ² But if at the boundary of that journey a man deposited on the Friday

¹The Jerusalem Talmud is not only the older and the shorter of the two *Gemaras*, but would represent most fully the Palestinian ideas.

²On the Sabbath-journey, and the reason for fixing it at a distance of 2,000 cubits, see *Kitto's Cyclop.* (last ed.) Sabbath-way and The Temple and its Services p. 148.

Appendix 17—The Ordinances and Law of the Sabbath as Laid Down in the Mishnah and the Jerusalem Talmud. (See Book III. ch. 35.) cxc
food for two meals, he thereby constituted it his dwelling, and hence might go on for other 2,000 cubits. Lastly, there was another Erubh when narrow streets or blind alleys were connected into a private dwelling by laying a beam over the entrance, or extending a wire or rope along such streets and alleyways. This, by a legal fiction, made them a private dwelling so that everything was lawful there which a man might do on the Sabbath in his own house.

[186]

Without discussing the possible and impossible questions about these *Erubin* raised by the most ingenious casuistry, let us see how Rabbinism taught Israel to observe its Sabbath. In not less than twenty-four chapters,³ matters are seriously discussed as of vital religious importance, which one would scarcely imagine a sane intellect would seriously entertain. Through 64½ folio columns in the Jerusalem, and 156 double pages of folio in the Babylon Talmud does the enumeration and discussion of possible cases, drag on, almost unrelieved even by Haggadah.⁴ The Talmud itself bears witness to this, when it speaks (no doubt exaggeratedly) of a certain Rabbi who had spent no less than two and a half years in the study of only one of those twenty-four chapters! And it further bears testimony to the unprofitableness of these endless discussions and determinations. The occasion of this is so curious and characteristic, that it might here find mention. The discussion was concerning a beast of burden. An ass might not be led out on the road with its covering on, unless such had been put on the animal previous to the Sabbath, but it was lawful to lead the animal about in this fashion in one's courtyard.⁵ The same rule applied to a packsaddle, provided it were not fastened on by girth and back-strap. Upon this one of the Rabbis is reported as bursting into the declaration that this formed part of those Sabbath Laws (comp. Chag. 1:8) which were like mountains suspended by a hair! (Jer. Shabb. p. 7, col. *b*, last lines). And yet in all these wearisome details there is not a single trace of anything spiritual—not a word even to suggest higher thoughts of God's holy day and its observance.

³In the Jerusalem Talmud a Gemara is attached only to the first twenty chapters of the Mishnic tractate *Shabbath*; in the Babylon Talmud to all the Twenty-four chapters.

⁴I have counted about thirty-three Haggadic pieces in the tractate.

⁵In the former case it might be a burden or lead to work, while in the latter case the covering was presumably for warmth.

[187] The tractate on the Sabbath begins with regulations extending its provisions to the close of the Friday afternoon, so as to prevent the possibility of infringing the Sabbath itself, which commenced on the Friday evening. As the most common kind of labour would be that of carrying, this is the first point discussed. The Biblical Law forbade such labour in simple terms ([Exodus 36:6](#); comp. [Jeremiah 17:22](#)). But Rabbinism developed the prohibition into eight special ordinances, by first dividing the bearing of a burden into two separate acts—lifting it up and putting it down—and than arguing, that it might be lifted up or put down from two different places, from a public into a private, or from a private into a public place. Here, of course, there are discussions as to what constituted a private place (*dyxyh tw#r*); a public place (*Mybrh tw#r*); a wide space which belongs neither to a special individual or to a community, such as the sea, a deep wide valley, or else the corner of a property leading out on the road or fields, and, lastly, a legally free place.⁶ Again, a burden meant, as the lowest standard of it, the weight of a dried fig. But if half a fig were carried at two different times—lifted or deposited from a private into a public place, or *vice versa*—were these two actions to be combined into one so as to constitute the sin of Sabbath desecration? And if so, under what conditions as to state of mind, locality, &c.? And, lastly, how many different sins might one such act involve? To give an instance of the kind of questions that were generally discussed, the standard measure for forbidden food was the size of an olive, just as that for carrying burdens was the weight of a fig. If a man swallowed forbidden food of the size of half an olive, rejected it, and again eaten of the size of half an olive, he would be guilty, because the palate had altogether tasted food to the size of a whole olive; but if one had deposited in another locality a burden of the weight of a half a fig, and removed it again, it involved no guilt, because the burden was altogether only of half a fig, nor even if the first half fig's burden had been burnt and then a second

[188]

⁶Such a free place (*rw+p Mwqm*) must cover less than four square cubits—for ex., a pillar would be such. To this no legal determination would apply. The wide space is called *Karmelith* (*tylmrb*). The Mishnah, however, expressly mentions only the private and the public place (or enclosed and open), although the *Karmeilth* was in certain circumstances treated as public in others as private' property. The explanation of the terms and legal definitions is in *Jer. Shabb. 12 d; 13 a; Shabb. 6, a, b; Toseft. Shabb. 1.*

Appendix 17—The Ordinances and Law of the Sabbath as Laid Down in the Mishnah and the Jerusalem Talmud. (See Book III. ch. 35.) cxciii
half fig introduced. Similarly, if an object that was intended to be worn or carried in front had slipped behind it involved no guilt, but if it had been intended to be worn or carried behind, and it slipped forward, this involved guilt, as involving labor.

Similar difficulties were discussed as to the reverse. Whether, if an object were thrown from a private into a public place, or the reverse. Whether, if an object was thrown into the air with the left, and caught again in the right hand, this involved sin, was a nice question, though there could be no doubt a man incurred guilt if he caught it with the same hand which it had been thrown, but he was not guilty if he caught it in his mouth, since, after being eaten, the object no longer existed, and hence catching with the mouth was as if it had been done by a second person. Again, if it rained, and the water which fell from the sky were carried, there was no sin in it; but if the rain had run down from a wall it would involve sin. If a person were in one place, and his hand filled with fruit stretched into another, and the Sabbath overtook him in this attitude, he would have to drop the fruit, since if he withdrew his full hand from one locality into another, he would be carrying a burden on the Sabbath.

It is needless to continue to analysis of this casuistry. All discussions to which we have referred turn only on the *first* of the legal canons in the tractate Sabbath. They will show what a complicated machinery of merely external ordinances traditionalism set in motion; how utterly unspiritual the whole system was, and how it required no small amount of learning and ingenuity to avoid committing grievous sin. In what follows we shall only attempt to indicate the leading points in the Sabbath-legislation of the Rabbis.

Shortly before the commencement of the Sabbath (late on Friday afternoon) nothing new was to be begun; ⁷ the tailor might no longer go out with his needle, nor the scribe with his pen; nor were clothes to be examined by lamplight. A teacher might not allow his pupils to read, if he himself looked on the book. All these are precautionary measures. The tailor or scribe carrying his ordinary means of employment, might forget the advent of the holy day; the person

⁷Here such questions are raised as what constitutes the beginning, for ex., of shaving or a bath.

examining a dress might kill insects,⁸ which is strictly forbidden on the Sabbath, and the teacher might move the lamp to see better, while the pupils were supposed to be so zealous as to do this.

These latter rules, we are reminded, were passed at a certain celebrated discussion between the schools of Hillel and Shammai, when the latter were in the majority. On that occasion also opposition to the Gentiles was carried to its farthest length, and their food, their language, their testimony, their presence, their intercourse, in short, all connection with them denounced. The school of Shammai also forbade to make any mixture, the ingredients of which would not be wholly dissolved and assimilated before the Sabbath. Nay, the Sabbath law was declared to apply even to lifeless objects. Thus, wool might not be dyed if the process was not completed before the Sabbath. Nor was it even lawful to sell anything to a heathen unless the object would reach its destination before the Sabbath, nor to give to a heathen workman anything to do which might involve him in Sabbath work. Thus, Rabbi Gamaliel was careful to send his linen to be washed three days before Sabbath. But it was lawful to leave olives or grapes in the olive or winepress. Both schools were agreed that, in roasting or baking, a crust must have been formed before the Sabbath, except in case of the Passover lamb. The Jerusalem Talmud, however, modifies certain of these rules. Thus the prohibition of work to a heathen only implies, if they work in the house of the Jew, or at least in the same town with him. The school of Shammai, however, went so far as to forbid sending a letter by a heathen, not only a Friday or on a Thursday, but even sending on a Wednesday, or to embark on the sea on these days.

[190] It being assumed that the lighting of the Sabbath lamp was a law given to Moses on Mount Sinai, the Mishnah proceeds, in the second chapter of the tractate on the Sabbath, to discuss the substances of which respectively the wick and the oil may be composed, provided always that oil which feeds the wick is not put in a separate vessel, since the removal of that vessel would cause the extinction of the lamp, which would involve a breach of the Sabbath law. But if the light were extinguished from fear of the Gentiles, of robbers,

⁸To kill such vermin is, of course, strictly forbidden (to kill a flea is like a camel). Rules are given how to dispose of such insects. On the same occasion some curious ideas are broached as to the transformation of animals, one into another.

Appendix 17—The Ordinances and Law of the Sabbath as Laid Down in the Mishnah and the Jerusalem Talmud. (See Book III. ch. 35.) cxcv
~~or of an evil spirit, or in order that one dangerously ill might go~~
to sleep, it involved no guilt. Here, many points in casuistry are discussed, such as whether twofold guilt is incurred if in blowing out a candle its flame lights another. The Mishnah here diverges to discuss the other commandments, which, like that of lighting the Sabbath lamp, specially devolve on women, on which occasion the Talmud broaches some curious statements about the heavenly Sanhedrin and Satan, such as that it is in moments of danger that the Great Enemy brings accusations against us, in order to ensure our ruin; or this, that on three occasions he specially lies in ambush: when one travels alone, when one sleeps alone in a dark house, and when one crosses the sea. In regard to the latter we may note as illustrative of St. Paul's warning not to travel after the fast (Day of Atonement), that the Jewish proverb had it: When you bind your *Lulabh*⁹ (at the Feast of Tabernacles) bind also your feet'—as regards a sea voyage (Jer. Shabb. 5 *b*, Ber. R. 6).

The next two chapters in the tractate on the Sabbath discuss the manner in which food may be kept warm for the Sabbath, since no fire might be lighted. If the food had been partially cooked, or was such as would improve by increased heat, there would be temptation to attend to the fire, and this must be avoided. Hence the oven was immediately before the Sabbath only to be heated with straw or chaff; if otherwise, the coals were to be removed or covered with ashes. Clothes ought not to be dried by the hot air of a stove. At any rate, care must be taken that neighbours do not see it. An egg may not be boiled by putting it near a hot kettle, nor in a cloth, nor sand heated by the sun. Cold water might be poured on warm, but not the reverse (at least such was the opinion of the school of Shammai), nor was it lawful to prepare either cold or warm compresses. Nay, a Rabbi went so far as to forbid throwing hot water over one's self, for fear of spreading the vapour, or of cleaning the floor thereby! A vessel might be put under a lamp to catch the falling sparks, but no water might be put into it, because it was not lawful to extinguish a light. Nor would it have been allowed on the Sabbath to put a vessel to receive the drops of oil that might fall from the lamp. Among

[191]

⁹The *Lulabh* (blwl) consisted of a palm with myrtle and willow branch tied on either side of it, which every worshipper carried on the Feast of Tabernacles (Temple and its Services p. 238).

many other questions raised was this: whether a parent might take his child in his arms. Happily Rabbinic literally went so far as not only to allow this, but even in the supposed case that the child might happen to have a stone in its hands, although this would involve the labour of carrying that stone! Similarly, it was declared lawful to lift seats, provided they had not, as it were, four steps, when they must be considered as ladders. But it was not allowed to draw along chairs, as this might produce a rut or cavity, although a little carriage might be moved, since the wheels would only compress the soil but not produce a cavity (comp. on the Bab. Talmud, Shabb. 22 *a*; 46; and Bets. 23 *b*).

Again, the question is discussed, whether it is lawful to keep the food warm by wrapping around a vessel certain substances. Here the general canon is, that all must be avoided which would increase the heat: since this would be to produce some outward effect, which would be equivalent to work.

In the fifth chapter of the tractate we are supposed to begin the Sabbath morning. Ordinarily, the first business of the morning would, of course, have been to take out the cattle. Accordingly, the laws are now laid down for ensuring Sabbath rest to the animals. The principle underlying these is, that only what serves as ornament, or is absolutely necessary for leading out or bringing back animals, or for safety, may be worn by them; all else is regarded as a burden. Even such things as might be put on to prevent the rubbing of a wound, or other possible harm, or to distinguish an animal, must be left aside on the day of rest.

Next, certain regulations are laid down to guide the Jew when dressing on the Sabbath morning, so as to prevent his breaking its rest. Hence he must be careful not to put on any dress which might become burdensome, nor to wear any ornament which he might put off and carry in his hand, for this would be a burden. A woman must not wear such headgear as would require unloosing before taking a bath, nor go out with such ornaments as could be taken off in the street, such as a frontlet, unless it is attached to the cap, nor with a gold crown, nor with a necklace or nose-ring, nor with

Appendix 17—The Ordinances and Law of the Sabbath as Laid Down in the Mishnah and the Jerusalem Talmud. (See Book III. ch. 35.) cxcvii

rings, nor have a pin¹⁰ in her dress. The reason for this prohibition of ornaments was, that in their vanity women might take them off to show them to their companions, and then, forgetful to the day, carry them, which would be a burden. Women are also forbidden to look in the glass on the Sabbath, because they might discover a white hair and attempt to pull it out, which would be a grievous sin; but men ought not to use looking-glasses even on weekdays, because this was undignified. A woman may walk about her own court, but not in the streets, with false hair. Similarly, a man was forbidden to wear on the Sabbath wooden shoes studded with nails, or only one shoe, as this would involve labour; nor was he to wear phylacteries nor amulets, unless, indeed, they had been made by competent persons (since they might lift them off in order to show the novelty). Similarly, it was forbidden to wear any part of a suit of armour. It was not lawful to scrape shoes, except perhaps with the back of a knife, but they might be touched with oil or water. Nor should sandals be softened with oil, because that would improve them. It was a very serious question, which led to much discussion, what should be done if the tie of a sandal had broken on the Sabbath. A plaster might be worn, provided its object was to prevent the wound from getting worse, not to heal it, for that would have been a work. Ornaments which could not easily be taken off might be worn in one's courtyard. Similarly, a person might go about with wadding in his ear, but not with false teeth nor with a gold plug in the tooth. If the wadding fell out of the ear, it could not be replaced. Some indeed, thought that its healing virtues lay in the oil in which it had been soaked, and which had dried up, but others ascribed them to the warmth of the wadding itself. In either case there was danger of healing—of doing anything for the purpose of a cure—and hence wadding might not be put into the ear on the Sabbath, although if worn before it might be continued. Again, as regarded false teeth: they might fall out, and the wearer might then lift and carry them, which would be sinful on the Sabbath. But anything which formed part of the ordinary dress of a person might be worn also on the Sabbath, and children whose ears were being bored might have a

[193]

¹⁰Literally, a needle which has not an eyelet. Of course, it would not be lawful for a modern Jew—if he observe the Rabbinic Law—to carry a stick or a pencil on the Sabbath, to drive, or even to smoke.

plug put into the hole. It was also allowed to go about on crutches, or with a wooden leg, and children might have bells on their dresses; but it was prohibited to walk on stilts, or to carry any heathen amulet.

The seventh chapter of the tractate contains the most important part of the whole. It opens by laying down the principle that, if a person has either not known, or forgotten, the whole Sabbath law, all the breaches of it which he has committed during ever so many weeks are to be considered as only one error or one sin. If he has broken the Sabbath law by mistaking the day, every Sabbath thus profaned must be atoned for; but he has broken the law because he thought that what he did was permissible, then every separate infringement constitutes a separate sin, although labors which stand related as *species* to the *genus* are regarded as only one work. It follows, that guilt attaches to the state of mind rather than to the outward deed. Next, forty less one chief or fathers of work (*Aboth*) are enumerated, all of which are supposed to be forbidden in the Bible. They are: sowing, ploughing reaping, binding sheaves, threshing, winnowing, sifting (selecting), grinding, sifting in a sieve, kneading, baking; shearing the wool, washing it, beating it, dyeing it, spinning, putting it on the weaver's beam, making a knot, undoing a knot, sewing two stitches, tearing in order to sew two stitches; catching deer, killing; skinning, salting it, preparing its skin, scraping off its hair, cutting it up, writing two letters, scraping in order to write two letters; building, pulling down, extinguishing fire, lighting fire, beating with the hammer, and carrying from one possession into the other.

[194] The number thirty-nine is said to represent the number of times that the word labour occurs in the Biblical text, and all these *Aboth* or fathers of work are supposed to be connected with some work that had been done about the Tabernacle, or to be kindred to such work. Again, each of these principal works involved the prohibition of a number of others which were derived from them, and hence called their descendants (*toledoth*). The thirty-nine principal works have been arranged in four groups: the first (1-11) referring to the preparation of bread; the second (12-24) to all connected with dress; the third (25-33) to all connected with writing; and the last (34-39) to all the work necessary for a private house. Another Rabbi derives the number thirty-nine (of these *Aboth*) from the numerical value of the initial word in [Exodus 35:1](#), although in so doing he has to

Mishnah and the Jerusalem Talmud. (See Book III, ch. 35.) cxcix
change the last letter (h)l, the h must be changed into a x to make thirty-nine).¹¹ Further explanations must here be added. If you scatter two seeds, you have been sowing. In general, the principle is laid down, that anything by which the ground may be benefited is to be considered a work or labour even if it were to sweep away or to break up a cold of earth. Nay, to pluck a blade of grass was a sin. Similarly, it was sinful labour to do anything that would promote the ripening of fruits, such as to water, or even to remove a withered leaf. To pick fruit, or even to lift it from the ground, would be like reaping. If for example, a mushroom were cut, there would be twofold sin, since by the act of cutting, a new one would spring in its place. According to the Rabbis of Caesarea, fishing, and all that put an end to life, must be ranked with harvesting. In connection with the conduct of the disciples in rubbing the ears of corn on the Sabbath, it is interesting to know that all work connected with food would be classed as one of the *toledoth*, of binding into sheaves. If a woman were to roll wheat to take away this husks, she would be guilty of sifting with a sieve. If she were rubbing the ends of the stalks, she would be guilty of threshing. If she were cleaning what adheres to the side of a stalk, she would be guilty of sifting. If she were brushing the stalk, she would be guilty of grinding. If she were throwing it up in her hands, she would be guilty of winnowing. Distinctions like the following are made: A radish may be dipped into salt, but not left in it too long, since this would be to make
pickle. A new dress might be put on, irrespective of the danger that in so doing it might be torn. Mud on the dress might be crushed in the hand and shaken off, but the dress must not be rubbed (for fear of affecting the material). If a person took a bath, opinions are divided, whether the whole body should be dried at once, or limb after limb. If water had fallen on the dress, some allowed the dress to be shaken but not wrung; other, to be wrung but not shaken. One Rabbi allowed to spit into the handkerchief, and that although it may necessitate the compressing of what had been wetted; but there is a grave discussion whether it was lawful to spit on the ground, and then to rub it with the foot, because thereby the earth may be

[195]

¹¹The Rabbis contend for the lawfulness of changing the h into a x for the sake of an interpretation. So expressly here. (Jer. Shabb. 9 b) and in Jer. Peah 20 b (Mylwlx into Mylwlx in [Leviticus 19:24](#)).

scratched. It may, however, be done on stones. In the labour of grinding would be included such an act as crushing salt. To sweep, or to water the ground, would involve the same sin as beating out the corn. To lay on a plaster would be a grievous sin; to scratch out a big letter, leaving room for two small ones, would be a sin, but to write one big letter occupying the room of two small letters was no sin. To change one letter into another might imply a double sin. And so on through endless details!

The Mishnah continues to explain that, in order to involve guilt, the thing carried from one locality to another must be sufficient to be entrusted for safekeeping. The quantity is regulated: as regards the food of animals, to the capacity of their mouth; as regards man, a dried fig is the standard. As regards fluids, the measure is as much wine as is used for one cup, that is, the measure of the cup being a quarter of a log, and wine being mixed with water in the proportion of three parts water to one of wine—one-sixteenth of a log.¹² As regards milk, a mouthful; of honey, sufficient to lay on a wound; of oil, sufficient to anoint the smallest member; of water, sufficient to wet eyesalve; and of all other fluids, a quarter of a log.

[196] As regarded other substances, the standard as to what constituted a burden was whether the thing could be turned to any practical use, however trifling. Thus, two horse's hairs might be made into a bird trap; a scrap of clean paper into a customhouse notice; a small piece of paper written upon might be converted into a wrapper for a small flagon. In all these cases, therefore, transport would involve sin. Similarly, ink sufficient to write two letters, wax enough to fill up a small hole, even a pebble with which you might aim at a little bird, or a small piece of broken earthenware with which you might stir the coals, would be burdens!

Passing to another aspect of the subject, the Mishnah lays it down that, in order to constitute sin, a thing must have been carried from one locality into another entirely and immediately, and that it must have been done in the way in which things are ordinarily carried. If an object which one person could carry is carried by two, they are not guilty. Finally, like all labour on the Sabbath, that of cutting one's nails or hair involves moral sin, but only if it is done in

¹²It has been calculated by *Herzfeld* that a log = 0.36 of a litre; six hen's eggs.'

Appendix 17—The Ordinances and Law of the Sabbath as Laid Down in the Mishnah and the Jerusalem Talmud. (See Book III, ch. 35.) cci
the ordinary way, otherwise only the lesser sin of the breach of the Sabbath rest. A very interesting notice in connection with St. **John 5.**, is that in which it is explained how it would not involve sin to carry a living person on a pallet, the pallet being regarded only as an accessory to the man; while to carry a dead body in such manner, or even the smallest part of a dead body, would involve guilt.

From this the Mishnah proceeds to discuss what is analogous to carrying, such as drawing or throwing. Other labours are similarly made the subject of inquiry, and it is shown how any approach to them involves guilt. The rule here is, that anything that might prove of lasting character must not be done on the Sabbath. The same rule applies to what might prove the beginning of work, such as letting the hammer fall on the anvil; or to anything that might contribute to improve a place, to gathering as much wood as would boil an egg, to uprooting weeds, to writing two letters of a word—in short, to anything that might be helpful in, or contribute towards, some future work.

The Mishnah next passes to such work in which not quantity, but quality, is in question—such as catching deer. Here it is explained that anything by which an animal might be caught is included in the prohibition. So far is this carried that, if a deer had run into a house, and the door were shut upon it, it would involve guilt, and this, even if, without closing the door, persons seated themselves at the entry to prevent the exit of the animal.

Passing over the other chapters, which similarly illustrate what are supposed to be Biblical prohibitions of labour as defined in the thirty-nine *Aboth* and their *toledoth*, we come, in the sixteenth chapter of the tractate, to one of the most interesting parts, containing such Sabbath laws as, by their own admission, were imposed only by the Rabbis. These embrace: 1. Things forbidden, because they might lead to a transgression of the Biblical command; 2. Such as are like the kind of labour supposed to be forbidden in the Bible; 3. Such as are regarded a sin compatible with the honour due to the Sabbath. In the first class are included a number of regulations in case of a fire. All portions of Holy Scripture, whether in the original or translated, and the case in which they are laid; the phylacteries and their case, might be rescued from the flames. Of food or drink only what was needful for the Sabbath might be rescued; but if the

food were in a cupboard or basket the whole might be carried out. Similarly, all utensils needed for the Sabbath meal, but of dress only what was absolutely necessary, might be saved, it being, however, provided, that a person might put on a dress, save it, to go back and put on another, and so on. Again, anything in the house might be covered with skin so as to save it from the flames, or the spread of the flames might be arrested by piling up vessels. It was not lawful to ask a Gentile to extinguish the flame, but not duty to hinder him, if he did so. It was lawful to put a vessel over a lamp, to prevent the ceiling from catching fire; similarly, to throw a vessel over a scorpion, although on that point there is doubt. On the other hand, it is allowed, if a Gentile has lighted a lamp on the Sabbath, to make use of it, the fiction being, however, kept up that he did it for himself, and not for the Jew. By the same fiction the cattle may be watered, or, in fact, any other use made of his services.

[198] Before passing from this, we should point out that it was directed that the Hagiographa should not be read except in the evening, since the daytime was to be devoted to more doctrinal studies. In the same connection it is added, that the study of the Mishnah is more important than that of the Bible, that of the Talmud being considered the most meritorious of all, as enabling one to understand all questions of right and wrong. Liturgical pieces, though containing the Name of God, might not be rescued from the flames. The Gospels, and the writings of Christians, or of heretics, might not be rescued. If it be asked what should be done with them on weekdays, the answer is, that the Names of God which they contain ought to be cut out, and then the books themselves burned. One of the Rabbis, however, would have had them burnt at once, indeed, he would rather have fled into an idolatrous temple than into a Christian church: for the idolators deny God because they have not known Him, but the apostates are worse. To them applied [Psalm 139:21](#), and, if it was lawful to wash out in the waters of jealousy the Divine Name in order to restore peace, much more would it be lawful to burn such books, even though they contained the Divine Name, because they led to enmity between Israel and their Heavenly Father.

Another chapter of the tractate deals with the question of the various pieces of furniture—how far they may be moved and used. Thus, curtains, or a lid, may be regarded as furniture, and hence used.

Mishnah and the Jerusalem Talmud. (See Book III. ch. 35.) ccciii
More interesting is the next chapter (xviii.), which deals with things forbidden by the Rabbis because they resemble those kinds of labour supposed to be interdicted in the Bible. Here it is declared lawful, for example, to remove quantities of straw or corn in order to make room for guests, or for an assembly of students, but the whole barn must not be emptied, because in so doing the floor might be injured. Again, as regards animals, some assistance might be given if an animal was about to have its young, though not to the same amount as to a woman in childbirth, for whose sake the Sabbath might be desecrated. Lastly, all might be done on the holy day needful for circumcision. At the same time, every preparation possible for the service should be made the day before. The Mishnah proceeds to enter here on details not necessarily connected with the Sabbath law.

In the following chapter (xx.) the tractate goes on to indicate such things as are only allowed on the Sabbath on condition that they are done differently from ordinary days. Thus, for example, certain solutions ordinarily made in water should be made in vinegar. The food for horses or cattle must not be taken out of the manger, unless it is immediately given to some other animal. The bedding straw must not be turned with hand, but with other part of the body. A press in which linen is smoothed may be opened to take out napkins, but must not be screwed down again, &c.

The next chapter proceeds upon the principle that, although [199] everything is to be avoided which resembles the labours referred to in the Bible, the same prohibition does not apply to such labours as resemble those interdicted by the Rabbis. The application of this principle is not, however, of interest to general readers.

In the twenty-second chapter the Mishnah proceeds to show that all the precautions of the Rabbis had only this object: to prevent an ultimate breach of a Biblical prohibition. Hence, where such was not to be feared, an act might be done. For example, a person might bathe in mineral waters, but not carry home the linen with which he had dried himself. He might anoint and rub the body, but not to the degree of making himself tired; but he might not use any artificial remedial measures, such as taking a shower-bath. Bones might not be set, nor emetics given, nor any medical or surgical operation performed.

In the last two chapters the Mishnah points out those things which are unlawful as derogatory to the dignity of the Sabbath. Certain things are here of interest as bearing on the question of purchasing things for the feast day. Thus, it is expressly allowed to borrow wine, or oil, or bread on the Sabbath, and to leave one's upper garment in pledge, though one should not express it in such manner as to imply it was a loan. Moreover, it is expressly added that if the day before the Passover falls on a Sabbath, one may in this manner purchase a Paschal lamb, and, presumably, all else that is needful for the feast. This shows how Judas might have been sent on the eve of the Passover to purchase what was needful, for the law applying to a feast day was much less strict than that of the Sabbath. Again, to avoid the possibility of effacing anything written, it was forbidden to read from a tablet the names of one's guests, or the *menu*. It was lawful for children to cast lots for their portions at table, but not with strangers, for this might lead to a breach of the Sabbath, and to games of chance. Similarly, it was improper on the Sabbath to engage workmen for the following week, nor should one be on the watch for the close of that day to begin one's ordinary work. It was otherwise if religious obligations awaited one at the close of the Sabbath such as attending to a bride, or making preparation for a funeral. ¹³

[200] On the Sabbath itself it was lawful to do all that was absolutely necessary connected with the dead, such as to anoint or wash the body, although without moving the limbs, nor might the eyes of the dying be closed—a practice which, indeed, was generally denounced.

In the last chapter of the tractate the Mishnah returns to the discussion of punctilious details. Supposing a traveller to arrive in a place just as the Sabbath commenced, he must only take from his beast of burden such objects are allowed to be handled on the Sabbath. As for the rest, he may loosen the ropes and let them fall down of themselves. Further, it is declared lawful to unloose bundles of straw, or to rub up what can only be eaten in that condition; but care must be taken that nothing is done which is not absolutely necessary. On the other hand, cooking would not be allowed—in

¹³It is curious as bearing upon a recent controversy, to note that on this occasion it is said that an Israelite may be buried in the coffin and grave originally destined for a Gentile, but not *vice versâ*.

Appendix 17—The Ordinances and Law of the Sabbath as Laid Down in the Mishnah and the Jerusalem Talmud. (See Book III. ch. 35.) ccv
~~short, nothing must be done but what was absolutely necessary to~~
satisfy the cravings of hunger or thirst. Finally, it was declared lawful on the Sabbath to absolve from vows, and to attend to similar religious calls.

Detailed as this analysis of the Sabbath law is, we have not by any means exhausted the subject. Thus, one of the most curious provisions of the Sabbath law was, that on the Sabbath only such things were to be touched or eaten as had been expressly prepared on a weekday with a view to the Sabbath (Bez. 2 b).¹⁴ Anything not so destined was forbidden, as the expression is on account of *Muqtsah* (hcqwm), i. e. as not having been the intention. Jewish dogmatists enumerate nearly fifty cases in which that theological term finds its application. Thus, if a hen had laid on the Sabbath, the egg was forbidden, because, evidently, it could not have been destined on a weekday for eating, since it was not yet laid, and did not exist; while if the hen had been kept, not for laying but for fattening, the egg might be eaten as forming a part of the hen that had fallen off! But when the principle of *Muqtsah* is applied to the touching of things which are not used because they have become ugly (and hence are not in one's mind), so that, for example, an old lamp may not be touched, or raisins during the process of drying them (because they are not eatable then), it will be seen how complicated such a law must have been.

Chiefly from other tractates of the Talmud the following may here be added. It would break the Sabbath rest to climb a tree, to ride, to swim, to clap one's hands, to strike one's side, or to dance. All judicial acts, vows, and tilling were also prohibited on that day (Bez. v. 2). It has already been noted that aid might be given or promised for a woman in her bed. But the Law went further. While it prohibited the application or use on the Sabbath of any remedies that would bring improvement or cure to the sick, all actual danger to life (tb#x t) hxwd ty#pn qps lb, Yoma vii. 6) superseded the Sabbath law, but nothing short of that. Thus, to state an extreme case, if on the Sabbath a wall had fallen on a person, and it were doubtful whether he was under the ruins or not, whether he was alive or dead, a Jew or Gentile, it would be duty to clear away the rubbish sufficiently

[201]

¹⁴This destination or preparation is called *Hachanah*.

to find the body. If life were not extinct the labour would have to be continued; but if the person were dead nothing further should be done to extricate the body. Similarly, a Rabbi allowed the use of remedies on the Sabbath in throat diseases, on the express ground that he regarded them as endangering life. On a similar principle a woman with child or a sick person was allowed to break even the fast of the Day of Atonement, while one who had a maniacal attack of morbid craving for food (swmlwb) = boulimoV might on that sacred day have even unlawful food (Yoma viii. 5, 6).

Such are the leading provisions by which Rabbinism enlarged the simple Sabbath-law as expressed in the Bible,¹⁵ and, in its anxiety to ensure its most exact observance, changed the spiritual import of its rest into a complicated code of external and burdensome ordinances. Shall we then wonder at Christ's opposition to the Sabbath-ordinances of the Synagogue, or, on the other hand, at the teaching of Christ on this subject, and that of his most learned and most advanced contemporaries? And whence this difference unless Christ was the Teacher come from God Who spake as never before man had spoken?

¹⁵Exodus 20:8-11; 23:12-17; 34:1-3; Deuteronomy 5:12-15.

[202]

**Appendix 18—Haggadah about Simeon Kepha
(Legend of Simon Peter.) (pyk Nw (m#d)tdg—Book
III. ch. 37.)**

This Haggadah exists in four different Recensions (comp. *Jellinek*, Beth ha-Midrash, Pt. V. and Pt. VI., pp. ix. x). The first of these, reproduced by Jellinek (u. s. Pt. V. p. xxvi. &c., and pp. 60-62) was first published by *Wagenseil* in his collection of Antichristian writings, the *Tela Ignea Satanae*, at the close of that blasphemous production, the *Sepher Toledoth Jeshu* (pp. 19-24). The second Recension is that by *Huldrich* (Leyden 1705); the third has been printed, as is inferred, at Breslau in 1824; while the fourth exists only in MS. Dr. Jellinek has substantially reproduced (without the closing sentences) the text of *Wagenseil's* (u. s. Pt. V.), and also Recensions III. and IV. (u. s. Pt. VI.). He regards Recension IV. as the oldest; but we infer from its plea against the abduction of Jewish children by Christians and against forced baptisms, as well as from the use of certain expressions, that Recension IV. is younger than the text of *Wagenseil*, which seems to present the legend in its most primitive form. Even this, however, appears a mixture of several legends; or perhaps the original may afterwards have been interpolated. It were impossible to fix even approximately the age of this Christianity in Rome, and that of the Papacy, though it seems to contain older elements. It may be regarded as embodying certain ancient legends among the Jews about St. Peter, but adapted to later times, and cast in an apologetic form. A brief criticism of the document will best follow an abstract of the text, according to the first or earlier Recension.

The text begins by a notice that the strife between the Nazarenes and the Jews had grown to such proportions that they separated, since any Nazarene who saw a Jew would kill him. Such became the misery for thirty years, that the Nazarenes increased to thousands and myriads, and prevented the Jew from going up to the feast of

[203]

Jerusalem. And distress was as great as at the time of the Golden Calf. And still the opposing faith increased, and twelve wicked men went out, who traversed the twelve kingdoms. And they prophesied false prophecies in the camp, and they misled Israel, and they were men of reputation, and strengthened the faith of Jesus, for they said that they were the Apostles of the Crucified. And they drew to themselves a large number from among the children of Israel. On this the text describes, how the sages in Israel were afflicted and humbled themselves, each confessing to his neighbour the sins which had brought this evil, and earnestly asking of God to give them direction how to arrest the advance of Nazarene doctrine and persecution. As they finished their prayer, up rose an elder from their midst, whose name was Simeon Kepha, who had formerly put into requisition the *Bath Kol* and said: Hearken to me, my brethren and my people! If my words are good in your sight, I will separate those sinners from the congregation of the children of Israel, and they shall have neither part nor inheritance in the midst of Israel, if only you take upon you the sin. And they all answered and said: We will take upon us the sin, if only thou wilt do what thou hast said. Upon this, the narrative proceeds, Peter went into the Sanctuary, wrote the Ineffable Name, and inserted it in his flesh. Having learnt the Ineffable Name, he went to the metropolis (*metropolin*) of the Nazarenes, and proclaimed that every believer in Christ should come to him, since he was an Apostle. The multitudes required that he should prove his claim by a sign (*oth*) such as Jesus had done while He was alive, when Peter, through the power of the Ineffable Name, restored a leper, by laying on of hands, and raised the dead. When the Nazarenes saw this, they fell on their faces, and acknowledged his Apostolate. Then Peter delivered this as his message, first bidding them swear to do as he would command: know (said he) that the Crucified hated Israel and their law, as Isaiah prophesied: “Your new moons and your feasts my soul hateth;” know also, that he delighteth not in Israel, as Hosea prophesied, “You are not my people.” And although it is in His power to extirpate them from the world in a moment, from out of every place, yet He does not purpose to destroy them, but intends to leave them, in order that they be in memory of His Crucifixion and lapidation to all generations. Besides, know that He bore all those great sufferings and afflictions to redeem you from

Gehenna. And now He admonishes and commands you, that you should do no evil to the Jews: and if a Jew says to a Nazarene, “Go with me one *parasang*” (Persian mile about three English miles), let him go with him two *parasangs*. And if a Jew smites him on the left cheek, let him present to him also the right cheek, in order that they may have their reward in this world, while in the next they will be punished in Gehenna. And if you do thus, you will deserve to sit with Him in Feast of the Passover, but observe the day of His death. And instead of the Feast of Pentecost observe the forty days from the time that He was slain to when He went up into heaven. And instead of the Feast of Tabernacles observe the day of His birth, and on the eighth day after His birth observe that on which He was circumcised.

[204]

To these commands all agreed, on condition that Peter should remain with them. This he consented to do, on the understanding that he would not eat anything except bread of misery and water of affliction—presumably not only to avoid forbidden food, but in expiatory suffering for his sin—and that they should build him a tower in the midst of the city, in which he would remain unto the day of his death, all which provisions were duly carried out. It is added, that in this tower he served the God of his fathers, Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob. What is still stranger, it is added, that he wrote many *Piutim*, a certain class of liturgical poems which form apart of the Synagogue service—and that he sent these throughout all Israel to be in perpetual memory of him, and especially that he despatched them to the Rabbis. The remark is the more noteworthy, as other Jewish writers also describe the Apostle Peter as the author of several liturgical poems, of which one is still repeated in the Synagogue on Sabbaths and Feast days (comp. Jellinek, *Beth ha-Midr.*, part v., p. 61, note). But to return. Peter is said to have remained in that tower for six years, when he died, and by his direction was buried within the tower. But the Nazarenes raised there a great fabric, and this tower may be seen in Rome, and they call it Peter, which is the word for a stone, because he sat on a stone till the day of his death. But after his death another person named Elijah came, in the wickedness and cunning of his heart to mislead them. And he said to them Simon had deceived them, for that Jesus had commanded him to tell them: it had not come into His heart to despise the Law of

[205]

Moses; that if any one wished to circumcise, he should circumcise; but if any one did not wish to be circumcised, let him be immersed in foul waters. And even if he were not immersed, he would not thereby be in danger in the world. And he commanded that they should not observe the seventh day, but only the first day, because on it were created the heavens and the earth. And he made to them many statutes which were not good. But the people asked him: Give us a true sign that Jesus hath sent thee. And he said to them: What is the sign that you seek? And the word had not been out of his own mouth when a great stone of immense weight fell and crushed his head. So perish all Thine enemies, O God, but let them that love Thee be as the sun when he goeth forth in his strength!

Thus far what we regard as the oldest Recension. The chief variations between this and the others are, that in the third Recension the opponent of Peter is called Abba Shaul (St. John also is mentioned; Jellinek, u. s. part vi., p. 156), while in the fourth Recension (in MS.), which consists of nineteen chapters, this opponent is called Elijah. In the latter Recension there is mention of Antioch and Tiberias, and other places connected with the lives of St. Peter and St. Paul, and the early history of the Church. But the occurrence of certain Romanic words, such as Papa, Vescova, &c., shows its later date. Again, we mark that, according to Recensions III. and IV., Peter sent his liturgical pieces to *Babylon*, which may either indicate that at the time of the document Babylon was the centre of the Jewish population, or else be a legendary reminiscence of St. Peter's labours in the Church that is in Babylon ([1 Peter 5:13](#)). In view of modern controversies it is of special interest that, according to the Jewish legend, Peter, secretly a Jew, advised the Christians to throw off completely the law of Moses, while Paul, in opposition to him, stands up for Israel and the Law, and insists that either circumcision or baptism may be practised. It will be further noted, that the object of the document seems to be: 1st, to serve as an apology for Judaism, by explaining how it came that so many Jews, under the leadership of Apostles, embraced the new faith. This seems to be traced to the continued observance of Jewish legal practices by the Christians. Simon Peter is supposed to have arrested the progress of Christianity by separating the Church from the Synagogue, which he did by proclaiming that Israel were rejected, and the Law of Moses

abolished. On the other hand, St. Paul is represented as the friend of the Jews, and as proclaiming that the question of circumcision or baptism, of legal observances or Christian practices, was a matter of influences. This attempt to heal the breach between the Church and the Synagogue had been the cause of Divine judgment on him. 2ndly, The legend is intended as an apology for the Jews, with a view to ward off persecution. 3rdly, It is intended to show that the leaders of the Christians remained in heart Jews. It will perhaps not be difficult—at least, hypothetically—to separate the various legends mixed up, or perhaps interpolated in the tractate. From the mention of the *Piutim* and the ignorance as to their origin, we might be disposed to assign the composition of the legend in its present form to about the eighth century of our era.

[207] **Appendix 19—On Eternal Punishment, according to the Rabbis and the New Testament (See Book V. ch. 6.)**

The Parables of the Ten Virgins and of the Unfaithful Servant close with a Discourse on the Last Things the final Judgment, and the fate of those Christ's Right Hand and at His Left (St. [Matthew 25:31-46](#)). This final Judgment by our Lord forms a fundamental article in the Creed of the Church. It is the Christ Who comes, accompanied by the Angelic Host, and sits down on the throne of His Glory, when all nations are gathered before Him. Then the final separation is made, and joy or sorrow awarded in accordance with the past of each man's history. And that past, as in relationship to the Christ—whether it have been with Him or not with Him, which latter is now shown to be equivalent to an against Him. And while, in the deep sense of a love to Christ which is utterly self-forgetful in its service and utterly humble in its realisation to Him to Whom no real service can be done by man, to their blessed surprise, those on the Right find work and acknowledgement where they had never thought of its possibility, every ministry of their life, however small, is now owned of Him as rendered to Himself—partly, because the new direction, from which all such ministry sprang, was of Christ in them, and partly, because of the identification of Christ with His people. On the other hand, as the lowest service of him who has the new inner direction if Christward, so does ignorance, or else ignoration, of Christ (When saw we Thee....?) issue in neglect of service and labour of love, and neglect of service proceed from neglect and rejection of Christ. And so is life either to Christ or not to Christ, and necessarily ends in the Kingdom prepared from the foundation of the world or in the eternal fire which is prepared for the Devil and his angels.

Thus far the meaning of the Lord's Words, which could only be impaired by any attempt at commentation. But they also raise

questions of the deepest importance, in which not only the head, but perhaps much more the heart, is interested, as regards the precise meaning of the term everlasting and eternal in this and other connections, so far as those on the Left Hand of Christ are concerned. The subject has of late attracted renewed attention. The doctrine of the Eternity of Punishments, with the proper explanations and limitations given to it in the teaching of the Church, has been set forth by Dr. Pusey in his Treatise: *What is of Faith as to Everlasting Punishment?* Before adverting, however briefly, to the New Testament teaching, it seems desirable with some fulness to set forth the Jewish views on this subject. For the views held at the time of Christ, whatever they were must have been those which the hearers of Christ entertained; and whatever views, Christ did not at least directly, contradict or, so far as we can infer, intend to correct them.¹ And here we have happily sufficient materials for a history of Jewish opinions at different periods on the Eternity Punishment; and it seems the more desirable carefully to set it forth, as statements both inaccurate and incomplete have been put forward on the subject.

[208]

1. Of course, we mean their general direction, not the details.

Leaving aside the teaching of the Apocrypha and Pseudepigraphic Writing (to which Dr. Pusey has sufficiently referred), the first Rabbinic utterances come to us from the time immediately before that of Christ, from the Schools of Shammai and Hillel (Rosh haSh. 16 *b* last four lines, and 17 *a*).² The former arranged all mankind into three classes: the perfectly righteous, who are immediately written and sealed to eternal life; the perfectly wicked, who are immediately written and sealed to Gehenna; and an intermediate class. who go down to Gehinnom, and moan, and come up again according to [Zechariah 13:9](#), and which seemed also indicated in certain words in the Song of Hannah ([1 Samuel 2:6](#)). The careful reader will notice that this statement implies belief in Eternal Punishment on the part of the School of Shammai. For (1) The perfectly wicked are spoken of as written and sealed unto Gehenna; (2) The school of Shammai expressly quotes, in support of what it teaches about these wicked, [Daniel 12:2](#), a passage which undoubtedly refers to the final judgment after the Resurrection; (3) The perfectly wicked, so punished, are expressly distinguished from the third, or intermediate

class, who merely go down to Gehinnom but are not written and sealed and come up again.

2. In view of the strange renderings and interpretations given of Rosh haSh. 16 *b*, 17 *a*, I must call special attention to this *locus classicus*.

[209]

Substantially the same, as regards Eternity of Punishment, is the view of the School of Hillel (u. s. 17 *a*). In regard to sinners of Israel and of the Gentiles it teaches, indeed, that they are tormented in Gehenna for twelve months, after which their bodies and souls are burnt up and scattered as dust under the feet of the righteous; but it significantly excepts from this number certain classes of transgressors who go down to Gehinnom and are punished there to ages of ages. That the Niphal form of the verb used, Nynwdyn; must mean punished and not judged appears, not only from the context, but from the use of the same word and form in the same tractate (Rosh haSh. 12 *a*, lines 7 &c. from top), when it is said of the generation of the Flood that they were punished surely not judged'—by hot water. However, therefore the School of Hillel might accentuate the mercy of God, or limit the number of those who would suffer Eternal Punishment, it did teach Eternal Punishment in the case of some. And this is the point in question.

But, since the Schools of Shammai and Hillel represented the theological teaching in the time of Christ and His Apostles, it follows, that the doctrine of Eternal Punishment was that held in the days of our Lord, however it may afterwards have been modified. Here, so far as this book is concerned, we might rest the case. But for completeness sake it will be better to follow the historical development of Jewish theological teaching, at least a certain distance.

The doctrine of the Eternity of Punishments seems to have been held by the Synagogue throughout the whole first century of our era. This will appear from the sayings of the Teachers who flourished during its course. The Jewish Parable of the fate of those who had not kept their festive garments in readiness or appeared in such as were not clean (Shabb. 152 *b*, 153 *a*) has been already quoted in our exposition of the Parables of the Man without the Wedding-garment and of the Ten Virgins. But we have more than this. We are told (Ber. 28 *b*) that, when that great Rabbinic authority of the first century, Rabbi Jochanan ben Zakkai—the light of Israel, the right hand pillar,

the mighty hammer'—^{Testament (See Book V. ch. 6.)} lay a dying and wept, he accounted for his ^{ccxv} tears by fear as to his fate in judgment, illustrating the danger by the contrast of punishment by an earthly king whose bonds are not eternal bonds nor his death eternal death while as regarded God and His judgment: if He is angry with me, His Wrath is an Eternal Wrath, if He binds me in fetters, His fetters are Eternal fetters, and if He kills me, His death is an Eternal Death. In the same direction is this saying of another great Rabbi of the first century, Elieser (Shabb, 152 *b*, about the middle), to the effect that the souls of the righteous are hidden under the throne of glory while those of the wicked were to be bound and in unrest (twklwhw twmmwz), one Angel hurling them to another from one end of the world to the other—of which latter strange idea he saw confirmation in [1 Samuel 25:29](#). To the fate of the righteous applied, among other beautiful passages, [Isaiah 57:2](#), to that of the wicked [Isaiah 57:21](#). Evidently, the views of the Rabbis of the first century were in strict accordance with those Shammai and Hillel. [210]

In the second century of our era, we mark a decided difference in Rabbinic opinion. Although it was said that, after the death of Rabbi Meir, the ascent of smoke from the grave of his apostate teacher had indicated that the Rabbi's prayers for the deliverance of his matter from Gehenna had been answered (Chag. 15 *b*), most of the eminent teachers of that period propounded the idea, that in the last day the sheath would be removed which now covered the sun, when its fiery heat would burn up the wicked (Ber. R. 6). Nay, one Rabbi maintained that there was no hell at all, but that that day would consume the wicked, and yet another, that even this was not so, but that the wicked would be consumed by a sort of internal conflagration.

In the third century of our era we have once more a reaction, and a return to the former views. Thus (Kethub. 104 *a*, about the middle) Rabbi Eleasar speaks of the three bands of Angels, which successively go forth to meet the righteousness, each with a welcome of their own, and of the three bands of Angels of sorrow, which similarly receive the wicked in their death—and this, in terms which leave no doubt as to the expected fate of the wicked. And here Rabbi José informs us (Tor. Ber. vi. 15), that the fire of Gehenna which was created on the second day is not extinguished for ever. With this

[211] view accord the seven designations which according to Rabbi Joshua ben Levi, attach to Gehenna (Erub. 19 *a*, line 11, &c., from bottom—but the whole page bears on the subject). This doctrine was only modified, when Ben Lakish maintained, that the fire of Gehenna did not hurt sinners from among the Jews (Kethub. u. s.). Nor does even this other saying of his (Nedar. 8 *b*, last four lines) necessarily imply that he denied the eternity of punishment: There is no Gehinnom in the world to come’—since it is qualified by the expectation that the wicked would be punished (Nynwdyn), not annihilated, by the heat of the sun, which would be felt as healing by the righteous. Lastly, if not universal beatification, yet a kind of universal moral restoration seems implies in the teaching of Rabbi Jehudah to the effect that in the *soeculum futurum* God would destroy the *Yetser haRa*.

Tempting as the subject is, we must here break off this historical review, for want to space, not of material. Dr. Pusey has shown that the Targumim also teach the doctrine of Eternal Punishment—though their date is matter of discussion—and to the passage quoted by him in evidence others might be added. And if on the other side the saying of Rabbi Akiba should be quoted (Eduy. ii. 10) to the effect that the judgment of the wicked in Gehenna was one of the five things that lasted for twelve months, it must be remembered that, even if this be taken seriously (for it is really only a *jeu d’esprit*), it does not necessarily imply more than the teaching of Hillel concerning that intermediate class of sinners who were in Gehenna for a year—while there was another class the duration of whose punishment would be for ages of ages. Even more palpably inapt is the quotation from Baba Mez. 58 *b* (lines 5, &c., from the bottom). For, if that passage declares that all are destined to come up again from Gehenna, *it expressly excepts* from this these three classes of persons: adulterers, those who put their fellow-men publicly to shame, and those who apply an evil name to their neighbors.

But there can at least be no question, that the passage which has been quoted at the outset of these remarks (Rosh haSh. 16 *b*, 17 *a*), proves beyond the possibility of gainsaying that both the Great Schools, in which Rabbinic teaching at the time of Christ was divided, held the doctrine of Eternal Punishments. This, of course, entirely apart from the question who—how many, or rather, how few—were to suffer this terrible fate. And here the cautions and

Testament (See Book V. ch. 6.) ccxvii
limitations, with which Dr. Pusey has shown that the Church has
surrounded her teaching, cannot be too often or earnestly repeated. [212]
It does, indeed, seem painfully strange that, if the meaning of it
be all realised, some should seem so anxious to contend for the
extension to so many of a misery from which our thoughts shrink in
awe. Yet of this we are well assured, that the Judge of all the Earth
will judge, not only righteously, but mercifully. He alone knows all
the secrets of heart and life, and He alone can apportion to each the
due need. And in this assured conviction may the mind trustfully
rest as regards those who have been dear to us.

But if on such grounds we shrink from narrow and harsh dogma-
tism, there are certain questions which we cannot quite evade, even
although we may answer them generally rather than specifically. We
put aside, as an unhealthy and threatening sign of certain religious
movements, the theory, lately broached, of a so-called Conditional
Immortality. So far as the readings of the present writer extends, it
is based on bad philosophy and even worse exegesis. But the ques-
tion itself, to which this rough-and-ready kind of answer has been
attempted, is one of the most serious. In our view, an impartial study
of the Words of the Lord, recorded in the Gospels—as repeatedly
indicated in the text of these volumes—leads to the impression that
His teaching in regard to reward and punishment should be taken in
the ordinary and obvious sense, and not in that suggested by some.
And this is confirmed by what is now quite clear to us, that the Jews,
to whom He spoke, believed in Eternal Punishment, however few
they might consign to it. And yet we feel that this line of argument
is not quite convincing. For might not our Lord, as in regard to the
period of His Second Coming, in this also have intended to leave
His hearers in incertitude? And, indeed, is it really necessary to be
quite sure of this aspect of eternity?

And here the question arises about the precise meaning of the
words which Christ used. It is, indeed, maintained that the terms
aiwnioV and kindred expression always refer to eternity in the strict
sense. But of this I cannot express myself convinced (see *ad voc.*
Schleusner, Lex., who, however, goes a little too far; *Wahl, Clavis*
N.T.; and *Grimm, Clavis N.T.*), although the balance of evidence
is in favour of such meaning. But it is at least conceivable that the
expressions might refer to the end of all time, and the merging of the

mediatorial regency (1 [Corinthians 15:24](#)) in the absolute kingship of God.

[213]

In further thinking on this most solemn subject, it seems to the present writer that exaggerations have been made in the argument. It has been said that, the hypothesis of annihilation being set aside, we are practically shut up to what is called *Universalism*. And again, that *Universalism* implies, not only the final restoration of all the wicked, but even of Satan and his angels. And further, it has been argued that the metaphysical difficulties of the question ultimately resolve themselves into this: why the God of all foreknowledge had created beings—be they men or fallen angels—who, as He foreknew, would ultimately sin? Now this argument has evidently no force as against absolute *Universalism*. But even otherwise, it is rather specious than convincing. For we only possess *data* for reasoning in regard to the sphere which falls within our cognition, which the absolutely Divine—the pre-human and the pre-created—does not, except so far as it has been the subject of Revelation. This limitation excludes from the sphere of our possible comprehension all questions connected with the Divine foreknowledge and its compatibility with that which we know to be the fundamental law of created intelligences, and the very condition of their moral being: personal freedom and choice. To quarrel with this limitation of our sphere of reasoning, were to rebel against the conditions of human existence. But if so, then the question of Divine foreknowledge must not be raised at all, and the question of the fall of angels and of the sin of man must be left on the (to us) alone intelligible basis: that of personal choice and absolute moral freedom.

Again—it seems least an exaggeration to put the alternatives thus: absolute eternity of punishment—and, with it, of the state of rebellion which it implies, since it is unthinkable that rebellion should absolutely cease, and yet punishment continue; annihilation; or else universal restoration. Something else is at least thinkable, that may not lie within these hard and fast lines of demarcation. It is at least conceivable that there may be a *quartum quid*—that there may be a purification or transformation (*sit venia verbis*) of all who are capable of such—or, if it is preferred, an unfolding of the germ of grace, present before death, invisible though it may have been to other men, and that in the end of what we call time or dispensation

~~only that which is morally incapable of transformation—be it men~~ [214]
or devils—shall be cast into the lake of fire and brimstone ([Revelation 20:10, 14, 15; 21:8](#)). And here, if, perhaps just, exception is taken to the terms purification or transformation (perhaps spiritual development), I would refer in explanation to what Dr. Pusey has so beautifully written—although my reference is only to this point, not to others on which he touches (Pusey, *What is of Faith, &c.*, pp. 116-122). And, in connection with this, we note that there is quite a series of Scripture-statements, which teach alike the final reign of God (that God may be all in all), and the final putting of all things under Christ—and all this in connection with blessed fact that Christ has tasted death for every man that the world through Him might be saved and, in consequence, to draw all unto Himself, comp. [Colossians 1:19, 20](#) (comp. [St. John 3:17; 12:32; Romans 5:18-24; 1 Corinthians 15:20-28; Ephesians 1:10; Colossians 1:19, 20; 1 Timothy 2:4, 6; 4:10; Hebrews 2:9; 1 John 2:2; 4:14](#)—all which passages must, however, be studied in their connection).

Thus far it has been the sole aim of the present writer to set before the reader, so far as he can, all the elements to be taken into consideration. He has pronounced no definite conclusion, and he neither wishes nor purposes to do so. This only he will repeat, that to his mind the Words of our Lord, as recorded in the Gospels, convey this impression, that there is an eternity of punishment; and further, that this was the accepted belief of the Jewish schools in the time of Christ. But of these things does he feel fully assured: that we may absolutely trust in the loving-kindness of our God; that the word of Christ is for all and of infinite value, and that its outcome must correspond to its character; and lastly, for practical purposes, that in regard to those who have departed (whether or not we know of grace in them) our views and our hopes should be the widest (consistent with Scripture teaching), and that as regards ourselves, personally and individually, our views as to the need of absolute and immediate faith in Christ as the Saviour, of holiness of life, and of service of the Lord Jesus, should be the closest and most rigidly fixed.

The End of the Second Volume.

Explanatory Notes and Corrections to the Second Volume

Page 15d: The Targum is quoted from the Venice edition.

Page 16g: However, the word has also been translated in the wider sense of garment. But see Rosh haSh., and compare also what is said about the *Tephillin*, which cannot be otherwise interpreted than in the text.

Page 21a: But the passage is a somewhat difficult one, and it has received different interpretations. See *Levy* as in note 1, and *Lightfoot* ad loc. Line 10, read: by a vow from anything by which he might be profited (or rather have enjoyment) from his son. And so as regards note 2, various interpretations and comments are given. But the principle that a vow would exclude parents from being profited is clearly established in Ned. ix. 1.

Page 116a: Simon b. Shetach compares him to a son who sins against his father, and yet he does what the child pleases, so Chony, although he was sinning against God, yet He answered that very prayer.

Page 162cde: Of course, these were only the extreme inferences from their principles, and not intended literally.

Page 156, note 1: On the Octave of the Feast probably [Psalm 12](#). was chanted (see Sopher. xix. beg.).

Page 182d: One of the prohibitions there would be exactly parallel to the making of clay.

Page 290, note 2, end: I refer here especially to Bemid. R. 2. It would be difficult to find anything more realistically extravagant in its exaltation of Israel over all the nations (delete 28). The note sets forth the general im-

pression left on the mind, and is, of course, not intended as a citation.

Page 297d: The reference is to one who hesitates to forgive injury to his name when asked to do so by the offender. At the same time I gladly admit how beautifully Rabbinism speaks about mercy and forgiveness. In this respect also are the Gospels historically true, since the teaching of Christ here sprang from, and was kindred to the highest teaching of the Rabbis. But, to my mind, it is just where Rabbinism comes nearest to Christ that the essential difference most appears. And from even the highest Rabbinic sayings to the forgiveness of Christ in its freeness, absoluteness, internalness, and universality (to Jew and Gentile) there is an immeasurable distance. Page 388, note 1: In Vayy. R. 3, there is another beautiful story of a poor man who offered every day half his living, and whose sacrifice was presented before that of King Agrippa.

Page 409d: As regards the view given of Jer. Ber. 9 a, I refer to Levy, Neuhebr. Wörterb. II., p. 10 a.

[216]

Page 411h: Comp. also Vayy. R. 1.

Page 431a: It was described as more beautiful than the waves of the sea.

Page 437a: The quotation of the Midrash on Cant. is again from the un mutilated citation in R. *Martini*, *Pugio Fidei* (ed. Carpz), pp. 782, 783.

Page note 1: The citations refer to the Jerusalem from heaven. For the rest see *Weber*, *Altsynag. Theol.*, p. 386. but probably the last clause had best be omitted.

Page 479, line 9: What is the *Pascha* &c.; rather: What is “on the *Pesach*?” On the 14 Nisan’—in the original: *BaPesach*, i.e. the beginning of the Passover.

Page 556, line 7: for on public Feast days read at the great public Feasts.

Page 609: The reference d applies to the end of the sentence. On the thirteen Veils comp. Maimonides (*Kel. haMiqd.* vii. 17).