

THE LEGENDS OF  
THE JEWS

# THE LEGENDS OF THE JEWS

BY

LOUIS GINZBERG

V

NOTES TO VOLUMES I AND II  
FROM THE CREATION TO THE EXODUS



PHILADELPHIA

THE JEWISH PUBLICATION SOCIETY OF AMERICA

1925

COPYRIGHT BY  
THE JEWISH PUBLICATION SOCIETY OF AMERICA  
1925

*Printed by*  
The Jewish Publication Society Press  
Philadelphia, Pa.  
U. S. A.

TO THE MEMORY OF  
JUDGE MAYER SULZBERGER

## PREFACE

The reader who wishes to acquaint himself with the aim and purpose of "The Legends of the Jews" and with the method and system followed by the author will find the necessary information in the Preface to the first volume. I desire, however, to supplement it by a few remarks which I hope will be useful as a guide to the two volumes of Notes.

Volumes one to four, containing the Bible as mirrored by Jewish imagination and phantasy, are intended chiefly for the general reader and not for the scholar. It is true, I flatter myself, that the latter too will welcome the opportunity offered him for the first time of reading hundreds of legends in connected form instead of being forced to hunt for them in the vast literature of the Jews spreading over a period of two thousand years and in Christian writings of many a century. In the arranging and setting of the material in order, however, my main effort was to offer a readable story and narrate an interesting tale.

Volumes five and six, on the other hand, which contain the notes to the previous four volumes, are meant primarily, if not exclusively, for the student. The material dealt with in them is of a nature which, in the opinion of the author, will interest not only students of the legendary lore of the Jews, but also students of many other fields of learning. The student of comparative folk-lore will be attracted not only by the rich material offered him for his studies, but also by the fact of its being Jewish. The Jews may well be described as the great disseminators of folk-lore. Many a legend that originated in Egypt or Babylonia was appropriated by the European peoples and many a European fairy tale found its way to Asia through the medium of the Jews, who on their long wanderings from the East to the West, and back from the West to the East, brought the products of oriental fancies to the occidental nations, and the creations of occidental imagination to the oriental peoples.

The danger of confounding popular beliefs with *the belief* of a people is great, and I have on more than one occasion strongly protested against the methodological error of a certain school of theologians, who attempt to draw a picture of the Jewish religion by the artificial light of popular fancies. But who will gainsay that the *Volksfrömmigkeit*

## Preface

is reflected in the legends of a people? If this be true of legend in general, how much more so of Jewish legend, and particularly of that part thereof in which Jewish imagination expressed itself with regard to biblical events, persons and teachings. Creation, the election of Israel, the Torah, the merits of the Fathers, reward and punishment, and many similar problems, engaged the attention, not only of Jewish thought, but also of Jewish imagination. It is a well known fact that one cannot know any one thing well unless he goes beyond it and apprehends its relation to other things. To understand a people, it is not sufficient to study its thought and imagination, but also the relation of the two to one another. Almost one half of this volume is therefore intended as much for the student of Jewish religious thought as for the Jewish folk-lore.

One of the outstanding characteristics of "the popular mind" is its conservatism and adherence to old forms. Nothing perhaps illustrates this more clearly and convincingly than the close affinity that exists between the pseudepigraphic literature and the rabbinic Haggadah, notwithstanding the centuries that lie between some of the Pseudepigrapha and the Midrashim. Fascinating as the study of the relation between these two branches of Jewish literature is, it is barely in its infancy. Jewish scholars have sorely neglected the study of the Pseudepigrapha, and non-Jewish scholars that of Rabbinics, and consequently very little has been achieved in this field of learning. The two volumes of Notes contain, besides hundreds of parallels between the rabbinic sources and the pseudepigraphic writings, also a number of lengthy studies on the Pseudepigrapha, especially on their relation to the Haggadah. To mention only two examples. To the Books of Adam, *i. e.* the *Vita Adae* and the *Apocalypse of Moses*, ten pages are devoted (118-128), and an almost equal number of pages is given to the *Books of Enoch* (153-162).

What has just been said about the relation of the pseudepigraphic literature to the Haggadah might be applied *mutatis mutandis* also to the affinity between Philo and the Rabbis. There are few Jewish authors about whom so much has been written as about Philo. And yet the most important problem connected with Philo is not yet solved. Was he a Jewish thinker with a Greek education, or a Greek philosopher with Jewish learning? I hope that the very numerous references in the Notes to the frequent similarity of the views held by the Rabbis and by Philo will contribute something towards the solution of this prob-

## Preface

lem. I call special attention to those Notes where apparently philosophic utterances of Philo reveal themselves on close scrutiny as sound rabbinic doctrine, the philosophical tinsel of which can be easily removed.

Notwithstanding the early claim of the Church to be the sole and true interpreter of the Bible, the products of later Jewish thought and imagination found their way into it. The channels through which they reached the Christian world were two. The Church had at its very beginning adopted the pseudepigraphic literature as well as the Hellenistic writings, especially those of Philo. Besides this literary influence of later Judaism upon the Church, cognizance must also be taken of the oral communications made by Jewish masters to their Christian disciples. Not only the Church Fathers, Origen, Eusebius, Ephraem and Jerome, of whom it is well known that they studied the Bible under the guidance of Jewish teachers, have appropriated a good deal of Jewish legendary lore, but also Tertullian, Lactantius, Ambrosius, Augustine and many other teachers and leaders of the Church have come under direct influence of Jews. It is true that the Church Fathers sometimes sneeringly refer to the *fabulae Judaicae*, but more often they accept these *fabulae* and even refrain from betraying the source from which they drew them. The large material culled from the writings of the Church Fathers to illustrate their dependence upon Jewish tradition will be, I hope, of some value to the student of the patristic literature. At the same time the student of Jewish literature will be interested to learn that many a Haggadah first met with in Jewish literature in a Midrash composed in the seventh or eighth century, and even later, was transmitted as Jewish tradition by the Church Fathers of the fifth or fourth or even the third century. Not infrequently the patristic literature throws also some light upon the origin of a Haggadah which often owes its existence to the desire of combating Christian interpretation of the Bible. An interesting example of such a Haggadah is pointed out in the very beginning of this volume on page 3, note 3.

The problems that presented themselves to the author were so manifold and diverse that it was quite impossible to deal fully with them. What I strove to achieve, and I hope that I have not failed, was to have the legendary material as complete as possible. There are very few Jewish legends bearing on biblical events or persons that will not be found, or at least referred to, in the seven volumes of this work. When a legend has several variants, I give them if they are essential, other-

## Preface

wise the student is referred to the sources for further minute study. I found it therefore advisable to give the reference to all parallel passages of the original sources, as in most cases some slight variants are not lacking. The order of the sources is the chronological one, *i. e.* the older source precedes the younger one, except when on account of its fulness or for some other reason the Text is based on the latter one, in which case it comes first.

I have purposely avoided references to secondary sources, and while one is frequently accustomed to be referred to Rashi, Yalkut and other mediaeval authors as sources for Jewish legend, these authors are mentioned in the Notes only when they offer either material not found in the older literature extant or some important variants.

I have also been very sparing with references to modern writers on the Haggadah or on general Folk-lore. There are a considerable number of doctoral dissertations, mostly in German, which attempt to give the lives of prominent figures of the Bible according to the Haggadah. At their best, they are correct translations of some sections of the Midrash Rabba, and there was no need to refer to translations, as the Notes are written for those who are able to make use of the original sources. For this very reason, I also refrained from giving explanations to the texts quoted if they are found in the commentaries. Explanations are given in the Notes only when the commentators fail to do so, or where I differ with their views. As I have a thorough dislike for polemics, I rarely gave my reasons for the refusal to accept the views of others.

As to the literature on general Folk-lore, I was guided by the consideration that a student of comparative Folk-lore is surely acquainted with the standard works of Boite and Polivka, Cosquin, Child, Clouston, Hartland, Grässe, Hertz, Köhler, Oesterley and other great masters of this field of study, and it would have been entirely superfluous to call attention to the very numerous parallels found in these works to Jewish legends. The relation of the legendary lore of the Jews to that of the other nations is of extreme interest to the student of Folk-lore, but the discussion of this relation does not fall within the scope of this work.

A folk-loristic *motif* often appears in a variety of legends which formally are quite distinct from one another. In cases like this, reference is made either to the Text of the related legend or to the Note pertaining thereto. The attention of the student is, however, called to the



## *Preface*

fact that it is necessary to examine both Text and Note to make clear the meaning of such a reference. To avoid multiplying the references, it was found advisable to refer to the Index, which will appear in the seventh volume, and which will contain under the subject headings all the passages of Text and Notes that are related to one another. The Index will also give a complete bibliography of the works quoted in the Notes. For the convenience of the reader, however, a list of abbreviated titles of books is attached to this volume. I have followed the usual forms of quoting, and no special directions are necessary for those who are able to make use of the sources in their original. The titles of the Hellenistic and patristic works are given in Latin, and the editions referred to are the critical ones, if there be any, otherwise the vulgate text is used. Most of the writings of the Church Fathers, for instance, are quoted according to the Patrology of Migne. In quoting the works of Philo the divisions of the older editions are retained for the benefit of those who have not the critical edition of Cohn and Wendland at their disposal. Almost all the Hebrew works made use of in the Notes were accessible to me in their first editions. In quoting, however, the Talmudim, Midrashim and similar works, the ordinary editions are referred to, except where critical editions exist.

The transliteration of Hebrew words is that of the Jewish Encyclopaedia, except that because of typographical difficulties, I did not make use of the diacritical points. Accordingly H stands for ה and ח, K for כ and ק, T for ט and ת, and Z for ז and צ.

The Notes were completely ready for the printer more than five years ago, and the delay of their publication is a matter for which the author must not be held responsible. I am glad, however, to be able to state that the sixth volume containing the Notes to volumes three and four is so far advanced in print that it will appear within a short time. I also hope that the seventh volume, which will consist of the Excursuses, Index and Bibliography, will not be delayed unduly.

In the concluding lines of the preface I can not help giving expression to the feeling of deep sadness that overcomes me at the thought that Dr. B. Halper, who greatly assisted me in seeing this work through the press, was snatched away from our midst before its completion. With the devotion of the friend and the interest of the scholar he did much more for this book than even the most conscientious editor could be expected to do. His untimely death was a great loss to Jewish scholarship and still more to his friends, who will always remember him with love and affection.

New York, April 24, 1925

LOUIS GINZBERG

## CONTENTS

	PAGE
I. The Creation of the World (Vol. I, pp. 1-46).....	3
II. Adam (Vol. I, pp. 47-102).....	63
III. The Ten Generations (Vol. I, pp. 103-142).....	132
IV. Noah (Vol. I, pp. 143-182).....	167
V. Abraham (Vol. I, pp. 183-308).....	207
VI. Jacob (Vol. I, pp. 309-424).....	270
I. Joseph (Vol. II, pp. 1-184).....	324
II. The Sons of Jacob (Vol. II, pp. 185-222).....	378
III. Job (Vol. II, pp. 223-242).....	381
IV. Moses in Egypt (Vol. II, pp. 243-375).....	391

## I. THE CREATION OF THE WORLD

(pp. 3-46)

<sup>1</sup> Tehillim 90, 391. For further details relating to the pre-existent things, see Excursus I.

<sup>2</sup> The Torah is conceived as having emanated from God's wisdom. Comp. Excursus I.

<sup>3</sup> PRE 3. As to God's taking counsel with the angels and the Torah, comp. also vol. I, pp. 51 and 55. Similarly both Talmudim and the Midrashim frequently speak of God's court of justice, consisting of the angels as members. Comp. Yerushalmi Berakot 9, 14b; Sanhedrin 1, 18a, and Babli 38b; WR 24. 2; BaR 3. 4; BR 51. 2; ShR 6. 1 and 12. 4; Shir 1. 9; PR 42, 175b; Tan. Wa-Era 16; Tan. B. I, 96, 106; II, 36, 51; Tehillim 119, 497; Yerushalmi Rosh ha-Shanah 2, 58b; ShR 30. 18. Tertullian, *Adversus Praxeum*, 16, clearly points to the fact that the legend that the angels were consulted by God with regard to the creation is due to an anti-Christian tendency. Its purpose is to exclude the possibility of assuming that the Trinity is implied wherever the Bible employs the plural in connection with the deity. Comp. notes 10 and 12 on vol. I, pp. 51-53.

<sup>4</sup> Raziel 20b and Sode Raza in Yalkut Reubeni on Gen. 1. 3, excerpted from an unknown but late midrashic source, since it is a further development of the Haggadot cited in notes 1 and 3 from Tehillim and PRE; comp. Luria on PRE 3, note 25, and vol. I, pp. 51-52.

<sup>5</sup> BR 3. 7 and 9. 2; Koheleth 3. 11; Tehillim 34, 245. This is a faint reflection of the view that God formed the world out of eternal chaos, since the legend could not question the doctrine of *creatio ex nihilo*. Comp. Excursus I. The legend about the nine hundred and seventy-four generations which existed prior to the creation of the world (or cautiously expressed, the generations that God had intended to create), originally presupposed a pre-existent chaos; comp. BR. 28. 4; Koheleth 1. 15 and 4. 3; Shir 4. 4; Tehillim 90, 392, and 105, 459; Hagigah 13b; ARN 31, 91; Tan. Lek 11 and Yitro 9; ER

2, 9; 6, 33; 13, 68; 16, 130; EZ 10, 189. Subsequently the legend concerning the nine hundred and seventy-four generations was brought into relation with the Haggadah that the Torah was created one thousand years prior to the creation of the world. Comp. Excursus I. See also Shabbat 88b and Targum Job 22, 16, according to the manuscript reading recorded in Levy's *Chaldäisches Wörterbuch* I, 186.

<sup>6</sup> BR 12. 15 and 21. 7; Midrash Shir 39b; PR 40, 167a (instead of *הוא מחנני רע הוא מחנני* read *מחנני רע הוא מחנני* "he would act as a spoiled child"); Yelammedenu quoted by Sikli (comp. Poznanski in *Hazofeh*, III, 16-17, and in *Maybaum-Festschrift*, as well as Ginzberg's remarks in *Hazofeh* IV, 31; Ozar Midrashim 64); Yerushalmi Targumim on Gen. 1. 2; a quotation from an unknown Midrash by R. Bahya in *Kad ha-Kemah, Rosh ha-Shanah* 68a, and by R. Aaron in *Orhot Hayyim* I, 99c. The goodness of God as underlying the principle of creation is very frequently mentioned by Philo; comp. *De Mut. Nom.*, 5; *De M. Opif.*, 5 (further references to Philo are cited by Siegfried, *Philo*, 205-206). Similarly Wisdom 11. 24. The daily morning prayer (*Yotzer*) reads: "And in His goodness He renews the creation every day continually." God is often described as "the very good" (Yerushalmi Ta'anit 2, 65b; PK 25, 161a), and hence the maxim: "Only God is good" (Matthew 19. 17; Alphabetot 83; the latter source was very likely used by R. Bahya, Gen. 1. 31), is only a paraphrase of Ps. 149. 9, as pointed out in the Alphabetot. Philo is accordingly dependent upon Jewish tradition, but the Jewish sources are independent of him, although it is rather striking that the rendering of אלהים by "God's goodness" in the Targumim, *loc. cit.*, coincides with that of Philo (*Quis Haeres Sit*, 6), while the Rabbis (see e.g. Sifre D., 27) maintain that the Tetragrammaton יהוה designates God's attribute of goodness but His justice is expressed by אלהים. Comp. note 46 on vol. I, p. 164, as well as note 9.

<sup>7</sup> As to Behemoth and Ziz, comp. vol. I, pp. 28, 29, 30.

<sup>8</sup> Comp. Index, *s.v.* "Israel, Guardian Angels of". Originally these two angels belonged to two different traditions: one considered Michael the guardian angel of Israel, while according to the other, contrary to Daniel 10. 21, Gabriel occupied this position. The rivalry of these two angels is met with in Jewish legends throughout the centuries (comp. Index, *s.v.*) and the harmonizing tendency of our legend argues for its comparatively late date. Instead of Michael and Gabriel, in Hekalot 6, 179-180, the Serafim (two of them; comp. Sode Raza in Yalkut Reubeni, Gen. 1. 26, 10a, which reads: There are two

angels with whom God takes counsel, and these are the same with whom God took counsel at the time of the creation of Adam) are said to burn the books containing the accusations brought by Satan and the guardian angels of the Gentiles against Israel (in accordance with Yoma 77a, read דבמאל instead of דמואל and בריו instead of בראיה). Comp. also Berakot 17a (בפמליא) and EZ 5, 182, as well as *Rimze Haftarot*, 1 *Sheb'uot*, concerning the accusations of the angels against Israel.

<sup>9</sup> Konen 37-38; Midrash Behokmah 63-66; Pesikta Hadta 48-49. The distance of the angels of destruction, as well as all other evils, from God is alluded to in very old sources; comp. Yerushalmi Ta'anit 2, 65b; Tan. B. I, 95, and III, 39-40; Tan. Tazria' 9; Tehillim 5, 54, and 87, 374; PK 24, 161b; Gittin 88a; Hagigah 12a; BR 3. 6 and 51. 31; MHG I, 22-25; see also note 54; note 176 on vol. II, p. 70, and note 766 on vol. III, p. 374. In all these and similar passages (Wa-Yekullu 17b-18a and Grünhut, *ad loc.*) the underlying idea is that God, the original source of good, would not come in close contact with evil. This view is related to, but not identical with, the doctrine of Philo that nothing but good emanates from God. To give a philosophic turn to a popular conception is one of Philo's chief merits. A different opinion is expressed by Freudenthal, *Hellenistische Studien*, I, 70. Origen, *Contra Celsum*, 4, 66, is evidently based upon Philo. The fallen angels are found according to 2 Enoch 18, in the second heaven, *i.e.*, far away from the throne of God. Attention, however, is to be drawn to the fact that in rabbinic sources the angels of destruction are not identified with the fallen angels, as in the Books of Enoch, and elsewhere in pseudepigraphic literature, but are the angels whose task it is to inflict punishment upon the wicked. The statement made in PR 22, 114a, that the angels of destruction, unlike all the others (comp. Friedmann, *ad loc.*), have "joints", wishes to convey the idea that they do not stand before God's throne, and do not fulfil their duties speedily like the other angels, but move about slowly, from one place to another, like human beings who move by means of "joints".

<sup>10</sup> The mystic passages in the earliest rabbinic sources already discuss the idea that God created the world by the means of "letters" (comp., *e.g.*, Yerushalmi Hagigah 2, 77c; Menahot 29b; Berakot 55a; BR 1. 9; Midrash Shir 39b; PR 21, 108b, and 33, 153a; ER 31, 164; Shir 5. 11; see also the passages referred to by Theodor on BR 9, line 9), and in gaonic literature this neo-Pythagorean-gnos-

tic theory plays an important part, especially in the *Sefer Yezirah* (see Ginzberg's article on the *Sefer Yezirah* in the *Jewish Encyclopedia*, and the literature cited there, as well as Joel, *Blicke*, I, 121), and the literature dependent on this book, as Midrash 'Aseret ha-Dibrot 62, *Konen* 23-24, and many others. Along with these mystic speculations (*Pesikta Hadta* 36 asserts that God created the universe by means of the *Sefer Yezirah*; comp. also *Seder Rabba di-Bereshit* 1-5), the forms, names, and order of the Hebrew letters are a favorite theme of the "pedagogic Haggadot", whose object it is to render the elementary instruction to the young interesting and attractive. Such Haggadot are, e.g., *Shabbat* 104a; *Yerushalmi Megillah* 1, 71d; *BR* 8. 11 (see the numerous parallel passages cited by Theodor), as well as the non-mystic elements of the two versions of the Alphabet of R. Akiba. Darmesteter, *R.E.J.*, IV, 259, seq., and Müller, *Sitzungsberichte Wiener Akademie, Phil.-historische Klasse*, CLXVIII, treatise 2, furnish a rich collection of parallels to these Haggadot from patristic as well as from later Christian literature. To these "pedagogic Haggadot" belong also the *Tagin* and Midrash R. Akiba, whereas Midrash ha-Shiloah (in Onkeneira's *Ayyumah Kannidgalot*, 18) and *Tikkune Zohar* deal exclusively with the first word of the Bible, concerning which a great deal may be found in other parts of rabbinic literature; comp. *BR* 1. 7; *MGH* I, 10-11; Alphabet of R. Akiba 19; *Seder Rabba di-Bereshit* 3-4; Midrash *Aggada* on Gen. 1. 1; the commentaries *Hadar*, *Da'at*, *Pa'aneah*, and *Toledot Yizhak* on Gen., *loc. cit.* For interesting parallels in Christian literature relating to the forms of the Hebrew alphabet, comp. especially ps.-*Matthew* 31; Gospel of Thomas 6 (in both versions).

<sup>12</sup> An allusion to Ps. 145. 15; comp. also *Berakot* 4b.

<sup>12</sup> There are different versions relating to the controversy of the letters about precedence—originally a "pedagogic Haggadah", it was later combined with the mystic theory of the letters. The text given is essentially based on 2 Alphabet of R. Akiba 50-55, with the omission of many biblical verses, which are quoted by God and by the letters. Other versions are found in *MHG* I, 12-13; 'Aseret ha-Dibrot 62; Midrash R. Akiba 23-24; *Zohar* I, 2b-3a and 205b.

<sup>13</sup> This number, as Lekah, Gen. 1. 1, correctly remarks, corresponds to God's "ten words". Comp. vol. I, p. 49 (beginning).

<sup>14</sup> *I.e.*, "time", which is here mentioned as having been created simultaneously with the world. This is in agreement with Philo, who in *De M. Opif.*, 7, rejects the view which assumes that "time" is older

than the world; BR 3. 7 and Koheleth 3. 11 hold this very opinion rejected by Philo.

<sup>15</sup> Hagigah 12a; PRE 3. The former passage mentions God's ten attributes which were made use of at the creation of the world. So also in ARN, second version 43, 119, whereas the first version knows only of seven such attributes. This latter view corresponds to Jub. 2. 2; Philo, *De M. Opif.*, 7; Tadshe 6, which state that only seven categories of creation took place on the first day. Other sources ascribe three kinds of creation to each day; comp. vol. I, pp. 82-83. Quite instructive is the fact that the Talmud does not conceive רוח אלהים (Gen. 1. 2) as "God's spirit", but as "God's wind", which interpretation is certainly due to an anti-Christian tendency, since the Christians identified God's spirit with the Holy Ghost; comp. Origen, *Princip.*, I, 33, and Jerome, *ad loc.* The Jewish interpretation was later accepted by some of the Church Fathers, as e.g., by Ephraim, I, 8 B, F; Basilius, *Hexaemeron*, 3, and Theodoretus, Gen., *loc. cit.*; comp. also Ginzberg, *Haggada bei den Kirchenv.*, 14-15. The prevalent opinion of the Palestinian Midrashim is that by "God's spirit" the spirit (=soul) of Adam is meant; according to others it implies the spirit of the Messiah; BR 8. 1. The souls of all the pious, however, were likewise created at the same time as Adam, or, as others assert, the primordial light which came into being on the first day is the material out of which the souls have been formed; comp. Excursus I, where details are also given concerning the view of the Rabbis about the doctrine of *creatio ex nihilo*, on which they insist to the extent of counting *Tohu* ("void") and *Bohu* ("emptiness") among the things created. As to God's spirit in the form of a dove (Matthew 3. 16), comp. Tosefta Hagigah 2. 5; Yerushalmi 2, 77a; Babli 15a; BR 2. 4.

<sup>16</sup> The heavens, like all the beings dwelling therein, consist of a combination of fire (not of an earthly or physical nature) and water, whereas the earth was formed of the snow found under the heavenly throne; Konen 24; BR 4. 7 (שמים "heaven" = אש ומים "fire and water"); Hagigah 12a; BaR 12. 4. Comp. further Lekah, Gen. 1. 1 (ארץ "earth" is derived from רץ "the running one", i.e., the one around which everything moves), and note 18.

<sup>17</sup> BR 1. 15; Yerushalmi Hagigah 2, 77c; Babli 12a; Tamid 32a (the question is here discussed whether light or darkness was created first; to Philo, too, darkness is something positive, not merely the absence of light; comp. *De M. Opif.*, 7, where darkness is identified

with *אֵיִר* air); WR 36. 1; Tan. B. I. 10 and 15; PRE 18; Shemuel 5, 55-56; Mishle 60; Tosefta Keritot (end); Mekilta (beginning). In most of the passages just quoted mention is made of two more views in addition to the one given in the text. According to one, the heaven preceded the earth (so Philo), while according to the second, the earth preceded the heaven. Joel, *Blicke*, I, 112, remarks that in these speculations we have an echo of the Greek theories appertaining to cosmogony. *Recognitiones*, I, 27, agrees with the later Rabbis that heaven and earth were created simultaneously. Comp. Konen 24, where the old view is still retained. Although created simultaneously, nevertheless the heavens were created by God's right hand, and the earth by His left; PRE 18; Zohar II, 18b, 65b; comp. Luria, PRE, *ad loc.* At the very beginning God created the world to come, which He, however, hid, so that not even the angels could see it, then He fashioned this world; Alphabetot 97; comp. Isa. 64.4.

<sup>18</sup> PRE 3. But in the older sources (BR 3. 4; PK 21, 145b; WR 31. 7; ShR 15. 22 and 50. 1; Tan. B. I. 6, and II, 123; Tan. Wa-Yakhel 6; Tehillim 27, 221, and 104, 440) it is the light emanating from God's splendor, that was the beginning of all creation. The view that snow was the primeval component of the earth is mentioned only in PRE and in the sources dependent on it (comp. Luria, *ad loc.*), whereas ShR 13. 1 maintains that the world was created of the earth found under God's throne; comp. however, BR 1. 6 and parallel passages, where it is proved by Job 37. 7 that the earth was created of snow. Zohar III, 34b, however, is directly dependent on ShR, *loc. cit.* As to the account of the creation in Konen 24-25, comp. Excursus I. It may also be remarked that the statement in ShR 15. 22, according to which the light emanated from fire (of a heavenly kind) occurs very likely already in 4 Ezra 6. 40, where *lumen aliquid luminis* is based on the faulty reading *אור מאור* instead of *אור מאש*. It is however possible that 4 Ezra wishes to say the same as many of the Midrashim just quoted, according to which the primordial light was made of God's splendor, in Hebrew "light from light." Philo expresses this view in words similar to those of the Haggadah; comp. Freudenthal, *Hellenistische Studien*, 71; Weinstein, *Genesis der Agada*, 41. See also the following note.

<sup>19</sup> BR 3. 6, 11. 2, 12. 6, and 42. 3; Hagigah 12a (only this passage and BHM VI, 59, give a detailed but rather obscure description of *Tohu* and *Bohu*; comp. Joel, *Blicke*, I, 142); PR 5, 20a, and 46, 187a; EZ 21, 94; Tehillim, 97, 422. Comp. further ER 3, 14 and



16-17; EZ 12, 193; Nispahim 56; PRE 3 (here, in accordance with ARN, second version, 37, 95, should be read אורות צדיקים instead of ארחות צדיקים); comp. also vol. I, pp. 86, 262, 388; vol. IV, p. 234, with regard to the future light of the pious. On this light which is, however, not identified with the primordial light (but comp. 4 Ezra 6. 40, which reads; *lumen, . . . de thesauris tuis*, which literally corresponds to the rabbinic אור הגנוז, since גנוז = "preserved in the treasury"; see also the preceding note), comp. the Apocalypse of Baruch 51. 3; Enoch 38. 4 (numerous parallel passages are cited by Charles, *ad loc.*); 2 Enoch 66. 3 and 9. Concerning Philo's view on the primordial light, comp. *De M. Opif.*, 8 and 18; Sachs, *Beiträge*, II, 34; Weinstein, *Genesis der Agada*, 38. For the further development of this light doctrine among the medieval philosophers and mystics, comp. Al-Barceloni, 18-22; Zohar I, 31b, 34a, 45b, and II, 158b.

<sup>20</sup> The Hebrew word for heaven שמים (for its etymology see note 16; BR 4.7 and parallel passages cited by Theodor) looks like a plural though it is really a singular (see Barth, *Z.D.M.G.*, 42; 346), hence the conception that there are several heavens is already met with in the Bible. But the exact fixing of their number belongs to a more recent date. Comp. the following two notes.

<sup>21</sup> The significance of the number seven in Jewish legend may be seen by referring to the Index *s.v.* Seven. PK 23, 154b-155a; Tehilim 9, 87 (comp. the parallel passages cited by Buber); PRE 18 and Tadshe 6, 19-20, maintain that from the history of mankind and that of Israel, as well as from nature, one may prove that this number plays an important part. Similar discussions on the importance of "seven" are found in Philo, *De M. Opif.*, 30-34 (in a very elaborate form), and in 4 Maccabees 14. 17. Yezirah 4, which is the source for Zohar I, 15b and 38a, as well as for MHG I, 11, points out that everything physical is determined by seven limitations: above and below, right and left, before and behind, and its own individual form. Similarly Philo, *All. Leg.*, 1. 2. Zohar I, 38a, derives the conception of seven heavens, seven hells, and other "sevens" from this fundamental idea, and this view of Zohar deserves serious attention. On the seven heavens comp. further the following note. The dependence of Tadshe, *loc. cit.*, on Philo is not to be assumed (against Epstein, *R.E.J.*, XXI, 87, *seq.*), in view of the fact that the conception of the seven stages of man's age, though of Greek origin, occurs not only in Philo and Tadshe, but also in Koheleth 1. 2.

<sup>22</sup> Hagigah 12b. For the correct reading of this classic passage concerning the seven heavens, comp., besides *Variae Lectiones, ad loc.*, MHG I, 14-15. The seven heavens are further mentioned in BR 19. 7; PK 1, 1b, and 24, 154b-155a (the names of the heavens are different here from those in the Talmud); PR 5, 17b-18b, and 15, 68b; Shir 5. 1; Tan. B. III, 37-38; Tan. Pekude 6 and Naso 15; BaR 12. 6 and 13. 2; WR 29. 11; Tehillim 9, 88, and 109, 471; Seder Rabba di-Bereshit 5-6 (read טעניות instead of טעניות). The last-named source, 21-26, also gives a detailed description of the heavens (this is the only rabbinic passage which speaks of a heavenly ladder leading from one heaven to another; comp. note 49 on Vol. I, p. 70). See also 'Aseret ha-Dibrot 63-65 and the older version of this Midrash on the first commandment; ARN 37, 110; Midrash Shir 2b; Alphabetot 86-87; PRE 18; DR 2. 32; comp. also PK 1, 7b; PR 20, 98b; Zohar I, 85b; II, 164b-165a, 172a; III, 9a-10a. That the idea concerning the seven heavens originated in the tannaitic period cannot be definitely proved. It is found in a statement by R. Meir (ARN, *loc. cit.*), but the authenticity of this source is not above suspicion. From DR 2. 32; Tehillim 109, 471 (read רב for רבנן), and 148, 538, it may be seen that even much later the prevailing view was that there were only three (according to some, two) heavens. This view is in agreement with the opinion of 12 Testaments, Levi 3, and 2 Cor. 15. 6. 2 Enoch 3-31, whose cosmogony, however, is rather syncretistic, and the following pseudepigraphic works (which contain Christian revisions), 3 Baruch; Ascension of Isaiah 8. 13; Testament of Abraham 19 (longer recension), as well as some versions of the 12 Testaments (containing Christian revisions), *loc. cit.*, are the oldest passages referring to the seven heavens. The view of "ten heavens" (corresponding to the ten groups of angels; it may also be a learned combination of the views concerning the three and seven heavens, respectively) is found in some of the texts of 2 Enoch 22 and Zohar II, 164b-165a and 172a. The later popular view among Jews, Christians, and gnostics was that there were seven heavens. The learned classes, however, were not inclined to accept this view; they were of the opinion that two, or at most, three heavens, were sufficient. As to the rabbinic sources, comp. Hagigah, DR, Tehillim, *loc. cit.* As to the Church Fathers, see Ginzberg, *Haggada bei den Kirchenv.*, 10-14, as well as Siegfried, *Philo.*, index, s.v. "Himmel". In the description of the individual heavens, each of the sources follows its own way. As to the pseudepigraphic works, comp. 2 Enoch; 3 Baruch; Ascension of Isaiah;

12 Testaments, Levi. As to the rabbinic literature, see Hagigah; Seder Rabba di-Bereshit 21-26; Sode Raza in Yalkut Reubeni on Gen. 1. 1, 3c-4a; Raziel 12a-13d, 19a-19c, and 27c-27d; Zohar II, 254a-263a, whose fantastic description of the seven "Hekalot" (the heavenly halls) is nothing more than an account of the seven heavens. Just as the gnostics speak of three hundred and sixty-five heavens (Tertullian, *Haer.*, 1), even so do the Jewish mystics assert that besides the seven heavens there is still another great number of heavens; comp. BHM I, 132; Alphabetot 89; Sode Raza, *loc. cit.* With regard to the description of the heavens in the text according to Hagigah, the following is to be noticed. The manna is placed in the third heaven; comp. vol. III, p. 44, and Apocalypse of Baruch 29. 8. As to the fourth heaven in which the heavenly temple is situated, comp. Zebahim 62a; Menahot 110a; *Kebod Huppah*, 11. For the literature appertaining to this subject, see Excursus I. PR 20, 98b, seems to locate the heavenly temple in the seventh heaven. As to the removal of the instruments of punishment from the sixth heaven, comp. Tan. B. I, 99; BR 51. 3; Tehillim 5. 54. With regard to this subject, *i.e.*, on the idea that no evil is to be found in God's proximity, see note 9. Comp. further Enoch 60. 17, and vol. IV, p. 102. As to the dew for the purpose of quickening the dead, comp. vol. III, p. 95; vol. IV, p. 333, 336, 360. See also the Apocalypse of Baruch 29. 7 and 73. 2; 2 Enoch 22. 9; as well as the "dew of light" of the gnostics in Preuschen, *Adamschriften*, 63. The old rabbinic sources where this is mentioned are the following: Yerushalmi Berakot 5, 9b; Ta'anit 1, 63d. This dew particularly plays a very important part in mystic literature; comp. PRE 34 (end) and the sources cited by Luria. As to the seventh heaven 'Arabot, comp. BHM I, 132, which is the source for *Tola'at Ya'akov* (at the end of *Asher Yazar*).

<sup>23</sup> The sea and the water in Jewish legend, like Apsu and Tiamat in Babylonian mythology, are two different elements: the one is sweet water and the other salt water. To point out the exact nature of this difference, Konen 24 uses the phrase מים מתוקים ("sweet water"), in contrast to ׀ "sea" = salt water.

<sup>24</sup> That is, counted from above downward.

<sup>25</sup> Seven names for hell are already given in 'Erubin 19a, which in Tehillim 11, 100 (with some variants) appear as seven compartments of hell; comp. notes 55-57.

<sup>26</sup> Corresponding to the number of days of the solar year.

<sup>27</sup> Concerning these monsters, comp. note 34 on vol. I, p. 114.

<sup>28</sup> MHG I, 16-17. For a full account of the seven earths, see Konen 35-37; Seder Rabba di-Bereshit 5-28 (different versions); Razi'el (מעשה בראשית), 27a-27b. Older sources speak of seven or ten names of the earth (comp. note 22 with reference to the seven or ten heavens), as well of the seven earths. It is, however, doubtful whether this does not really mean seven parts (zones); comp. PK 24, 155a; WR 19. 11; Shir 6. 4 (here, however, only six heavens are mentioned, the highest of which, where God dwells, not being included, and six earths; comp. PK 1, 7b, and ShR 15. 26); ARN 38, 110; second version 43, 119; Mishle 8, 59, and 9, 61; Tehillim 92, 402; PRE 8; see further Sode Raza in Yalkut Reubeni on Gen. 1. 1, 2d-3a. Another sevenfold division of the earth is to be found in the following statement of Hagigah 12b and, with essential variants, in Yerushalmi 2, 77a; Leket 8b; Tehillim 104, 442; Seder Rabba di-Bereshit 11. According to this statement, the earth rests on pillars, which rest on water, which rests on mountains, which rest on the winds, which rest on storms, which rest on God's arm. The number of the pillars upon which the earth rests is variously given: seven, twelve, and even one, whose name is "Zaddik" (righteous). These seven pillars of the earth are personified in the Clementine writings as the seven saints Adam, Enoch, Noah, Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, and Moses. The view that there is a connection between the seven pillars of the earth spoken of by the Rabbis and the seven saints of the Clementine writings, first suggested by Ginzberg in the Jewish Encyclopedia, IV, 114, is now proved to be correct by Alphabetot 103, where the seven pillars are actually identified with the seven pious men: the three patriarchs and Moses, Aaron, David, and Solomon.

<sup>29</sup> BR 1. 13; Tan. B. I, 6. Comp. also Alphabetot 97.

<sup>30</sup> Seder Rabba di-Bereshit 4-5; Alphabetot 89. A passage found at the end of the Mishnah which, however, does not belong to it, but is a later insertion (comp. Sanhedrin 100a; Tehillim 31, 239, and Schwarz, *Die Controversen*, 2) reads as follows: In the time to come God will bestow three hundred and ten worlds on every righteous person. Comp. further Petirat Mosheh 121 (where רבוא is to be struck out), and *Ketoret ha-Sammim* 4b, where a passage from ARN is cited concerning the three hundred and ten worlds. This passage does not occur in our texts of this Midrash, but it resembles the statement of BHM I, 132 (this is the source of R. Bahya, Gen. 1. 1) with reference to the three hundred and ninety heavens. On these heavens see Derek Erez R. 2 (end) and Targum Yerushalmi Exod. 28.

30. Instead of three hundred and ten, Alphabetot of R. Akiba has three hundred and forty. In the same source, 29, the view regarding the distance between the angels and the Shekinah is very likely connected with the statement made in 'Abodah Zarah 3b and Seder Rabba 4 concerning the eighteen thousands worlds. Comp. likewise note 97.

<sup>31</sup> BR 6. 6 and numerous parallel passages cited by Theodor. Comp. likewise Ascension of Isaiah 7. 18; vol. II, p. 307; vol. III, p. 111; vol. IV, p. 334. See also the sources cited in the following note.

<sup>32</sup> Ta'anit 10a; Pesahim 94a; Yerushalmi Berakot 1, 2c. Comp. the material collected by Hirschensohn, *Sheba' Hokmot*, 1-13, on the views of the ancient rabbinic sources concerning the extension of the earth and other physical-meteorological observations found in these writings. On the thickness of the heavens comp. BR 6. 6, and the Greek Baruch 3.

<sup>33</sup> Konen 27. Yalkut Reubeni on Lev. 2. 13 quotes the following from an unknown Midrash: The world is divided into three parts: inhabited land, desert, and sea; the temple is situated in the inhabited land, the Torah was given in the desert, and salt from the sea is offered with every sacrifice. God's power extends over all these three parts of the earth; He led Israel through the Red Sea, they wandered through the wilderness, and reached the inhabited land, Palestine; R. Bahya on Num. 10. 35. According to 4 Ezra 42, a seventh part of the earth is water; but this bears no relation to *Recognitiones* 9, 26. This passage contains only the view that the world is divided into seven zones. Comp. the rabbinic parallel passages cited in note 28. The division into twelve zones, which is frequently found in non-Jewish sources (comp. Broll, *Sphaera*, 296, and Jeremias, *ATAO* 2, 50-51), is not unknown to rabbinic literature, where it is stated that according to Deut. 32. 8 the earth consists of twelve parts corresponding to the twelve sons of Jacob. Comp. Seder Rabba di-Bereshit 4; Alphabet R. Akiba 24; Lekah, Gen. 1. 14 (end, where it is said that the various zones correspond to the signs of the Zodiac). See further note 73 on vol. I, p. 173.—The view that paradise is situated in the east is based on Gen. 2. 8. But מִקְדָּם in this verse was taken by very old authorities in the sense of "pre-existing" (comp. Excursus I). Thus many Rabbis assert that paradise was situated in the west, or to be more accurate, in the north-west.

Comp. Tosafot Berakot 55b, caption מטרא; Enoch 32; vol. III, p. 161.

<sup>34</sup> Konen 28-31; Baba Batra 25a; vol. III, pp. 160, 232.

<sup>35</sup> Gittin 31b. On the winds comp. Hirschensohn, *Sheba' Hokmot*, 8-11; Derenbourg, *Monatsschrift*, XXX, 173-174. Comp. vol. III, p. 282.

<sup>36</sup> Gittin 31b; Konen 31. An interesting parallel to 2 Enoch 40. 11, concerning the stilling of the wind in order that the world should not be destroyed, is found in BR 24. 4 (comp. the parallel passages cited by Theodor).

<sup>37</sup> PRE 3; Tehillim 2, 16. Comp. likewise Baba Batra 25b.

<sup>38</sup> This is the usual transliteration, whereas *Shetiyyah* is the only permissible form, if it is to be derived from שתי.

<sup>39</sup> Tan. B. III, 78; Tan. Kedoshim 10. We are here confronted with a legend which is composed of various elements. Palestine, God's favorite land, was created before all other parts of the world; Sifre D., 37; Mekilta RS, 168; Ta'anit 10a; Sibyl. 5. 300. Comp. likewise Excursus I. Instead of Palestine in general, Jerusalem (Yoma 54b; Tehillim 50, 279; Targum Ps. 50. 2), or the site of the temple (comp. the following note) is designated as the beginning of creation. The widespread popular notion that the earth came into being as a result of a stone which God had thrown into the water (comp. Dähnhardt, *Natursagen*, I, 4, and see further the remarks on water as the primeval first element in Excursus I) was subsequently brought into relation with the view that creation began with the site of the temple; hence the legend that creation began with the stone found in the holy of holies; see Tosefta Yoma 4. 6; comp. also Babli 54b (ר' יצחק), in view of Tosefta 'Erubin 7. 18, against Rabbinovicz, is to be retained); Yerushalmi 5, 42b; Tan., *loc. cit.*, and parallel passages. Independent of, and partly contradictory, to this view is the opinion which maintains that Palestine is situated in the centre of the earth; Jub. 8. 12; Enoch 26. 1 (according to 90. 20, Gehenna is likewise located in the centre of the earth, because an entrance thereof is found in Jerusalem, the centre of Palestine; see 'Erubin 19a; Preuschen, *Adamschriften*, 27, which is not anti-Jewish); PR 10, 34a, and many of the parallel passages in later Midrashim, cited by Friedmann (Yoma, *loc. cit.*, on the contrary, distinguishes between the centre of the earth and Jerusalem), to which many more may be added; comp. e.g. Seder Rabba di-Bereshit 4; Zohar II, 151a; III, 161b and 221b. Jerusalem is already mentioned in Aristeas, 83 as

the centre of Palestine, and this agrees with the later Midrashim, Tan., *loc. cit.*, and parallel passages; Seder Rabba di-Bereshit, *loc. cit.* Since it was assumed that the ark was placed in the centre of the holy of holies (Meleket ha-Mishkan 53; not so Maimonides, *Yad ha-Hazakah, Bet ha-Behirah* 4. 1, and RSBM on Baba Batra 99a) upon the *Eben Shetiyyah*, the legend, desirous of finding creation centres (comp. the elaborate account of such circles in Zohar II, 157, and III, 161b), quite naturally saw in this stone the centre of the earth. In view of the belief that the creation of the earth (and of everything; comp. Yoma 85a) began with its centre, the *Eben Shetiyyah* also became the beginning of creation. The oldest source (Yoma 5. 2), where this stone is mentioned, leaves no doubt that it is considered to have come down there at the time of the first prophets (*i.e.*, Samuel and David; comp. Sotah 48b and Yerushalmi 9, 24b; see, however, Yerushalmi Berakot 5, 8d), and it is therefore impossible to assume that the Mishnah identified it with the stone with which creation began. It is accordingly probable that שתייה is the same as אשתייה, and שתייה 'א is to be translated "fire-stone", *i. e.*, meteor. We have here, therefore, a tradition based upon 2 Samuel 24. 16, *seq.*, and 1 Chron. 21. 26, according to which a meteor fell down at this place (note that the Mishnah does not read (היה נחון), where subsequently the holy of holies was situated. *Hadar* on Exod. 19. 19 quotes Targum Yerushalmi *ad loc.*, in which אִשְׁחָא is employed in the sense of meteors. Later, however, שתייה 'א was connected with שתי "loom" (creation as a spinning out of skeins of the warp is a favorite picture; comp. BR 10. 5 and the parallels given by Theodor) and שתי "foundation"; comp. Tosefta, Yerushalmi, and Babli Yoma, *loc. cit.*; Yerushalmi Pesahim 4, 30d; PK 28, 171a; Tan. B. III, 78; Tan. Ahare 3 and Kedoshim 10; WR 20. 4; BaR 21. 4; Shir 3, 9. In all these passages it is stated that the stone was called *Eben Shetiyyah* because the foundation of the world had been laid with it. A later development of the *Eben Shetiyyah* legend transferred to this stone all that which had originally been said concerning the foundation of the temple (comp. vol. IV, p. 96, and note 69 appertaining to it). It is therefore asserted that the "Ineffable Name" was engraved on this stone, whose power checks the *Tehom* from overflowing the earth; comp. Targum Yerushalmi Exod. 28. 30; Targum Eccl. 3. 11. This legend is further enlarged upon in Jewish Jesus tales. Since the knowledge of this name enabled anyone to accomplish all one desired, a device was necessary to prevent misuse. At

the gate of the temple two brazen dogs were placed (on such magic dogs comp. vol. III, pp. 6-7), so that whenever a person who had acquired the knowledge of the Name would pass, they began to bark. Frightened by this sound, the person would forget the knowledge of the Name. Jesus, however, had written the Name on paper, which he hid under his skin. He forgot the Name while passing the dogs, but later learned it again from the paper which he pulled out from under his skin. By means of the Name he was able to perform all the miracles. Comp. Krauss, *Leben Jesu*, index s.v. "Grundstein." The view that the Name of the Messiah is engraved upon a stone of the heavenly temple belongs likewise to the *Eben Shetiyyah* legend cycle. For further details concerning this legend, see vol. I, p. 352; Feuchtwanger in *Monatsschrift* LV, 43-47; Jeremias, *Babylonisches im NT*, 79-80, and *ATAO* 2, 49, 155, 372, 374, 585.

<sup>40</sup> Konen 24-25, based on old sources; comp. BR 3. 4-5; PK 21, 145b; WR 31. 7; ShR 15. 22 and 50. 1; Tehillim 50, 279 (where it is said that also the destruction of this world as well as the creation of the new world will begin with Zion) and 104, 441; ER 5, 21; Tan. B. II, 96.

<sup>41</sup> Originally a mythological conception of creation as a struggle between light and darkness (=chaos). In Jewish sources the prince of darkness is the angel of death (=Satan); comp. ShR 8. 6; Yelammedenu in *Ozar Midrashim* 64b; Tan. Wa-Yakhel 4. He is, of course, considered to have been created by God.

<sup>42</sup> PR 20, 95a-96b, and 203a. The allegorical interpretation of the sign of the Zodiac, although found in both versions of the *Pesikta*, does not belong to the original legend concerning the struggle between light and darkness, i. e., God and Satan, and is therefore rightly omitted in the manuscript made use of for the text. In this account water and darkness are identical, because water is conceived as the chaotic primeval substance. On the rebellion of the water comp. notes 50-53 and 71-73, as well as Konen 25 (read ונתרקמה מכבודו or ונתרקמה for ונתרקנה כבודו; the formation of solid bodies out of the fluid water will thus be explained), where, quite manifestly, the struggle between light and darkness, as the strife of the former against the water, is described, although just a little before (24) this struggle is given in quite a different form.

<sup>43</sup> BR 5. 8 and 46. 3, where the Midrash refers to Aquila's translation of שדי by "ikanos"; comp. Theodor on the second passage just referred to and Joel, *Blicke*, I, 147. As to the aspiration of created things



to be infinite, see the utterance of R. Simeon b. Lakish in Hagigah 12a (combined with the myth of the rebellion of the waters; see note 42), and Dähnhard, *Natursagen*, I, 2. Comp. also Tan. B. I, 7-8, 80, 197, 202; Tan. Hayye Sarah 3. In the first passage of Tan. it is said that the heavens which were created out of the heap of snow (comp. note 18), in accordance with God's blessing, "became fruitful and multiplied".

<sup>44</sup> PRE 4; Konen 25. comp. note 98 on vol. I, p. 83, and Jub. 2. 4, according to which the firmament only was created on the second day. See also Philo, *De M. Opif.* 10.

<sup>45</sup> PRE 4; Theophil, 2. 13. Comp. vol. III, p. 162.

<sup>46</sup> BR 4. 2-7, which contains a number of remarks concerning the relation of the firmament created on the second day to the heavens created on the first day. See further Mekilta RS, 100, and Jerome on Is. 64. 1.

<sup>47</sup> Tosefta Hagigah 2. 6; Yerushalmi 2, 77a; Babli 15a; BR 2. 4 and 4. 3-5. Comp. the following note.

<sup>48</sup> Seder Rabba di-Bereshit (the text must be emended to read *והמים שלקח למעלה כונן עליהם ז' מעונות... שנתן למטה*). The waters above (comp. Greek Baruch 2) are found, however, according to another view at a "distance of five hundred years" from the firmament, where they are suspended at God's command. The waters above are assumed in Seder Rabba di-Bereshit to be of an illuminating nature, while the waters below are of the opposite character. Accordingly, in 2 Enoch 27, light and darkness are identified with the waters above and the waters below, respectively. See also Konen 24 and note 42.

<sup>49</sup> BR 4. 6. This is to serve as an explanation why the Bible does not use the phrase "and it was good" in connection with the creations of the second day; comp. note 54 where this subject is treated at full length.

<sup>50</sup> *Hadar* on Gen. 1. 9 and thence in BHM V, 150-156; the text needs to be emended. The sentence from *וניתן* to *בראשית* certainly does not belong here, and instead of *והלאנוכו'* read *בפלגות* and after *באצבעא* and *ופלט אש* insert *ידו*. On the formula of incantation used by the angel of the countenance" (*שר הפנים*) comp. Origen, *Contra Celsum*, 4. 34. Quite a considerable number of versions of the legend of the rebellion of the waters (comp. note 42) are extant. The waters above, which are masculine, aspired to a union with the

waters below, which are feminine, and had not God separated them by means of the firmament (read ותן הרקיע המים הזכרים), their union might have destroyed the world. Seder Rabba di-Bereshit 6. As to other versions comp. the notes 52,53, and 72.

<sup>51</sup> Comp. notes 49 and 54.

<sup>52</sup> Seder Rabba di-Bereshit 9 (the source for this paragraph is not identical with that of 6); Raziel 11b, 18a-18b, and 27d; Konen 25. God "tore" the mass of waters into two halves, the waters above and the waters below, and informed them that they would be divided again for Israel's sake (as to these conditions, comp. also vol. I, pp. 50-51); 'Aseret ha-Dibrot 63; MHG I, 26; ShR 15. 22; *Hadar* on Gen. 1. 4: as compensation to the waters below, God commanded the water libation in the temple and the use of salt with all sacrifices. A similar source was used by Rashi; R. Bahya; R. Shem Tob b. Shem Tob; R. Isaac Caro, and Bertinora on Lev. 2. 13; comp. Berliner, *Raschi*, 426. Comp. also ER 31, 161, concerning the weeping of the primeval elements of creation, which wished to remain all the time in God's proximity. See further the following note, as well as note 72.

<sup>53</sup> 'Aseret ha-Dibrot 63; MHG I, 26; Raziel 27d. The song of praise to God by the waters originally belonged to another cycle of legends which state that the waters—the primeval element—praised God before any other thing had been created, and that they willingly submitted to His command to withdraw in order to render creation possible. Comp. BR 5. 2-4; ShR 17. 1 and 15. 22 (the second passage, however, contains a mixture of myths, referring also to the rebellion of the waters at the same time); Tehillim 93, 415-416 (in *Ma'asiyyot*, Gaster's edition, 8, it is Alexander the Great, not Hadrian, as in Tehillim, who hears the hymn of the waters); PR 192b; Alphabetot 82 (the hymn of the water induced God to create the world); Midrash quoted in *Hadar* on Gen. 7. 5 and Exod. 15. 8 (the waters praised God when Israel crossed the Red Sea); Yerushalmi 'Abodah Zarah 3, 42a; PRE 5; Ta'anit 25b. Comp. notes 71-72; Tertullian, *De Baptismo*, 3.

<sup>54</sup> BR 4. 16, where two other reasons are given why the Bible does not have the sentence "And He saw that it was good" with reference to the second day of creation: 1) because the things created on the second day were not completed on that day and were finished on the third; hence this sentence is repeated twice on the third day; 2) because God had foreseen that Moses would incur death on

account of the "water"; comp. vol. III, 307, *seq.* Two of the midrashic explanations are also cited by the Church Fathers; comp. Jerome on Gen. 1. 8; Ephraim 1, 15 B-C; Albertus Magnus XIX, 1. 731; Origen, *Ad Africanum*, 4. See Grünbaum, *Gesammelte Aufsätze*, 176, and Ginzberg, *Haggada bei den Kirchenv.* 15-16. Midrash ha-Ne'elam on Gen. 1. 9 reads: Only unity is good. This agrees almost verbatim with Philo, *De Allegor.*, 2. 1. That hell was created on the second day is also found in various other passages of rabbinic literature; comp. BR 11. 9 and 31. 9; Pesahim 54a; PRE 3; ShR 15. 22; Tan. B. I, 12; Tan. Hayye Sarah 3; Tosefta Berakot 5 (6). 7. Comp. Excursus I.

<sup>55</sup> In rabbinic sources the word ordinarily used for "hell" is *Gehinnom*, although this is at the same time the name of one of the parts of hell; comp. the passages quoted in note 25. The Rabbis, of course, knew that Gehinnom originally was the name of the valley near Jerusalem (Jer. 7. 32), where Moloch had been worshipped in ancient times, and they therefore explained the meaning of this word, as well as its synonym Tofet, from its connection with the worship of Moloch. Comp. the vivid description of the worship of Moloch in Ge ben Hinnom in Tan. B. V, 15; Ekah 1, 71-72; Yelammedenu in 'Aruk, s.v. גִּי' and קִנְקִל. See Krauss in ZDMG, LXVI, 273-274. The relation between Gehenna and Jerusalem is, however, of a closer nature, for one of the three gates of hell (the one is found in the inhabited land, the other in the wilderness, and the third at the bottom of the sea) is located in Jerusalem; 'Erubin 19a (where the exact place of this gate is given); PK 29, 186b (bottom); comp. note 39. Tamid 32b cites two opinions: according to one, hell is found above the firmament (but not in heaven), while the other maintains that it is "beyond the mountains of darkness". There is a widespread view that hell and paradise are situated side by side, so that it is possible to look from one place into the other; PK 30, 191b; Koheleth 7. 14; Midrash Tannaim 224. On the enormous size of hell comp. Pesahim 94a; Ta'anit 10a; Shir 6. 9 (the size of the entire world bears the same relation to hell as a lid to its pot); PR 41, 173b (hell expands according to its needs); PRK, Grünhut's edition, 71. As to the intensity of the fire of hell, comp. Berakot 57b and Shabbat 39a (bottom), which state that the heat of the hot springs of Tiberias is due to the fact that its waters pass the gates of Gehenna. Comp. also Yerushalmi Berakot 6, 10d (end) where ג' דקלים have reference to the statement in 'Erubin 19a.

<sup>56</sup> Sotah 10b (מִדּוּרָה "habitations", a play on the word מִדּוּרָה "fire-place"); for the various descriptions of hell and paradise comp. Index, s.v. "Hell and Paradise". The place where Moloch was worshipped (comp. the preceding note), according to the description in the older Midrashim, consisted of seven compartments (Ge ben Hin-nom is thus modelled after Gehinnom). The allegoric interpretation of the seven compartments as symbolizing the sevenfold punishment is found not only in Ezra 7. 80-81, but also among the later Kabbalists; comp. Zohar II, 150b, and Azulai, *Hesed le-Abraham*, 51d. Rather strange is Mishle 7, 57, which speaks of fourteen compartments of hell (the text is not to be emended, as it is based on the interpretation of שְׁבַעֵתִים as "two times seven"), whereas the rabbinic sources (in addition to those mentioned above, comp. also Tehillim 11, 100-103) and the Babylonian myth concerning the descent of Ishtar into hell know only of seven compartments.

<sup>57</sup> The names vary in the different versions; comp. 'Erubin 19a; Tehillim 11, 100 and 101; PRK, Grünhut's edition, 77, and vol. I, p. 10.

<sup>58</sup> Seder Rabba di-Bereshit 15; Konen 35 (bottom; read אֵלֶּפֶים ע' (פחות ח"ט); comp. further Alphabet R. Akiba 28; BHM V, 50; vol. I, p. 10. The numbers given in Konen concerning the dimensions of hell presuppose a "distance of 500 years" as a unit. Comp. vol. I, p. 11.

<sup>59</sup> Seder Rabba di-Bereshit 19-20; BHM V, 49-50. Comp. further vol. II, pp. 311-312, as well as vol. III, p. 37. On serpents which have venom instead of blood, see King, *Creation Tablets*, 16 and 50.

<sup>60</sup> Masseket Gehinnom 147. On the different kinds of fire comp. vol. II, p. 310; vol. III, p. 244; vol. IV, p. 199. See further Alphabet R. Akiba 81; PRK, 16a; Sefer Yezirah (not in our text) in Mahzor Vitry 319. On the Persian origin of this legend, comp. Darmsteter in *R.E.J.* I, 186, and Kohut, *Angelologie*, 32-33.

<sup>61</sup> BR 1. 3 and 3. 8 (according to one opinion the angels were created as late as the fifth day, simultaneously with the other winged creatures), as well as 11. 9; Tan. B. I, 1 and 12; ShR 15. 22; PRE 4; Tehillim 24, 204; 76, 373-374; 104, 442; Konen 25. Reminiscences of the old view, according to which the angels were created on the first day (Jub. 2. 2; 2 Enoch 29. 3; Apocalypse of Baruch 21. 6), have been preserved even in authoritative Midrashim, but particularly in the mystic literature. In the latter an attempt is made to har-

monize the conflicting views concerning the day on which the angels were created by assuming that the higher ranks were created on the first day, and the lower ones later; comp. Tan. Wa-Yesheb 4 and Yelammedenu in Ozar Midrashim, I, 64 (where two contrary opinions are found besides one another); ER 1, 3, as well as 19, 160, and perhaps also BR 21. 9 (ER, *loc. cit.*, understands BR to say that the Cherubim were created first, taking מקדם to mean "in the beginning"); PRE 4; Konen 24 (in the two last-mentioned sources the archangels are differentiated from the other angels; comp. the words מלאכים שנבראו חולה, and Luria, note 1); Zohar I, 46a (the contrary opinion is given in III, 217); *Ketab Tamim* 59; *Peletat Soferim* 2; Zohar Hadash 11b and 12a (mention is made here of angels who existed prior to the creation of the world; comp. Excursus I); R. Bahya on Gen. 38. 12. The authoritative view maintaining that the angels were created on the second day (as to the reason given for this view, comp. also the statement in Alphabetot 89 and 103 concerning the disappearance of all the angels before the creation of the new world; see further Tertullian, *Adversus Hermogenem* 34) is also found in Tan. Hayye Sarah 3 and in the quotation from this Midrash in Makiri Is. 43, 141; Batte Midrashot IV, 33; Targum Yerushalmi Gen. 1. 26. Comp. also note 22 on vol. I, p. 59.

<sup>62</sup> PRE 4; Konen 25 and 24. The fact that the angels were created of fire does not interfere with their incorporeality, for in legend fire, particularly the heavenly fire, is incorporeal (comp. Konen 24); see also Enoch, at the beginning and 20, which reads: "All the fiery hosts of great archangels and incorporeal powers". Although they are incorporeal, they are not eternal, since there are angels who come into being for a moment only and vanish immediately after. Thus there are angels who spring up daily out of the stream Dinur (= "stream of fire"; \*comp. Dan. 7. 10); they praise God, and then disappear. Out of every word uttered by God angels are created. Comp. Hagigah 13b-14a; BR 78. 1 (Michael and Gabriel are the only angels who do not vanish); Alphabetot 88; Trypho in Justin's *Dialogue*, 128. Trypho's remarks concerning angels are particularly important with respect to the attitude of the Synagogue towards angelology. His remark, 60, that wherever Scripture speaks of the appearance of angels, it wishes to express symbolically God's visible activity, is also found in BR 97. 3; ShR 2. 5 and 32. 9. His other statement, 128, that the angels are borne by God's power, corresponds to the view poetically expressed by the Rabbis that the splen-

dor of the Shekinah sustains the angels. Comp. PK 6, 57a; ShR 32. 4 and 47. 5. A statement like that of Jub. 15. 27 to the effect that certain classes of angels bear the sign of the Abrahamic covenant on them would have struck the Rabbis as blasphemy. Comp. the following note and note 6 on vol. I, p. 50.

<sup>63</sup> BR 21. 9; Yelammedenu in Yalkut II, 69 and 925; ShR 25. 2; PRE 4; Tehillim 104, 442 (in the two last-named sources the angels are wind when performing their duties, in God's presence they are fire). Comp. also BR 50. 1. On angels as shades, see BaR 10. 5; perhaps also Baba Batra 91a. In WR 31. 5 it is said that the angels are males and not females, *i.e.*, they never assume the form of women; but comp. the parallel passages in Mishle 21, 89, and BR, *loc. cit.* It is, however, to be observed that Lekah, Gen. 3. 24, in citing the last-named passage does not read the word נָשִׁים. Men, women, boys, and maidens among angels are mentioned in mystical literature, but this description has hardly anything to do with their forms; it merely expresses the different degrees of their ranks. Comp. Yalkut Hadash, *s. v.* מַלְאָכִים Nos. 63, 93; R. Moses ha-Darshan in *Magazin*, XV, 80; Hasidim 277. Although the rabbinic sources hardly offer any remarks concerning the forms of angels, many a statement is found in the older literature regarding their size and rapidity; comp. Enoch 40. 1; Berakot 4b; Hullin 91b; BR 68. 12 and 51. 1. As to the material out of which the angels were created, comp. the preceding note, as well as PK 1, 3a-3b; ShR 3. 11; BaR 15. 8; DR 5. 12; Yerushalmi Rosh ha-Shanah 2, 58a; 2 ARN 24, 48-49; Tan. Wa-Yiggash 6; Targum Job 25. 2; Pesahim, 118a (bottom). Along with fire which is the peculiar heavenly element, water and snow (also hail) are mentioned as the material out of which the angels were fashioned. On fire, water, and snow as the primeval elements, comp. Index, *s. v.* The statement found in many passages of rabbinic literature that Michael was created of fire and Gabriel of snow or water (see Index, *s.v.* "Michael", "Gabriel") implies the view that the former belongs to heaven and the latter to the earth. The idea that the residence of the angels is in heaven is unanimously expressed by the Rabbis, as well as by the authors of the pseudepigraphic writings. Philo's view, *De Gigant.*, 2, and *De Somn.*, 22, that the angels inhabit the air is entirely unknown to the Rabbis (BR 26. 5, to which Siegfried, *Philo*, 147, alludes, has nothing to do with the place inhabited by the angels; this passage was misunderstood by Siegfried; for the correct translation thereof, see note 1 on vol. I, 105). Similarly there is no-

thing in the older sources of rabbinic literature in support of Philo's statement concerning the identity of the angels with the souls (*Noë* 4; *De Gigan.*, and *De Somn.*, *loc. cit.*), which is only found in the *Kabalah*; comp., e. g., *Zohar* I, 7a, and note 444 on vol. II, p. 184.

<sup>64</sup> Enoch 20. 1; Yerushalmi 'Erubin 1, 19d, and Shemuel 23 (for the two last mentioned passages see Ginzberg, *Unbekannte Sekte*, 243 note 2; concerning the presence of the Shekinah in the assembly of ten, comp. also Sanhedrin 39a; Berakot 6a); *Adamschriften*, 27, speaks of nine hosts of angels. On the names of the ten classes of angels, found only in medieval sources, comp. *Azilut* (beginning); Maimonides, *Yad ha-Hazakah*, *Yesode ha-Torah*, 2. 7; *Zohar* II, 43a; R. Moses ha-Darshan (from a manuscript in Gross, *Gallia Judaica*, 411); Konen 25; Derek Erez 2. The last two sources know only of five (six?) classes of angels; comp. the following note. The division of angels into seven classes mentioned in Enoch 61. 10 is an older view which makes the number of classes correspond to the number of archangels and to the heavens. On the other hand, there is one view which counts three heavens (comp. note 22), and hence knows only of three archangels (see note 13 on vol. I, p. 54). Accordingly the idea that there are ten classes of angels is based on a combination of two older views. On the number of angels comp. *Sifre N.*, 42; *Sifre D.*, 51; *Tehillim* 68, 319; *ER* 6, 32 and 34; 17, 84; 29, 156, and 160; *EZ* 12, 193; *Alphabet R. Akiba* 21; *Seder Rabba di-Bereshit* 28; a midrashic quotation (the source is a somewhat different version of the description of Solomon's throne given in *BHM*. V, 34.) by R. Bahya on *Gen.* (beginning). The statement "as great as is the multitude of the angels, so great is the race of man" (*Revelation of John* towards the end) has a parallel in *Tehillim*, *loc. cit.* All these classes of angels reside at a very great distance from the Shekinah, whereas God is near to those that are broken-hearted (*Ps.* 34. 19), because He loves them more than the angels; *Alphabet R. Akiba* 29; *Midrash Shir* 16b (frequently quoted by the mystics, as, e. g., *Rokeah*, *Hasidut*, at the end; *Teshubah* 28; *Orehot Hayyim* I, 101a).

<sup>65</sup> *PRE* 4; Enoch 9. 1; 40. 2-10 (here the reading is Phanuel instead of Uriel); 71. 9. On these four archangels comp. vol. III, p. 232, and the note 440 appertaining to it. The very old view concerning the seven archangels (Enoch 20. 1-8; 81. 5; 90. 21-22; 12 Testaments, *Levi* 8. 1, and in many other works of the pseudepigraphic literature, as well as rabbinic writings of the post-talmudic period as *PRE*, *loc. cit.*, and particularly in mystic works; comp. *Al-Bar-*

celoni, 247, which is indeed the oldest rabbinic source on the names of the archangels and their relation to the planets; Raziel 38a, 61a, where various sources are made use of) naturally supposes seven classes of angels. Along with the sevenfold and fourfold divisions of angels, found in pseudepigraphic and rabbinic literatures, we meet with the conception of twelve archangels, which is connected with the signs of the Zodiac; comp. Raziel 52a, 61a (which is based on another source than the two other passages referred to above). As to this view in pseudepigraphic literature, comp. Bousset, *Religion*, 374-376.

<sup>66</sup> Hullin 91a; 2 ARN 27, 55; 44, 124; Midrash Tannaim 71; Sifre D., 306 (end); BHM VI, 37; Mishle 9. 75; BR 65. 21; Tan. B. III, 74; Tan. Kedoshim 6; Nispahim 56. The last-named passage states that when the angels had complained of the fact that man was preferred to them, God replied: "What, ye wish to precede Israel in chanting songs of praise to Me? They, though 'born of woman' and subject to the evil inclination, conquer their evil inclination and daily proclaim Me as the one God and King, and wait for the coming of My Kingdom and the establishment of My house."—Although man, who is a terrestrial being, is inferior to the angels, he surpasses them by overcoming the evil inclination, which the angels do not possess at all (BR 48. 11). The pious are therefore greater than the angels (Sanhedrin 39a; BR 88. 1; Tehillim 91, 398, and 103, 438). In the world to come the angels will try to find out from Israel the things taught to them by God; Yerushalmi Shabbat 3, 8d, and BR 1. 12. Comp. Schechter, *Aspects*, 49; Singer, *Das Buch d. Jubiläen* 98, note 6; vol. I, p. 334; vol. III, p. 32.

<sup>67</sup> The windows of heaven are frequently mentioned in Enoch (comp. Charles' Index, *s.v.*) and likewise in rabbinic sources; comp. Yerushalmi Rosh ha-Shanah 2, 58a; ShR 15. 22; PRE 6; Ginzberg, *Unbekannte Sekte*, 78.

<sup>68</sup> On the defilement of the celestials by coming into contact with terrestrial beings, comp. note 105.

<sup>69</sup> This stream of fire is very likely the one which springs out of the perspiration of the Hayyot encircling God's throne, and out of which the daily angels rise to chant songs of praise to God and disappear after their task has been accomplished; BR 78. 1; ShR 15. 6; Hagigah 14a. Comp. note 62.

<sup>70</sup> Seder Rabba di-Bereshit 28-30; 3 Hekalot 161-163. In other sources it is not Shamiel who appears as the master of heavenly song (probably the correct reading is Shammiel, since it is derived from



וַיִּקְרָא "he summoned"), but Michael (comp. vol. I, p. 386), or rather Metatron; comp. *Sefer ha-Heshek*, 26, No. 13, and 8a, No. 61. The mystic literature knows also of a heavenly Hazzan; comp. Hagigah 13b and PR 20, 97a, concerning the function of the angel Sandalfon (on the text of PR sec *Ketab Tamim*, 59). See also the account in the mystic literature of the gaonic period (*Pirke Hekalot*, Wertheimer's edition, 31; comp. also Baer, *Siddur*, 120) concerning the angel Israel; comp. Zunz, *Synagogale Poesie*, 477. This angel is described as belonging to the order of the Hayyot; comp. note 253 on vol. I, 388. Originally the name Hayyot was used to designate the creatures with animal forms mentioned in Ezekiel 1. 5, *seq.*, as surrounding God's throne. These were considered as a distinguished class of angels (Sifra 1. 1 and Sifre N., 103; in these passages the life of the angels, or at least of this class, is assumed to be eternal; comp. note 62); subsequently, however, the Hayyot denoted a class of angels. Similarly Hashmal (Ezek 1. 4) is taken to be as the name of a class of angels; comp. Hagigah 13a-13b. In this passage of the Talmud (comp. Seder Rabba di-Bereshit 28) the description of God's throne in Is. 6. 1-3 is said to be identical with that of Ezek. 1. 5, *seq.*, and the discrepancies are removed. Thus it is said, for instance, that the six wings of the Seraphim in Is. correspond to the four faces of the Hayyot of Ezek., since two of the wings with which they had formerly praised God were taken away from them after the destruction of the temple. PR 33, 155b-156a, reads somewhat differently. The bull image of the Hayyot (Ezek. 1. 10), was changed by Ezekiel's prayer to that of Cherubim, so that God should not be constantly reminded of Israel's aberration in connection with the golden calf. The feet of the Seraphim (Is. 6. 2) were concealed for the same reason because the calves' feet (Ezek. 1. 7) would have constantly served as a reminder of the golden calf; Hagigah 13b; WR 27. 3. On the liturgical formulas which the angels employ in their doxology, comp. Hullin 91b-92a; Hagigah 14a; ER 31, 163; Hasidim 400; Seder Amram 18a. See also the quotations from medieval authors given in Baer's *Siddur*, 120. Comp. also Hagigah 12b; *Mahkim* 119; *Seder Troyes* 26 (Moses caught the formula *Baruk Shem*, etc., from the whispering angels); DR 2. 36. In all these legends the tendency is to trace back the origin of the essential parts of the liturgy, as the *Shema'*, *Bareku*, and *Kedushah*, to the angels; comp. also vol. III, pp. 256-257. Not all angels however are perfect; comp. the sources cited at the beginning of this note, according to which countless

numbers of angels perish in the stream Dinur, whenever they do not chant their hymns at the exact moment. Comp. Zohar III, 64b; Ekah 3, 132-133.

<sup>71</sup> PRE 5 (read, with the two last parallel passages, מַקְצָץ); Tehillim 93, 415; Aguddat Aggadot 7; MHG I, 29. A different version is given in Tehillim 90, 391, which reads: The mountains flew over the waters as birds, whereupon God distributed them in accordance with the nature of the earth. Other legends concerning the origin of the mountains are found in vol. I, pp. 79-80; see note 29 on vol. I, p. 112. הָרִים in BR 3. 8 is based on an erroneous reading (comp. Theodor, *ad loc.*) and הָרִים is the correct reading, for the Midrash attempts to explain why Gen. 1. 3 reads יוֹם אֶחָד "one day", and not יוֹם רִאשׁוֹן "the first day", a difficulty to which also Josephus, *Antiqui.*, 1, 1, calls attention. See also Hippolytus, *ad loc.*

<sup>72</sup> PRE 5; Aguddat Aggadot 7. On the rebellion of the waters comp. vol. I, pp. 14-15, as well as the following note.

<sup>73</sup> Baba Batra 74b; Tan. IV, 97-98; Tan. Hayye Sarah 3 and Hukkat 1; BaR 18. 22; ShR 15. 22; Tehillim 1, 17 (עֲרִוּתוֹ שֶׁל יָם); Wa-Yosha' 46; Hagigah 12a (הַיָּם הָיָה מִרְחִיב וְכוּ'). Comp. also vol. I, pp. 14-16, 27, and 40 (Leviathan, Rahab, and the angel of death are considered identical), as well as vol. III, p. 25, and Yerushalmi Sanhedrin 7, 25d, where the prince of the sea (שֶׁר שֶׁל יָם) is mentioned twice. In the Midrashim cited above two entirely different elements are combined: God's strife with Rahab (which is a reminiscence of an old Babylonian myth), taken from the Babylonian Talmud, *loc. cit.*, and the weeping of the waters on account of the separation of the upper and lower waters (a mythological explanation of rain as tears), which is found in the Palestine sources (BR 5. 4 and the Midrashim cited in note 52). The eagerness of the waters to obey God's command is emphasized in PR 192b-193a and WR (according to a quotation from it found in Makiri on Ps. 33, 210) as a protest against the mythological account of the rebellion of the waters. A legend which is also composed of various elements is the one given in Tan. Hayye Sarah, *loc. cit.*, and ShR, *loc. cit.*, where the ocean and the "sea of death" are considered identical (a Babylonian view, comp. KAT 3, 576, note 2), and at the same time it is said that it will be "cured" in the time to come. The last statement is found in the old sources in connection with the Sea of Sodom (comp. note 184 on vol. I, p. 256), which was known to Pausanias and the Church Fathers as the "Dead Sea". This name is unknown in Jewish sources;

hence the above-mentioned Midrash confused the "Dead Sea" of his source—of Christian origin?—with the "Sea of Death" of Babylonian mythology, that is the ocean. In 'Erubin 22b it is supposed that the ocean surrounds the earth (so also Herodotus II, 21 and 23), whereas according to PRE 5, the earth extends over the waters of the abyss as a ship in the midst of the sea. 'Aseret ha-Dibrot 63 speaks of the "Great Sea that encompasses the earth". This corresponds to 'Erubin, *loc. cit.*, since the designation of "Great Sea" for the ocean is known in rabbinic literature; comp. the explicit statement concerning this identity made in Konen 32, as well as Seder Rabba di-Bereshit 9 and Luria, note 7 on PRE, *loc. cit.*, and the statement (in Sifre D., 39; Mikwaot 5. 4; BR 5. 8) that there is only one sea; the Bible speaks of "seas", because the sea differs in its peculiarities in different places. The reason why the ocean does not overflow, though all the waters enter into it, is because the salt waters "absorb" the sweet; BR 13. 9; Bekorot 9a; Koheleth 1. 7. A different view is given in Tikkune Zohar (end), which reads: The ocean derives its name (אוקיניס) from אוקי "he spat out", because it "spits out" the water or the aquatic animals that come into it. Comp. Kohut's essay in *Jüdische Wochenschrift* II, No. 5, on the ocean according to Jewish sources.—With regard to the strife of the waters, comp. also 4 Ezra 4. 15–17, where it is said that the waves of the sea took counsel to wage war against the wood of the field that they win more territory; although the wood had been vanquished by fire, the counsel of the waves of the sea did not succeed because the sand kept them within their bounds. This is, however, not a mythological conception, as maintained by many, but a fable; comp. the following note. The reason why the waters of the seas and the abysses did not overflow the earth is due to the fact that God had sealed their boundaries with His name; Prayer of Manasseh 3. For details on this "sealing" comp. vol. III, p. 99, and vol. IV, p. 96.

<sup>74</sup> Konen 25, which essentially follows BR 5. 9. Comp. further Sanhedrin 39b; ER 29, 143; Elleh Ezkerah (beginning). It is a legendary application of an old fable, which is already found in Ahikar; comp. Smend, *Alter und Herkunft des Ahikar-Romans*, 77, seq. From Ahikar it was directly or indirectly borrowed by the Greeks; comp. Back, *Monatsschrift* XXV, 132–135, and XXXIII, 267. On the pride of the trees comp. *Tub ha-Arez* 93, which reads: The fruits of the ground thrive even when moistened by the feminine waters (on the sex of the waters comp. vol. I, p. 162), but not the trees, which,

on account of their pride, would not thrive unless moistened by masculine waters. According to PRE 5 and Aguddat Aggadot 7, the plants of paradise were created first and were afterwards utilized for the purpose of the cultivation of the earth. For the opposite view comp. BR 15. 1, which reads: God took cedars of Lebanon, which were not larger than the tentacles of a grasshopper, and planted them in paradise. Comp. note 96 on vol. I, p. 82. The shooting up of the trees is only a special application of the view that the first things in creation were produced in their fully developed form (comp. note 21 on vol. I, p. 59). This view is especially emphasized by Philo, *De M. Opif.*, 13, with reference to plants, which God brought forth out of the ground in their complete form, "as if the earth had been pregnant with them for a long time". PRE 5 similarly speaks of the pregnancy of the earth, where, in connection with the conception of rain as the consort of the earth (comp. note 39 on vol. I, p. 162), the legitimate fecundation is differentiated from the illegitimate. When the earth is fructified by rain, it is considered a legitimate fecundation, whereas when it is artificially watered, it is an illegitimate fecundation. As to the statement made in PRE concerning the origin of rain, comp. also BR 13. 9-10 and the parallel passages cited by Theodor, where various views are expressed on this point. The view that the clouds drew their water from the ocean, and the objection raised against it, is also found in the Slavonic version of III Baruch 10. 8.

<sup>75</sup> Hullin 60a; comp. Back, *Monatsschrift* XXIX, 307, with reference to this talmudic passage. The Palestinian sources, BR 5. 9, and Yerushalmi Kilayim 1, 27b, mention two views: according to one the earth did not follow God's bidding; it only produced edible fruits, but not edible trees, which it was also commanded by God to produce. On account of this disobedience it was cursed by God after Adam's fall. The opposite view maintains that the earth was so eager to obey God's orders that it went one step further and produced all trees bearing fruit; but after Adam's fall the fertility of the earth was diminished, and it produced barren trees as well; comp. vol. I, p. 80 (top). "The prince of the world" mentioned in Hullin, *loc. cit.*, bears no relation to the demiurge of the Gnostics, nor to Satan, "the prince of the earth" (John 12. 31, and in many other places of the New Testament), but it signifies, here as elsewhere in rabbinic literature (comp. Index, *s. v.*), the angel in charge of the world, or, to be more accurate, the earth. Comp. Joel, *Blicke*, I, 124-128. The

identification of this angel with Metatron in the mystic literature of the gaonic period is not found in talmudic sources. In Ascension of Isaiah 2. 4 "the ruler of the world" is Satan as the prince of the world in the New Testament.

<sup>76</sup> Jub. 2. 7; BR 11. 9, 12. 5, 15. 3, 21. 9; 2 Enoch 21. 1. The prevalent view in the rabbinic sources is that paradise was created before the world; comp. Excursus I. In Konen 25 paradise is differentiated from its plants, presupposing that paradise is pre-existent, while the plants were created on the third day. This is an attempt to harmonize two different views.

<sup>77</sup> On this gold, comp. Yoma 45a; BaR 11. 3; Tan. B. IV, 33; Tan. Naso 9. In all these passages it is stated that this gold bears fruit. In this and in other accounts of paradise the description of the future Jerusalem and the temple by the prophets is transferred to paradise; for later on paradise was identified with the heavenly Jerusalem. Alphabet 96-97 contains many points which are analogous to the description given in the text, with this essential difference that the reward of the pious is postponed for the future world. As to the site of the earthly paradise, comp. vol. I, p. 11. The old rabbinic sources hardly contain anything definite on the earthly paradise; but in the pseudepigraphic literature, particularly in the Books of Enoch (comp. Charles' edition, index, s. v.) and in later haggadic works a good deal is said about it.

<sup>78</sup> According to Baba Batra 75a and PR 38, 163a, there are seven "canopies" given to each pious person.

<sup>79</sup> These four streams are frequently mentioned in the legends; comp. 2 Enoch 8. 5; PR 38, 163a; Aggadat Shir 4, 83-84; see also vol. I, p. 132; vol. II, p. 315; *Visio Pauli* 23; Koran 47. 16-17. While in the Koran the stream of oil is replaced by a stream of fresh water, it is just this stream of balsam which is frequently alluded to in rabbinic literature; BR 62 (beginning); Ta'anit 25a; Yerushalmi 'Abodah Zarah 3, 42c; Tan. B. II, 131; Bacher, *Agada der palästinensischen Amoräer*, II, 102, note 7; Jeremias, *Babylonisches im NT*, 47. On the wine preserved for the pious, comp. Sanhedrin 99a and Matthew 26. 29; Targum Eccl. 9. 7, where the Midrash given in the text was very likely made use of.

<sup>80</sup> This picture is mentioned in the Talmud, Baba Mezi'a 48a, with reference to the beauty of R. Johanan, upon which our source is based; comp. PK 1, 3b.

<sup>81</sup> *I. e.*, the branches of this tree extend to the farthest ends

of paradise. On the joys of the four different ages, which the pious experience, see Zohar I, 140a, where it is explained allegorically.

<sup>82</sup> Instead of מְכִין read מְבִין ("fanning", from נָבַח "blew"); the variant מְנַשְׁבִין seems to be an explanation of the difficult מְבִין, which, as a *lectio difficilior*, deserves preference. On the seven clouds of glory see vol. II, p. 374.

<sup>83</sup> Comp. vol. IV, p. 205, with reference to the fragrance of paradise. Concerning the "canopies", see note 78.

<sup>84</sup> Concerning these worlds see note 30. According to Zohar I, 125a, Eden is situated in the seventh heaven (according to another view, even above the seventh heaven), and paradise is situated on earth directly opposite to it. Comp. Berakot 34b; Sanhedrin 99a: No eye has ever seen Eden, . . . Adam dwelt in the garden (=paradise) of Eden; comp. note 17, end.

<sup>85</sup> The divisions of the dwellers in paradise (or Eden?) into seven classes is very frequently met with (Sifre D., 10 and 47; Midrash Tannaim 6; Tehillim 11, 10, and 16, 128; WR 30. 20; PK 28, 197b; PRK, Schönblum's edition, 36a). In one passage only is the number reduced to three (ARN 43, 120; comp. also note 97). Perhaps the difference of opinion on this point is in some way related to various opinions about the number of the heavens (comp. note 21); each heaven having a separate class of dwellers, the more pious one is, the higher the heaven in which he dwells. It is said in Shir 6. 8 that sixty groups of the pious study the Torah under the shades of the tree of life, while eighty groups of the average men study the Torah within a short distance from that tree. Mention is often made of the habitations, or rather worlds, which every pious man receives according to his merit; comp. Shabbat 152a; Ruth R. 1, 16; PK 4, 75a; Tehillim 34 (end); ShR 42. 2; Koheleth 12. 5; Baba Batra 75a (שָׁכַל אֶחָד וְאֶחָד); 2 Enoch 61. 2; John 14. 2. This view does not conflict with the division of the pious into classes, since the individual, though being one of a class, does not forfeit his independence.—The honor conferred upon R. Akiba and his colleagues as members of the first, *i. e.*, the foremost division, is already mentioned in Baba Batra 10b.

<sup>86</sup> *I. e.*, as martyrs during the religious persecutions; comp. Gittin 57b.

<sup>87</sup> Comp. Hagigah 14b where this Rabbi describes his disciples as belonging to the "third division".

<sup>88</sup> Under these, the descendants of Moses (comp. vol. IV, p. 317) are to be understood.

<sup>89</sup> In Berakot 34b two views are cited; according to one, those who repent are considered superior to those who have never sinned, while the other view maintains the opposite case. As to the high esteem in which innocent youths are held, comp. Pesahim 113a. On the study of the Torah under God's guidance, comp. note 194.

<sup>90</sup> Perek Gan 'Eden, which is extant in many recensions: Yalkut I, 20 (from a poor text of Yalkut published by Jellinek in BHM II, 52-53, under the wrong title Seder Gan 'Eden); Baraita di-Shemuel 25 (text in manuscript by Rachlin, *Bar Levoi*, New York, 1906, pp. 82-84); Mahzor Vitry 735. Aggadat Shir and Targum Eccl., and probably also Zohar (comp. notes 79 and 81), seem to have made use of this description of paradise. Most of the legends relating to paradise and hell are attributed to R. Joshua b. Levi, who, according to a well-known tradition, already mentioned in the Talmud (Ketubot 77b), was permitted to enter paradise during his life-time. Hence the description of paradise begins: "R. Joshua b. Levi said: There are eighty myriads of trees in every corner of paradise, etc." In Baraita di-Shemuel, after this description of paradise, there follows in a second chapter another description of the seven divisions of the pious in paradise (comp. note 97). The entire tractate is headed Masseket Gan 'Eden. It is, however, quite obvious from the contents that the two descriptions are of different origin. That a description of hell followed the one of paradise is quite probable, and the designation of the latter as Perek Gan 'Eden clearly points to this direction; but the description of hell found in our text of Baraita di-Shemuel 30-32 (published in BHM I, 147-149), from another source, has been artificially attached to that of paradise. One of the descriptions is purely legendary, while the other is midrashic-haggadic; they therefore must be of different origin.

<sup>91</sup> These seven divisions are obviously identical with those previously described. There are many other descriptions of these divisions; comp. note 97. Concerning the proselyte Obadiah, comp. vol. IV, pp. 240-241.

<sup>92</sup> The views of the ancient authorities differ on the question whether the "generation of the wilderness" have a portion in the life to come (=paradise); comp. note 177 on vol. III, p. 79.

<sup>93</sup> The sentence *וְכָל מַאֲבָשָׁלוֹם* is to be placed after *הוּא שָׁם*; hence the translation in the text.

<sup>94</sup> Read *שְׁבַשְׁמִים* instead of *שְׁמִינִים*, and comp. Konen 28. On Chileab comp. Vol. II, p. 260 and vol. IV, p. 118. On Menasseh

comp. Vol. IV, p. 280. On those who repent, see note 89 and Koheleth 1. 8.

<sup>95</sup> Read *בנוי מישפה ואדם* (= Ezek. 28. 13) instead of the meaningless *בנוי ויפה כאדם הראשון*. Comp. Konen 29. A scribe who mis-read *אדם* for *אדם* added *הראשון*.

<sup>96</sup> According to Yoma 45a, fine gold (*פז*) is the third best among the seven kinds of gold, whereas Parvaim gold (comp. note 77, as well as Masseket Kelim 89) is the very best.

<sup>97</sup> Ma'aseh de-R. Joshua b. Levi 48-49. This description is partly (not in its entirety, as Jellinek asserts) incorporated into Konen 28-30, which source is to be used for the establishing of a correct text of Ma'aseh (comp. notes 94-95). Great caution must, however, be taken, since Konen had other sources, along with Ma'aseh, at its disposal for the description of paradise. R. Joshua b. Levi's description of paradise, found in Gaster's *Ma'asiyyot* 96-97, corresponds to ours in the introductory parts only, in which the adventure of this sage with the angel of death is mentioned (according to Ketubot 77b; comp. note 90), but not in the description of paradise proper. Very characteristic is the fact that this source knows only of three halls of paradise, one of glass, for proselytes; one of silver, for the righteous of Israel (instead of *כל מלכי ישראל*, p. 97, line 24, read *כל אוחם* *שהם מורע ישראל*); one of gold, in which dwell the three patriarchs and Moses, Aaron, David, "the weeping" Messiah, and Elijah comforting him. On the division of paradise into three, comp. note 85. The most elaborate description of paradise is that given by Jellinek in BHM III, 131-140 (comp. also the additions, 194-198), published under the title of Seder Gan 'Eden. This description has been extensively made use of by kabbalistic authors (comp. Jellinek, *Einführung und Zusätze*, as well as Zohar I, 41a; III, 167b) who describe it as a part of the Book of Enoch. It, however, shows traces of speculative mysticism (for instance, great emphasis is laid upon the difference between spirit and soul, on the union of the masculine with the feminine souls which result in the productions of new souls, and on many other views of speculative mysticism), and it therefore could not have originated earlier than the end of the twelfth century. The division of the pious into seven classes is also known to this source, but it differs from the divisions found elsewhere (Perek Gan 'Eden 52-53 and Sha'are Gan 'Eden 42-43 = Baraita di-Shemuel 28-29; comp. note 90). This source is also acquainted with a portion of paradise assigned to women, who, like the men, are divided into sev-



en classes, each of which is under the supervision of some famous woman from biblical times. These are: Bithiah, the foster-mother of Moses, Jochebed, Miriam, Huldah the prophetess, Abigail, the four matriarchs, Sarah, Rebekah, Rachel, Leah. As nine women are given here as heads of seven divisions, the text must therefore be corrected in accordance with Zohar III, 167b. The distinction drawn here between the garden (=paradise) and Eden is old (comp. note 84 and Sha'are Gan 'Eden, *loc. cit.*, where the dwellers of Eden are divided into twelve classes), but this source expresses this distinction in a different manner. To the old mysticism belongs the conception of the 390 heavens and 18000 worlds (comp. note 30), but this source gives a different interpretation of this mystic doctrine. Quite new is the conception of the secret chamber of the Messiah in paradise which is called here, as well as in Zohar II, 8a, by the peculiar name "bird's nest". On the whole, the Messiah plays an important part in this description of the life of the pious in paradise. Old is the view that the pious, particularly the patriarchs and the Messiah, grieve over Israel's suffering, and pray to God for their redemption; Berakot 18b; ShR 15. 26; BaR 19. 15; Tehillim 14, 115; Ekah 2, 11 (in the two last-named passages it is Jacob especially who is most concerned about Israel's suffering); Baba Mezi'a 85b (comp. this passage in vol. IV, p. 219); Mahzor Vitry 17; Pardes 54d; Seder Rashi 22; a kabbalistic source in Yalkut Reubeni on Deut. 23. 3; Tosafot on Sotah 34d (caption אַבְרָהָם), and the passages cited there from the Talmud; see further PR 12, 46b-47a. Whereas Tehillim 30, 234 and 14 (according to the reading of Makiri, *ad. loc.*, 79, bottom), and PR 2, 5b, state that the pious when dead continually praise God, later sources (PR 198a; BHM V, 43; Recanati on Gen. 3. 24; R. Bahya on Exod. 20. 8; Seder Gan 'Eden 138) maintain that on the Sabbath, festivals, and new-moons the dead rise from their graves, behold the the Shekinah, and praise the Lord. Comp. also Zohar II, 8a (which very likely depends upon the Seder Gan 'Eden, *loc. cit.*); Yalkut Reubeni Gen. 19. 2; vol. III, p. 400. On Korah comp. vol. III, p. 300, and vol. IV, p. 234.—R. Joshua b. Levi is also the author of a description of hell which is given in vol. II, pp. 310, *seq.* For further details concerning the description of hell and paradise, comp. Gaster, *Hebrew Version of Hell and Paradise in Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society*, 1893, pp. 571-611; Rachlin, *Bar Levoi*, 70-86; Landau, *Hölle und Fegfeuer* (Heidelberg, 1909, *passim*). A fragment of a description

of paradise is found in *Steinschneider-Festschrift*, Hebrew section, 55-56. Comp. also *Abkai Rokel*, II, 1.

<sup>98</sup> Hagigah 12a. The view that the light created on the first day is identical with that of the heavenly bodies is given as that of the majority of scholars. But there are some who maintain that the light of the first day is entirely different from all the other lights. Comp. vol. I, pp. 8-9. Philo, *De M. Opif.*, 3-4, asserts that the ideal world was created on the first day (concerning this explanation of the expression *אור ראשון* comp. note 71), whereas the material world appeared on the following days. Similarly a Tanna of the middle of the second century asserts: Everything was created on the first day, except that some things appeared earlier and others later; Tan. B. I, 2; BR 12. 4; Origen on Gen. 2. 2; Ephraim, I, 127C; Basiliius *Hexaemeron*, 4. Comp. Ginzberg, *Haggada bei den Kirchenv.*, 24. See also Ginzberg's remarks in *R.E.J.*, LXVIII, 148. On the same view by the philosophers of the middle ages, see Horovitz, *Ueber den Einfluss... auf den Kalam*, 22, note 2. Comp. also note 97 on vol. I, p. 82.

<sup>99</sup> God created the sun and the moon in order to give the lie to the heathen who worship them as deities; had God only created one of them, the heathen would have apparently had good reason for adoring it. Similarly Philo, *De M. Opif.*, 14-15; Theophilus 2. 15; Tadshe (beginning), which reads: God first created the plant world and then the heavenly bodies, in order that it should not be said that the latter produced the former; comp. also vol. I, p. 16, where the same idea is expressed with reference to the angels.

<sup>100</sup> Konen 25-26, which is based on older sources; comp. BR 6. 3; Hullin 60b; Shebu'ot 9a (the sacrifice of atonement on the new-moon is God's acknowledgement that He dealt too severely with the moon); PRE 4 and 51; Targum Yerushalmi Gen. 1. 16 and Num. 28. 15. These sources, as well as others (Mekilta Bo 1, 3a; PK 5, 54a; PR 15, 78a; Tan. B. II, 47), also speak of the compensation received by the moon for its reduction in size: it became a symbol of Israel and the pious, whereas the sun represents Esau and the ungodly. Moreover the moon is sometimes seen also by day while the sun on the other hand is never seen by night. A reminiscence of the mythological conception of the diminution of the moon (the rationalistic explanation of the Haggadah by Back, *Monatsschrift* XXIX, 226, *seq.*, must not be taken seriously) as a punishment for its rebellious conduct toward God may be found in Enoch 18. 15,

where mention is made of the chastisement of the stars which "did not come at their appointed times". This corresponds to the reproach administered to the moon, mentioned in BR, *loc. cit.*, for having encroached upon the province of its colleague (=the sun), *i. e.*, for having shone during the day. The myth sought to explain the appearance of the moon by day, which, owing to the superiority of the sun over it, was rather baffling to the primitive mind. Hulin, *loc. cit.*, as well as the later addition in BR (אני הוא שגרמתי), does not present the myth in its original form.—That the sun and moon are endowed with wisdom and passion like man is originally a mythological conception which had been maintained for a long time by Jews and Christians. On this conception in pseudepigraphic literature and Philo, comp. Psalms of Solomon, end (the prayer at the appearance of the new-moon, קרוש לבנה, in present use, which is already found in Sanhedrin 42a, partly corresponds to this psalm); Apocalypse of Baruch 48. 9; Enoch 2, 1-5, 3 (it is more than a poetic description of the order reigning in nature and the lack of order displayed by man); Philo, *De Plant. Noe*, 3; *De Somn.* 1, 4 and 2, 16. On the rabbinic sources containing this view, comp., besides the passages referred to at the beginning of this note, also those cited in notes 102, 104, 105, 112. For the Christian sources, see Origen, I, 7; *Visio Pauli* 4-6. Like the heavenly bodies, even so the earth, the plants, in short, all existing things, were conceived more or less by analogy to man; comp. note 193.—Concerning the motions of the heavenly bodies, the Books of Enoch, as well as the old rabbinic sources, contain a good deal of material which is on the boundary line of mythology and astronomy; comp. Pesahim 94a; Yerushalmi Rosh ha-Shanah 2, 58a; Baba Batra 25a; PK 29, 186a-186b; ER 2, 9-10; Hallel 89; Shir 3. 11; see also the two writings Baraita di-Shemuel and Baraita di-Mazzalot, which are entirely devoted to this subject. Old material is found also in Raziël, which is particularly instructive for the history of astrology. Of interest is "the case" in which the disc of the sun is inserted (γαρθήκιον נרחיק "case"), a conception often mentioned in old rabbinic literature as well as in the writings of the Persians and Arabs (comp. Grünbaum, *Gesammelte Aufsätze*, 145-146). It is noteworthy that this "case" is known in rabbinic sources (BR 6. 6; Koheleth 1. 5; PK 29, 186a; Nedarim 8b; 'Abodah Zarah 3b; Tehillim 19, 168 and 170; Tan. B. II, 98; Tan. Tezawweh 8; Hallel 89; Baraita di-Ma'aseh Bereshit 50) by the Greek word נרחיק.—Concerning the darkness of

the sun and the moon, which occupied the minds of the ancients, comp. Mekilta Bo 1. 3a; Tosefta Sukkah 2. 6 and Babli 29a; Derek Erez 2; Nispahim 10; see also the references in note 112, and Index s. v. Eclipse. The view that the light of the sun is seven times as intense as that of the moon (Enoch 72. 37, 73. 2, and 78. 4, as well as 2 Enoch 11, 2) is based on Is. 30. 26. This opinion is also shared by the legend given in the text in accordance with Kohen 24-25 concerning the restoration of the light of the moon and the sevenfold increase of the light of the sun in the future. The old midrashic sources (Midrash Tannaim 181; ShR 15. 21; Targum, *ad loc.*), however, conceive the passage of Is., *loc. cit.*, in a different manner, and according to them the relationship between the light of the sun and that of the moon is 1: 49 or 1: 343. That the sun and the moon had been of equal size, as stated by Enoch 72. 37, is not stated explicitly in rabbinic literature, but the legend given in the text implies it. Similar is the view of modern scientists that the moon was originally an independent planet; comp. See, *Researches*, II. Like all first things created (comp. vol. I, p. 59), the moon was created in a fully developed form, so that there was full moon on the fourth day of creation; Seder 'Olam 4.

<sup>101</sup> PRE 6; Baraita de-Ma'aseh Bereshit 50. The metaphor of the sun as bridegroom is, of course, taken from Ps. 19. 6. It is, however, questionable whether the crown and the wreath (in Hebrew these two things are represented by one word) belong to this conception. The wreath of the bridegroom is Jewish (comp. Sotah 9. 14) but the wreath of the sun may have been borrowed from the Greeks, as the Jews have often seen the image of the sun-god wreathed. The Greek Apocalypse of Baruch knows of the crown of the sun, as well as of its chariot; so also Enoch 75. 8; 2 Enoch 11. 2. Many of the rabbinic sources cited above employ the word מרכבה "chariot", which is, however, rendered "throne", in order to retain the picture of the bridegroom.

<sup>102</sup> MHG I, 41-42; PRE 6; Tehillim 19, 168-170; Baraita de-Ma'aseh Bereshit 50; Koheleth 86; 'Aseret ha-Dibrot 64; Zohar Hadash on Gen. 4, 19b; 2 Enoch 11. 4; Greek Apocalypse of Baruch 6. Comp. also vol. I, p. 132. The song of praise of the heavenly bodies is partly based on Ps. 19, but presupposes also an acquaintance with the Pythagorean doctrine (perhaps of oriental origin) of the music of the spheres. The original text of Enoch 41. 7 very likely read וְהֵם מוֹדִים וּמְפַאֲרִים וּשְׂבַחָם אִם לֹא יִשְׁבַּחוּ: "And they give thanks

and they glorify; they would cease to exist if they would not praise." In consequence of the similarity between the letters פ and פ, the translator was misled into making the text say just the opposite. With regard to the music of the spheres, Philo, *De Car.*, 3, refers to it in the very words which remind one of the anonymous Midrash quoted in *Hadar*, Deut. 32. 1. Comp. also DR 10. 1 and 2; Yelammedenu in *Yalkut I*, 729. See further vol. I, pp. 44, *seq.* The song of praise of the sun and moon did not strike the naïve mind as strange, in view of the fact that the surfaces of these luminaries resemble the human countenance; comp. R. Benjamin b. Zerah (about 1050) in his piyyut מַחְמַח אֱלֹהֵינוּ אֱלֹהִים אִמָּח in the Roman and German Mahzor (comp. Zunz, *Literaturgeschichte*, 121), who undoubtedly made use of a version of Midrash Kohen different from ours, but which Treves still had before him in his commentary on the Roman Mahzor entitled *Kimha Dabishuna*, *ad loc.* The human countenance of the sun is also referred to in the Greek Apocalypse of Baruch 6. Comp. also the preceding note as well as note 112 and note 6 on vol. IV, p. 4.

<sup>103</sup> PRE 6; Baraita de-Ma'aseh Bereshit. See also 2 Enoch 37. 2. In the Midrashim (BR 5. 6; Koheleth 1. 5; Tehillim 19, 170; Baraita de-Ma'aseh Bereshit, *loc. cit.*) it is said that the sun is led through a stream, which is put up for that purpose in heaven, before it starts its revolution, to cool off its heat; otherwise it might consume the earth.

<sup>104</sup> PRE 51 and 6; Baraita de-Ma'aseh Bereshit 50. The moon and the stars have light but no heat, and hence the "bath of hail". On the stream of fire in which the sun bathes, comp. also Enoch 17. 4 and Baba Batra 84a. The latter passage reads: The sun passes paradise in the morning and hell in the evening. Dawn is a reflection of the roses of paradise; the evening twilight of the fire of hell. The stream of fire in which the sun bathes, is identical with the Nehar di-Nur; comp. Luria on PRE 51 and note 62.

<sup>105</sup> WR 31. 9; Tehillim 19, 169; ER 2, 11; MHG I, 42; Alphabetot 118; Baraita de-Ma'aseh Bereshit 50. Quite similar is the statement of the Greek Apocalypse of Baruch 8 to the effect that the angels remove the crown of the sun in the evening, bring it to heaven, and "renew" it there (the "renewing" of creation every day is also alluded to in the morning prayer, at the end of Yozer, comp. note 6), because the sun and its rays are becoming defiled on earth. With regard to the compulsory motion of the heavenly bodies, which do not wish to shed their light upon a sinful world, comp. vol. III, pp. 197-298;

vol. IV, p. 309. In *Visio Pauli* 4-6, the sun, moon, stars, and the sea implore God to grant them the power to destroy the sinners. There is a widespread view, which is based on Deut. 31. 28, to the effect that the earth, the heaven, and the heavenly bodies bear witness for and against man, according to his actions; comp. Enoch 1. 7; Sifre D., 306; 'Abodah Zarah 3a. The following legend is quoted by many medieval authors (Mahzor Vitry 373; Zohar III, 275a; *Sefer Mizvot Gadol*, 42nd positive precept; Kaneh in Yalkut Reubeni I, 16, 8b) from an unknown midrashic source which reads: Whenever Satan brings accusations against Israel on the New Year, the day when God sits down to judge the whole universe, God commands him to produce witnesses in support of his accusations. But he can only secure one witness on that day, the sun, because the moon is invisible at that time; but when Satan appears ten days later, on the Day of Atonement, with his second witness, he is informed by the Lord that Israel repented of their sins during the ten days of penitence and that they were pardoned. Satan fares still worse in the legend given in PR 45, 185b-186a, according to which, while Satan is searching for more sins, God removes sins from the balance in which the good and evil deeds are weighed. On the appearance of the heavenly bodies, before and after their daily course, before God, comp. Baba Batra 25a and vol. III, p. 116.

<sup>106</sup> Zohar Hadash Bereshit 4, 23a (on Gen. 2. 8); that God's name is engraved in the sun is already mentioned in PRE 6, as well as in the Baraita de-Ma'aseh Bereshit 50; whereas according to the Greek Apocalypse of Baruch 6, the bird running before the sun (comp. vol. I, p. 32) bears on its body an inscription of golden letters. In the old Midrashim (Tan. B. II, 112; Kinyan Torah; introduction to Ekah 2; Tan. Ki-Tissa 16; PK 15, 121a; ShR 41. 6) it is said that a heavenly voice proclaims daily on mount Horeb: "Woe to mankind for contempt of the Torah." The revelation which took place on Sinai-Horeb is a constant accusation against mankind for not walking in God's path, despite the Torah that was given to them. Similarly the daily appearance of the sun also is a constant accusation against the sinners who do not recognize their Creator.

<sup>107</sup> BR 6. 7; ShR 5. 9; Koheleth Z. 86; Shemuel 9, 74; Yoma 20b-21a; PRE 34. On the grating of the sun against its wheel, comp. Sachs, *Beiträge*, I, 50; Perles, *Etymologische Studien*, 72; Grünbaum, *Gesammelte Aufsätze*, 145. This has nothing to do with the music of the spheres, despite the statement of Maimonides, *Guide of the*

*Perplexed*, II, 8, and Zohar Hadash Bereshit 4 (caption תני"ר שמעון). The old Jewish sources are not acquainted with the conception of the music of the spheres; comp. note 102. As to the noises which resound throughout the universe but are nevertheless inaudible to man, a good deal more is mentioned in the sources just quoted. These noises are at the birth and death of man, at the first sexual intercourse, as well as at the time of divorce, the felling of a fruitful tree and the sloughing of the skin of a serpent, the falling of rain (*Yoma loc. cit.*, reads more accurately: the roaring of the taurine angel when he causes the water from the lower abyss to be poured into the upper abyss; comp. Ta'anit 25b; Baraita de-Ma'aseh Bereshit 49; Seder Rabba di-Bereshit 10; *Responsen der Geonim*, Harkavy's edition, No. 289. p. 142); finally there resounds out of Rome such a loud voice, that were it not for the grating of the sun, it would have been audible all over the world. In these sources mythological conceptions, as, for instance, the roaring of the taurine angel of the abyss, which is merely the Jewish recast of the Babylonian belief about the god "Ea", are found side by side with purely poetical images. As to the loud voice which resounds at the time of a divorce, comp. Index s. v. Divorce. See also vol. I, p. 59.

<sup>108</sup> Nedarim 8b; *Yoma* 20b, which reads: These notes are named לא "la" in Aramaic, according to which לה (Dan. 4. 32) is explained. On the grating of the sun, comp. Löw in *Orientalische Literaturzeitung*, XV, 305.

<sup>109</sup> Yerushalmi Ta'anit 4, 68b; Babli 27b; Soferim 7. 5. One should not go out of doors on Wednesday night (*i.e.*, on Wednesday eve, for according to the Jewish conception the day belongs to the preceding night) because the demon Agrat the daughter of Mahlat (= אגרת בת מחלה; the transliteration is doubtful, and Kohut's Persian etymology in *Angelologie*, 88, is certainly untenable) with her eighteen myriads of malicious throngs come out on this night (also on Saturday night) to inflict evil on man. See Pesahim 111a and 112b; PRK (Grünhut's edition) 73; BaR 12. 3. Comp. further Sifra 26. 4; Geiger, *Kebuzzat Maamarim*, 167, and Ginzberg's note in the supplement. In the middle ages Monday (comp. vol. I, p. 15) and Wednesday were considered as unlucky days, and there is an accepted rule אין כ"ד מחילין בב"ד "one should not begin any undertaking on Monday or Wednesday". Brüll, *Jahrbücher*, IX, 5 (comp. also *ibid.*, 66), accepts the explanation found in a manuscript, according to which the belief

is due to the fact that בַּד in Persian signifies "bad"; but this explanation is rather far-fetched.

<sup>110</sup> Comp. vol. I, pp. 23-24.

<sup>111</sup> It is not on earth but in heaven where the moon slipped in its terror of the punishment which was pronounced.

<sup>112</sup> *Hadar* on Gen. 1. 16, which cites an unknown midrashic source; *Toledot Yizhak* on Gen., *loc. cit.*, which is very likely based on *Hadar*. According to this legend, the word כוכבים "stars" is connected with the word כבה "was extinguished"; the light of the moon was dimmed because some of her parts fell off. On the etymology of שמש "sun", ירח and סהר "moon", see Konen 25-26. The text of this passage is to be corrected in accordance with *Zohar Hadash Bereshit* 4, 19b: שמש = עַמֶּשׁ "servant of man". Jellinek emended it correctly without having known the parallel passage.—In the legends concerning the sun, moon, and the stars it is presupposed that these luminaries are endowed with consciousness and intelligence. This idea, as pointed out in note 100, was so widespread among the ancients that Maimonides, *Guide of the Perplexed*, II, 5 (comp. also *Yad ha-Hazakah, Yesode ha-Torah*, 3. 9), was justified in referring to the Haggadah as support for his doctrine which he borrowed from the Greeks, that the heavenly bodies were endowed with intelligence. Philo, *De Plan. Noe*, 3 and *De Somn.*, 4, likewise calls attention to the agreement among the Jews and the Greeks concerning this view. It should, however, be observed that in the liturgy, at least as far as the old prayers are concerned, the conception of the heavenly bodies as intelligent or animate beings is entirely ignored, though the opportunity has frequently presented itself to make use of this idea, as, for instance, in the morning and evening prayer, in the passages of Yozer and Ma'arib 'Arabim. On the passages in pseudepigraphic literature stating that the heavenly bodies are endowed with life and senses, comp. note 100, as well as Enoch 41. 5, and the passages cited by Charles. Not only Enoch 18. 13-16, but also the Talmud (Mo'ed Katan 16a) speaks of "rebellious" stars; comp. also vol. IV, p. 36, on Meroz (Jud. 5. 23). On the eclipse of the moon and sun comp. note 100. See further Philo, *De M. Opif.*, 19, and Steinschneider in *Magazin für Literatur d. Auslands*, 1845, No. 80. Concerning the material of which the sun and moon were made very little is found in the Haggadah; according to Konen 25 the moon consists of light, the sun of fire. The statement made in the Greek Apocalypse of Baruch 9 to the effect that the moon has the likeness of a



woman (in the original myth she must have been the wife of the sun) is unknown in Jewish sources. On the human form of the moon, however, see note 102. Comp. further Index, s, v. "Man in the Moon".

<sup>113</sup> Konen 26, where שׂא should probably be read instead of אור; comp., however, Ginzberg, *Unbekannte Sekte*, 114, note 2, as well as PRE 9.

<sup>114</sup> Konen 26. On the three elements, light, fire, and water, by the combination of which all the heavenly and earthly bodies have been formed, comp. Konen 24.

<sup>115</sup> Hullin 127a; Yerushalmi Shabbat 14, 14c; Tehillim 104, 445; PR 23, 117a. The creation of the sea shows God's might as much as that of all the other creatures taken together. Similarly God's power is manifested in the creation of Leviathan as in that of all the other creatures taken together. See Mekilta Bahodesh 7, 69b (read שׂהים instead of שׂהים), and Mekilta RS, 109.

<sup>116</sup> Midrash Jonah 98; comp. also vol. I, p. 40, and vol. IV, p. 249, as well as Mekilta RS, 109. A vast collection of passages from rabbinic literature, which treat of Leviathan, is given by I. Löw in *Judaica* (Cohen-Festschrift, Berlin, 1912), 338-340. Comp. also Löw in *Orientalische Studien*, 555; Grünbaum, *Gesammelte Aufsätze*, 127-130.

<sup>117</sup> Baba Batra 74b; BR 7. 4; Konen 26; Targum Yerushalmi Gen. 1. 20. In all these passages, תנייני (Gen., *loc. cit.*) is identified with Leviathan (so BR 11. 9, and the parallel passages cited by Theodor, *ad loc.*). תנין is indeed the proper word for Leviathan, since by looking at it man is induced to relate (=תן) God's wonders. Comp. Lekah, Gen., *loc. cit.* According to another view תנייני means the "sea-gazelle"; comp. Baba Batra, *loc. cit.*, and note 132.

<sup>118</sup> Baba Batra 74b; Zohar II, 108b. Konen 26 mentions the creation of the female Leviathan, but not its slaying; it thus assumes the existence of a pair of these monsters which have no sexual desire, so that they do not multiply. This is explicitly stated in BR 7. 4 with reference to Behemoth; this source quotes the dissenting view that neither Leviathan nor Behemoth exists as a "pair". In Baba Batra, *loc. cit.*, however, it is stated that God not only slew the female, but also castrated the male. Comp. also Targum Yerushalmi Gen. 1. 20. The Leviathan "pair" may be compared with the Babylonian myth concerning Tiamat and her only mate Kingu, according to which the latter is vanquished by Marduk and made harmless, while the former is slain.

<sup>119</sup> Baba Batra 74b. The Midrashim (PK 6, 58; PR 16, 81a; WR 22. 9; BaR 21. 18; Tan. Pinehas 6) describe, in still more glowing colors, the enormous quantities of water needed by Behemoth, and quote a view according to which a river comes out from paradise in order to quench the thirst of this monster. Comp. note 142.

<sup>120</sup> PK 29, 188a; Baba Batra 74b; Midrash Jonah 98; PRE 9. Comp. vol. I, p. 40; vol. IV, p. 249.

<sup>121</sup> Baba Batra 74b-75a. Comp. also the Midrashim cited in note 119.

<sup>122</sup> Shabbat 77b; PRK (Grünhut's edition) 74; Iggeret Ba'ale Hayyim 3, 12. According to I. Löw, *Orientalische Studien*, 565, כַּלְכִּי כַּלְכִּי which causes terror to the Leviathan, is the Greek χαλκίς "lizzard".

<sup>123</sup> PK 29, 188a. Comp. also vol. I, p. 28, with regard to the illuminating canopy over the heads of the pious made of the hide of Leviathan. The clothes of the first "human couple" which were "garments of light", were made of the hide of the female Leviathan (comp. Index, s. v. "Adam, Garments of"). Comp. the unknown Midrash in *Hadar* and *Da'at* (פְּנֵחַ יְהוּדָה) on Gen. 3. 21. In the Babylonian myths of creation the heavens are formed of the upper parts of the body of Tiamat.

<sup>124</sup> 'Abodah Zarah 3b; PRE 9; Midrash Jonah 98; Hasidim 476. Comp. further Septuagint and Targum on Ps. 104. 26, both of which understand this passage to say (very likely on the basis of Job 40. 27, as already remarked by Rashi on Ps., *loc. cit.*, which escaped the notice of Grünbaum, *Gesammelte Aufsätze* 128) that God sports with Leviathan. In 'Abodah Zarah, *loc. cit.*, the following account is given of God's occupation during the twelve hours of the day. He studies the Torah during the first three hours; He judges the world for three hours; during the next three hours He provides for the needs of all living creatures; the last three hours He spends sporting with Leviathan. This Haggadah is allegorically explained in ER 2, 61-62, where Leviathan is taken symbolically to represent the power of the heathen (comp. Tehillim 104, 445). It is accordingly stated there that nothing pleases God so much as the failure of the designs of the heathen against Him (comp. Ps. 2. 1-4). On the plan of God's daily occupation comp. further ER 17, 84; 18, 90; 26, 130; 31, 162. On Leviathan=evil, comp. note 127, end.

<sup>125</sup> Baba Batra 75a, which literally reads: If Leviathan were not to put his head into paradise and become perfumed by its frag-

rance, no creature could exist on account of the awful odor he emits. This statement has nothing to do with the medieval legend concerning the offensive odor of the devil, but it is related to the ancient identification of Leviathan with the sea. The latter has an offensive odor. Comp. vol. III, p. 25 (end of paragraph).

<sup>126</sup> Baba Batra 74b, where a reason is given why the female monster and not the male was put to death. Comp. note 118 and the following note.

<sup>127</sup> PK 29, 188a-188b; Baba Batra 75a; Alphabetot 98. The contest between the angels and the monsters is variously described in the sources quoted above, and especially noteworthy is the description of Alphabetot. Gabriel receives the order from God to drag out Leviathan from the Great Sea (=Ocean, or the Mediterranean Sea; comp. Baba Batra 74b and note 73), for which purpose the angel provides himself with the necessary implements. He succeeds in hooking Leviathan, but is swallowed up in his attempt to drag him out on dry land. Whereupon God Himself is obliged to seize Leviathan, and He slays him in the presence of the pious. Then Michael and Gabriel are sent against the male and female Behemoth, but being unable to carry out God's command (this is the way the fragmentary text is to be emended), He Himself is then obliged to accomplish it. For further details concerning Leviathan and Behemoth, comp. Pirke Mashiah, 76; BHM VI. 150; WR 13. 3; Kalir in the piyyut ויכון עולם (end of *Lamentations* in Roman Mahzor), who made use of old sources which are no longer extant, in his description of the two monsters and of their contest which ends with the annihilation of both. Comp. further vol. I, pp. 29 and 30 with reference to Ziz and Behemoth. It is noteworthy that the tannaitic literature does not contain anything concerning Leviathan and Behemoth (the remark in Sifra 11. 10 that Leviathan is a clean fish has hardly anything to do with the view that it will be eaten at the Messianic banquet, comp. also Hullin 67b and note 139, beginning), nor concerning the Messianic banquet. The word used in Abot 3. 25 need not be taken literally, as may be seen from Tosefta Sanhedrin 8. 9. Only in post-tannaitic literature, especially in later Midrashim, does the Messianic banquet play a great part. Comp., besides the sources already quoted, Nistarot R. Simeon 80; BHM V, 45-46; VI, 47; Alphabet R. Akiba 33. Comp. also vol. IV, pp. 115-116 and 249. Luzzatto, in his notes on the Roman Mahzor II, 212b, correctly remarked that the legend about the Messianic banquet wants to convey the view that this will be the

last feast, after which the pure spiritual life will begin, when there will be no bodily needs or pleasures. Those who interpret the Leviathan-Behemoth legends allegorically conceive the Messianic banquet in a spiritual sense. Comp. further below. Targum Yerushalmi Num. 11. 26 reads: And they will enjoy the good things which were prepared for them in the pristine times. This is not to be translated, as is done by Bousset, *Religion*, 327: And they will . . . to enjoy the meat of the steer. This mistranslation is due to the fact that Bousset incorrectly read חוריא for טוריא. Comp. also note 79 with regard to the wine of the Messianic banquet. The pseudepigraphic literature already knows the essential elements of the highly developed Leviathan-Behemoth legends found in the later Midrashim. In Enoch 60.7-10 it is asserted, in agreement with BR 7.4, that Leviathan and Behemoth (alluding to Job 40. 20 and Ps 50. 10-11, Behemoth was described in the Hebrew text of Enoch as בהמות שדה, which the translator, however, misunderstood and instead of שדה "field", *i.e.*, "the dry land", has שדה "his breast") were created on the fifth day, and of these two the former was the female and the latter the male. But they were separated (comp. vol. I, p. 27, with regard to the female of the Leviathan), the male monster, Behemoth, received the desert Dudain for his abode (undoubtedly identical with the desert Dudel, Enoch 10. 4; that the latter is situated in the proximity of Jerusalem, the former east of paradise, cannot be urged as an objection to this identification, as the holy city is east of paradise; comp. PRE 20 20, beginning. See further notes 119 and 141 on the habitation of Behemoth in the proximity of paradise), whereas the female Leviathan lives in the depth of the sea. Both, however (verse 24), will serve as food (for the pious; but the text is not very clear here). In 4 Ezra 6. 49-52, Enoch is made use of, but at the same time an attempt is made to explain how it happens that the male monster Behemoth lives on the dry land, while his mate, Leviathan, is in the water. The mates of Leviathan and Behemoth are spoken of in rabbinic sources (comp. note 118). Nowhere, however (Targum Yerushalmi I, 21, is based on Baba Batra 74b, and does not maintain, as Gunkel, *Schöpfung und Chaos*, p. 54, incorrectly asserts, that Behemoth is the wife of Leviathan), is the idea expressed that both monsters are "a mated pair"; nor does it occur in BR 7. 4; comp. Ginzberg, *Haggada bei den Kirchenv.*, 16. The Apocalypse of Baruch 29. 4 knows of the legend that both monsters are destined to be the food of the pious in the time to come, but does not offer any additional

information on the subject. The Apocalypse of Abraham 10 speaks of Leviathans (*i. e.*, the male and female monsters), which the archangel Jael holds in check; in another passage (21; the text is not quite clear) Leviathan and his possession are spoken of, where, perhaps, the Leviathan and his mate should be read. In case this apocalyptic work was originally composed in Hebrew, the present text can easily be explained as being due to the translator's confusion of קנייתו = קנייתו "his mate" with קנייתו = קנייתו "his possession". Comp. Kiddushin 6a, where instead of the reading קנייתו, as is found in our texts, we should read, with the Geonim in *Sha'are Zedek* 17a, No. 4, קנייתו = קנייתו "my mate". In the last passage of the Apocalypse referred to above the remark is made that the world rests upon Leviathan. This shows the high antiquity of the similar statement found in rabbinic sources; PRE 9; Konen 26; 'Aseret ha-Dibrot 63; Baraita de-Ma'aseh Bereshit 47 (the whole world, as well as the "Great Sea" which compasses it, rests on four pillars, and these pillars rest on one of the fins of Leviathan); Seder Rabba di-Bereshit 9; Zohar III, 279. Comp. also the numerous quotations from Kabbalistic writings by Luria on PRE, *loc. cit.*, as well as Ginzberg, *Haggada bei den Kirchenv.*, 19, where a quotation from a New Testament apocrypha is given concerning the "divos pisces (*i. e.*, Leviathan and his mate) jacentes super aquas . . . tenentes totam terram". Rather obscure is the statement of Jerome on Is. 27. 1 that, according to a *Judaica Fabula*, the monster spoken of by the prophet lives under the ground and in the air, whereas the monsters mentioned in Gen. 1. 21 have their habitation in the sea. As an explanation of these obscure words of Jerome, attention should be called to the fact that next to the view mentioned above which sees in Leviathan a monster which encircles the whole earth, there is also another which identifies him with the vault of heaven to which the signs of the Zodiac are affixed. Comp. the quotation from PRE by Kimhi on Is., *loc. cit.*; Kalir, *loc. cit.* (it has 365 eyes = days of the year); Kaneh 30c and 32c-32d; Rokeah in the commentary on Yezirah 14c. Comp. also Harkavy תלי אחליה in the Hebrew periodical *Ben 'Ammi*, January 1887, 27-35. That Leviathan was not identical with the תנינים mentioned in Gen., *loc. cit.*, is also presupposed by the Haggadah which asserts that Leviathan was created first (this is based on Job 40. 19, which rather applies to Behemoth; thus the two monsters are taken to be a "pair"; comp. above), and afterwards the rest of the world. Comp. Ibn Ezra's introduction to his commentary on the Pentateuch, and פרוש על איוב

ed. Sulzbach, Job, *loc. cit.* All these legends concerning Leviathan and Behemoth point to the fact, which has already been observed by several authors (comp. especially Gunkel, *Schöpfung und Chaos*, 41-69), that a good deal of old mythological material has been preserved in them. Nevertheless one must not look exclusively for Babylonian myths, and one is not warranted to identify, on the basis of Enoch, *loc. cit.*, Behemoth and Leviathan with Tiamat and Kingu, respectively, of the Babylonian mythology, since not only the rabbinic sources but also Job 40 clearly describes Behemoth as a land monster. It may therefore be said that Behemoth belongs to quite another cycle of myths, but owing to learned combinations, the pseudepigraphic authors made it the consort of Leviathan, whereas the rabbinic sources retain the original conception of it as a land monster. The allegorical interpretation of the Leviathan-Behemoth legends originated at a very early date, and is found not only among the Gnostics (comp. the Jewish gnostic Apocalypse of Abraham, *loc. cit.*, and Hippolytus 5. 21, on Leviathan as a bad angel in the system of Justinus), but also in rabbinic sources. Comp. ER 2, 61-62 (partly quoted in note 124); *Guide of the Perplexed*, III, 23; Kimhi on Is. 27. 1, and particularly in kabbalistic literature in which Leviathan is identified with "Evil" which will disappear in Messianic times, when the righteous as purely spiritual beings like the angels, will enjoy life in paradise. See *Ma'areket* 8, 102-103b; *Nefesh ha-Hayyim* 1, 17; the numerous passages cited from Zohar by Heilpern, *Erke ha-Kinnuyim*, s. v. לויתן. See also the remark of R. David b. R. Judah he-Hasid in *Shitah Mekubbetet* on Baba Batra 75a. On Leviathan as the serpent encircling the world, comp. Grünbaum, *Gesammelte Aufsätze*, 129, and note 275 on vol. I, p. 394.

<sup>128</sup> Hullin 27b; PK 4, 35a; Tan. B. IV, 112 (the feet of the hen therefore resemble the scales of the fish); Tan. Hukkat 6; BaR 19. 3; Koheleth 7. 23; Konen 26. Philo, *De M. Opif.*, 20, finds the relationship between birds and fishes in that these two kinds of animals swim, the former in the air (*πρῆξιεν* "to swim" may also be used for the flight of birds), the latter in the water. On the view of PRIE 9 concerning the origin of birds and fishes, comp. Ginzberg, *Unbekannte Sekte*, 114. See further Targum Yerushalmi, Gen. 1. 20.

<sup>129</sup> The name Ziz is derived from Ps. 50. 11 (זִיז שָׂרִי), which is taken by the Haggadah as a proper name. Johann Heinrich Wolfius wrote a monograph on Ziz under the title "*Dissertatio de portentosae magnitudinis ave זִיז שָׂרִי*", which appeared in Leipzig, 1683.

<sup>130</sup> WR 22. 10; Tehillim 80, 363. Comp. further PK 6, 58a; PR 16, 81a; Tan. Pinehas 12; BaR 21. 18, with regard to Ziz; see also vol. I, pp. 4-5.

<sup>131</sup> Targum on Ps. 50. 11, which is very likely based on Baba Batra 73b. Comp. the following note. It is stated in Konen 26 that Ziz rests its feet on the fins of Leviathan (comp. note 127), and that his head reaches the throne of glory. On this passage comp. note 139.

<sup>132</sup> Baba Batra 73b. Comp. further *Ma'asiyyot* (Gaster's edition 8), where in the Alexander legend an allusion is made to this axe.

<sup>133</sup> WR 22. 10; BR 19. 4.

<sup>134</sup> Gittin 31b and Baba Batra 25b. In both of these talmudic passages the winged *בן נץ* is none other than Ziz, as may be seen by comparing the talmudic statement with that found in the sources referred to in the preceding note. The commentators, however, take *בן נץ* to be a winged angel; comp. Rashi, *ad loc.*, as well as in his commentary on Job 39. 26.

<sup>135</sup> Bekorot 57b and Menahot 66b, as an explanation of Job 39. 13.

<sup>136</sup> Targum Job 3. 6, 38. 36, 39. 13. In all these targumic passages this bird bearing the name *ברא חרנוול* "the wild cock" (comp. *שור הבר* "wild ox", as a name for Behemoth, note 143; it is nevertheless doubtful whether the word *ברא* is to be translated by "wild" in these cases) is undoubtedly to be identified with Ziz, although in the legend of Solomon (comp. vol. IV, p. 168 and note 86 appertaining to it) *ברא חרנוול* is employed to describe an entirely different bird. Comp. note 139.

<sup>137</sup> On *שכוי* (Sekwi) comp. Targum on Job 38. 36 (according to Rosh ha-Shanah 26a and Yerushalmi Berakot 9, 13c, it signifies "cock"); comp. note 139. On *בר יוכני* "son of the nest", see the following note.

<sup>138</sup> The attempt to explain *בר יוכני* as Persian must not be taken seriously; comp. Ginzberg in *Jewish Encyclopedia*, II, 512 s. v. "Bar Yokni," where reasons are given for the translation "son of the nest". The talmudic passages where this gigantic bird is mentioned are: Sukkah 5a (bottom); Yoma 80a; Bekorot 57b. Comp. also Menahot 66b and Sifra 1. 14. Comp. Ginzberg in *Schwarz-Festschrift*, 360.

<sup>139</sup> WR 22. 10, where it is explicitly stated that Ziz and Leviathan belong to the "clean animals" (comp. note 127 with reference to Leviathan), whereas in 13. 3 and Tehillim 146, 535, it is emphasized, with reference to the use of these animals, that in the time of

the Messiah a new Torah will be given which will dispense with the present dietary laws. Nistarot R. Simeon 8 reads: Behemoth will be slaughtered, Leviathan (a fish does not require to be killed ritually) will be torn by Ziz, and the latter slaughtered by Moses. In view of the description of the contest between Behemoth and Leviathan (comp. vol. I, p. 28), we should probably read in Nistarot *וּבְהֵמָה* לְיִתְחַן שְׁחַטוֹ, "and Behemoth will be slain by Leviathan", i. e. by the points of his fins, which may be used as instruments for ritual slaughtering; comp. Hullin 1. 2. On the disposal of the three monsters, Leviathan, Behemoth, and Ziz, that is, the representatives of the three animal kingdoms, at the Messianic banquet, see Tehillim 18, 153, and 23, 202, whence the statement found in later writings (*Kad ha-Kemah*, end of letter ח, 93a; Levita, Tishbi, s. v. יִכְנֶה) that the bird Bar Yokni will be used as food for the pious in Messianic times. No trace is found in older sources of the identity of this bird with Ziz; but since רַנְיִים (Job 49. 13) is according to Bekorot 57b, the same as Bar Yokni, and in the opinion of Targum, *ad loc.*, it is the same as חַרְנוּל בְּרִיא, i. e., Ziz (comp. Targum Ps. 50. 11), it was quite natural for the later authorities to identify Bar Yokni with Ziz. In most of the Ziz legends the dependence upon Iranic mythology is evident. The "heavenly singer and seer" is naturally the sacred cock of Avesta (Vendidad 18, 33, *seq.*); comp. Grünbaum, *Gesammelte Aufsätze*, 37, *seq.*; Rubin, *Kabbala und Agada*, 23-25; Ginzberg in *Jewish Encyclopedia*, s. v. "Cock", as well as note 194. Of Iranic origin is also the conception that the wings of Ziz eclipse the sun. With this should be compared the sun birds of the Greek Apocalypse of Baruch 6-8 and the Chalkidri in 2 Enoch 15; comp. Bousset, *Religion*, 568.<sup>1</sup> Highly instructive is the following passage in Konen 26, which precedes the description of the creation of Ziz (comp. note 131): And He created an Ofan (a kind of angel) on earth, whose head reaches the holy Hayyot who is the mediator between Israel and their heavenly Father. He bears the name Sandalfon and fashions out of 'the prayers wreaths (or crowns) for God's majesty, which ascend upon the head of the Lord at his uttering the holy name. Whatever is said here concerning Sandalfon is taken from Hagigah 13b (comp. also PR 20, 97a). The connection, however, between Sandalfon and Ziz can only be understood when one considers the fact that Ziz was originally taken as the heavenly singer; he is hence identical with Sandalfon. To quite a different cycle of legends belongs the conception of the gigantic bird Ziz, which will be eaten by the pious in the world to come.



<sup>140</sup> Hullin 27b; PRE 11. For a different view see Konen 26, which reads: He took water, earth, and light, out of which He created Behemoth; comp. notes 113 and 128.

<sup>141</sup> Baba Batra 74b, where it is said that the male monster was castrated, and the desire to propagate its kind was taken away from the female. Konen 26 reads: He created Behemoth of the thousand mountains, as well as the ox who uproots thousand mountains daily, and both appear daily in paradise to make merry in the presence of the Lord. That Behemoth is a female monster disagrees with the view of the older rabbinic sources, as well as that of the pseudepigraphic writers (comp. notes 117-118, as well as note 127). Moreover Konen made two monsters out of the two names of the monster. The older rabbinic sources speak of Behemoth, or following Ps. 50. 10, of "Behemoth upon a thousand hills," but sometimes they use שׂוֹר הַבֵּר or, in Aramaic sources, its equivalent תּוֹר בֵּר, instead of Behemoth (comp. e. g. Targ. Ps. *loc. cit.*) and hence in Konen the female Behemoth of the thousand mountains (hills) is found alongside of the ox who uproots thousand mountains daily. Comp. also Kalir in the Piyyut וִיכֹן (end of *Lamentations* in the Roman Mahzor) who speaks of the two consorts of Leviathan. Comp. note 127, and on the sports of the monsters in paradise see note 124.

<sup>142</sup> PK 6, 58a; PR 16, 80b, and 194 (here it is also stated that Leviathan lies on the abyss, which otherwise would flood the earth; since the water of the ocean is salty, he is compelled to raise his fins whenever he wants to drink, in order that the water of the abyss should come up); WR 22. 10; BaR 21. 18; Tan. Pinehas 12; PRE 11. Comp. also Baba Batra 74b. The last-named Midrash understands Ps. 50. 10 to say that the grass of the thousand mountains grows anew every night, whereas in the older Midrashim a view is cited, according to which the meaning of this verse is that thousand animals grazing on the thousand mountains serve as food for Behemoth. On Behemoth in the close proximity of paradise, comp. note 127 and Konen 26. For an allegorical interpretation of this legend, comp. Zohar I, 18b, 223a (bottom), as well as III, 217a, 240b.

<sup>143</sup> WR 13. 3; PRE 11. Concerning Behemoth as food for the pious, comp. further notes 127 and 139. On the prejudice against attending a theatre, comp. 'Abodah Zarah 10b, where, like Tertullian, *De Spectaculis* 4, Ps. 1. 1 is said to refer to the pious who keep away from the theatre and circus.

<sup>144</sup> A quotation from a manuscript Midrash in *Midbar Kede-*

*mot* ק, No. 12, and Aguddat Aggadot 39. A similar statement is found MHG I, 95-96 concerning a certain serpent related to the one which seduced Eve. Comp. also Rashi on Is. 30. 6 and Herodotus III, 109.

<sup>145</sup> Baba Batra 73b; comp. also *ibid.* 74b, where a view is quoted which declares the monsters תנינים (Gen. 1. 21) to be אורזלי דימא, which is very likely a kind of *Re'em*.

<sup>146</sup> Tehillim 22, 195, where one view is also cited to the effect that the circumference was about one hundred cubits; comp. vol. IV, p. 83. On a frightful kind of tiger comp. Hullin 59b; a passage which was strangely misunderstood by the author of the article "Leviathan and Behemoth" in *Jewish Encyclopedia*, VIII, 39.

<sup>147</sup> This species is known as Adne [Sadeh], or more accurately Idne; the singular is Adan. Comp. the following note.

<sup>148</sup> Tan. Introduction 125. Comp. further R. Simeon of Sens on Kil'ayim 8. 5 and *Ma'asehbuch* 201; *Magen Ahot* 35b and 68a (women who grow on trees); Eshkol 24b; the references to non-Jewish writings (Mas'udi, Ibn Tufail, and Pseudo-Calisthenes) given by Steinschneider, *Pseudo-Epigraphische Literatur*, 25, and *Hebräische Uebersetzungen*, 12, 360. On the plant-man comp. further note 150, and note 89 on vol. I. 360. Kil'ayim 8. 5 speaks of ארני השדה (it is plural of ארן which occurs frequently in correct manuscripts instead of אדם), which Yerushalmi, *ad loc.*, 31c, renders in Aramaic by בר נש דטורא, "the man of the mountain" (שדה is also found in the Bible in the sense of "mountain"). It is undoubtedly a certain species of ape. The Yerushalmi continues that this species is vulnerable only in its navel; later authors, however, found in this remark of the Yerushalmi a reference to the plant-man which is fastened by its navel to the ground. Comp. Fink, *Monatsschrift*, LI, 173-182; Nathan, *ibid.*, 501. Comp. Ginzberg in *Schwarz-Festschrift*, 327-333, who deals at length with the meaning of ארני השדה, which Rashi identifies with the Werewolf and believes to be referred to in Job 5. 23.

<sup>149</sup> Tan. Introduction 125.

<sup>150</sup> Responsa of R. Meir of Rothenburg (Lemberg edition, No. 160), and through the literary channels, namely, the writings of the Franco-German scholars of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, who often discussed the "legal status" of the barnacle-goose, scholars of other countries became acquainted with this legend, though there it failed to engage the popular fancy. Christian authors, at the same

time, discussed the question whether it was permissible to eat these birds during Lent. Comp. Geraldus Cambiensis (1154-1189), whose zeal burned against the rashness of those who indulged in the enjoyment of this bird during the Lent season. It appears, however, that his zeal was not of much avail, since Duran, in his *Magen Abot*, 35b, confirms the persistence of the "rashness and indulgence" of the Frenchmen of his time, two hundred years after that "zeal for the observance". Comp. Oppenheim, *Monatsschrift*, XVIII, 88-93; Güdemann, *Erziehungswesen* II, 117, 213, and III, 129; Steinschneider, *Hebräische Bibliographie* V, 116-117; Steinschneider in Gosche's *Archiv* III, 8; *Ha-Goren* IV, 99; *Jewish Encyclopedia*, s. v. "Barnacle-goose."

<sup>151</sup> BR 19. 5: Shemuel 12, 81; Tan. Introduction 155; 2 Alphabet of Ben Sira 27a, 28b, 29a-29b; Bereshit Rabbeti cited by Jellinek, *Einleitung* to BHM VI, 12, note, 4. The older sources name the phoenix חוּל, and find in Job 29. 18 a reference to this bird; in the two last-named sources the immortal bird is called מלחם or מלתם, a word of obscure origin which is very likely corrupt. Ben Sira 27a adds that this bird and its species, after the fall of man, was locked up in a city to which no one, not even the angel of death, has access. Here the very old legend concerning Luz is made use of (vol. IV, pp. 30 and 175). The Church Fathers, as well as the Rabbis, refer to the phoenix as a proof for the resurrection of the dead. The discrepancies of the sources in the description of the rejuvenation of the dead represents different dogmatic opinions relating to the doctrine of resurrection; comp. Ginzberg, *Haggada bei den Kirchenv.*, 52-55; Güdemann, *Religionsgeschichte*, 55-65. See further note 37 on vol. I, p. 161, and note 67 on vol. I, p. 74. The description of the rejuvenation of the pious in the world to come, found in Alphabetot 107, which was probably made use of in Mahzor Vitry 317, line 11 (טל ילדות צומח) presupposes the phoenix legend. On the phoenix legend in patristic literature, comp. the vast collection of material given by Charles, 2 Enoch 12.

<sup>152</sup> Greek Apocalypse of Baruch 6; comp. notes 133-134. On a similar idea in rabbinic literature, comp. the legend concerning Ziz vol. I, 29. and notes 134, 139.

<sup>153</sup> On this inscription comp. note 106.

<sup>154</sup> The etymology of the word "Chalkidri" is very obscure; comp. Forbes and Charles on 2 Enoch 12. 1; Bousset, *Religion*, 568. The latter conjectures that it is to be regarded as an Iranian word.

<sup>155</sup> 2 Enoch 12 and 15. The ordinary angels have six wings (Is. 6. 2), but these sun-birds are higher beings, and therefore possess twelve wings; comp. PRE 13, where the important place of Sammael in the heavenly hierarchy, before his fall, is characterized by the fact that he possesses twelve wings.

<sup>156</sup> This is only found in Rashi on Hullin 127a.

<sup>157</sup> Hagigah (end); Sanhedrin 63b; Hullin 127a (comp. Rashi, *ad loc.*, and 'Aruk. s. v. סלמנדרא), Tan. Wa-Yesheb 3; Sifra 11. 29; ShR 15. 28. A vast collection of material relating to Salamander in Jewish literature is given by Löw in Krauss' *Griechische und Lateinische Lehnwörter*, s. v. סלמנדרא. See also Löw in *Florilegium*, in honor of De Vogüe's seventieth birthday 399-406. Comp. further Lewysohn, *Zoologie des Talmuds*, 227-230; Straschun in *Ha-Maggid* IX, No. 14. It is noteworthy that Philo, *Quaestiones*, Exod. 28, likewise mentions *πυρλίγες*, which could move about in fire without suffering any harm. Philo surely had Salamander and similar creatures in mind. Hullin and Sifra, *loc. cit.*, likewise speak of creatures in the plural which live in the fire, that is, Salamander and others. The statement of Aristotle, *Historia Animalium*, V, 19, and that of Pliny, *Historia Naturalis*, X, 68 and 87, concerning the Salamander essentially agrees with the view of the rabbinic sources. On the use of the myrtle in the producing of the Salamander (comp. note 156), see Hippolytus, *Haereses* 4. 33. Comp. also the following three notes.

<sup>158</sup> Zohar II, 211; Hadassi, Eshkol 24d; *Abkat Rokel* 2, 1. These assertions concerning the clothes of Salamander, slightly differing from one another, are not found in the talmudic-midrashic literature, but are, however, known, in non-Jewish writings of the Middle Ages; comp. Jellinek, *Beiträge zur Geschichte der Kabbala*, I, 48, and Grässe, *Beiträge zur Literatur und Sage des Mittelalters*, 81.

<sup>159</sup> Sanhedrin 108b, where עליותא (the reading is doubtful) is the Semitic name for Salamander. In Tan. Wa-Yiggash 3 עכביו "spider" is the correct reading, since according to Aristotle, *Historia Animalium*, V, 19, the size of the Salamander is like that of the house-fly and the difference between the latter and the spider is not very great.

<sup>160</sup> Sanhedrin 63b. Comp. Bacher, ZDMG XXVII, 15, and vol. IV, p. 226.

<sup>161</sup> Abot 5. 6; Sifre D., 355; Midrash Tannaim 219; Pesahim 54a; 2 ARN 37, 95; PRE 19. Comp. further note 99 on vol. I, p. 83.

<sup>162</sup> Tosefta Sotah 15. 1; Babli 48b; Yerushalmi 9, 20d. It is

stated in PR 33, 155a, that the Shamir was also applied to the building of the temple for the purpose of splitting the rock-like hard wood (so is גלומי to be translated; comp. Syriac גלמא "rocky ground").

<sup>163</sup> Tosefta Sotah 15. 1; Babli 48b; Yerushalmi 9, 20d. Comp. note 166.

<sup>164</sup> Tehillim 77, 351, which was incorporated in Yalkut II, 182. Another legend on the procuring of the Shamir is given in vol. IV, p. 166.

<sup>165</sup> Sotah 9. 2 (it is the first temple which is meant here, contrary to the view of Tosafot on Zebahim 54b, caption אבנים); Tosefta 15. 1; Babli 48b; Yerushalmi 9, 20d. In the talmudic-midrashic sources it is never explicitly stated that the Shamir was a living creature. Nevertheless, as a matter of fact, the opinion of medieval authors that it was a worm (Rashi Pesahim 54a; Maimonides, commentary on Abot 5. 6; Mahzor Vitry 540 and many others) is undoubtedly correct. In Babli Sotah, *loc. cit.*, and PR 38, 153a, the expression מראה וכו', used in connection with the Shamir, clearly shows it was the glance of a living being which effected the splitting of wood and stones. A caper-spurge, to which the non-Jewish sources of the Middle Ages ascribed the characteristic of the Shamir, is also known in Jewish literature (WR 32. 4; Koheleth 5. 9); but it is not identical with the Shamir. The view of the tannaitic sources that the Shamir was only accessible to man at the time of the building of the temple, while the caper-spurge could be found in later times, proves that these two must not be confused with one another. Comp. Cassel, *Shamir*, in *Denkschriften der Kgl. Akademie der Wissenschaften*, Erfurt, 1854; Grünbaum, *Gesammelte Aufsätze*, 41, *seq.*; Löw, *Graphische Requisiten*, 181, *seq.* (he justly refutes Cassel's assertions that Shamir was a stone); Salzberger, *Salomos Tempelbau und Thron*, 36-54.

<sup>166</sup> Shabbat 28b; Yerushalmi 2, 4d; PR 33, 154d; Koheleth 1, 9. Comp. vol. III, p. 164. On the one-horned animal see note 108 on vol. I, p. 98. PR, 155a, states that the wood used by Solomon (1 Kings 10. 12) was also created with this end in view; it therefore disappeared as soon as it had fulfilled its purpose.

<sup>167</sup> Baba Batra 74a. Comp. Löw, *Aramäische Fischnamen*, No. 19, in *Nöldeke-Festschrift* 550.

<sup>168</sup> Tosefta Bekorot 1. 11 and Babli 8a, where instead of דולפינין of the Tosefta, the Aramaic בני ים is used, which Rashi renders by "sirens" while ps.-R. Gershon explains it as "seamen". In our text of

the Talmud nothing is said about a union of the sirens and men, and it is uncertain whether this statement of Rashi is based on a different text (עם for כבוי) or whether, influenced by the belief in fays and naiads, prevalent in the Middle Ages, all through Europe, Rashi ascribes to the Talmud something which is alien to it. According to the Tosefta and the Talmud, the dolphins give birth to their children in the same manner as human beings do. The assertion of Duran, *Magen Abot*, 68a, concerning the dolphins belongs rather to European folklore, although it pretends to be Jewish. Comp. Lewysohn, *Zoologie des Talmuds*, 153-155; Löw, *Aramäische Fischnamen*, No. 49, in *Nöldeke-Festschrift*; Grünbaum, *Gesammelte Aufsätze*, 101. According to Enoch 19. 2, the women who caused the fall of the angels were transformed into sirens; comp. Apocalypse of Baruch 10. 8.

<sup>169</sup> Comp. vol. I, pp. 26, 28, 30; further note 322 on vol. I, p. 424.

<sup>170</sup> Comp. vol. I, pp. 23-24, concerning the fall of the moon. But in none of the sources is it mentioned (comp. notes 100, 110-112) that the light taken from the moon was added to the sun.

<sup>171</sup> 2 Alphabet of Ben Sira 25a and 34a. Perek Shirah (cat and mouse) very likely alludes to this legend.

<sup>172</sup> 2 Alphabet of Ben Sira 25a-25b. The other legend of the origin of the enmity between the cat and the mouse which is found in *Iggeret Ba'ale Hayyim* 2, 6, is derived from Arabic sources, since these animals are brought into relation with the descendants of Cain and Abel, whereas according to Jewish and Christian legends Abel died childless; comp. Index s. v. Abel.

<sup>173</sup> The text of 2 Ben Sira does not seem to be in proper form.

<sup>174</sup> 2 Alphabet of Ben Sira 26a-26b; see also 34b, where it is said that Noah stole the hair which he needed for his work, from a sleeping swine. The story told in this source (25a-34b) concerning the donkey, which was shocked at having to serve man without any compensation, practically agrees with the Sicilian legend by Dähnhardt, *Natursagen*, III, 178. The characteristics of these animals to scent their excrement and to urinate, as soon as one of them starts to do it, is explained in the following manner. They threatened God that they would stop to propagate their species in case they were not to receive their reward for their work. They received the following answer: "Ye will receive your reward for your labor as soon as your urine will flow as a stream big enough to work a mill and when your excrement will smell as perfume." Hence the donkeys

wish to ascertain whether they have fulfilled the conditions under which a reward was promised to them.

<sup>175</sup> As the cause of this, Noah remarks: "The inhabitants of the city of Ai" (עַי; ע' = עֵרֶב "raven"; ' = יוֹנָה "dove") will slay Jair, because he permitted the use of the meat of the raven, but prohibited that of the dove (comp. Sanherdin 100a, top) in contradiction to the Torah". Comp., however, vol. IV, p. 8 with reference to the piety and learning of Jair.

<sup>176</sup> This suspicion against Noah is already found in older sources, comp. note 46 on vol. I, p. 164. See further PRK (Schönblum's edition), 32b.

<sup>177</sup> This supposed peculiarity of the raven is already mentioned in Aristotle's *Historia Animalium*, V, 47, and by many classical authors; comp. Bochart, *Hieroz.*, III, 818, as well as Lewysohn, *Zoologie des Talmuds*, 173. According to Barnabas, 10. 8, it is the weasel which is impregnated through the mouth. This, however, inaccurately reproduces the statement of Aristeas 165, according to which the Bible has prohibited the enjoyment of this animal because it is impregnated through the ears and gives birth through the mouth. This widespread view is also mentioned by Aristotle in *De Generatione Animalium*, III, 6. 5 who, however, scoffs at it. A statement similar to that of Barnabas concerning the annual change of sex of the hyena is found in medieval Jewish writings, but not in the old rabbinic literature. Concerning the hare (אַרְנַבָּת), comp. Ibn Ezra on Lev. 11. 6. Related to this view is the quotation in *Pa'aneah*, Lev. 12. 2 from PRE (not found in our text) that the stomach of a hare is a cure for sterility. R. Eleazar, *Rim e Haftarot*, Naso, explicitly states that this cure, which the women recommended to Samson's mother, and against which the angel warned her (Jud. 13. 7), is due to the peculiarity of this species to change its sex. It is highly probable that *Pa'aneah* introduced the quotation with the words אֲלֵעִזָּר ר' בַּפ' that is "in the commentary (on the Haftarot) by R. Eleazar (of Worms)"; but the scribe misread the abbreviation בַּפ' (= בַּפְרוֹשׁ) as בַּפְרִיקִי, and hence אֲלֵעִזָּר ר' בַּפְרִיקִי. For further remarks on the raven, comp. the following note.

<sup>178</sup> 2 Alphabet of Ben Sira 26b-27a and 34a-35a. The older sources (Sanhedrin 108b; BR 36. 7; Yerushalmi Ta'anit 1, 64d; Tan. Noah 12) state that three were punished because they did not observe the law of abstinence while in the ark (comp. vol. I, p. 166): Ham, the dog, and the raven. Ham became the ancestor of the black

(colored) race; the dog remains attached to the body of his mate after cohabitation; the raven conceives through his mouth. Comp. further note 46 on vol. I, p. 164, and note 54 on vol. I, p. 166.

<sup>179</sup> Ketubot 49b; WR 19. 1; Shemuel 5, 57; Shir 5. 11.

<sup>180</sup> Pesahim 113b.

<sup>181</sup> WR 19, Shemuel 5. 57; PRE 21. Comp. vol. I, p. 113. Makiri on Ps. 147, 286, quotes, from PRE, the statement that she-bears have no breasts with which to nurse their young, but God makes the young bears suck their paws, and this sustains them until they grow up and are able to provide for themselves. Concerning the sucking of paws or fingers, comp. vol. I, p. 189. The jackals hate their young, and abandon them as the ravens do; they would even devour them if they could see them. For this reason God ordained that when the female jackal nurses her young ones, their faces are covered as if with a veil, so that she cannot see them. Ekah 4, 144. Comp., on the other hand, Tan. Behukkotai 3 and Tan. B. III, 111, where the opposite view is given to the effect that these animals are devoted to their young.

<sup>182</sup> 2 Alphabet of Ben Sira 24a (read לְבָיִים לְבָיִים) and 33b. Comp. PRE 21, and the quotation from the latter in Makiri on Ps. 147, 286, as well as in Aguddat Aggadot 38, note 4.

<sup>183</sup> 2 Alphabet of Ben Sira 26b. The proverb, "he who is dissatisfied, etc." (most likely the word לֹא fell out before נִמְצָא) is a variant of the proverb already found in Tosefta Sotah 4. 16 and in the parallel passages (comp. note 34 on vol. I, p. 78). Sanhedrin 106a reads: The camel looked for horns, and lost his ears which he had possessed. This is allusion to the fable found in Pend-Nameh 207.

<sup>184</sup> 2 Alphabet of Ben Sira 25a (בְּרִיאַ is used here in the sense of the English "strong", "stout"). Comp. Duran, *Keshet u-Magen* for the similar Arabic legend concerning Mohammed.

<sup>185</sup> BR 19. 1. On the original superior qualities of the serpent, comp. further vol. I, pp. 71-72.

<sup>186</sup> Tehillim 58, 300. On the mole, comp. also Mo'ed Katan 6b, and Yerushalmi I, 80c.

<sup>187</sup> The angel of death occurring often in rabbinic literature, in which he is identified with Satan (Baba Batra 16a), is also well known in pseudepigraphic literature; comp. the Apocalypse of Baruch 21. 25; Ascension of Isaiah 9. 16. See also note 317 on vol. I, p. 300. The relationship between Leviathan and the angel of



death clearly points to the assumption that the view prevalent in the Kabbalah concerning the identity of Satan with Leviathan (comp. note 127) goes back to an ancient tradition. According to a legend handed down from a different version, there are several angels of death. Thus PRK 14b (Schönblum's edition) states that there are six angels of death. Gabriel is in charge of taking away the lives of young persons; Kazfiel is appointed over kings; Meshabber over animals; Mashhit over children; Af over the other kinds of men; Hemah over domestic animals. On the relation of Gabriel to the angel of death, comp. Ma'aseh Torah 98; Huppat Eliyyahu 6; Zohar I, 99a.

<sup>188</sup> According to ancient sources (comp. note 115), it is the weasel, which lives on the dry land, and if we want to be accurate, we ought to read "weasel" instead of "cat" in the text.

<sup>189</sup> The heart, according to the Hebrew idiom, signifies the intellect. The conception that one can acquire the characteristics of an animal by eating it is well known among all primitive peoples.

<sup>190</sup> 2 Alphabet of Ben Sira 27a-28b and 36a. The text requires many emendations. 28a, line 8, read: אֲזַרְרִי לִי הַמָּוֶה; 28a, line 15: לִכְאֵן וְלִכְאֵן; 36a, 1. 15: וְשֵׁם נִכּוֹן. On the origin of this animal fable, comp. Ginzberg, *Jewish Encyclopedia*, II, 680; s. v. "Ben Sira", Abrahams, *Book of Delight*, 159, seq. It should be further noted that although MHG II, 45, *Sekel*, Exod. 29, *Imre No'am* and *Hadar* on Exod. 7. 14 give different versions of the similar fable found in Yalkut I, 182 (in the first edition מִדְרַשׁ is given as source) concerning the lion, the ass, and the fox, there can be no doubt that the origin of our fable is to be found in that about the ape and the crocodile (Pantchatantra IV, 1), which has found its way also into the Alphabet of Ben Sira, where, however, it was combined with other elements. Whether the author of the Alphabet had directly made use of the Indian-Arabic fable literature, or whether he had adapted fables known to him from older Jewish writings, is a moot question. The first alternative, however, is the more likely, since the author knows a number of animal fables, which are not extant in the older Jewish literature. Some animal fables are also given in 1 Alphabet 5a-5b and 7a-7b; but those are found also in the older rabbinic literature, so that the priority of this source is more than questionable. The account of the pious son who was compensated by Leviathan because he had fulfilled his father's last wish (on this motive comp. vol. I, pp. 118, seq.) is known not only to 1 Alphabet (5a-5b), but is also

found in *Hibbur ha-Ma'asiyyot*, fifth commandment, and is very likely borrowed from there in the *Ma'asehbuch* 194. In these sources the following stories are welded into one: The story from 1 Alphabet 7a-7b, with the lesson "not to do any good to the wicked, so that one should not suffer from them"; the story given in vol. IV, pp. 138-141, concerning the man who understood the language of the animals; as well as the one about the pious son. This, of course, proves that the sources are quite new. WR 22. 4 and Koheleth 5. 4 must certainly have been made use of by Alphabet and the two other sources mentioned.—The Talmudim, like the Midrashim, contain very extensive material of animal folk-lore, a very small part of which is to be found in Lewysohn, *Zoologie des Talmuds* (350-358). As to the post-talmudic period, see Duran, *Magen Abot* (comp., e. g., 35b-37b) and *Shebet Musar* (particularly chapter 22), which contains vast material on this subject. The following contains material taken from the older sources. The propagation of animals is usually the result of cohabitation, but there is also spontaneous generation, *i. e.*, animals springing forth as the result of the putrefaction of animals or vegetables. Man, fish, and serpent are the only species whose mates face each other during cohabitation, because they are the only living creatures to whom God spoke (Gen. 3. 14; Jonah 2. 11); hence this distinction is conferred upon them; Bekorot 8a; BR 20. 3. Once in seven years God transforms nature, as a result of which the hornet springs forth from the remains of the horse; bees from the cattle; the wild boar from the mountain-mouse; the multipede from the backbone of the fish; the serpent from the backbone of the human body which did not formerly bow down at the time of prayer; Yerushalmi Shabbat 1, 3b. The beginning of this passage is badly corrupted, part of it, however, may be restored in accordance with Baba Kamma 16a (bottom) and with the text of R. Hananel, *Baba Kamma loc. cit.* One may read, with certainty, קמושה מיתעבר חמ. . . אפא מיתעבר שד ממוחו דרישא. . . ודמעיא סממא. It is questionable whether קמוש and חמ in Yerushalmi and Babli are to be taken as bramble-bushes. Targum on Is. 34. 13 and Hos. 9. 6 takes these nouns to be certain species of animals, as has been rightly observed by Duran, *Magen Abot*, 58b; comp. also Kimhi on the first passage. Both Yerushalmi and Babli speak in this connection of the sexual metamorphosis of the hyena (comp. note 177 with respect to the peculiarity of giving birth through the mouth, comp. Huppah Eliyyahu 3, where this is ascribed to the raven), and Babli knows

of a long process of transformations of this animal, which finally becomes a demon. Concerning the splendor of the color of this animal, it is said that it possesses 365 different colors; see BR 7. 4; Tan. Tazria' 2; Tehillim 103, 432. Comp. also Berakot 6a, where this is stated with reference to the bird Kerum.—The serpent is the wicked among the animals (Bekorot 68a; Yerushalmi Berakot 2, 9a; accordingly MHG I, 95, הַרְשֵׁעַ=the serpent), and despite his punishment after the fall, this animal retained his weakness for the feminine sex; comp. Shabbat 109a, and note 60 on vol. I, p. 72. A remedy against serpents is the fumigation of the places frequented by them with the horns of a hind (this is also found in Pliny, *Historia Naturalis*, VIII, 32, 50), which is the "pious one" among the animals. Whenever a drought occurs, the other animals apply to the hind to pray to God, who will listen to its prayers on account of its piety. It digs a pit in the ground into which it sticks its horns, and prays to God for rain. Whereupon God causes water to come up from the abyss. See Tehillim 25, 187. The attribute "pious" is shared by the hind with the stork which is called in Hebrew *Hasidah*, "the pious one", because the animals of this species are kind to one another; Hullin 63a; Tehillim 104, 144; Philo, *De Decalogo*, 12, who is very likely dependent upon Aristotle, *Historia Animalium*, 9. 13. Comp. also Hasidim 240–241, and the passages referred to by the editor, as well as *Shebet Musar* 25 (end), concerning the family purity of the stork. The heron, though it is closely related to the stork, is possessed of a different nature; it is a very unkind animal, and its name in Hebrew is therefore *Anafah*, "the wrathful one"; Hullin, *loc. cit.* The stork and the heron both belong to the family of birds that are distinguished for their keen sight, so that from Babylon they can see any object in Palestine; Hullin 63a–63b; PK 29. 187b. The ostrich like the heron is also a cruel bird, which does not even care for its young; Lekah, Lev. 11. 16 (it is very likely based on a reading very different from our texts of Hullin 64b). On the hyena, jackal, and bear comp. note 181. The lowest and least developed mind is attributed to the fishes; Philo, *De M. Opif.*, 22 (it is very likely based on Plato, *Timaeus*, 92a), and this view is connected with the statement that the fishes did not receive any names from Adam; Tosafot on Hullin 66b; and *Pa'aneah*, Lev. 11 (end). Philo, however, *Quaestiones*, Gen. 12, makes Adam name every living thing. Descriptions of fabulous animals are found in the Hebrew version of the Alexander legend (comp. Lèvi in *Steinschneider-Festschrift* 145, *seq.*); Hadassi, Eshkol 24b–24c, and *Zel*

'*Olam*, II, 5, *seq.* The following account by R. Akiba goes back to an Indian fable. R. Akiba saw once a lion, a dog, and a lizard (אֲנָקִיּוֹת is akin to Hebrew אֲנָקָה); the lion wanted to attack the dog, but could not carry out his plan out of fear of the lizard (read צָרִי), which is the protector of the lion, whereas the dog is the protector of the lizard. *Tehillim* 104, 445.

<sup>191</sup> *Shabbat* 77b. The sentence "Whatever, etc." literally agrees with that of Aristotle, *De Coelo*, I, 4: 'Ο δὲ θεὸς καὶ ἡ φύσις οὐδὲν μάρτην ποιούσιν. Many a species of animal was only created on account of a single specimen to which some special historical mission was assigned. For instance, the gnat that lives only one day was destined to cause the death of Titus (it crept through his nose into his brains); *Gittin* 56b; 2 Alphabet of Ben Sira 24a; *BR* 10. 7; *WR* 22. 1; *Koheleth* 5. 8; *Koheleth Z.*, 104; *BaR* 18. 22; *Tan. B.* IV, 98, *seq.*; *Tan. Hukkat* 1; *ShR* 10. 1. Comp. also *Ecclu.* 39. 28-34. The emphasis frequently laid on the statement that everything in nature has a mission to perform, so that even the bad may be applied as a means to attain the good, is directed against the view of the Persians, according to which all noxious animals are the creation of the god Ahriman. See Lactantius, *Institutiones*, 7. 4, who like the Rabbis emphasized the usefulness of all created things.

<sup>192</sup> 'Erubin 100b, where the monogamous life of the dove is pointed out as a moral lesson which may be derived from nature. The statement concerning grasshoppers, storks, and frogs are found in *Shebet Musar* 22, 70b and 73c, as well as 31, 98a (comp. also note 190), the source or sources of which are not known. On the frog, comp. Löw in *Florilegium* . . . *M. de Vogüe*, 398, and below, note 194. A description of the superiority of many animals over man in moral and physical respects is contained in part 15 of *Ben ha-Melck*. On the ant comp. *DR* 5. 2.

<sup>193</sup> *Tosefta Yoma* 2. 5 and *Babli* 38a, as well as *ShR* 17. 1, where this idea, derived from the Bible (*Is.* 43. 7 and *Prov.* 16. 4), is fully developed. The creation is the revelation of God's majesty and splendor in nature; comp. vol. I, p. 3, and note 2 on vol. I, p. 49.

<sup>194</sup> *Perek (Pirke) Shirah*. On the oldest source where this small treatise is made use of and on its history, comp. Steinschneider, *Hebräische Bibliographie*, XIII, 103, 106, and Zunz, *Magazin*, XVIII, 301-302. It is questionable whether, as Steinschneider maintains, this treatise was influenced by the fable of the contest of animals which plays an important role in the writings of the Pure Brethren.

The conception that the animals and all created things chant praise to God is genuinely Jewish, and is not only poetically expressed in the Bible (Ps. 65. 14, etc. ), but occurs quite frequently in talmudic and midrashic literature, where the "singing" and praise of the animals and trees are spoken of; comp. Rosh ha-Shanah 8a; Hullin 54b; 'Abodah Zarah 24b; BR 13. 2; Tehillim 104, 442-443 (read אִין עֹמֵר אִינִי 'ורע' are an explanatory gloss), and 148, 538. That animals chant praise seems quite natural in legends, since they originally spoke in human language (comp. vol. I, p. 71), and after the fall of man they were still in possession of languages which many a wise man understood; Gittin 45a. Comp. also vol. IV, p. 138, *seq.* The language of trees was understood not only by R. Johanan b. Zaccai (Sukkah 28a; Baba Batra 184a; Soferim 16. 9), but also by the Gaon R. Abraham; comp. 'Aruk, s. v. חן 1, and the parallels cited by Kohut, as well as *Toratan shel Rishonim* I, 63. If we further find that in Perek Shirah inanimate objects also praise God, we have to bear in mind that Hippolytus, *Haeres.*, 9, 25 explicitly states (comp. also 5, 2, where the same assertion is made concerning the gnostic sect of the Naasenians) that according to the Jewish view, "all things in creation are endowed with sensation, and that there is nothing inanimate". In mystic literature the angels of animals, trees, rivers, etc., praise God; comp. Seder Rabba di-Bereshit 7-8; Tosafot on 'Abodah Zarah 17a (bottom); Hullin 7a (bottom). Comp. notes 102, 105, 112, and Grünbaum, *Gesammelte Aufsätze*, 340. The Christian legend knows not only of talking animals, trees, or other inanimate objects like ships, water, pictures, etc. (comp. Günter, *Christliche Legende.* s. v. "Redend"; Acts of Xantippe, 30; Narrative of Zosimus II), but is also familiar with the chants of praises of all things, which are divided into twelve classes, and utter their praise in turn one hour every day. Comp. the Testament of Adam, and the literature appertaining to it, cited by Bezold, *Das Arabisch-Aethiopische Testamentum Adami in Orientalische Studien*, 893-912, and James, *The Lost Apocrypha* 2-4. 2 Enoch 2. 5 is a reminiscence of Ps. 150. 6, while the Testament of Abraham 3 speaks of the human language of the trees; comp. Hagigah 14b.—In connection with the praises enumerated in Perek Shirah the following is to be noted: On the earth comp. Sanhedrin 37b and 94a ("the prince of the earth", alluded to in this passage, refers to the angel of the earth; comp. note 75); on the sea and the water comp. note 53; concerning the trees see Hagigah 14b. God's visit paid to the pious in paradise,

with which the song of the cock is to be connected, is frequently mentioned in later Midrashim, especially in the mystic literature; comp. Midrash Shir 42a; midrashic quotation in the anonymous commentary on Song of Songs, published in *Steinschneider-Festschrift*, Hebrew section, 55-56, where the song of praise of the trees in paradise is brought in connection with God's visit; Seder Gan 'Eden 132-133; Zohar I, 10b, 40b, 72a, 77a-77b, 82b, 92a, 92b, 178b, 218b; II, 46a, 57a, 173b, 175b, 196a; III, 22a, 22b, 23a, 52b, 193a; Zohar Hadash Bereshit 3, 17b. On the cock as the herald of light, and the one who admonishes man not to forget to chant praise to God, comp. the Greek Apocalypse of Baruch 7, and for further details, see Grünbaum, *Gesammelte Aufsätze*, 77, seq., and Ginzberg in *Jewish Encyclopedia*, s. v. "Cock", and note 39. As to the song of praise of the vulture, comp. Hullin 63a. Concerning the song of the mouse, comp. note 171. On the hymn of the frog see vol. IV, pp. 101-102, and Löw *Lurchnamen* 7 in *Florilegium* in honor of M. de Vogüé, 398. In connection with the Hebrew name of the first letter of the alphabet, God is made to say: "I open the tongue and mouth of all men (אָלף = אפתח לשון פה), so that they shall praise Me daily and recognize Me as King over the four corners of the earth. Were it not for the daily hymns and songs of praise, I should not have created the world." The heavens, the earth, the rivers, the brooks, the mountains, and the hills, in brief, the entire order of creation, chant hymns to the Creator. Adam too intoned a hymn to the Lord saying, (comp. vol. I, 83-85): "It is a good thing to give thanks to the Lord, and to sing praise to His name." With these words he referred to the songs of praise intoned by the celestials and terrestrials; Alphabet R. Akiba 12-13.

## II. ADAM (pp. 49–101)

<sup>1</sup> Abot 5. 1; ARN 31, 90 (second version 36, 90); Rosh ha-Shanah 32a; BR 17. 1; PR 21, 108 (whence Mahzor Vitry 535); PRE 3; Lekah, Gen. 1. 5; Tikkune Zohar 70; the commentators of the Mishnah quoted by Schechter on 2 ARN. The number 10 (on the significance of this number comp. Lekah, *loc. cit.*; Tehillim 5, 19; Ma'aseh Torah 10) is computed in various ways. In Gen. 1. 3–29 the expression “and God said” occurs only nine times, but the prevalent view is that the very first beginning of creation likewise resulted from God’s utterance (on the doctrine of *creatio ex nihilo* comp. Excursus I), so that there were ten utterances corresponding to the ten acts of creation. The Gnostic Manicismus also speaks of the ten creations; comp. Hippolytus, *Haeres.*, 8. 7. The expression “God’s word is an act” occurs frequently in Jewish and Christian writings; comp. BR 44. 22; Tehillim 107, 461–462; Enoch 14. 17; 2 Enoch 33.4; Philo, *Sacrif. Caimi*, 18. Comp. further Apocalypse of Baruch 14. 17; 4 Ezra 6. 38; Heb. 11. 3; 2 Peter 3. 5; Clemens Alexandrinus, *Horatio*, 4.

<sup>2</sup> Tosefta Sanhedrin 8. 7–8; Babli 38a; Yerushalmi 4 (end). Comp. note 8.

<sup>3</sup> Alphabet of R. Akiba 59, whence Rashi borrowed his remark on Gen. 1. 27. This assertion is found much more frequently in Christian sources; comp. Theophilus Ant., *Ad Autol.*, II, 18; Aphraates, 240; Clementine *Homilies*, II, 52; III, 20; IV, 34 (the last passage is a quotation from Is. 41. 20); Athenagoras, *Legat.*, 33; Irenaeus, *Haer.*, 5. 5, 1, and 2. 58 (the hands of God = the Holy Ghost and the Son); Apocalypse of Ezra (beginning); Tertullian, *De Resurrectione*, 5; *Adversus Marcionem*, 2; ps.-Tertullian, on Gen. 35–40; Origen, *Contra Celsum*, 4, 37 (the biblical passages referring to this subject, as Job 10. 8 and Ps. 119. 73, are not to be taken literally, but have a hidden meaning); Clemens Alexandrinus, *Instructor*, 1, 3; Emerson, *Legends of Cain* (*Publications of Modern Languages Association of America*, XXI, 41) shows the continuance of this conception in Christian literature of the latter part of the Middle Ages. Comp. further Ginzberg, *Hag-*

*gada bei den Kirchenv.*, 21-22, and 29, note 2. On the occurrence of this legend in pseudepigraphic literature comp. 4 Ezra 4. 14, and the Armenian version of the Book of Adam in Preuschen's *Adamschriften*, 29, and 2 Enoch 44. 1. In the following passages of the older literature the expression "the right, the left hand, one, and both hands of God" must not be taken literally; they only describe the relative importance of creations. God created the world with one hand, the temple with both hands (Mekilta Shirah 10, 44a; Mekilta RS. 70); He created the heavenly beings with His right hand, and the terrestrial with His left (Menahot 36b; Sifre D., 35; Midrash Tannaim 28; Mekilta Pasha 17, 21a; Wa-Yosha' 49; see further vol. IV, p. 426). He created the whole world with one hand, man and the temple with both (ARN 1, 8; Ketubot 5a; comp. further PRE 7, beginning; Ma'amar 'Aseret Melakim 54; Mekilta Bahodesh 6, 69b; Alphabet of R. Akiba 24-25; Seder Rabba di-Bereshit 1, bottom, and 4, bottom; note 12 on vol. I, p. 8, the sources with reference to the letters by means of which God created the world). The statement which emphasizes the fact that man is the creation of God's hands is probably directed against the doctrine of Philo and the Gnostics who maintain that Adam was partly or wholly created by the angels; comp. note 14. It is noteworthy that Philo, *De Somn.*, 1, 36, emphatically asserts that "man was not made by hand, but is the work of invisible nature."

<sup>4</sup> ARN 31, 91-92, where parallels are drawn between man and the world. The comparison between man and the world in both directions, man as microcosmos and the world as macroanthropos, is a favorite subject of the Haggadah; comp., e. g., Aggadat 'Olam Katan 57-59; Pesikta Hadta 36; Alphabet of R. Akiba 13; Tan. B. II, 34; Abkir in Yalkut I, 148 and 743; Koheleth and Koheleth Z. 1. 4 (this is the source of Yalkut I, 186; the reference to Tan. in the editions is erroneous); PR 203a; Targum and Midrash in Eccl. 9. 4 and 12. 2, *seq.* Of special interest are, in later literature, the parallels elaborately drawn between man and the world; see *Orehot Zaddikim* 28 (towards the end), and *Shebet Musar* I. Since the conception of the microcosmos (Hebrew עולם קטן) occurs for the first time in Tan. Pekude 3) was already known to the Babylonians (see Winckler, *Babylonische Cultur*, 33), there is no necessity to trace the haggadic conception of the microcosmos to the corresponding philosophical doctrine of the Greeks. Dependent upon the latter are Philo (*De M. Opif.*, 28; *De Plant. Noe*, 19; *Moses*, 3. 14) and the statement bearing upon this subject found in the medieval philosophical literature of the



Jews (comp. *Jewish Encyclopedia*, s. v. "Microcosmos", and Malter, *Personification of Soul and Body*, J.Q.R., N.S., II, 453, *seq.*). The doctrine of the later Kabbalah concerning the Adam Kadmon (comp. Ginzberg, *Jewish Encyclopedia*, I, 183) partly coincides with the philosophical and partly with the haggadic conception of man as microcosmos. It is questionable whether 4 Ezra 4. 10 knows of man as microcosmos; but one may ascribe the acquaintance with this view to 2 Enoch 30. 8.

<sup>5</sup> Derek Erez Z. (end). Comp. the sources in the preceding note and Rashi on Bekorot 16a.

<sup>6</sup> BR 7. 11, 12. 8, 14. 3; Hagigah 16a (on the text of the talmudic passage comp. Lekah, Gen. 1. 20, according to which angels resemble man with respect to the fact that they are endowed with speech, but not in the use of the Hebrew language, as our texts of the Talmud read; comp. note 58); ARN 37, 109; Shemuel 2, 48; PR 43, 179b; Aggadat Bereshit 52, 106; Baraita of 32 Middot, No 16; Ma'aseh Torah 98; Sifre D., 306, 132b (וּכְךָ הָיָה ר' דִּימָא); Midrash Tannaim 185-186; Midrash R. Akiba 31; EZ 3, 176. Comp. Schechter on ARN, *loc. cit.*, and Yalkut II, 831 (end). Man, according to Philo too, is a "creature" on the boundary-line of the mortal and the immortal; comp. *De Fortitud.*, 3; *De M. Opif.*, 46 and 24. In Lactantius, *Institutiones*, 2. 13, the conception of man as a creature combining the heavenly and earthly elements is brought into relation with the view that he is considered as microcosmos (comp. note 4). This Church Father, in several passages, calls attention (7. 5, 9; 2. 13) to the fact "that animals look downward because they are earthly; man looks upward because he is of heavenly origin." This statement is found not only in Lactantius, but also in Philo, *Noe*, 2. 4, and *Quod Deterius Potiori Insidiari Soleat*, 29. A midrashic passage quoted by many medieval authors (*Sefer Mizvot Gadol*, Introduction to the positive precepts; *Sefer Mizvot Katan*, No. 53; Hasidim 478), and found also in a manuscript of Tan. (Introduction 152 and 154), reads as follows: Neither the angels nor the animals satisfied God; the former have no evil inclination (this view is based on BR 48. 11), the latter have no good inclination. The good of the one and the evil of the other, therefore, are not the result of their free will. God therefore created man who possesses both the good and evil inclinations; if he follows evil, he is likened to an animal; if he follows good, he is higher than an angel (comp. BR 14. 3-4 and the parallel passages). A similar view on the nature of man is expressed by the

Church Fathers; comp. Theophilus, 2, 27, and especially Tertullian, *Adversus Marcionem*, 2, 8, who finds, in agreement with R. Akiba in BR 21. 5, the superiority of man to the angels in his free will. Here and there one meets with the view that man was created in the image and likeness of the angels, not in that of God; comp. BR, *loc. cit.*, and ShR 30. 16. This is most likely directed against the Christians, who interpret Gen. 1. 27 and 5. 1 christologically; comp. Tertullian, *Adversus Marcionem*, 2. 5; *De Resurrectione*, 6; *Adversus Praxean*, 12. There are numerous other explanations of these verses in Genesis; comp. BR 8. 9, and the parallel passages cited by Theodor; see further Abot 3. 21 (on this statement of R. Akiba comp. Ginzberg, *Jewish Encyclopedia*, s. v. "Adam Kadmon" and "Akiba", as well as Geiger, *Kebuzzat Ma'amarim*, Poznanski's edition, 101-105, and Ginzberg's notes, 396); *Peletat Soferim*, 3-4; Tan. Introduction 154 (read כְּמוֹ שֶׁכִּתְּבוּהוּ); Lekah, Gen. 1. 27; *Guide of the Perplexed*, I, 1. The conception that man was created in the image of the angels is perhaps related to the statement made in Jub. 15. 27, according to which certain classes of angels were created "circumcised"; comp. Tikkunim 47. The view expressed in the last-named passage, as well as in other kabbalistic sources, that only the Jew who observes the law resembles the image of God or of the angels, finds its counterpart among the Church Fathers with respect to Christians; comp. Clemens Alexandrinus, *Protrepticus* (end); Clementine *Homilies*, 11. 4; 16. 19; 17. 7; Origen, *De Princ.*, III, 6. 1; *Contra Celsum*, 7, 63 (where a rationalistic attitude is adopted). On the question whether animals possess an evil inclination, comp. 2 ARN 34, 74; BR 14. 4; Berakot 60a.

<sup>7</sup> Yalkut Reubeni on Gen. 1. 26 (the source is given as Midrash, but it must be a later one). The older sources (BR 12. 8; WR 9. 9; Tan. B. I, 11; MHG I, 51; Zohar III, 219b, which gives a somewhat mystic interpretation) remark: All things came to being alternately out of heaven and earth, both of which had been created on the first day. Accordingly the firmament, the creation of the second day, sprang up from heaven; the plants on the third day from the earth; the lights on the fourth day emanated from heaven; the animals on the fifth day arose from the earth. When God was about to create man, He said: "If I create man of the earth, the terrestrial creations will be numerically more than the celestial ones; if I create him of heaven, the result will be the reverse." Hence He created man's soul of heaven and his body of earth. Thus was harmony established between heaven and earth.

<sup>8</sup> The view occurring frequently in rabbinic and pseudepigraphic literature that the world was created for the sake of Israel (BR 1. 4, and the parallels cited by Theodor; see further Batte Midrashot I, 44; Shir 2. 2 and 7. 3; Tan. B. IV, 5; Tehillim 109, 465; Makiri on Ps. 47, 262; 4 Ezra 6. 55; Apocalypse of Baruch 14. 17; Assumption of Moses 1. 12; comp. further vol. IV, pp. 399, 407, 415, 424, as well as the numerous sources cited by Weber, *Palästinensische Theologie*), does not owe its origin to national pride, but is closely connected with the ethical conception of creation. Man was the purpose of creation, and just as "the host will not invite his guest to the feast, until everything has been prepared...; even so thought and did the Guide of all things...When He wished to invite man to the feast, He prepared the necessary good things" (Philo, *De M. Opif.*, 25; comp. further *De Sacrificiis Abelis*, 3; *De Decalogo*, 10). Practically the same words are used by the Rabbis, Sanhedrin Tosefta 8. 7-9; Babli 38a; Yerushalmi 4 (end). See also Kiddushin 4. 14. Of course, it is not every man that can claim to be the "crown of creation". "He who observes the law...and obeys God...outweighs the whole world", observe Philo (*De Decalogo*, 10) and the Rabbis, Sanhedrin 103b. It is not the average man but, to use a modern expression, the "superman" who was the goal of creation. Hence the Rabbis remark that the world was created for the sake of Abraham, Moses, David, the Messiah; BR 1. 7; 12. 2 and 9; Sanhedrin 98b; Hullin 89a. To be sure, every man is given the opportunity to attain to the highest ideal. It is therefore asserted that "every Jew, that every man may outweigh the whole world"; comp. Sanhedrin 4. 5; ARN 30, 90-91 (מִשְׂרָאֵל has been added by the editor without good authority); second version 36, 90. The means whereby man may attain the goal of his task was given in God's revelation, in the Torah. Hence the frequent statement that it is the Torah for whose sake the world was created; comp. Index, s. v. "Torah". See further Assumption of Moses 1. 12, where *legem* should perhaps be read instead of *plebem*. Nahmanides, in his *Derashah*, 1-4, with his deep insight recognized the relationship that exists between the rabbinic statement concerning man as the purpose of creation and the assertion of the Rabbis regarding Israel and the Torah as necessary conditions for the existence of the world. His polemic against Ibn Ezra (Gen .1.1) and Maimonides (*Guide of the Perplexed*, III, 13), who deny that man is the purpose of creation, is justified from the talmudic point of view. The fundamental idea that man is the crown of creation,

and that the Torah was revealed to Israel as the only means whereby man can perform the task assigned to him, is found in the Bible (comp. especially Jer. 31. 35 and 33. 25-26; Ps. 8. 6-7; Is. 42. 5-6). The Church accepted this view, without any modifications, substituting only the word "Christian" for "Jew". "The Christian is of greater importance than the whole world", observes Cyprian (*Epistola ad Donatum*, 1. 14), and Justin Martyr, 2 *Apologia*, 7, speaks of "Christians who knew that they were the cause of the preservation of nature". This statement, with variations, is likewise found in the letter *Ad Diogenem*, 7 (towards the end), ascribed to that Church Father. Comp. further his *Apologia*, 1. 45, as well as Aristides, *Apologia*, 26, 1. 17 (Syriac text). The attacks on Jewish arrogance and exclusiveness, in modern theological literature, on account of this belief, are practically identical with those against which Origen had to defend the Christians. Similar charges were brought by the pagan Celsus against the Christians, and Origen refuted them in his *Contra Celsum*, 4. 27-31 (he quotes the following from Euripides: The sun and the moon are slaves of mortal men), and particularly 74-79. Comp. also note 6, which contains quotations from patristic literature on the view that the Christian alone was made in the image of God. On the view that the world was created for the sake of man, see also Justin, *Apologia*, 1. 10; *Dialogue*, 10; Aristides, *Apologia* (bottom). See also Lactantius, *Institutiones*, 2. 11 and 8. 5; Tertullian, *Adversus Marcionem*, 2. 3 and 4. Comp. also, Ginzberg, *Haggada bei den Kirchenv.*, 9-10. The following characteristic remark of the Talmud (Berakot 61b) may be quoted here: The world was created only for the very pious or for the very wicked, for men like R. Hanina b. Dosa (a saint who flourished during the first century C. E.); or for men like Ahab; this world was created for the latter, the other for the former.

<sup>9</sup> BR 5. 5 (the reading יוֹרֵן '7 is also in Mekilta RS, 53); Aguddat Aggadot 21-22; Midrash Jonah 102-103; Zohar II, 198b. The view that miracles are primordial creations was later developed by Maimonides, *Guide of the Perplexed*, II, 29, in whose theology it plays an important part. The following sources have this remark on miracles: God already performed in this world, through the prophets, a part of the miracles which are to take place in the world to come: PK 9, 76a; WR 27. 4; Tan. B. III, 90, and IV, 4; Tan. Emor 9; Koheleth 3. 15. Comp. also Tan. Introduction 153.

<sup>10</sup> Abkir in Yalkut I, 17; Midrash Shir 8; Tan. Pekude 2; 2

Ben Sira 32b; Pesikta Hadta 38; Aguddat Aggadot 8; comp. Horowitz, *ad loc.* See further vol. III, p. 151; vol. IV, p. 399. On the idea that God consulted the angels, comp. note 12, and note 3, on vol. 1, p. 3.

<sup>11</sup> Shabbat 88a; DR 8. 5; Ruth R. (beginning); Koheleth 1. 4. Comp. note 8, and note 202 on vol. III, p. 92.

<sup>12</sup> BR 8. 3-9; Tan. Introduction 154; Tehillim 1, 23; PR 40, 166b; comp. further Yerushalmi Berakot 9, 12d; Sanhedrin 38b; DR 2. 13, and parallels cited by Theodor on BR 8. 9. The opposition of the angels to the creation of man is already mentioned in tannaitic sources (comp. Tosefta Sotah 6. 5), and is frequently alluded to in talmudic-midrashic literature; comp. PK 4, 34a; PR 14, 59b; Tan. B. IV, 110; Tan. Wa-Yera 18 and Hukkat 6; BaR 19. 3; Koheleth 7. 23; Tehillim 8, 73; 2 Ben Sira 32a; see also the following note. This legend emphasizes the Jewish view as opposed to the Philo-Gnostic opinion, according to which man was, wholly or partly, created by the lower powers, not by God Himself; comp. Philo, *De M. Opif.*, 24; *De Confusione Linguarum*, 35; *De Profug.*, 14. For the Gnostic doctrine see Hippolytus, 7. 16 and 20; Tertullian, *De Resurrectione*, 5, and *De Anima*, 23. In opposition to this view, that man was, wholly or partly, created by the evil or lower powers, the Jewish legend lays stress upon the fact that the angels had nothing to do with man's creation, which they tried rather to prevent. A vague reminiscence of the Gnostic doctrine is the statement found in later sources (*Hadar*, Gen. 1. 27) that, when the angels noticed their superiority to the animal world, they became very proud; hence God commanded them to make a man, in order to humiliate them by their inability to carry out His command. Just as Philo, in the passage cited above, found this theory concerning the angels co-operating in the creation of man confirmed in the words of Scripture: "Let us make" (Gen., *loc. cit.*), so the Christians believed that these words indicated the co-operation of the Logos. It is a moot question in Jewish, as well as in Christian literature, as to how the plural of *אשר* is to be understood. BR, *loc. cit.*, cites not less than six different explanations of this strange plural (some explain it there as a *pluralis majestatis*), whereas most of the Church Fathers take it Christologically; comp. Irenaeus, 2. 5; Justin Martyr, *Dialogue*, 62 (refutes the Jewish view that God consulted the angels); Theophilus, *Ad Autol.*, 2. 18; Theodoretus, Gen. 1. 27; Basilius, *Hexaemeron*, Hom. 9. 6; Christian Sibylline Oracles, 8, 544. On the assertion of the Midrashim that God, though

not in need of any service, took counsel with the angels, in order that He might serve as an example to man to ask the advice of his fellow-men, comp. Philo, *De Confusione Linguarum*, 27. See further Ginzberg, *Haggada bei den Kirchenv.*, I, 19-21, as well as Goldfahn, *Justin Martyr und die Agada*, 24-25. The angels whom God consulted were the Seraphim, God's advisers, according to some; Mercy and Justice, according to others; see Sode Raza and Sefer ha-Tagin in Yalkut Reubeni, Gen. 1. 27; comp. note 6, on vol. I, p. 4. The statement that when a man commits a sin the angels accuse him (quoted from Tan. or Yelammedenu in Makiri on Prov. 3. 18) is probably related to the view that from the very beginning the angels were not favorably inclined towards man. The view that man's own good and evil deeds are his heavenly defenders and accusers, respectively, occurs already in a tannaitic statement (Shabbat 32a). Comp. the following note and note 20.

<sup>13</sup> Konen 26-27, and Yerahmeel 14-15 (read Boel instead of Labiel), parts of which only go back to Sanhedrin 38b. Comp. also vol. III, p. 110, and further 2 Ben Sira 32a concerning the terrible punishment God inflicted on the revolting angels. According to Sode Raza in Yalkut Reubeni, Gen. 1. 27, these angels were thrown down from heaven on earth, where Adam met them later. It is noteworthy that in Konen the heads of the heavenly hierarchy are not four or seven (comp. note 440 on vol. III, pp. 231-32, and note 64 on vol. I, 16), but three. This corresponds to the threefold division of the cosmos, already found among the Babylonians, into heaven, earth and water. Michael is therefore said to consist of fire, the heavenly element; Gabriel of snow, the primordial substance of which the earth was made (comp. note 18 on vol. I, 8). According to others, Michael is of snow, and Gabriel of fire; comp. Targum Job 25. 2; the numerous references by Buber on PK 1, 3a, and note 63 on vol. I, p. 16, as well as the Christian pseudepigraphic *History of Joseph the Carpenter*, 22, which reads: Michael the prince of the angels (the same title is also found in 13, whereas in 6 Gabriel bears this title; comp. BR 78. 1; Shir 3. 6 and BaR 11. 3, where the phrase is used: Michael and Gabriel, the princes of the angels; see Dan. 12. 1), and Gabriel the herald of light. The element out of which the third archangel was made, we may well assume, is the water beneath the earth, the streams of Belial of the Bible = the waters of death. Comp. also notes 23 and 187 on vol. I, pp. 10, 40-41, respectively. Since in Babylonian mythology Nergal, the god of the nether-world, has the form of a lion (comp. Jeremias in

Roscher's *Lexicon der Mythologie*, III, 250), לביאל may be taken to stand for לבי "lion" and אל "god", and its transliteration should accordingly be Lebiel. Most likely the name Raphael had originally nothing to do with רפא "he healed", but was derived from רפאים "shades". In Enoch 22. 1-6 this angel clearly appears as the prince of Hades. In 20. 2-3 the original text probably read: ועל השאול רפאל הממונה "And over the Tartarus, Raphael who is in charge of the departed souls". But the translator took ועל השאול to belong to the preceding sentence. The identification of Lebiel with Raphael in Konen is therefore a learned explanation of an old tradition. It is not certain whether Raphael, as the angel of healing, owes his calling to the false explanation of his name (as "healer" we find him in Tobit and frequently in Jewish and Christian literature; comp., e. g., Baba Mezi'a 86b; Origen, *De Princ.*, I, 8. 1), for the development of the "prince of the nether-world" into the "healer" is quite conceivable. Similar developments may be found in many mythological systems.—On the function of the three archangels, it may be observed that Origen, *loc. cit.*, considers Michael as the angel of prayer, who brings man's prayers before God, and Gabriel as the angel of war. The latter is also the view of the Rabbis, as may be seen from the statement that Gabriel was the one who annihilated Sennacherib's camp, destroyed Sodom, and set fire to the temple at Jerusalem (comp. Index, s. v. "Gabriel"), and is therefore called the severe angel, in contrast to Michael, "the angel of mercy"; comp. Ekah 2, 98. The angel of prayer, according to the Rabbis, is Sandalfon (comp. note 139 on vol. I, p. 29, and Index, s. v.), but the Greek Apocalypse of Baruch 11 seems to agree with Origen. In the Christian pseudepigraphic work the *Passing of Mary*, 8, Michael appears as the prince of paradise, which is to be compared with the function of this angel as high priest in the heavenly temple (comp. Index, s. v.), which is only another expression for paradise. Although in Jewish angelology Michael is superior to Gabriel, so that he alone bears the title "prince" (*Hagigah*, *loc. cit.*, and *Hullin* 40a; comp. further the Jewish tradition given by Jerome on Dan. 8. 10), one must not fail to note that at least among the Babylonian Jews Gabriel's prestige almost equals that of his rival Michael. Comp. Kohut, *Angelologie*, 24-33, whose views require a thorough revision. Comp. also note 8 on vol. I, p. 5.

<sup>14</sup> Yerahmeel 15. For a similar statement among the Arabs, comp. Grünbaum, *Neue Beiträge*, 61-62. According to Konen 27., it was Michael, not Gabriel, who brought the dust for Adam's body.

The rivalry between these two angels is often met with throughout Jewish literature; comp. the preceding note and note 8 on vol. I, p. 5.

<sup>15</sup> PRE 11; Tan. Pekude 3 (end); Targum Yerushalmi, Gen. 2. 7; Yerahmeel 15-16; Sanhedrin 38a-38b. Comp. further Philo, *De M. Opif.*, 51, which reads: But in the foundation of the body he is like the whole world, since he is made out of the combination of the same elements as the world, *i. e.*, out of earth, water, air, and fire, in which each element contributed its part towards the completion of the composition of material sufficient for this purpose... to form this visible image. This view of the Greek philosophers that the human body consists of the four elements is mentioned by Philo also, *De Decalogo*, 8; but in *De Somn.*, 1. 3, he is in agreement with the Jewish sources (comp. Targum Yerushalmi, *loc. cit.*; MHG I, 73, goes back to a very late source, which is acquainted with the philosophical doctrine of the four elements), and states that Adam's body was formed out of earth and water. 2 Enoch 30. 8 knows of seven substances which were employed in the composition of the human body; comp. Charles, *ad. loc.*, as well ARN 31, 91-92, with reference to the correspondence between the parts of the human body and those of the earth. The etymology of the name Adam found in the Sibylline Books III, 24-26, and elsewhere in Christian literature (comp. Schürer, *Geschichte*, III, 290): Ἀνατολή "east", Δύσις "west", Ἄρκτος "north", and Μεσημβρία "south", goes back to 2 Enoch 30. 13. The rabbinic sources (Sotah 5a; comp. further PRE 12) explain אָדָם "Adam" as אֶפֶר "dust", דָּם "blood", and מָרָה "gall". Josephus, *Antiqui.*, I, 1. 2, reads: He was called Adam... which signifies one who is red (אָדָם), because he was formed out of red earth... of that which is virgin soil (קָרָקַע בְּתוּלָה in mishnic Hebrew) and real earth. Concerning this passage comp. Löw, *Zeitschrift für neut. Wissenschaft*, XI, 167. A Christological explanation of the virgin soil is found in the *Martyrdom of Bartholomew*. Just as the first Adam was created out of a virgin, so was the second. The old mythological conception of "mother-earth" has also left its traces in the Jewish legends; comp. 4 Ezra 5. 28, and the legend concerning the "pregnancy of the earth with Adam" in Aguddat Aggadot 77; comp. also Ecclu. 40. 1. In connection with the view that the dust for the human body was taken out of the whole earth, Sanhedrin 38a-38b reads: The soil of Palestine furnished the material for Adam's head; that of Babylon for his trunk; that of Akra de-Agma (a town in Babylon, notorious on account of the loose morals of its inhabitants) for his privates; that of all other countries



for his extremities. Parallels to this legend in later Christian and Arabic writings are cited by Grünbaum, *Neue Beiträge*, 55-58 and 62.—On the conception that man's existence is only possible as the result of God's mercy, comp. BR. 8. 4; PR 40, 166b; Tehillim 1, 23, as well as vol. I, pp. 3-5. On the creation of the world by means of God's justice and kindness, comp. further the quotations from Yelammedenu by Sikli, *Talmud Torah* 6. Tertullian, *Adversus Marcionem*, 1. 25-26, and 2. 3, emphasizes, as do the Rabbis, the necessity of these attributes of God for the existence of the world and man. Recanati, Lev. 23. 24, quotes the following from an unknown Midrash: When God betakes Himself to His seat of judgment to judge the world, Mercy on His right and Justice on His left strive with one another. Justice says: "Judge the world with exact justice, and requite the sinners according to their actions"; but Mercy rejoins: "If Thou, O Lord, heedest sins, who shall be able to exist?" (Ps. 130. 3). Justice then says: "The wicked shall die because of his sins" (Ezek., 23.8). Whereupon Mercy replies: "I ask not the death of the wicked" (Ezek. 18. 32 and 23. 11; the citations are not literal). Justice says: "All this takes place because of the sins of Jacob" (Micah 1. 5). But Mercy replies: "Not now shall Jacob be ashamed" (Is. 29. 22). "Then will I also do this unto you" (Lev. 26. 16), says Justice. "For my own sake will I do it" (Is. 48. 11), replies Mercy. "Since yesterday is the conflagration (i. e. hell) made ready" (Is. 30. 33), says Justice, and Mercy replies: "Before the mountains were created . . . and Thou sayest: Return, ye children of men" (Ps. 90. 2-3). Justice says: "Therefore hath the deep (i. e. hell) enlarged her desire" (Is. 5. 14), and Mercy replies: "A tree of life is she (wisdom) to those that lay hold on her" (Prov. 3. 18). "I will no longer have any mercy" (Hos. 1. 6), says Justice, and mercy replies: "For the Lord will have mercy on Jacob" (Is. 14. 1). Justice says: "And some to disgrace and everlasting abhorrence" (Dan. 12. 2), and Mercy replies: "And these to everlasting life" (*ibid.*).

<sup>16</sup> Yerushalmi Nazir 7, 56b; BR 14. 8, PRE 11, 12, and 20; Tehillim 92, 405; EZ 2, 173. In later Midrashim two different legends have been united, and it is asserted that the dust taken from the various parts of the earth, out of which Adam's body was formed (comp. the preceding note) was kneaded at the holy place in Jerusalem. The older sources (Nazir and BR, *loc. cit.*), as well as Philo, *De M. Opif.*, 47 (he took the best of the whole earth), do not know of this combination. Comp. note 137.

<sup>17</sup> BR 8. 1 (on the text comp. Sikli, *Talmud Torah*, 11, where, however, מִן is to be read for נִשְׁמָה); WR 14. 1; Tan. B. III, 32; Tan. Tazria' 1; Tehillim 139, 529. Comp. also Sanhedrin 38a. In the sources just quoted, as well as elsewhere (comp. Excursus I) "the spirit of God", which in the beginning of creation moved on the surface of the waters, was afterwards identified with the spirit (=soul) of the Messiah. This was probably occasioned by an anti-Christian tendency (Origen, *De Princ.*, I, 3.3, Ephraim I, 8 B, Theodoretus, *ad loc.*, as well as many other Church Fathers identify the spirit of God in Gen. 1. 2 with the Holy Ghost). The Talmud, Hagigah 12a, however, explains the word רוּחַ in this passage as "wind". Comp. Ginzberg, *Haggada bei den Kirchenv.*, 14-15, and note 14 on vol. I, p. 8.

<sup>18</sup> BR 14. 9; comp. further WR 32. 2; DR 2. 37. The philosophers found here the doctrine of the various powers of the soul, but there is no doubt that this Haggadah, in its original form, wishes to express the view of polypsychism, which was prevalent in ancient times; comp. Toy, *Introduction to the History of Religion*, 20. These five souls are, according to the Midrash, blood, wind, breath, the principle of life (immortal soul?), and the individual soul. One of these souls leaves the body at the time of sleep (on this "dream-soul" comp. Toy, *ibid.*, 2, and further Tertullian, *De Anima*, 43, who opposes this popular conception of the Christians of his time); see BR, *loc. cit.*, and 78. 1; WR, *loc. cit.*, and 4. 8; DZ 5; Berakot 60b (in a prayer still found in the liturgy); PR 8, 29a, and 31, 143a; Koheleth 10. 20; Ekah 3, 132; Tehillim 11, 102 (here dreams are explained as the result of the wanderings of the soul during the time the body is asleep), and 25, 210; ER 2, 8; EZ 15, 199; Tan. Mishpatim 16; Alphabetot 114-116; Al-Barceloni, 181 (Kaufmann's remark, 342, is accordingly to be corrected); Zohar I, 53b, 121a, 122a, 169b, 183a, 200a and (probably based on Tehillim 11. 102) III, 119a, as well as 234b; Mahzor Vitry 78; Pardes 55a; *Orehot Hayyim* I, 1a; Shibbole ha-Leket, 41. In the last-named non-midrashic sources (comp. Tehillim 57, 307) it is said that the soul, which at the time when the body is asleep is in God's keeping, does not wish to return to man again; but God compels it to do so, saying to it: "I do not wish that man who entrusted his soul to Me when he went to sleep should be disappointed." Comp. Ginzberg, *Haggada bei den Kirchenv.*, 23, whose explanation of BR 14. 9, though accepted by Theodor, *ad loc.*, is erroneous, as may be seen from the passages quoted above concerning the journey of the soul while the

body is asleep. In Tehillim 62, 307 עולה ויורדה signifies "breathing."

<sup>19</sup> Tan. Pekude 3, where the statement occurs that all souls are but part of Adam's soul. Comp. Tan. Ki-Tissa 12; ShR 40. 3. This view which is probably of Christian origin (comp. I Cor. 15. 22, and Rom. 5. 14, as well as Tertullian, *De Anima*, 40), plays a great part in the Kabbalah, which speaks of the sparks of Adam's soul forming the souls of later generations. A different view is given in BR 8. 8, where it is said that God consulted the souls of the pious concerning the creation of man; comp. Excursus I. The abode of the souls of the unborn, according to Hagigah 12b, is the seventh heaven (in this passage the souls are differentiated from the spirits; comp. the preceding note); but according to Tan. Pekude, *loc. cit.*, it is in paradise. Yebamot 62a and parallel passages speak of a  $\eta$ ג where the soul of all future generations are preserved. It also has the additional remark that the Messiah will not come until this  $\eta$ ג is emptied. According to the traditional interpretation,  $\eta$ ג denotes a promtuary (comp. 'Aruk, s. v.). See further 2 Enoch 23. 14; and 58.5 (here an abode of the souls [spirits?] of animals is likewise spoken of); Apocalypse of Baruch 23. 5; 4 Ezra 4. 35. According to another view, this  $\eta$ ג is identical with the "curtain" (פרגוד) before God's throne (frequently mentioned in the Talmud), on which all souls are "painted"; comp. 'Aruk, *loc. cit.*; Zohar II, 96b, and the quotation, from a work of R. Eleazar of Worms (Rokeah), by R. Joseph Jabez, at the end of the latter's work *Ma'amar ha-Ahdut*.

<sup>20</sup> Tan. Pekude 3, and as an independent Midrash entitled *Yezirat ha-Walad* ("creation of the embryo") in *Abkat Rokel*, whence it was republished by Jellinek in BHM I, 153-155. The latter scholar added a second midrashic treatise giving more material about the physical nature of man and the "creation of the embryo" from *Likkute ha-Pardes* 4d-5b, which is partly of the same contents as that of the first treatise. *Yerahmeel* 10, 19-23, is identical with Tan., *loc. cit.* As to particulars, note the following. On the angel Lailah ("night") and his functions, comp. *Niddah* 16b; *Sanhedrin* 96a; 'Aseret ha-Dibrot 79; note 98 on Vol. I, p. 232. In *Zohar* II, 11a-11b, it is Gabriel who is in charge of the soul; comp. also *ibid.* 96b. That everything is predestined by God, except man's moral freedom, is also found in *Ke-tubot* 30a; *Apocalypse of Baruch* 54. 15. Comp. the references given by Charles, *ad loc.*, to Josephus and other sources. There is also a statement that a few days before the birth of a male child a heavenly voice announces: That woman is destined to become his wife, that house

or that field will belong to him; comp. Sotah 2a and Mo'ed Katan 18b. On the view that marriages are made in heaven, see further Yerushalmi Bezah 5, 63a (bottom); WR 8. 1; BR 68. 4; PK 2, 11b-12a; Tan. Ki-Tissa 5; Shemuel 5, 62. See also Abrahams, *J.Q.R.* II, 172-177 = *Book of Delight*, 172-183. On the predestination of the intellectual and other traits of man, comp. Yelammedenu in Yalkut II, 916 on Job 28. The differentiation of the sex of the embryo, according to the Kabbalists, is brought by the angel Sandalfon; comp. Yalkut Reubeni, Lev. 12. 2. The refusal of the soul to enter the embryo is already presupposed in Abot 4 (end). The two heavenly companions of the soul are naturally the guardian angels of every individual person, who are frequently alluded to in Jewish, as well as in Christian, literature; comp. Berakot 60b (top); Shabbat 119b; Ta'anit 11a; Tan. Wa-Yeze 3; Matthew 18. 10; *Hermas Pastor*, Visio, V, 6. 2; Clemens Alexandrinus, *Stromata*, 6. 17; Justin Martyr, *Dialogue*, 5, and 2 *Apologia*, 5; Athenagoras, *Legatio*, 10. 20; *Visio Pauli*, 14; *The History of Joseph the Carpenter*, 13. In the Jewish sources (comp. Shabbat and Tan., *loc. cit.*; ER 18, 100; Tehillim 104, 440) the doctrine of the guardian angels appears quite early with a rationalistic explanation. In view of Shabbat *loc. cit.*, Maimonides, *Guide of the Perplexed*, III, 23, is certainly correct in asserting that the ancient Rabbis understood these guardian angels to represent the good and evil inclinations. It is interesting that *Hermas Pastor*, *loc. cit.*, represents practically the same conception. Directly dependent on Maimonides is Zohar, I, 144b, 165b, 191a; II, 41b-42a; III, 106a. Here and there the view is found, both in Jewish and Christian sources, that every man has only one guardian angel; comp. ER, *loc. cit.*, and *Kimha Dabishuna* on the piyyut הַיּוֹמִים אֶחָד (morning prayer of the Day of Atonement); *Visio Pauli*, *loc. cit.* The prevalent opinion, however, is that there are two guardian angels; comp. the sources quoted above, and Eusebius, 689a, as well as vol. I, p. 95. That the angels who accompany man testify before God concerning his acts is found not only in Ta'anit, *loc. cit.*, but also in 2 Enoch 19.5. Here also belong the remarks about the angels who come to God to plead for a man if he is good, and about those who accuse him if his conduct is bad; comp. Tehillim 94, 418; Mishle 11, 70. Hence the statement that man's actions, his limbs and his soul are his witnesses; comp. Ta'anit, *loc. cit.*; 'Aseret ha-Dibrot 79; Sifre D., 307. Midrash Tannaim 187; Tan. B. I, 21: When a man is about to die, God appears (the appearance of God is mentioned also in Sifre N., 103), and says to him: "Write down

all thy deeds, because thou art about to die now." The man then writes everything down, and signs it with his hand. On the last day of judgment, God will produce these books, and a man's actions will be shown to him. Comp. also Shabbat 32a, which reads: A man's good deeds are his *Parakletin* ("defenders") at the heavenly court. To the oldest sources, where guardian angels are mentioned, belongs 2 Maccabees 3. 26; Comp. also note 12.—According to Niddah 30b, the soul of the embryo knows and sees everything, and hence the corresponding statement in 'Aseret ha-Dibrot 79 as well as in the sources cited at the beginning of note. Comp. further Mishle 2, 49; Tan. B. III, 32; WR 14. 8–9. On the relation of this conception to the Platonic doctrine of anamnesia, comp. Güdemann, *Religionsgeschichtliche Studien*, 7, seq., and Joel, *Blicke*, I, 118–119. The kabbalistic treatment of this Platonic doctrine appears in Ziyoni, *Hayye Sarah* (beginning). On the idea that every man has a place in paradise or hell after death, according to his deserts, see Hagigah 15a; 2 Enoch 49; Tehillim 21, 239; Apocalypse of Baruch 23. 4; comp. especially the elaborate amplification of Hagigah, *loc. cit.*, in Hasidim 36. The idea that an angel causes the soul to forget everything, when it enters this world, is derived from Nidah 39a, where it is emphasized that the heavenly hosts adjure the embryo with the following words: "Be pious and not wicked; but when the world regards thee as pious, it shall appear to thee as though thou art wicked. Know that God is pure, His servants are pure, and thy soul is pure. If thou keepest it pure, it is well for thee; otherwise it will be taken away from thee." On the loud weeping of the dying, comp. note 107 on vol. I, p. 26. Zohar I, 98a (Midrash ha-Ne'elam) and 79a, call the moment of death "the great judgment" for the individual, in which the soul acknowledges everything it has done during its life. For this point in the older sources comp. Sifre D., 307; Midrash Tannaim 187; Tan. B. I, 21.—The words of the angel of death are taken almost verbatim from Abot 4 (end). The motive of refusing to die plays an important part in the legends concerning Abraham and Moses (comp. Index, s. v. "Abraham", "Moses"), and is also found in Christian legends; comp. Louise Dudley, *Egyptian Elements in the Legend of the Body and Soul*, 151, seq. The dependence of the Christian on the Jewish legends, and not on the Egyptian, as Dudley assumes, appears quite clearly from the passage of *Visio Pauli* 4, which Dudley, 27, is unable to explain. The angels who took away the soul of the sinner say to him: "As for that from which thou departest, again wilt thou return unto it." This

Christian source quotes almost verbatim from Abot *loc. cit.*, though the words do not fit into the description of death in *Visio Pauli*. Almost all men (comp. Index, s. v. "Death by Kiss") die by the "sword of the angel"; nevertheless the death of the pious is painless, that of the wicked is painful. Comp. the following passages where details concerning this point are given: Berakot 8a; 'Abodah Zarah 20b (here two different views are blended into one: 1) the sword of the angel of death; 2) a drop of venom, bitter as death, from the angel's hand causes death); Tehillim 11, 102-103. In the last passage it is also said that the soul (נשמה) is removed from the body, whereas the spirit (=wind רוח) remains at the tip of the nose after death until the corpse becomes putrefied, whereupon it is removed by the angel Duma into its proper place, paradise or hell. On the various souls which man possesses, comp. note 18. The older sources (Yerushalmi Mo'ed Katan 3, 82b; Tan. Mikkez 4; comp. further Shabbat 152a) maintain that the soul during the first three days hovers about the dead body, in the hope that it will be resurrected, and it leaves it mournfully when putrefaction has set in; comp. John 11, 39, and Bousset, *Religion*, 341, note 1, as well as Zohar III, 53a, and notes 139-140.

<sup>21</sup> BR 14. 7; BaR 12. 8; Shir 3. 11; Hullin 60a (on this talmudic passage comp. Al-Barceloni, 74, and *Responsen der Geonim*, Harkavy's edition, 199); Jerome, I, 902; Ephraim, I, 159; comp. Ginzberg, *Haggada bei den Kirchenv.*, 31-33, with regard to the Christian form of this view, and note 97. The opinion of the superiority and the accomplishment of the first "human pair" is only a special application of the idea that all primordial creations came out fully developed. Comp. Seder 'Olam 4, with reference to the heavenly luminaries, and Sifra 26. 4, with respect to the plant world. Comp. also notes 74 and 100 on vol. I, pp. 19 and 24, respectively. Philo, *De M. Opif.* 13, 47, 51, also speaks of the excellence of primordial creations, particularly that of Adam. To many gnostic systems this legend concerning Adam's spiritual and physical excellence is of great import; comp. *Recognitiones*, I, 47. Shu'aib, Ki-Tissa, 39c, quotes the following from an unknown Midrash: Adam received five crowns: he was king, prophet, high priest, his countenance shone in heavenly splendor, and God revealed the Torah to him.—Since the word Adam in Hebrew means "man", the first man is called אדם הראשון and not infrequently also אדם הקדמון; hence in Aramaic אדם קדמא. Comp. Sifra 5. 17; BaR 10. 2; BR 20. 11 and note 60.

<sup>22</sup> BR 8. 1; 21. 3; 24. 2; Hagigah 12a; PRE 11; ARN 8, 22-23; PR 23, 115a; Tehillim 139, 529; WR 14. 1 and 18. 2; Tan. B. III, 37; Tan. Tazria' 8. Adam's enormously high stature plays an important part in the views of many gnostic sects, according to whom Adam was a gigantic monster without any intelligence, and moved about by creeping. Comp. Irenaeus V, 22. 2; Hippolytus 5. 2 and 8. 16. Allusions to the time when Adam's body was not yet endowed with intellect are found in many other passages of rabbinic literature; comp. Sanhedrin 38b; ARN 1, 5 (second version 8), as well as 8, 22; PK 23, 150b; PR, *loc. cit.*, and 46, 187b; ShR 40. 3; Tan. B. III, 31; Tan. Shemini 8; Tehillim 92, 403. According to Abkir in Yalkut I, 34, and readings of manuscripts of Midrash Ruth (comp. Ginzberg, *Hazofeh*, IV, 35-36), God created, as the very first act of creation, the soulless (אֵלֶּם in all these passages does not mean "lifeless") Adam and then all the other creatures. Accordingly, Adam, though the first creation, did not receive his soul before all other creations had been formed, in order that he should not be considered as God's assistant in creation; comp. note 61 on vol. I, p. 16. Hence man is rightfully regarded as the beginning and the end of creation. 2 ARN 8, 22-23, and Epiphanius, *Haer.*, 1. 4. 4, oppose the view that Adam was God's first creation; comp., however, vol. I, p. 56, with reference to Adam's soul which was created on the first day. Philo, *Quaestiones*, Gen. 2. 56, asserts that the ideal man was created on the sixth day, the physical on the seventh. This does not harmonize with his general view of creation, according to which the former is of a timeless state (comp., *e. g.*, *Legum Alleg.*, 2. 4), and it appears that he tried to fit a Haggadah into his system, but did not succeed. Freudenthal, *Hellenistische Studien*, I, 70, and Weinstein, *Zur Genesis der Agada*, 52, 79, find, in the utterances of the Haggadah concerning Adam's dimensions, which extended over the whole world, an echo of Philo's doctrine of the ideal man, the image of the whole world (*De M. Opif.*, 24, 46, and 51). This assumption is only partly correct. Both the Rabbis and Philo made use, each in his own way, of the old myth, according to which the world is a macroanthropos; comp. note 4. On Adam as a soulless monster among the Arabs, comp. Grünbaum, *Neue Beiträge*, 62, *seq.* See further Dähnhardt, *Natursagen*, I, 242-246.

<sup>23</sup> PRK (Schönblum's edition, 16b; Grünhut's edition, 72; Jelinek's edition, 97); Sotah 10a (does not know of Zerubbabel's wonderful voice, and has Asa, king of Judah, instead of Ashael; comp. on

this point vol. IV, p. 73; on Zedekiah see vol. IV, pp. 293-294); PRE 53 (one of the chosen is Josiah, whose nostrils were wonderful); MHG I, 66; Tan. B. V, 8 (Buber's statement, note 20, is incorrect); Tan. Wa-Ethanan 1; Yalkut on 1 Kings (end); Al-Barceloni, 30; Zohar I, 123b; Duran, *Milhemet Mizwah*, 26. On Zerubbabel comp. note 25 on vol. IV, p. 352; on Adam see Ecclu. 49. 16, which reads: Adam excelled all creatures in splendor.

<sup>24</sup> Baba Batra 58a. On Adam's splendor which eclipsed the sun, comp. PK 4, 36b, 12, 101a; 27, 170a; PR 14, 62a; Koheleth 8. 1; WR 20. 2; Tan. B. III, 57; IV, 114; Tan. Ahare 2; *Adamschriften*, 29; *Apology of Sadrach*, 7 (along with Adam, Eve's beauty and splendor are mentioned). Comp. also on this point notes 69 and 105. The following persons are mentioned as ideals of beauty: Eve, Sarah, Rahab, Abigail, Esther, Abishag (not half as pretty as Sarah, but not inferior to Eve), Michal, and Jael, among the women. The men are: Adam, Jacob, Joseph, Saul, Absalom, R. Ishmael, and R. Ab-bahu. Comp. Baba Batra, *loc. cit.*; Baba Mezi'a 84a; Megillah 15a; PRK (Schönblum's edition, 24a); Sanhedrin 39b; BR 40. 5; Ma'aseh 'Aseret Haruge Malkut 23; Zohar I, 142b; II, 55a; III, 83b; Al-Barceloni, 41 and 45; Philo, *De Abrahamo*, 19. Comp. further on Adam's beauty, notes 104 and 105. On Eve's beauty see the Gnostic view quoted by Irenaeus I, 30, 7. On Sarah's beauty, see note 67 on vol. I, p. 222.

<sup>25</sup> Berakot 10a; WR 4. 8; Tehillim 103, 433 (cited in *Pugio Fidei*, 554, with considerable variations); Tan. Hayye Sarah 3; DR 2. 37; PRE 34; Zohar I, 125a; Philo, *De M. Opif.*, 23. The latter is the intermediary between the Stoics, who speak of the relationship that exists between God and the soul (comp. Diogenes of Babylonia; *Philodem. De Piet.*, Gompertz' edition, 82; Seneca, *Ep.*, 65. 24), and the Haggadah. Comp. Bergmann in *Judaica* (in honor of Hermann Cohen), 151. In the Midrashim mentioned above, as well as elsewhere (comp. BR 14. 9) it is asserted that the soul does not sleep (comp. note 18 on the "dream soul") any more than does God. This conveys the idea of the immortality of the soul, as sleep (so already in the Gilgamesh epos) is the likeness of death; Berakot 57b. Comp. Vol. I, p. 64 (bottom). A doctrine concerning the soul, borrowed from the Stoics, is the one found in Sanhedrin 91b, according to which the soul enters the body at the time of conception. Comp. Bergmann, *loc. cit.*, and vol. I, p. 56. Along with the view that the soul is something exclusively spiritual, found in the



sources cited at the beginning of this note, there is the primitive conception which regards it as a material substance endowed with some form. The latter view has been preserved in some passages, according to which the soul has the form of a bird, and it is perhaps for this reason that the Talmudim and Midrashim often speak of the flight of the soul; comp. Yerushalmi Mo'ed Katan 3, 82b; Yerushalmi Yebamot 15, 15c; Ketubot 62b פרח רחוק "expired"); BR 93. 8 and 100. 7; WR 18. 1. Comp. further the sources referred to by Malter, *J. Q.R.*, N.S., II, 476-478. See also Tehillim 11, 102, where it is said that the soul has the appearance of a חגב בעל כנפים. This is most likely influenced by the Greek conception, and this phrase is to be rendered by "butterfly" (literally, "winged grasshopper"). The assertion found in Tehillim, *loc. cit.*, that the soul is fastened to the spine is probably related to the old view, according to which a part of the spine (comp. note 44 on vol. I, p. 163, and Index, *s. v.* "Luz") is indestructible, and will, in the time of resurrection, furnish the material out of which the human body will be quickened. As has been previously stated, the soul enters the body at the time of conception; but opinions differ as to the time the two inclinations, the good and the evil, enter it. According to some, the evil inclination enters the body at the time of conception; according to others, at the time of the formation of the embryo (*i. e.*, forty days after conception; comp. Berakot 60a; Menahot 99b; note 97); a third view, which is the most prevalent, maintains that it enters the body at the time of birth. But the good inclination does not make its appearance before the completion of the thirteenth year (*i. e.*, at the time of puberty); comp. ARN 17, 63-64 (second version, 36); Sanhedrin 91b; Yerushalmi Berakot 3, 6d; BR 34. 10; Tan. Bereshit 7 (this is the only passage which states that the evil inclination enters the body at the tenth year); MHG I, 108-109; Koheleth 4. 13. Comp. note 14 on vol. I, p. 108.

<sup>26</sup> MHG I, 74. Comp. vol. I, p. 66. Koheleth 2. 12 reads: God took counsel with His court concerning every single limb of man. Comp. further the quotation from a Midrash by Shu'aib, Tazria' 61a, where it is pointed out that the number of the veins of the human body corresponds to the days of the solar year. On this number of the veins, see Targum Yerushalmi Gen. 1. 27. The remark that the wonderful mechanism of the human body shows God's skill as well as His solicitude for man occurs frequently in the Haggadah; comp. Berakot 10a; Niddah 31a; WR 14. 3-4 and 15. 2-3; Tan. B.

III, 33-34, 35-36; IV, 98; Tan. Tazria' 2-3 and 6, as well as Hukkat 1; BaR 18. 22; Tehillim 103, 431-432, 434; Shemuel 5, 59-60; see also parallels cited by Buber, and comp. Mekilta RS, 67. Very instructive is WR 34. 3, where Hillel, pointing to the duty which man owes to his body, remarks: The officer in charge of the washing and cleaning of the king's statues at the theatre and circus is not only paid a salary, but occupies a high rank among the dignitaries of the kingdom; how much more is man bound to do honor to God's image! The passages in *Recognitiones*, 8. 28-33, on the human body are closely related in many respects to those of the Haggadah. For later literature one may refer to *Shebet Musar I*, where the purpose of the various component parts of the human body is minutely described.

<sup>27</sup> Seder 'Olam 30 (read חסיד'י for חכמי and בינוני for נביאי; otherwise the prophets and the sages would be mentioned twice); Sanhedrin 38b; 'Abodah Zarah 5a; BR 24. 2; ShR 40. 2-3; WR 26. 7; PR 23 (beginning); ARN 31, 91 (second version 8, 22); Tan. B. I, 21, 22; Tan. Ki-Tissa 12 (comp. on this passage Recanati on Gen. 2) and Emor 2; Tehillim 139, 530; Shemuel 24, 120; EZ 6, 183 (here all that is said in the older sources concerning Adam is transferred to Moses; comp. vol. III, pp. 36, 398, 443); Targum Ps. 139. 16. Most of these sources (comp. also Baba Mezi'a 85b, bottom) speak of a book which God showed to Adam, in which all future generations are recorded, and this is the Jewish form of the view prevalent among the Babylonians (comp. Jeremias, *Babylonisches im NT*, 69, seq.). At the same time this legend holds the view that the entire human race was potentially created in Adam, so that all future generations have been predestined at the time of the creation of Adam. Comp. note 19. Instead of the book of Adam, there appears in Zohar I, 90b, the "painted curtain" on which all souls are drawn, and which God showed him. Comp. note 19.

<sup>28</sup> BaR 14. 12; PRE 19; Tehillim 95, 408. There are numerous additions in the following later sources (God and Metatron as witnesses sign the deed of a gift to David); Bereshit Rabbeti 67-68 in Epstein's *Eldad*; Huppat Eliyyahu in Aggadat Bereshit, Introduction 37; Sikli in *Hazofeh*, III, 11; Yalkut I, 41. Comp. further Zohar I, 55a, 140a, 168a, 248b; II, 235a; vol. IV, p. 82. The Arabs also know of the legend (comp. Grünbaum, *Neue Beiträge*, 63-74), but they missed the point concerning the "days of the Lord" (comp. note 72) because of their ignorance of the Bible. According to Yebamot 64b, it was only at the time of David that seventy years were

fixed as the average age of man. Comp. also Herodotus I, 32, and Jub. 23. 9. Zohar I, 168a, blended the Adam-David legend with another, according to which Abraham and Jacob were supposed to live 180 years, exactly as Isaac, but their deducted years, that is five of Abraham's, twenty-eight of Jacob's, as well as thirty-seven of Joseph's (who should have lived, according to his father's blessing, as long as he), were bestowed on David.

<sup>29</sup> BR 18. 4; PK 4, 34a; PR 14, 59b; Tan. B. IV, 110; Tan. Hukat 6; BaR 19. 3; Koheleth 7. 23; PRE 13; Tehillim 8, 73-74; 2 ARN 8, 23. Comp. further note 34. Adam's wisdom is praised in Wisdom 10. 1 and by Philo, who also points to the naming of animals, where Adam's wisdom was displayed. PK 6, 62b, and 21, 144a (this is the source of Makiri, Is. 42, 128) maintains that the Tetragrammaton is the name by which Adam called God; comp. also Midrash Aggada Lev. 11. 4, and Berakot 7b.

<sup>30</sup> Lekah, Gen. 2. 19. The older sources (comp. the preceding note), however, only speak of Adam's wisdom (not of his prophetic gift), by means of which he succeeded in naming the objects. Nevertheless Adam is known in the older sources as a prophet; comp. Seder 'Olam 21; Septuagint Gen. 2. 20 (against this explanation of חַדְשָׁה as prophetic ecstasy, which is also found in Seder 'Olam, comp. BR 16. 5 and 24. 17; Tan. B. I, 22, however, seems to accept the first view); Philo, *Quis Rer. Div. Haer.*, 52. This view occurs quite frequently in patristic literature; comp. Origen, *De Princ.*, I, 3. 7; Jerome, Gen. 2. 21; Aphraates, 354; Tertullian, *Adversus Marcionem*, 11; Clemens Alexandrinus, *Stromata*, 1. 21; Clementine *Homilies*, 3. 18. Comp. further Fabricius, *Codex Pseudepigraph.*, 6 and 12, as well as Ginzberg, *Haggada bei den Kirchenv.*, 35. Zohar I, 125a, reads: Every one of the forty-eight prophets (on this number comp. Index, s. v. "Prophets") received a drop from the water of paradise, but Adam received as much as all of them together. The metaphor of the "drops of prophecy" in Zohar is borrowed from Shir 4. 11; comp. further Al-Barceloni, 130 and note 21.

<sup>31</sup> BR 24. 7; Tan. B. I, 4; Philo, *Quaestiones*, Gen. 1. 21-22; Eusebius, 515c; Augustine, *Quaestiones*, Exod. 69. According to one version of the Book of Adam (comp. *Adamschriften*, 24), it was an angel who, after the expulsion from paradise, taught Adam smithcraft, brought the fire-tongs and hammer, and taught him how to use them. Moreover (*ibid.*, 33), this angel instructed him how to tame an ox and to train it to work the soil; he also showed him how

to eat the produce of the ground and to satisfy his hunger with it. As to rabbinic parallels to these legends, comp. notes 96 and 99, and further note 91 on vol. I, p. 181. On the Arabic legends concerning a book of Adam, comp. Grünbaum, *Neue Beiträge*, 66. Comp. note 11.

<sup>32</sup> Berakot 31a; MHG I, 80 (with substantial variations). Comp. further note 37.

<sup>33</sup> ARN 1, 8 (second version 8, 23). For the opposite view concerning the relation of the angels to Adam, comp. vol. I, p. 64 (bottom).

<sup>34</sup> Bereshit Rabbeti (its source is Eldad; comp. Epstein, *Eldad*, 66, *seq.*). On Satan's twelve wings, comp. PRE 13, which was made use of by Eldad. See also note 55 on vol. I, p. 133. On the wings of the angels see Batte Midrashot IV, 5, as well as *Kimha Dabishuna* on the Piyyut אֱמִצִי שְׁחָקִים in the Roman Mahzor for the Day of Atonement. Epstein, *loc. cit.*, as well as Grünbaum, *Gesammelte Aufsätze*, 68, *seq.*, and *Neue Beiträge*, 57, *seq.*, rightly assumes that Eldad's story of Satan's fall goes back to Mohammedan, and indirectly to Christian, sources. Incorrect, however, is their view that the legend of the fall of Satan came to the Jews from the Christians and Mohammedans. For, though it is true that the doctrine of the fall of the angels, as well as that of Satan, has, at a very early period, been opposed by the leaders of the Synagogue, the traces of that legend are nevertheless to be found in rabbinic and pseudepigraphic writings, and this shows that these ideas were popular among certain classes of people. Comp. the following note.—In *Eldad* the legend about Satan is connected with that of Adam's giving names to the animals. These two legends were originally independent. The anachronism of Adam's speaking to Eve concerning the naming of the animals, which is against the explicit statement of Gen. 2.19—22, leads one to assume that Eldad made use of a Mohammedan source. A midrashic source, in which the names of the various animals were explained by their characteristics, was made use of by R. Sa'adya Gaon (comp. his words quoted by R. Bahya, Gen. 2. 19, and *Tashlum* Abudirham, 75) and Ibn Sabba, Gen., *loc. cit.* Comp. further MHG I, 79; *Tol-edot Yizhak*, Gen., *loc. cit.*

<sup>35</sup> Vita Adae 14—16; Bereshit Rabbeti in *Pugio Fidei* 563. This assertion concerning the fall of Satan, whose jealousy brought about Adam's misfortune, is widely known; comp., e. g., Apocalypse of Sedrach 5; Questions of Bartholomew; Koran 2. 33. See Bousset,

*Religion*, 386, and Epstein, *Eldad*, 75, *seq.* The oldest source, however, 2 Enoch 29. 4 and 5, which speaks of the fall of Satan, ascribes it to his jealousy of God. According to this source, Satan thought that he "would make his throne higher than the clouds of the earth, and would be equal in rank to God" (comp. Is. 14. 12-14, the reference to which Charles failed to recognize). It is for this reason that God cast down him and his angels from the heights. Satan was flying about continually in the air (on this point see Targum Job 28. 7, which reads: Sammael who flies like a bird in the air) above the abyss. According to this source, the fall of Satan and his hosts occurred at the beginning of creation (on the second day?), while 31 reads that "Satan wanted to create another world, because things were subservient to Adam on earth", to rule them and to have dominion over them. Thus we again have the idea that Satan's jealousy of Adam brought about his fall. The conception that everything, including the angel world, was created "in order to serve man" is genuinely Jewish (comp. note 8 and Index *s. v.* "Angels"), and is emphasized by Paul, Hebrews 1. 14. Moreover, it is quite probable that Hebrews 1. 6, goes back to Vita Adae, *loc. cit.*, and, in midrashic fashion, makes the angels worship the second Adam (= Jesus), instead of the first. Indeed the sources cited in notes 36 and 37 seem to be directed against the popular conception that Adam was worshipped by the angels. A description of the fall of Adam, somewhat similar to that of 2 Enoch, is found in Alphabetot 93-94, where the text was shortened by the copyist, because the contents appeared to him too daring. In the part retained it is said that Satan, on the last day, will endeavor to renew his rebellion against God, and will proclaim that he is of equal rank with God, and that he was God's "partner" (שותף) in creation, that God created heaven and he created hell. Nevertheless the fire of hell will destroy him, and put an end to his arrogant talk. The words 'והיו כל וכי' in our text are the end of the missing description of the fall of Satan and his angels (מלאכי שטן) occurs very rarely in rabbinic literature) at the beginning of creation. In Tehillim 82, 369 (comp. Buber who gives the better text of Rashi) Satan's fall is alluded to, although, according to Trypho's observation in Justin Martyr's *Dialogue*, 124, the Jewish scholars refused to accept the view that Ps. 82. 7 refers to Satan's fall or to that of the angels. According to PRE 14 and 27, Satan's fall was a punishment for his having misled Adam to sin. This apparently corresponds to Revelation 12. 9; whereas according to an-

other source (ARN 164; comp. vol. II, p. 242), it was a punishment for his conduct toward Job. Comp. note 10 on vol. I, p. 150. There is, however, still another view, according to which Satan was wicked from the very beginning, or, as the Haggadah expresses it, "was created out of the fire of hell" (comp. vol. II, p. 470). On Satan's jealousy of Adam as the cause for seducing the latter to sin, comp. vol. I, p. 95; Ginzberg, *Haggada bei ben Kircheng.*, 44-45.

<sup>36</sup> PRE 11; Tan. Pekude 3 (end); MHG I, 56.

<sup>37</sup> BR 8. 10; Koheleth 6. 10; Koheleth Z., 107. Comp. also the sources quoted in the preceding note, as well as Zohar I, 38a. 2 Alphabet R. Akiba 59 (whence Yalkut I, 20, on Gen. 2. 19, without giving source) remarks that the angels, noticing Adam's resemblance to God, said: "Are there two powers in this world?" Whereupon God reduced Adam's size, which had formerly filled the entire universe (comp. note 22) to one thousand cubits; comp. notes 73 and 33. Hasidim 290 made use of the same source, and has the addition that the part taken from Adam's body was transformed into earth, and it is only this part which became inhabited (comp. vol. I, p. 62), while the rest remained a desert. At this time the exact number of future generations was fixed, which shall not be complete until the original size of Adam's body (=711; comp. note 19) is restored in those of his descendants.—On sleep as a sign of mortality, comp. note 25. See further 12 Testaments, Reuben 3. 1, and Ginzberg, *Unbekannte Sekte*, 243-244.

<sup>38</sup> PRE 3. In this as well as in the preceding legend an answer is offered to the question why Eve was not created at the same time as Adam. BR 17. 4 reads as follows: God foresaw that Adam would complain against Eve's creation (comp. vol. I, pp. 76-77); she was therefore not given to him until he asked God for her. Theophilus, 2 gives the following reason: If two human beings, Adam and Eve, had been created at the same time, people would have declared that there were two gods. Quite similar is the statement in Mishnah Sanhedrin 4. 5 and Tosefta 8. 4-5, with reference to the question why only one man was created; comp. Ginzberg, *Haggada bei den Kircheng.*, 25. These rabbinic sources also give ethical reasons why only one man was created (*i. e.*, one "human pair"): If there were more than one pair, it would be said that the pious are the descendants of the first pious pair and the wicked are descendants of the first wicked pair. In order that families should not boast of their ancestors, all mankind is descended from one pair. Moreover, if thieves and

robbers molest their fellow-men now, how much more obnoxious would they have been, had they been of different descent. Finally the creation of only one man exhibits God's power, who, by means of one mould, is able to produce various kinds of types. Adam is the progenitor of all mankind, and how different men are from one another!

<sup>39</sup> BR 17. 4. According to MHG I, 80-81 and 83, Adam became conscious of the sexual instinct only when he saw Eve before him. A different view is given in Yebamot 63a, where it is stated that Adam had unnatural relations with the animals before Eve was created. This passage was, at an early period, explained figuratively (comp. Lekah, Gen. 2. 23). On the question whether sexual intercourse had taken place before the fall of Adam and Eve or not, comp. note 4 on vol. I, p. 106.

<sup>40</sup> 2 Alphabet of Ben Sira 23a-23b and 33a-33b. The text is corrupt, and can only partly be restored with certainty (read in 23a, l. 5: *אמר להם הקב"ה אמרו לה*), but its main purport cannot be misunderstood. On Lilith's abode in Egypt, comp. Tobit 8. 3; Revelation 9. 14; Müller, *Beiträge... Tobias*, 22. Egypt as the seat of witchcraft and the home of demons is frequently mentioned in the Kabbalah; hence the name of this country (*מצרים*) is explained as the place of oppressors (*מצרים*), *i. e.*, demons; comp. Yalkut Reubeni, Deut. 26. 2. The view that it was the Red Sea in Egypt where Lilith remained is based on the conception that water is the abode of demons; comp. the assertion of Aristides, *Apologia*, 4: Wind ministers to God, fire to the angels (comp. note 63 on vol. I, p. 16, bottom), and water to the demons. This accounts for the warning given in Pesahim 112a, with reference to the drinking of the water, in order that one might not be exposed to injury by the demons found therein. The conception of Lilith as a wind spirit, now known from Babylonian sources, was retained by the Jews as late as the thirteenth century; comp. Parhon, *s. v.* *ליל*. It is, however, true that generally she was conceived as a "Lamia", so that she was even identified with the Babylonian Labartu. Comp. Ginzberg's communication to Perles in *Orientalistische Literaturzeitung*, XVIII, 179-80, and the latter's remark against Lévi (*R.E.J.* LXVIII, 13), who considers the part ascribed to Lilith, in Alphabet of Ben Sira and in medieval literature, as a later development. Comp. further Grünbaum, *Gesammelte Aufsätze*, 94, 100, and vol. III, 280; vol. IV, 5. The assertion in Zohar I, 19b 34b, and III, 19a, concerning Lilith as Adam's first wife is based on Alphabet, *loc. cit.* But old sources speak already of "the first Eve",

though they do not identify her with Lilith; comp. BR 22. 7, and Augustine, *Contra Adversarium Legis*, 2. 5. See also on this point Ginzberg, *Haggada bei den Kirchenv.*, 60, note 3, and more fully note 47 on vol. I, p. 118. The confusing of the Babylonian wind spirit Lilith with the "Liliths", night spirits, is already found in 'Erubin 18b. The statement of Hasidim, 354, that these "Liliths" (ליליות) assemble under certain trees belongs to German popular beliefs. On Lilith in the Talmud, comp. Kohut, *Angelologie*, 86-89, whose statements are not tenable. Attention should be drawn to the sentence in Shabbat 151a: Whoever sleeps alone in a house (or, whoever sleeps in an isolated house?) is seized by לילית. This very likely has nothing to do with the she-devil. אָחַז "seized" is employed in the Talmud only with respect to diseases; when referring to demons, the form מוֹיֵק or גִּזֵּק is used.

<sup>41</sup> MHG I, 83. The proverb "only when, etc." is frequently quoted in the Talmud; comp., e. g., 'Abodah Zarah 73a, where our text reads וַיִּעָוֶר וַיִּעָרָה; the reading of MHG, is נִעָרָה ("closed tightly", from עָרָה = עָרַי?). Philo, *Questiones*, I, 20, gives more reasons why Eve was not created at the same time as Adam. One of the reasons is that woman should not claim equality with man (comp. vol. I, 65). Concerning Lilith's insubordination comp. vol. I, p. 65.

<sup>42</sup> BR 8.1 and 17.6; Berakot 61a; 'Erubin 18a; WR 14 (beginning); Tan. B. III, 33; Tan. Tazria' 2; Tehillim 139, 529. In all these sources a second view is cited, according to which Adam was created as "androgynus", and was subsequently separated into man and woman. The relation of this view to that of Plato, *Symposium*, 189d, 190d, was already noticed by Eusebius, 585c-585d, and in recent times by Freudenthal, *Hellenistische Studien*, I, 69. Jeremias (*Altes Testament im Lichte des Orients*, index, s. v., "Androgynus"), however, has shown that this view is already found among the Babylonians. The Rabbis were particularly concerned with explaining the contradiction between Gen. 1. 27 and 2. 7, seq., and since in the first passage the rather unusual expression וַיִּבְרָא אֱלֹהִים אֱנוֹשׁ occurs, it was quite natural for them to take it to denote "androgynus." Philo, *De M. Opif.*, 24, 46, and in many other passages (comp. the references given by Gfrörer, *Philo*, I, 267, seq., and 407, seq.), solves this exegetical difficulty in a philosophic manner. The first account of the creation speaks of the idea of man, which is incorporeal, hence neither masculine nor feminine, whereas the second account treats of the material creation of man, which has a definite form, either man or woman. It is worth



noticing that in the first passage Philo speaks of the double sex of the "ideal man", but as of no sex in the second passage. However, one may easily see that the mythological conception of the "androgynus" is still discernible in his philosophical interpretation. Justin Martyr, *Cohortatio ad Gent.*, 30, and Clemens Alexandrinus, *Instructor*, 3, follow Philo almost literally in their explanation of the biblical double account of the creation of man; but the interpretation of Tertullian, *Adversus Hermogenem*, 26, and of Hippolytus, Gen. 1. 27, is in agreement with the Baraita 32 Middot, No. 12, according to which the Bible first gives a general account, and then a detailed one. Comp. also BR 17. 4; Philo, *Quaestiones*, 1. 19. On the question whether Philo knew of the myth concerning the "androgynus Adam", comp. Bousset, *Religion*, 406. It is, however, frequently found among the Gnostics; comp. Hippolytus, V, 1 and 3; VI, 1. It is noteworthy that Celsus, in Origen, *Contra Cels.*, 4. 38, observes that Jews as well as Christians consider the account of the creation of Eve out of Adam's rib to be an allegory. In the earlier rabbinic literature now extant no such allegory is known; comp., in addition to the sources cited at the beginning of this note, ARN 1, 8 (second version 8, 23), as well as 2 Alphabet of R. Akiba 59; Zohar II, 55a; III, 44b. Even Philo does not know such an allegory, and accordingly Celsus probably refers to oral communications which were imparted to him by enlightened Jews. Targum Yerushalmi Gen. 2. 21 (comp. further BR 17. 6) remarks: Eve was formed out of the third rib of the right side.

<sup>43</sup> BR 8. 2 (מִקְרַח רֵאשׁ is the contrast of the expression הָקַל רֵאשׁ which occurs very frequently) and 45. 5; DR 6. 11; Tan. B. I, 172; Tan. Wa-Yesheb 6; 2 ARN 45, 126; MHG I, 83. Comp. vol. I, p. 60 (bottom), and Grünbaum, *Neue Beiträge*, 58-59.

<sup>44</sup> BR 18. 3; Berakot 61a; Niddah 45b. In the last passage, as well as BR 18. 1, a different view is cited, according to which a man's intelligence matures sooner than that of a woman, since the former has the opportunity to develop his mind in school, which opportunity is denied the latter.

<sup>45</sup> BR 18. 8; 2 ARN 9, 24-25; Kiddushin 2b; Yelammedenu in 'Aruk, s. v. לִמְדָה. On the three precepts (besides the two mentioned in the text, there is a third one in connection with menstruation), the observance of which is particularly enjoined upon women, comp. Shabbat 31b-32a; Yerushalmi 2, 5b; Tan. B. I, 28, and III, 53; Tan. Noah 1 and Mezora' 9. Philo, *De Sacr. Abel. et Caini*, 32, is

in agreement with the view of the last-mentioned rabbinic sources, which speak of Adam as the dough which God kneaded. Concerning the covering of a woman's head, comp. also 2 ARN 42, 117; 1 Timothy 2. 15; 1 Cor. 11.10; Tertullian, *De Habitu Muliebri*, 1; *Adversus Marcionem*, 5. 8; *De Oratione*, 22. The statement made by Tertullian, in the last-named passage, that the unmarried Jewish women cover their heads, contradicts the assertions of the Jewish sources, according to which married women only covered their heads; comp., e.g., Ketubot 2. 1; Yebamot 114b. See, however, Nedarim 3. 8; Sifre N., 11; Berakot 24a. The idea that the covering of a woman's head is a punishment for Eve's sin is also found among later Christian authors; comp. Grünbaum, *Neue Beiträge*, 58-59.

<sup>46</sup> BR 18. 7; 2 ARN 8, 24; Sanhedrin 39a. On Adam's first wife comp. note 40, and note 47 on vol. I, p. 118.

<sup>47</sup> BR 18. 4 (on the expression *בְּיוֹן הַקִּישׁ בְּיוֹן* comp. Mekilta Beshallah 1, 26b, and Tehillim 106, 456). On Eve's beauty see note 24 and Irenaeus, I, 30, 7. See further Grünbaum, *Gesammelte Aufsätze*, 79-80. In view of the fact that Eve was taken from Adam's body, Yebamot 62b and Ephes. 5. 33 say: "One should love his wife as oneself." The Talmud adds: "And honor even more than oneself".

<sup>48</sup> PRE 12 (*מָטָר* fell out before *מָטָר*; the correct reading is found in MHG I, 82, and in the commentary on Job by R. Isaac ha-Kohen 31. 40), essentially based on older sources; comp. BR 18. 1; Shabbat 95a; Yerushalmi 10, 12c; Tan. B. I, 83 and 86; Tan. Wa-Yera 1; Koheleth 7. 2 and 8. 1; Tehillim 25, 213-214; ARN 4, 19 (second version 8,22); Kallah Rabbeti 1; ShR 1. 5; Shir 4. 11; WR 12. 2; PK 4, 37a; PR 14, 62a; Baba Batra 75a; Targum Yerushalmi Deut. 34. 6, and the second version, Gen. 35. 9; 2 Alphabet R. Akiba 60 (the description of the splendor of the first wedding is more elaborate here than in any other source); Baraita 32 Middot, No. 17. In many of the sources just cited it is mentioned that in the beginning, middle (not to be taken literally), and conclusion of the Pentateuch examples are given of God's loving-kindness which man is to emulate. God adorned the bride (Eve), visited the sick (Abraham, Gen. 18. 1), and attended to Moses' burial.—The etymology of the names of "man" and "woman", which is ascribed in Sotah 17a to R. Akiba, was also known to Eusebius; comp. *Praeparatio Evang.*, 517b. Depending on Theodotion, Gen. 2. 23, Origen, *Ad Afric.*, 12, and Jerome, Gen., *loc. cit.*, connect *אִשָּׁה* "wife" with *אָשָׁה* "took"; *Vocabitur as-*

*sumptio quia ex viro sumpta est*, says Jerome. Many explanations are also offered of the name חווה "Eve". It might signify חויה "serpent", because she was the serpent, *i. e.*, the seducer of Adam, or the "speaker" (from חוה "declared"), because she was the only one besides the serpent who understood the language of the animals (comp. note 58), and it was from her that Adam learned it; comp. BR 20, 11, 22. 2, and further 18. 6; Lekah and *Imre No'am* on Gen. 3. 20, as well as *Ha-dar*, 11.21 (מלאך המות = מ"ה), and והמבין = והמבין ('בין); comp. Baba Batra 16a), and Philo, *Quaestiones*, 1. 52.

<sup>49</sup> Zohar Hadash (beginning of Noah ); Recanati, Gen. 3. 24. On the Machpelah as the entrance to paradise, comp. Index, s. v. On the view that all the souls of the dead are presented to Adam, see vol. I, p. 102. The pillars of paradise are really identical with the celestial ladder of Konen 28, and are also known in Christian legend; comp. Bonwetsch in the *Göttingen Nachrichten*, 1900, and James, *Lost Apocrypha*, 96 seq. Comp. also note 22 on vol. I, p. 10.

<sup>50</sup> *Imre No'am* and *Hadar* on Gen. 3. 22. The huge size of the tree is already alluded to in older sources; comp. BR 15. 6; Yerushalmi Berakot 1. 2c; Shir 6. 9; Aggadat Shir 1, 13 and 55; Tehillim 1, 18; ER 2, 10; 2 ARN 43, 119 (below). Comp. further R. Bahya on Gen. 2. 9, who remarks: The tree of knowledge and the tree of life were both in the centre of the Garden, for they formed one tree at the bottom, and branched out into two when they reached a certain height. Philo, thinking the literal interpretation of the paradise narrative absurd (*De Plant. Noe* 8; comp. also *Leg. Alleg.*, 1. 30), is the only one who explains it allegorically, but the Rabbis, Josephus, and the pseudepigraphic writers (the Books of Enoch, Jub., etc.) take this biblical narrative literally. Not until we reach the Arabic period, when the philosophic studies influenced Jewish thought, do we find the allegorical interpretation of the paradise narrative in rabbinic circles. See Gabirol in *Peletat Soferim*, 45, seq. and Maimonides, *Guide of the Perplexed*, II, 30. Although the Kabbalah does not deny the existence of an earthly paradise, it nevertheless interprets the paradise account in an allegoric-mystical manner. MHG I, 76, goes back to a medieval source influenced by philosophical speculations. A timid attempt at allegorization of the paradise account is already found in PRE 21.

<sup>51</sup> Josephus, *Antiqui.*, I, 13. The etymologies given by him for the Hebrew names of these rivers correspond partly to BR 16. 1-4. Comp. further Philo, *Quaestiones*, Gen. 1. 12-13, whose state-

ments (comp. especially his remark on the Euphrates) go back to the Palestinian Haggadah found in BR *loc. cit.* Jerome's remarks on Gen. 2. 12 are based on oral communications from his Palestinian teacher, and not on Josephus. He says: "*Fison...Gangem putant*"; in the extant midrashic sources Pishon is identified with the Nile; comp. BR, *loc. cit.*; Theodor, *ad loc.*, as well as Targum Yerushalmi, *loc. cit.*, where הַיְרֵדִיק is not Indian, but, as Epstein, *Eldad*, 33, *seq.*, proves, signifies southern Ethiopia. With respect to Gen. 15. 18, נִלוֹס (the Nile) is explained as נִינוֹס "small"; in contrast to the Euphrates, the "great" river, the Nile is the small one; comp. *Pa'aneah* and Midrash Aggada on Num. 1. 7. To the cycle of legends concerning the rivers of paradise, belongs the stream of life, which plays an important part in the Alexander legend, a stream which, according to Tamid 32b, flows out of paradise. The view held by some writers (comp. Friedlaender, *Chadhirlegende*, 47) that this feature of the Alexander legend is not Jewish, because the Jewish legend does not know of the "stream of life," is based on an error. "Living waters" is mentioned in Enoch 17. 4; Revelation 22. 17, and, among the Gnostics, by Hippolytus, 5. 2, as well as 5. 22. Zimmern, *Keilinschriften und AT*, 524, *seq.*, and 562, has pointed out that this view is found among the Babylonians.

<sup>62</sup> BR 13. 9 and the parallels cited by Theodor, as well as Targum Yerushalmi Gen. 2. 6 and Greek Baruch 2. 2. The theories of the ancient Rabbis concerning rain, clouds, etc., are given by Hirschensohn, *Sheba' Hokmot*, 6-8 and 9-11.

<sup>53</sup> Hullin 60b.

<sup>54</sup> Sifre D., 41; Midrash Tannaim 22; BR 16. 5; PRE 12; 2 ARN 21, 44 (the literal and haggadic meanings of Gen. 2. 15 are found next to one another); 2 Enoch 30; Theophilus, 2. 19; Ephraim I, 23E; Lactantius, *Institutiones*, 2. 13; Philo, *Quaestiones*, Gen. 1. 14. A different view is given in ARN 11, 45 (second version, *loc. cit.*): Adam was commanded to work in order that his descendants should know the value of work. Mekilta RS, 107, and (the statement of R. Jose) ARN, *loc. cit.* read: Adam died only after he had ceased working; comp. also Grünbaum, *Neue Beiträge*, 58.

<sup>55</sup> Seder 'Olam 5; Sanhedrin 56a; Tosefta 'Abodah Zarah 8. 4, *seq.*, and Babli 64b; Sifre N., 111; BR 16. 6, 24. 5, 26. 1, and 34. 8; PK 12, 100b; ShR 30. 9; BaR 14. 12; DR 1. 21 and 2. 25; Shir 1. 2; Koheleth 3. 11; Tehillim 1, 10-11, and 2, 26; Mishle 21, 110; Tan. B. II, 69; Tan. Yitro 3. Comp. also the interesting passage in Sekel

1, 108 and Lekah, Gen. 1. 15. In the rabbinic sources these commandments are known as the "seven Noachian commandments" (besides the six mentioned, the seventh commandment is the one enjoined upon Noah not to eat the meat of a living animal; comp. Gen. 9. 4), which, in contrast to the other biblical precepts obligatory upon Israelites alone, must be accepted by all men. In some passages, however, thirty Noachian commandments are mentioned, which the children of Noah accepted, but did not fulfil. The fulfilment of those will only take place in Messianic times; comp. Yerushalmi 'Abodah Zarah 2, 40c; Hullin 92a; BR 98. 9; Tehillim 2, 26 (read שלש instead of שלש) and 31, 177. It is not stated what these thirty commandments are; comp. R. Bezalel Ronsburg's marginal glosses on Hullin, *loc. cit.*, and Joel in *Graetz-Jubelschrift*, 174, note 1. In Sanhedrin and Tosefta, *loc. cit.*, the opinions of some scholars are cited which add a few more to the Noachian commandments, as, *e. g.*, the prohibition of witchcraft; but even with these the number thirty is not yet reached. Tertullian, *Adversus Judaeos*, 2, tries to prove that in the prohibition of fruit enjoined upon Adam the entire decalogue is contained. A similar statement is found in Zohar I, 36a; comp. also Grünbaum, *Gesammelte Aufsätze*, 177. Anti-Christian is the remark (BR 16. 5) that Adam received the commandments concerning the observance of the Sabbath and the daily sacrifice. The inferiority of the ceremonial laws, as *e. g.*, the observance of the Sabbath and the sacrifices, is proved by Christian apologists from the fact that Adam, the creation of God's own hands, was not enjoined to observe them.

<sup>56</sup> Sanhedrin 59b; ARN 1, 5; Zohar I, 38a. The attendance on the part of the angels caused the jealousy of the serpent (Satan?; comp. note 35) against Adam; comp. note 60. That Adam was not permitted to eat meat is asserted by some of the Church Fathers; comp. Theophilus, 2. 18 (there were no carnivorous animals before Adam's fall); Novatian, *De Cibis Judaicis* 2. For details see note 56 on vol. I, p. 167.

<sup>57</sup> Apocalypse of Moses 15. It seems to follow from BR 19. 5 that Eve alone took care of the animals; comp. Ginzberg, *Haggada bei den Kirchenv.*, 53-54; see also *Imre No'am* and *Hadar* on Gen. 3. 20. In the last two sources the name of Eve is brought into relation with this idea; comp. note 48. On the entertainment of Adam in paradise by the angels, see the preceding note, and the Revelation of Ezra (beginning). 2 Enoch 31. 2, on the contrary, reads: I made

the heavens for him open, that he should perceive the angels sing the song of triumph.

<sup>58</sup> Jub. 3. 28; Josephus, *Antiqui.*, I, 1. 4; Philo, *Quaestiones*, Gen. 1. 22; the Christian chronologists Syncellus, Cedrenus, and Zonaras; comp. Charles on Jub., *loc. cit.* The older rabbinic literature does not know of the original language spoken by man and the animals, and even Lekah, Gen. 3. 1, maintains that only the serpent spoke Hebrew (*i. e.*, the original speech of man; comp. note 91 on vol. I, p. 181), whereas the rest of the animals spoke their own languages, which, however, Adam understood (comp. note 48). This is also the view of Hasidim 454. On the different languages of animals see Index, *s. v.* "Animals, Language of". It may be noted that Clemens Alexandrinus, *Stromata*, 1. 21, also declares that animals have a language which they use among themselves. Rationalistic explanations of the biblical passages presupposing the language of animals (the serpent and Balaam's ass) are found in geonic literature; comp. Ibn Ezra on Gen. 3, and the responsum of R. Hai Gaon in *Kohelet Shelomoh*, 13. Philo, *De Conf. Ling.*, 3, ridicules the Greek fable concerning the original language of animals. Comp., on the other hand, his observations in *Quaestiones*, 1. 32, where he concedes the possibility that animals were able to speak before the fall. Comp. note 113.

<sup>59</sup> Apocalypse of Moses 11; for further details concerning this subject comp. note 113.

<sup>60</sup> BR 19. 19; Koheleth 1. 18; Shemuel 7, 66; Sanhedrin 59b; ARN 1, 5 (both versions); Philo, *Quaestiones*, Gen. 1. 32. Comp. also Jerome on Gen. 3. 1 and Yerushalmi Kiddushin 4, 65c (מעשה חיי); Zohar I, 79a and 191. The idea that jealousy caused the serpent's hatred occurs already in the Septuagint, Gen. 2. 24, and 2 Enoch 31. 3, as well as in John 8. 44, and in the different versions of Vita Adae; comp. Preuschen, *Adamschriften*, 27 and 54, as well as note 35, with regard to jealousy as the cause of Satan's fall. Comp. also note 131. In pseudepigraphic literature (comp. note 116), instead of the serpent, it is Satan who is the real seducer; comp. Ginzberg, *Haggada bei den Kirchenv.*, 42-45. In rabbinic literature (Sotah 9b; Sanhedrin 29a; Sifre D., 323) the serpent is described as הקדמוני, which apparently corresponds to  $\delta\phi\iota\varsigma\ \delta\ \acute{\alpha}\rho\chi\alpha\iota\omicron\varsigma$  of Revelation 20. 2. But the use of הקדמוני with reference to Adam (comp. note 21) shows that this description of the serpent by the Rabbis is entirely different from that of Revelation. On the

bodily similarity of man to the serpent comp. MHG I, 87, where the observation is made that man can only deceive another who resembles him. On the serpent as the possessor of gold and silver, comp. vol. IV, p. 135 (top).

<sup>61</sup> PRE 13; BR 19. 3-4; ARN (both versions) 1, 4-5 and 151; Sanhedrin 29a. Comp. further the sources cited in the preceding note, as well as Philo, *Quaestiones*, Gen. 1. 33-34, and Josephus, *Antiqui.*, I, 1. 4. Lekah, Gen. 3. 1, remarks that God announced this prohibition respecting the fruit of paradise in the presence of the serpent, so that he knew everything about it.

<sup>62</sup> BR 19. 4. The serpent's slandering of God is frequently mentioned in the Haggadah; comp. Tan. B. III, 47; Tan. Bereshit 8; DR 5. 10; ShR 3. 12; Tehillim 1, 9-10; 2 ARN 1, 6; Apocalypse of Moses 18; comp. vol. I, p. 96. The view that the creation of the six days was of a progressive order occurs also in 2 ARN 43, 120; comp. also Philo, *De M. Opif.*, 21 and 14.

<sup>63</sup> ARN 1, 4. In the second version, 1, 5, a view is cited, according to which the tree, as the serpent wanted to touch it, exclaimed, saying: "Let not the foot of pride come against me, and let not the hand of the wicked remove me" (Ps. 36. 12); comp. further ARN 157, concerning Satan's attempt to enter paradise. See also vol. I, p. 96, as well as PRE 11, where the two different versions of ARN are blended together into one.

<sup>64</sup> Ibn Sabba, Gen. 3. 6.; very likely dependent upon a lost Midrash.

<sup>65</sup> 2 ARN 1, 6; PRE 11; Targum Yerushalmi Gen. 3. 6 (where after *וַאֲמַלְחָה* the sentence *וַחַמַּת* to *וַרְחִילָה* should be read). Comp. the sources cited in the next note, as well as vol. I, pp. 96-97.

<sup>66</sup> BR 19. 5; Tan. Introduction 155; Shemuel 12, 81. Comp. vol. I, p. 97.

<sup>67</sup> 2 Alphabet of Ben Sira 28b, 29a-29b, and 36a (the last passage reads *מִלְחָם* unlike Yerahmeel 48, which associates the name of the immortal bird with *חַמַּל* and not its synonym *חַס*), and Bereshit Rabbeti in BHM VI, 12 (introduction), where the bird is named *מִלְחָם*. This legend is, of course, only a different version of the widespread phoenix legend; comp. vol. I, p. 32 and note 151 appertaining thereto. Besides this bird and its descendants, there are mentioned in 2 Alphabet of Ben Sira 28b eleven persons (the meaningless *וְיֵשׁ אֲוִמְרִים* obviously resulted from an incorrect reading of the abbreviation *וְיֵשׁ אֲוִר*, which = *עֲשֵׂר* (ואחד עשר) who en-

tered paradise during their life-time. These are: Enoch, Serah the daughter of Asher, Bithiah the daughter of Pharaoh, Hiram the King of Tyre, Eliezer Abraham's servant, Elijah (missing in the printed text; comp. manuscript reading on 36a), Jabez, Ebedmelech the Ethiopian, Jonadab the Rechabite as well as his descendants, and of post-biblical times, R. Judah ha-Nasi's slave and R. Joshua b. Levi. A similar list of immortals is to be found in Derek Erez Z., 1 (end); PRK (Grünhut's edition, 83); Aguddat Aggadot (Carmoly's edition, 12), and the sources cited by Tawrogi on Derek Erez Z. The greatest number of immortals is to be found in Yalkut II, 367, where Methuselah (this is of Christian origin; comp. note 62 on vol. I, p. 142) and the three sons of Korah are included in the list. Comp. Index under the names enumerated above as well as *s. v.* "Paradise", "Entering Alive", "Moses", "Bithiah", "Hiram", "Baruch", "Ezra". The men "who were taken up to heaven without tasting death" (לא טעמו טעם מיתה) comp. BR 21. 5, where this expression is employed with respect to Elijah, whereas the usual term for the immortals is "those who entered paradise during their life-time") are already mentioned in 4 Ezra 6. 26. The following are known as such in pseudepigraphic literature: Enoch (Books of Enoch), Moses (Assumption of Moses 106-107); Jeremiah (2 Maccabees 2. 1); Baruch (Apocalypse of Baruch 77. 2), and Ezra (4 Ezra, end). Comp. Box on 4 Ezra 6. 26. Nothing is to be found in the Jewish sources concerning the association of these immortals with the Messiah. The part ascribed in the Midrash (comp., *e. g.*, DR 10. 1 and vol. II, p. 373, as well as vol. III, end) and in the New Testament to Moses as the forerunner or assistant of the Messiah does not presuppose Moses' immortality, but his resurrection at the very beginning of the Messianic time. In case 4 Ezra 14. 9 is not a Christian interpolation, this passage does not suppose a pre-existing Messiah but only implies that the Messiah entered paradise alive after having completed his earthly career, as is explicitly stated in Derek Erez Z., *loc. cit.*, and parallel passages. In conclusion it may be remarked that the list of the immortals is found only in late writings (hardly earlier than the end of the tenth century C. E.), at the time when Enoch came to be honored again. The older rabbinic literature is not particularly favorably inclined toward Enoch; comp. note 58 on vol. I, p. 130. On Elijah as the companion of the Messiah in paradise, see vol. I, p. 22-23.

<sup>68</sup> ARN 1, 6 (read אמרה לו instead of לה אמר); PRE 13.



69 PRE 14; Targum Yerushalmi Gen. 3. 7 and 21. The older Haggadah speaks of "garments of light", which the first "pair" wore before the fall of man, as bestowed upon them by God, in accordance with Gen. 3. 21, where עור ("skin") is explained as though it were written אור ("light"). This verse is said to refer to the state before the fall; comp. BR 18. 56, as well as 20. 12, and the remarks of Theodor on these passages. See further Zohar I, 36b (this is the source of Recanati, quoted by Theodor!), and for details comp. notes 93 and 104. The later Haggadah retains the legend about the light which shone on the first "human pair", but explains עור (Gen., *loc. cit.*) literally; hence the assertion of PRE and Targum Yerushalmi, *loc. cit.* Comp. note 123 on vol. I. p. 27.

70 BR 15. 7. The forbidden fruit is identified, respectively, with the fig, grape, apple of paradise (*Etrog*), wheat (which grew on stalks as tall as the cedars of Lebanon), and the nut; comp. BR, *loc. cit.*, and 19. 5; Berakot 40a; Sanhedrin 70a; PK 20, 142a; PR 43, 175a; WR 12. 1; BaR 10. 2 and 8; Esther 2. 1; Targum Song of Songs 7. 9 (read, with R. Tam, in *Sefer ha-Yashar*, 217: ריח אחרונה דין (עין); Greek Apocalypse of Baruch 4. 8; Apocalypse of Abraham 23; Enoch 32. 4 (which reads: The tree of knowledge is in height like a fir, and its leaves like those of the carob, and its fruit like the clusters of a vine); Apocalypse of Moses 21; Tertullian, *Adversus Marcionem*, 2.2; Methodius, *Symposium*, 2; Origen, Gen. 9. 20; Epiphanius, *Haer.* 45 (has grapes, according to the view of the Gnostics); Moses bar Cepha, 36 E. The oldest and most prevalent view identifies the forbidden fruit with the grape, which goes back to an old mythological idea that wine is the beverage of the gods. The fig owes its distinction to the incident that the first "pair" took hold of the fig leaves after the fall, and this identification is not only found in rabbinic sources, but also in the Apocalypse of Moses and in Tertullian, *loc. cit.* Purely midrashic is the identification with the wheat which is only found in rabbinic sources and accepted by Moses bar Cepha. This is based on the play on the words חטה ("wheat") and חטא ("sin"). The identification with the apple of paradise is due to a similar play on words, the אחרונה being derived from רגג "he desired"; comp. Nahmanides on Lev. 23. 40. The carob likewise owes its distinction to its name which signifies destruction. "Adam's apple", widely known all over Europe (it is met for the first time in ps.-Tertullian, Gen. 85), is perhaps the result of the inaccurate rendering of the Hebrew תפוח, which in the Bible denotes "apple", but in later literature signifies also the apple

of paradise, *i. e.*, the Ethrog; comp. Shabbat 88a, and the remark of R. Tam, *loc. cit.* The benediction mentioned in geonic sources אֲשֶׁר אֵנוֹן צִנֹּן (comp. Seder R. Amram, Frumkin's edition, II, 406) is based on the assumption that the tree of knowledge, whose fruit produced sexual desire, was a nut-tree; comp. note 3 on vol. I, p. 105. Comp. also ps.-Tertullian, Gen. 86; Commodianus, *Instructiones*, 3, though he speaks of the palm-tree, which misled Adam, describes, at the same time, the fruit as the apple. On this point comp. Hippolytus, 6. 22, who remarks: The palm-tree is the symbol of battle and slaughter (the gnostic view cited by the same author 7. 1 concerning God as a seed of fig-tree probably bears a close relation to the fig as the fruit of the tree of knowledge). Ps.-*Matthew* 21 and the *Passing of Mary* 7 speak of the palm of paradise; comp. further BR 15. 7, where מַחְמָרוֹת ("shoot up as a palm tree") is used in connection with the forbidden fruit. On the grape as the forbidden fruit, comp. also vol. I, p. 167; Sifre D., 323; note 79 on vol I, p. 20. The legend discussed in the last passage concerning the wine of paradise preserved for the pious is probably related to the view that the fruit which brought sin into the world will become "a healing" in the world to come; comp. WR 12 (end), and the Christological form of this legend in the Greek Apocalypse of Baruch and in Moses bar Cepha, *loc. cit.* The fig leaves with which Adam and Eve covered themselves are explained by Irenaeus III, 23. 5, as a sign of repentance, because they were leaves which hurt the body. The statement of R. Meir in 'Erubin 18b (זְרִיזֵי הַתְּאֵיבִים) has the same meaning. It may further be noted that in the rabbinic sources mentioned above (comp. also Tan. B. I, 105) a view is cited according to which Scripture purposely refrains from mentioning the forbidden fruit, in order that men should not hate it afterwards for having caused death. On the exact determination of the tree of life, comp. note 113. See further Grünbaum, *Neue Beiträge*, 64-65, and Ginzberg, *Haggada bei den Kirchenv.*, 38-42.

<sup>71</sup> Yelammedenu in MHG I, 91 and in Yalkut I, 744; Likkutim, IV, 31b. Comp. note 870 on vol. III, p. 417.

<sup>72</sup> BR 19. 8; PR 40, 167a; Jub. 4. 30; Justin Martyr, *Dialogue*, 81; Irenaeus, V, 22. 2; Comp. further Charles on Jub., *loc. cit.*, and Theodor on BR 8. 2, as well as the sources cited in note 28. Many reasons are given why Adam did not die on the day he sinned, as God had threatened. Comp. Symmachus, Jonathan, and Jerome on Gen. 2. 17, as well as Philo, *De M. Opif.*, 40 (were it not for God's mercy, he would have died immediately; so also Tan. B. IV, 68; Tan. Mass'e 8; comp.

also PR, *loc. cit.*); *De Leg. Aleg.*, 33; *De Profug.*, 21; *Quaestiones*, Gen. 1. 16. The view found in the last three passages of Philo that the sinner, even when alive, is already regarded as dead, whereas the righteous continue to live also after their death (comp. also Wisdom 1. 2 and 16), occurs frequently in rabbinic Haggadah; comp. note 287 on vol. III, p. 134; note 54 on vol. I, p. 218, and also Aphraates, 168. The rationalistic explanation of the prolonged life of the ante-diluvians (according to some, their years are to be considered as lunar ones) is only met with in medieval Jewish literature; comp., e. g., Maimonides, *Guide of the Perplexed*, II, 47. But Lactantius, *Institutiones*, 2. 13, shows that such attempts are very old.

<sup>73</sup> BR 12. 6; and 19. 8; BaR 13. 2; Shir 3. 7; PK 1, 1b; PR 15, 68b; Tan. B. Introduction, 156; Hagigah 12a (comp. Rabbinovicz, *ad loc.*). See details in notes 22, 137 and 37 on Adam's original size, and further Ginzberg, *Haggada bei den Kirchenv.*, 30-31. On the different explanations of לָרַח הַיּוֹם (Gen. 3. 8) comp. Aquila, Symmachus, and Theodotion cited by Jerome, *ad loc.*, as well as BR 19. 8 and ps.-Tertullian Gen. 113.

<sup>74</sup> PK 5, 44b; PR 15, 68b; Shir 3. 7; BaR 11. 3; Tan. (introduction) 156; Shemuel 18,97. Comp. note 113.

<sup>75</sup> MHG I, 93 (top) and Targum Yerushalmi Gen. 3. 9. In these sources it is further stated that when Adam wanted to hide himself from God, the latter said to him: "Dost thou want to hide thyself from Me? Can anyone hide himself that I shall not see him?" (Jer. 23. 24). Comp. note 97.

<sup>76</sup> Derek Erez R., 3; Yalkut I, 28; 2 Alphabet of R. Akiba 51.

<sup>77</sup> BR 19. 9; PK 15, 119a; Ekah (introduction) 5. This Haggadah endeavors to eliminate the anthropomorphic expression of Gen. 3. 9, and similar solutions are found in Philo, *Quaestiones*, Gen. 1. 45; *De Decalogo*, 3. 17; Justin Martyr, 99; Tertullian, *Adversus Marcionem*, 2. 24; Theophilus, 2. 26 and 29; Ephraim, 1, 23 C; Aphraates, 138. Comp. further note 20 on vol. I, p. 110. Another attempt to explain this anthropomorphism is found in the sources cited in note 75.

<sup>78</sup> Tan. B. III, 39; Tan. Tazria' 9. Adam's wickedness and persistence in sinning are frequently referred to in the Haggadah; comp. Sanhedrin 38b, where he is declared to have been a heretic (מֵיִן); see also Tertullian, *Adversus Marcionem*, 2. 2: Who will hesitate to declare that Adam's great sin was heresy?, and that he denied God. It is further stated that, like the wicked sinners Esau and Achan (comp.

Sanhedrin 44a and Tan. B. I, 127), he removed the mark of circumcision. Here it is presupposed that Adam was created bearing the sign of the covenant, as is explicitly stated in ARN 2, 2, and parallel passages (comp. note 318 on vol. I, p. 306). As to Adam's wickedness, comp. also BR 19. 12; Tan. B. I, 18; PR 7, 26b; BaR 13. 3; Apocalypse of Moses 21.

<sup>79</sup> PRE 14 (complete text is only found in MHG I, 93). Comp. further PK 17, 130b; Ekah 3, 39; Aggadat Bereshit 61, 125, concerning Adam, Jacob, and the people of Israel, who instead of being grateful for the benefits God had bestowed upon them, complained about them.

<sup>80</sup> BR 17. 4; 2 ARN 8, 23.

<sup>81</sup> Tan. B. III, 39; Tan. Tazria' 9; MHG I, 93. Zohar Hadash Bereshit 24a (3. 1). The quotation from Targum by Sabba, 7a, according to which Gen. 3. 7 should be rendered: And they uttered grumbling words, is taken from Zohar Hadash. Yelammedenu in Yalkut I, 47, and Hizkuni, Gen. 3. 16, remark that Eve was punished because she was still a part of Adam's body when God commanded him not to eat of the forbidden fruit and decreed death as a penalty.

<sup>82</sup> Tan. B. III, 39; Tan. Tazria' 9; BR 20. 2; BaR 19. 11; Sanhedrin 29a. Philo, too, attempts to explain why God did not afford the serpent the opportunity to plead his case; comp. *Leg. Alleg.*, 21. Philo and the Rabbis also explain why the serpent was first cursed; comp. *Quaestiones*, Gen. I. 94 (top); BR 20. 3; Berakot 61a; Ta'anit 15b; Sifra 10. 6; MHG I, 94 (top); comp. further ARN 1, 7 (below). The Midrash (Tan. B. III, 40; Tan. Tazria' 9) lays stress upon the fact that God's name is not mentioned in the curse pronounced against Adam and Eve, because He did not allow His name to be associated with evil. On this view which occurs in the Haggadah as well as in Philo, comp. note 9 on vol. I, p. 5, and note 176 on vol. II, p. 70.

<sup>83</sup> 2 ARN 42, 117. Other sources (PRE 14; MHG I, 96; comp. Ginzberg's note on this point in *Ha-Zofeh* IV, 31-32) enumerate nine penalties for each of the three sinners, and one, death, for all of them. PRE gives the downfall of Sammael and his host as the first penalty of the serpent, in agreement with the view of this Midrash, according to which the real seducer was Satan (=Sammael), who made use of the serpent; comp. note 116. Tadshe 8 gives six penalties for the serpent and five each for Adam and Eve. The leprosy of the serpent is also mentioned in BR 20. 4; Tan. B. II, 53,

as well as III, 42 and 47; Tan. Mezora' 2; ShR 3. 13; ps.-Epiphanius, *Hexaemeron*, 251. The statement made in Tan. that in the last judgment Edom's guardian angel (*i. e.* Sammael) will be afflicted with leprosy is partly connected with the identification of the serpent with Sammael. On the loss of the serpent's feet, comp. the following note. On the loss of the serpent's language, see note 58, where it is shown that rabbinic sources do not know of any primitive animal language; this is confirmed by the above-mentioned sources, which speak of the language which only the serpent possessed before his fall. Among European peoples, however, legends concerning animals becoming dumb are widespread; comp. Dähnhardt, *Natursagen*, I, 219-223.

<sup>84</sup> BR 20. 4-5; ARN 1, 5; Baraita 32 Middot, No. 12; Koheleth 10. 11; Tosefta Sotah 4. 18; Babli 9b. Comp. further note 183 on vol. I, p. 39. The cutting off of the serpent's feet is also mentioned (on the erectness of his stature comp. vol. I, p. 71) in Aphraates, 245. Comp. further Yelammedenu in Yalkut II, 961 (Prov. 26), which practically agrees with BR, *loc. cit.*, and note 124. According to 2 Alphabet R. Akiba 61, God split the tongue of the serpent as a punishment for the "evil tongue" he employed. Comp. Grünbaum, *Neue Beiträge*, 59-60.

<sup>85</sup> 'Erubin 100b; ARN 1, 4 (second version 42, 117; read מַחְרִיטָה "shows herself in public"); BR 20. 6-7; Tadshe 7. On the various views concerning the penalties, comp. Ginzberg's remarks in *Ha-Zofeh*, IV, 31-32. In all the sources menstruation is regarded as a penalty for Eve's sin, and since sexual desire is considered as the result of the eating of the forbidden fruit, the Gnostics, as well as the Kabbalists, maintain that menstruation came to Eve with the enjoyment of the fruit. Comp. note 3 on vol. I, p. 105; Dähnhardt, *Natursagen*, I, 211, is to be corrected accordingly. 2 Enoch 31. 7-8 remarks that it was only the serpent (here, Satan) and the wicked deeds of man that were really cursed, "but these (Adam and Eve), whom I had previously blessed, I did not curse". On this peculiar conception, comp. note 82 (end), and further note 60 on vol. I, p. 169, as well as PRK 31a (Schönblum's edition), which reads: Three were cursed, and their curses were beyond any limit, namely, the serpent, the woman (Eve), and the slave (Canaan). But Adam is not included among the cursed ones. In all the sources (BR 20. 5 and 95. 1; 2 ARN 42, 117; Tan. B. III, 47; Tan. Mezora' 2) it is especially stated

that in the "future" every one shall be cured except the serpent, who will remain cursed for ever.

<sup>86</sup> BR 20. 6; Yerushalmi Sotah 8 (beginning); Tehillim 9, 86.

<sup>87</sup> ARN 42, 116-117. Quite different is the view of PRE 14 concerning the punishments inflicted on Adam; comp. Ginzberg in *Ha-Zofeh*, IV, 31. On the "garments of light", comp. notes 69 and 93 (with respect to the "horny skin" mentioned vol. I, p. 74, as well as in the first passage, comp. Dähnhardt, *Natursagen*, I, index, s. v. "Mensch"; *Orehot Hayyim*, I, 68c); on the second punishment comp. Philo, *De M. Opif.*, 24 and 40. Whether death is the consequence of the sin committed or not, see note 142. All animals were tame before the fall of man, and will become tame again in Messianic times; comp. Tan. B. III, 47; Tan. Mezora' 2; BR 20. 5. Comp. further notes 59 and 113. On the curses which were pronounced against Adam, comp. also vol. I, pp. 97-98, and the notes appertaining to them. According to 2 ARN 34, 74, the years of man's life have been shortened, but not those of the animals.

<sup>88</sup> BR 5. 9; Yerushalmi Kil'ayim 1, 27b; comp. vol. I, p. 19.

<sup>89</sup> Zohar Hadash Bereshit 24b on Gen. 3. 15, where two views are cited as to how long the curse lasted over the earth; according to one, it lasted to the birth of Noah (comp. vol. I, pp. 146-147); according to another, to the birth of Abraham. The idea that the sun and the earth are witnesses for and against man, is already found in the older sources; comp. Sifre D., 306; note 105 on vol. I, p. 25. On the eclipse of the sun at the time of the fall of man, comp. the account given in Matthew 27. 45 of the eclipse of the sun at the time of the crucifixion of Jesus; see further Sukkah 29a and note 113.

<sup>90</sup> 2 ARN 42, 117; PRE 14; comp. Luria's note, *ad loc.*, and Ginzberg in *Ha-Zofeh*, IV, 31. On vermin as a consequence of the fall of man, see also BR 5. 9 and 20. 8, as well as the Christian legends; comp. Dähnhardt, *Natursagen*, I, 216. Another view declares that whatever God created has its value; comp. vol. I, p. 42, and the note appertaining to it. On the origin of the mountains, comp. note 31 on vol. I, pp. 112-113; on the disclosing of the absorbed blood by the earth, comp. vol. I, p. 112, as well as vol. III, pp. 31 and 91. On the curse of the earth comp. 2 Alphabet R. Akiba, 61.

<sup>91</sup> BR 20. 10; ARN 1, 6-7; Pesahim 118a; ER 31, 164.

<sup>92</sup> Slavonic Apocalypse of Baruch 9; the Greek version of the apocalypse reads: The moon did not hide at the time of the fall, although

it found itself near to Sammael when he seduced Eve. On the eclipse of the sun during the fall, see vol. I, p. 79 (below).

<sup>93</sup> PRE 20; Targum Yerushalmi Gen. 3. 21. Against this later view the older sources maintain that the garments mentioned in Gen., *loc. cit.*, were given to Adam and Eve by God before the fall, and that they really were not "garments of skin", but of light; comp. BR 20. 12, citing R. Meir's statement (the explanation given there שְׂרוּמֵי לְפָנֶיךָ is a later rationalistic addition), and note 69. The view that the garments were made of the skin of Leviathan (*Hadar, Da'at*, and Hizkuni on Gen., *loc. cit.*, very likely quoted the same source) wishes to retain עוֹר ("skin") in the biblical text, without losing the "light", since the skin of Leviathan has a shining lustre; comp. vol. I, pp. 27 and 28. The Church Fathers Irenaeus, III, 23. 5, and Tertullian, *De Pudicitia*, 9, and *De Resurrectione*, 7, speak of the celestial garments of Adam and Eve. Origen, *Contra Celsum*, 4. 40 (based very likely on Philo, *Quaestiones*, Gen. 1. 53), remarks: They received garments of skin at the time of the fall; *i. e.*, bodies, since before the fall they were spiritual beings. A similar statement is found in Zohar I, 36b, which reads: Before the fall they were dressed in garments of light" (= כְּתוּנַת אֹרֶךְ), after the fall in "garments of skin" (= כְּתוּנַת עוֹר), which were useful only for the body, not for the soul. A very important part is played by Adam and Eve's "garments of light" in the various versions of the Vita Adae; comp. *Adamschriften*, 52-53. However, we must not, without any further proof, connect the garments of light with the splendor of the light which shone over Adam before the fall (comp. note 105). But we shall not go astray if we identify them with the celestial garments of the pious, frequently mentioned in pseudepigraphic literature, and in early Christian as well as in kabbalistic writings; comp. Enoch 62. 16; 2 Enoch 22. 8-10; Ascension of Isaiah 4. 16, and the parallel passages cited by Charles. See further Zohar II, 150, and the lengthy discourse by Vital, *Sha'are Kedushah* (beginning). But also those who assert that Adam and Eve received their garments from God after the fall maintain that these clothes were of a superior and unusual kind. God created these garments at the twilight of the first Friday, hence it belongs to the primordial creations, on account of which both Adam and his descendants wore them as priestly garments at the time of the offering of the sacrifices. Furthermore they were not only of extraordinary brilliance and splendor, but had also supernatural qualities; comp. Sifre D., 355; Mekilta Wa-Yassa' 5, 51a; Pesahim

54b (top); 2 ARN 37, 95 (read *העור*, with respect to *כתנות עור*); BR 20. 2; Tan. B. I, 17-18 and 33. See further vol. I, pp. 177, 319, and 332. Identifying Adam's priestly garments, which he received after the fall, with the garment of light, Abkir has the following statement (Yalkut I, 34): God made high-priestly garments for Adam which were like those of the angels; but when he sinned, God took them away from him. In 2 ARN 42, 116, it is stated briefly: Adam wore splendid garments, which were removed from him after the commission of the sin. That the garments of Adam and Eve belonged to the primordial creations is also asserted in Christian sources; comp. ps.-Justinian, *Quaestiones, . . . ad Orthodoxos*, VI, 1293; Jacob Sarug, cited by Moses bar Cepha, *De Paradiso*, 84A; comp. further Theodoretus, Gen. 3. 27. The latter cannot admit that God killed certain animals in order to furnish Adam and Eve with clothes. The same objection to the literal interpretation of *כתנות עור* is very likely the basis of the statement in Sotah 14a and BR 20.12 that the garments of Adam and Eve were made of wool, or, according to others, of linen.

<sup>94</sup> BR 21. 5-9; Philo, *De M. Opif.*, 60. The cherubim as a definite group of angels are already mentioned in the Book of Enoch (comp. Enoch 61. 10; 2 Enoch 19. 6), and are even considered as the "angels of destruction", for which reason Enoch 20. 7 mentions them alongside with the serpents, and in ShR 9. 11 they are explicitly described as such. Later sources (*Pa'aneah*, Gen. 3. 24 and *Hinnuk*, precept 62) insert *שרים* instead of *מלאכי חבלה* (Rashi on Gen., *loc. cit.*, employs the latter, more accurate expression), which is not exactly correct, because the "angels of destruction" are not devils. The statement of *Hadar*, Gen., *loc. cit.*, that the cherubim have the form of steers is perhaps due to the confusion of *שרים* = *שורים* "oxen" with *שרים* "devils". However their name is explained in this source from the Aramaic *כרב* "he ploughed". This view concerning the form of the cherubim would be very interesting if it should contain a reminiscence of the winged bulls. Comp. Index, s. v. "Cherubim".

<sup>95</sup> MHG I, 106 (based on two different sources); ER 1 (beginning); Targum Yerushalmi Gen. 3. 24. Comp. also BR 21 (end), and Philo, *Quaestiones*, Gen. 1, 57. On the flaming sword which is found in front of paradise, comp. vol. I, p. 174, and the note appertaining to it, as well as *Hemat ha-Hemdah* 14a. In the last passage it is said (based on Sa'adya Gaon's remarks in his *Polemic*



against *Hiwi*, 37.3, where הליכתו means the road to paradise) that God, after Adam's expulsion from paradise, did not cause him to forget the way back to paradise; on the contrary, He always made him look at it, in order that he should ever bear in mind his transgression, which deprived him of his blissful habitation. The author then quotes the following narrative from a non-Jewish chronicle. There was a king in ancient times who wished to ascertain the exact situation of paradise. He betook himself to a neighboring district, at the mountain called Lebiah (= "lioness?"). At the top of this mountain one could hear the sound of swords turning about, which resounded from the other side of the river. He let some of his men down by means of poles, but none of them returned. The author, R. Shet b. Yefet, adds thereupon that this story confirms the view of those who take the biblical account of paradise literally. Comp. note 50 concerning the allegorical conception of the description of paradise. The sources quoted in the beginning of this note belong to the oldest group of rabbinic literature, which makes a serious attempt to give a figurative explanation of the biblical passages concerning paradise. The view found in Targum Yerushalmi Gen. 3. 24 that the flaming sword stands for Gehenna is also found in Lactantius, *Institutiones*, 12. 13. Comp. further Ginzberg, *Haggada bei den Kirchenv.*, 55-56.

<sup>96</sup> Apocalypse of Moses 27-29; Vita Adae 25. 4; Armenian Book of Adam in *Adamschriften*, 16. The tree of life is preserved for the pious in the world to come; Enoch 25. 4; 4 Ezra 7. 52; Revelation 2. 7 and 22. 14. Philo's remark, *De M. Opif.*, 54, seems to be directed against such a view. To the older rabbinic literature such a view is quite alien, but is well known to later authors; comp. MHG I, 127, where, in agreement with Revelation 22. 2, the "wholesome fruit" (Ezek. 47. 12) is identified with the tree of life. See further Targum Yerushalmi Gen. 3. 24, which, along with the old view, offers also the later interpretation of this verse. With respect to the spices which Adam brought from paradise, the following may be noted. Originally this legend wishes to convey that the various kinds of spices used in the temple came from paradise, which also furnished wood for the tabernacle (Shu'aib, end of Terumah). Subsequently, however, this was connected with another legend, according to which the civilization of the world goes back to Adam (comp. notes 31-32; Dähnhardt, *Natursagen*, I, index, s. v. "Adam"; Grünbaum, *Neue Beiträge*, 66), and therefore he had to be the one who brought for mankind,

from paradise, the seeds necessary for the cultivation of the soil. Some rabbinic passages (Tehillim 104, 445; comp. the manuscript reading quoted by Buber, note 66; the midrashic quotation by Duran, *Hofes Matmonim*, 90; 2 Alphabet of Ben Sira 21b) speak of thirty kinds of trees (based on a Persian legend; comp. Bundehesh, Justi's edition, 37, and Schorr in *He-Haluz*, VIII, 24), which Adam took with him from paradise; comp. note 74 on vol. I, p. 19; Löw, *Aramäische Pflanzennamen*, 2, and Ginzberg in *Zeitschrift für Hebräische Bibliographie*, XI, 126.

<sup>97</sup> PK 23, 150b; PR 46, 177b; Sanhedrin 38b; WR 19. 1, Tan. B. III, 31; Tan. Shemini 8; ARN 1, 5, 6, 8 (both versions); Tehillim 92, 403; PRE 11. Although according to the Jewish calendar, the day follows the night, nevertheless the twelve hours mentioned in the different versions of the legend are to be understood as a part of the sixth day (the sources quoted do not correspond, in all details, to one another; comp. also note 3 on vol. I, p. 105), since nothing was created at night; comp. BR 12, 14. The Church Fathers likewise assert that Adam sinned on the very first day of his creation. Some of the Christian sources divide this eventful day in a manner similar to that of the Rabbis, and they even find a Christological meaning in this division; comp. Irenaeus, V, 22. 2; Victorinus of Pettau, *De Fabrica Mundi*; Aphraates, 168; Ephraim, I, 19 C and in Moses bar Cepha, *De Paradiso*, 90A; *Schatzhöhle*, 7. Comp. further the passages cited in Ginzberg's *Haggada bei den Kirchenv.*, 48-49, as well as Malan in his notes on the book of Adam, 209-210. Quite different is the view concerning the time of the fall found in Jub. 3. 4, according to which Adam and Eve, who had both been created outside of paradise (this is also presupposed in the sources cited at the beginning of the note), did not enter it simultaneously, that is, Adam entered paradise when he was forty days old, while Eve did not arrive there until she was eighty days old, *i. e.*, when Adam was already eighty-seven days of age (he was seven days older than Eve). They stayed seven days and forty years in paradise, whence they were expelled on the first of Tammuz, seventy days after the fall, which took place on the seventeenth of Iyar. The Melchizedekite fragment (comp. 2 Enoch 90) seems to be the only source which, like the Book of Jub., speaks of seven years' sojourn in paradise. Philo, *Quaestiones*, Gen. 1. 25, observes that the formation of the female embryo (so is this passage to be understood) takes eighty days, that of the male only forty days. There can be no doubt that this observation wishes to explain the

law of Lev. 12. 4, *seq.*, as may be seen from Niddah 3. 7. Comp. vol. I, p. 163, and Roscher, *Die Zahl* 40, p. 103, *seq.* The connection of this law with the creation of Adam and Eve is, however, only found in Jub. This book also differs from the view current in the later Haggadah with regard to the date of the creation of the world. Jub. and Philo (*De Spec. Leg.*, 19; *Quaestiones*, Exod., 1. 1), as well as some rabbinic authorities of the first century C. E. (Rosh ha-Shanah 10b), are of the opinion that the world (the same view is held by the Stoics; comp. Arnim, *Stoic. Vet. Fragm.*, II, 584) was created in spring, or, to be more accurate, in the month of Nisan. A different view prevalent among the later Rabbis is that the world was created in autumn, in the month of Tishri; comp. Rosh ha-Shanah, *loc. cit.*, where R. Eliezer (about 100 C. E.) already maintains this view. The Jewish legend which considers that all first things were created in a fully developed form (comp. note 21) decided in favor of the opinion which fixes autumn, the "season of ripeness", as the time of creation. For the sake of accuracy, the legend maintains that it was the first day of autumn, the Jewish New Year, on which Adam was created, the same day on which he was expelled from paradise. Comp. PK 23, 150b; PR 46, 186b. Ephraim I, 15 A, and Theodoretus, Exod. 72, assume that the world was created in Nisan; see Ginzberg, *Haggada bei den Kirchenv.*, 31-32. Medieval authors point out that the letters of the word בראשית, with which the account of creation begins, may be re-arranged to read 'א בחשרי, that is, "on the first day of Tishri"; comp. *Pa'aneah*, Gen. 1. 1.

<sup>98</sup> Tan. B. I, 12; BR 11. 9 מריאים as a name for the demons is only found here, and may be explained either as a derivative of מרה "he rebelled", and accordingly, these demons were originally classed with the rebellious angels, or as derivative of מרה "master", = שד; comp. below); PR 46, 187b. Another classification of primordial creations is that of Jub. 3. 2, *seq.*, and (based on it) Tadshe 6, according to which the number of creations amounted to twenty-two, corresponding to the number of the letters of the Hebrew alphabet, the number of the books of the Bible (counting Lamentations as a part of Jeremiah and Ezra-Nehemiah as one), and the generations from Adam to Jacob. On the first day the following things were created: The heavens, earth, water, darkness, wind, abyss, and light; on the second day, the firmament; on the third day, the gathering of the waters, grass, trees, and paradise (in view of the doctrine of the pre-existence of paradise, Tadshe has springs, instead of

paradise, as the fourth creation of the third day); on the fourth day, the sun, the moon, the stars; on the fifth day, the sea-monsters, birds, and worms; on the sixth day, wild and domestic animals, creeping things, and Adam. Comp. the detailed account of the creations of each day in vol. I, pp. 8-30, and further Tan. Hayye Sarah 3. A Haggadah quoted by medieval authors (Pardes 56a; Mahzor Vitry, 108; *Shibbole ha-Leket*, 96; *Kimha Dabishuma*, on the dirge אִיכָה עָצַם), from a Sefer Yezirah (not in ours), endeavors to demonstrate in an elaborate manner why the world was created in seven days: Each two days of creation form a pair of witnesses on the unity of God, the uniqueness of Israel, and the singular sanctity of the Sabbath. Furthermore, Israel and the Sabbath testify to the unity of God; God and the Sabbath testify to the uniqueness of Israel; God and Israel testify to the singular sanctity of the Sabbath.—The demons, in accordance with their origin, are between angels and men. They have wings like the former, and move about from one end of the earth to the other, and know what will come to pass; but, like the latter, they eat and drink, propagate their kind, and die. They also have this much in common with angels that they assume any form they please, and that they can see man without being seen by him. See Hagigah 16a; Tan. B. I, 12 (there is a statement here also concerning the sexual relations between men and demons; comp. vol. I, p. 118); Berakot 6a; PR 6, 24a (the angels can see the demons, but the demons cannot see the angels); 2 ARN 37, 109; Kisse we-Ippodromin, 35; PRK (Schönblum's edition, 15b); Ma'aseh Torah, 98 (where it is said: They live with one another, like angels, without hatred or envy); Mahzor Vitry, 507. The assertion that demons do not cast a shadow (Gittin 60a, and Yerushalmi 6, 48b) is very likely connected with the conception that the shadow is that soul which reflects the body (comp. note 18 on polypsychism), and since demons have no bodies, they have no shadows. On the countless numbers of demons, comp. Berakot 6a; Gittin 68a (שׂוֹדָה עֲצוּמָה) means: this female demon which is mentioned in Eccl. 2. 8, cannot be accurately determined, since there are so many of them); Tehillim 91, 398. As to the view found in pseudepigraphic literature, and prevalent among the Church Fathers (comp. Bousset, *Religion*, 382, *seq.*), according to which the demons are the descendants of the fallen angels, from their union with the daughters of man, nothing but a slight trace thereof remains in rabbinic literature (comp. Index, s. v. "Angels, the Fallen"). The doctrine connected with this view concerning the demons as seducers

to idolatry and other transgressions does not occur at all in rabbinic literature. The view found in Josephus, *Bell. Jud.*, VII, 6. 3, as well as in Philo, *De Gigant.*, 6-8, and *De Somn.*, 1. 133-136, that demons are the souls of the wicked reappears again in the Kabbalah (comp. Zohar III, 70a), where it is borrowed from Christian sources, while it is entirely unknown to the earlier Rabbis; comp., however, note 88 on vol. I, p. 180. The mortal nature of the demons is also known to Eusebius, 206, who quotes Plutarch as his authority.

<sup>99</sup> Abot 5. 9; Mekilta Wa-Yassa' 5, 51a; Sifre D., 355; Midrash Tannaim 219; Pesahim 54a; PRE 19 (comp. Luria, *ad loc.*); PRK (Schönblum's edition, 40a; Grünhut's edition, 85); 2 ARN 27, 95; Targum Yerushalmi Num. 22. 18; Seder Rabba di-Bereshit 7. No two of the sources cited exactly correspond with one another in the enumeration of the things which lie on the boundary-line between the primordial things and those developed out of them, comp. Ginzberg, *Haggada bei den Kirchenv.* 50. 'Aknin's assertion, in his commentary on Abot, *loc. cit.*, that these things were created in the twilights of the first six days is untenable. Besides the things enumerated in the text, others are also mentioned: The first pair of tongs (on this point comp. Tosefta 'Erubin, end, and Hagigah I, end, as well as *Adamschriften*, 54), without which no other instrument could be made; Moses' staff; the Shamir; the garments of Adam and Eve (comp. note 93); fire (without which no civilization would have been possible) comp., however, note 104; the mule (comp. vol. I, p. 424, on the origin of the mule, and further vol. IV, p. 125); the pillars of fire and of cloud, which moved before Israel in the wilderness, as well as the clouds of glory which surrounded them (ARN, *loc. cit.*, it is thus to be explained according to Targum Yerushalmi and Seder Rabba di-Bereshit, *loc. cit.*); the vessel in which the manna has been preserved in the holy of holies; the demons (comp. the preceding note); the ram which Abraham sacrificed in place of Isaac. Comp. also note 31, according to which *כתב ומכתב* in the above-mentioned passages refer perhaps to the use of "writing" and "stylus", and not to the material which was employed for the tables; see Mahzor Vitry, *ad loc.*; Rashi on Pesahim, *loc. cit.*; Responsa of the Geonim (Harkavy's edition, 11-12); Nahmias, commentary on Abot, *loc. cit.* See further note 258 on vol. III, p. 119; comp. also vol. III, pp. 362, 477.

<sup>100</sup> Zohar Hadash, Gen. 2. 4, 22a. The conception that the entire universe chants a continuous song to God is widely known; comp. Alphabet of R. Akiba 12, and the details given in note 194 on vol.

I, p. 46. On the song of the heavenly bodies on the first Sabbath, comp. the following note.

<sup>101</sup> Seder Rabba di-Bereshit 7-8, where at the end the following reading is to be adopted, with *Kimha Dabishuna* (on אל ברוך in the morning prayer of the Day of Atonement): אמר ה' לאדם לשבת אתה אומר ולי אין אתה. This Midrash is the source, direct or indirect, of the statement of the medieval authors concerning the song chanted by the Sabbath. Comp. Hasidim 126; *ha-Mahkim* 133; *Orehot Hayyim* I, 64d-65a; *Tola' at Jacob* (סוד השבת ברוך שאמר); Yalkut Reubeni, Gen. 2. 3, and in the supplement of this work *Shikhat Leket* (שבת No. 4); Treves' commentary on the Prayer Book (לאל אשר שבת); ps.-Rashi on BR 14 (end); Bereshit Rabbeti, according to the manuscript quotation thereof in *Ha-Hoker*, II, 1. Many medieval writers quote from BR, or rather Yerushalmi (comp. Buber *Yerushalayim ha-Benuyah*, note 90, and further *Orehot Hayyim* I, 36c; Abudirham ג' סעודות; Tosafot Ketubot 7b, below; *Sefer Mizvot Gadol*, precept 48), the following sentence: "Come and chant a song; a guest, Sabbath, is come." Comp. also the quotation, from the Midrash, in *Or Zarua'* II, 18c and 47a; *ha-Mahkim*, 136: Angels have six wings, one for each day of the week with which they chant their song; but they remain silent on the Sabbath, for it is Israel (Sabbath?) who then chants a hymn to God. On this point comp. Ginzberg, *Geonica*, II, 48. All these legends about the songs on the Sabbath, or rather of the Sabbath (on this conception among the Mohammedans, comp. Goldziher in the *Kaufmann-Gedenkbuch*, 87) are later developments of the legend mentioned in note 103. The personification of the Sabbath reaches its utmost limits among the Falashas; comp. *Teezaza Sanbat* 12b *seq.*, on the angel Sabbath, God's favorite, whom all the other angels adore and to whom they chant a song. On the various angels who participate in the glorification of God and the joy of the Sabbath, comp. Tehillim 104, 440, which reads: There is nothing below which does not have one appointed over it above, corresponding to it. *Recognitiones*, I, 45, says: When God created the world, . . . he appointed chiefs over the several creatures, even over the trees and the mountains, over the fountains and the rivers, and over all the things He had made. BR 9. 6 reads: There is not a blade of grass which does not have its star in heaven, urging it, saying: "Grow." Comp. Maimonides, *Guide of the Perplexed*, II, 10; Zohar (addition from *Sitre Otiyyot*, I, 15a), where instead of the

star (מול) the reading ממונה of Tehillim, *loc. cit.*, is found. Comp. note 60 on vol. I, p. 137.

<sup>102</sup> Jub. 2. 17-20. That the angels rest on the Sabbath is also mentioned in Tikkunim 48, 86a. Comp., on the contrary, PR 23, 120, which records the witty answer of R. Akiba to Tinaeus Rufus on the question why God allows the powers of nature to work on the Sabbath (comp. John 5. 17), when everything rests. That nature, however, is not exactly the same on the Sabbath as on week-days may be seen from the state of rest of the river Sambation (comp. Index, s. v.) and from the failure of the necromancers on that day (on this point comp. also Sanhedrin 65b). In connection with the Sabbath rest, rabbinic literature in many places emphasizes the doctrine that the creation must not be taken as a direct act of God, but as the word of God. It is further emphasized that even after the completion of creation God's activity continues in the deeds of the pious, as well as of the wicked, by means of which they create for themselves their portions in the world to come. Comp. Mekilta Bahodesh 7, 69b, and Shabbat 104b; Mekilta RS, 109 and 162; Midrash Tannaim 22-23; BR 10. 9 and 11. 5-6, 9; PR 23, 120, and 41, 174a; Tan. Ki-Tissa 33. The above-mentioned passages contain many expressions about the great significance of the Sabbath (comp. also Tehillim 19, 162, and 92, 201-202). It may be noted, however, that nowhere in the old rabbinic literature is there to be found a trace of the mystical conception of the Sabbath occurring in Philo (*Moses*, 2 [3]. 33), according to which this distinguished day dates not only since the world was created, but from the time when the heaven and all the perceptible universe were still uncreated. It is only in PRE 3 that the Sabbath is counted among the things which existed in the thought of God prior to the creation of the world; comp. Excursus I. On the eternal Sabbath in the world to come, see note 140. The Sabbath must not be understood as a cessation from the work of creation, but as a creation in itself; everything was created in six days except rest, which was created on the Sabbath; hence Scripture speaks of the completion of creation on the Sabbath (Gen. 2. 2); comp. BR 10. 9, and the parallels cited by Theodor, where several explanations of the peculiar wording of this biblical verse are offered, and where it is further stated that the elders who translated the Torah for Talmai (=Ptolemy) did not give a literal rendering of Gen. 2. 2, but translated: "And God completed on the sixth day." Comp. note 140.

<sup>103</sup> PRE 19; Tehillim 92, 404, and 5, 22; PR 46, 187b. The older sources (BR 22. 13; PK 22, 160b; Tan. B. I, 19; WR 10. 4; Baba Batra 14b; Shir 4.4) know only that Adam composed Psalm 92 on the glorification of repentance (תְּשׁוּבָה = הַשְׁבֵּת), in accordance with the method of the Haggadah, when he repented of his sins; comp. vol. I, p. 112. In ARN 1, 7 (whence it was borrowed by Alphabet R. Akiba 15), on the contrary, it is stated that Adam and the angels equally shared in the composition of this Psalm, which they sang in honor of the Sabbath, to the accompaniment of music, on the first day after the expulsion from paradise, which occurred in the twilight of the first Sabbath. Comp. also Targum on Ps. 92. 1, and note 101. The statement frequently made in later sources (comp., however, Sanhedrin 65b and BR 11. 5) that the wicked in hell rest on the Sabbath is closely related to this legend, according to which Adam was delivered from the suffering from hell by the Sabbath; comp. PR 23, 120a; Tan. Ki-Tissa 33; Seder Gan 'Eden 43; Recanati on Gen. 3. 24; R. Bahya on Exod. 20. 8.

<sup>104</sup> BR 11. 1 and 12. 6 (in both passages מְרִידוֹ מִנֵּיץ is a later gloss, which is due to a misunderstanding; the difference of opinion of the scholars quoted there turns about the question whether Adam was allowed to retain the heavenly light on the first day after the expulsion, but not on the question whether he spent a night in paradise or not; comp. the sources cited in note 97, all of which agree that Adam left paradise before night); Mekilta RS, 109 (this is the source for BR, *loc. cit.*: יוֹסִי = אֹסִי); Mekilta Bahodesh 7, 69b; PR 23, 118a-118b and 46, 186b-187a (at the same time the significance of New Year is here emphasized; comp. note 97); Yerushalmi Berakot 8, 12b; Pesahim 54a; PRE 20; Tehillim 92, 402. In most of the sources the primordial light is already identified with the splendor of Adam's countenance, whereas originally a different view had been entertained. The former belongs to a widespread cosmological speculation, according to which creation was made possible by the advance of the primordial light into the darkness of chaos; this is connected with Gen. 1. 3. Comp. also note 19 on vol. I, p. 9. See also vol. I, pp. 262, 388; vol. IV, p. 234. This light appears in Philo, *De M. Opif.*, 8 and 18, as the invisible and ideal, as the image of God's wisdom. On the other hand, the splendor of Adam's countenance is the concrete expression of the legend of the divine nature of man before his fall, and belongs to the view concerning the light of the pious in the world to come, which is prevalent in Jewish, as well as in Christian, eschatology; comp.



Bousset, *Religion*, 318, for the references to this view in pseudepigraphic and ancient rabbinic literature. See further Sifre D., 10; Midrash Tannaim 6; WR 30. 2; ER 3, 14; Yerushalmi Hagigah 2, 77a (below), where the sentence of Sifre, *loc. cit.*, (שבוע כחות), appears in abbreviated form. Comp. also note 93 with regard to the "garments of light" of Adam and Eve. See further Preuschen, *Adam-schriften*, 52, as well as notes 24 and 69. A rationalistic explanation of Adam's splendor is found in BR, *loc. cit.*, and parallel passages, where it is said that man's face is brighter on the Sabbath than on week-days because of the rest and the pleasure he enjoys. Reference may also be made here to the statement found in the Talmud (Bezah 16a, and parallel passages) that upon the arrival of the Sabbath, man (*i. e.*, the Jew) receives an "additional soul", which stays with him until the expiration of the Sabbath; comp. Berliner, *Jahrbuch für jüd. Geschichte und Literatur*, 1910, 205.—The part of Prometheus, which is ascribed to Adam, who, endowed with God-like wisdom, brought down fire and light (comp. on this point Jellinek, *Einführung* to BHM V, 48), is connected with the cycle of legends, in which the beginnings of culture were traced back to Adam; comp. notes 31 and 99. The stones which he used in bringing down the light are more accurately described in Tehillim 92, 404; one was the stone of darkness, the other the stone of dimness; comp. Job 28. 3, and vol. I, p. 8 (below), with regard to these stones of the abyss. In *Orehot Hayyim* I, 68c, the legend of the "horny skin" is connected with the one which treats of the bringing down of the fire, and states that Adam brought down the light by means of his finger-nails (comp. vol. I, p. 74 and note 69).

<sup>105</sup> BR 12. 6; Tan. B. I, 13; Tan. Bereshit 6; BaR 13. 12; comp. further Sifra 26. 4-13; ShR 30. 3. Another version is preserved in PRK (Schönblum's edition, 43b); Kebod Huppah 19-21; MHG I, 126-130. In these sources twenty-two or twenty-four blessings are enumerated which God had bestowed on Adam, of which man was gradually deprived after the fall of Adam and the sins of the following generations, and which mankind will receive again in Messianic times. On account of his sins Adam forfeited the so-called image of God (*i. e.*, the God-like splendor), tall stature, paradise and the tree of life. The generation of the deluge in consequence of its sins, lost its gigantic strength, its longevity, the multitude of children, and peace. The generation of the Tower of Babel lost the unity of speech, that is, the Hebrew language. The

generation of the sinful cities (Sodom and Gomorrah) lost riches and fertility of the soil. The generation of the wilderness lost six heavenly blessings: the manna, the well which followed them in their wanderings, the pillars of cloud and fire, the knowledge of the Ineffable Name, and the presence of the Shekinah. With the exile of the ten tribes real joy passed out of existence. Upon the destruction of Jerusalem the Davidic dynasty, the dignity of the high priest, the Holy Spirit, the Jewish courts of justice (Synhedrion), the temple, and the abundance of the water of Gihon passed away. This stream used to water Palestine, but Hezekiah stopped up its springs, so that the heathens should not in their envy take possession of Jerusalem, and expel Israel therefrom. Comp. the passages cited by Horowitz in *Kebod Huppah*, and parallels cited by Schechter on MHG, I, *loc. cit.* See further MHG I, 103 (top; this passage, which is closely related to the sources cited in note 90 concerning the ten curses of Adam, and Index, under the twenty-four objects given above. On the fertility of the soil in Messianic times, comp. note 30 on vol. I, p. 112, and Yerushalmi Kil'ayim 4, 35c. On the beauty of man in Messianic times, comp. Zohar I, 113b.

<sup>106</sup> Vita Adae 1-17. The Slavonic version of this pseudograph offers essential variants, but they are very likely of Christian origin, and the same remark applies to the Armenian additions to the Vita in Preuschen, *Adamschriften*, 30 and 41. The description of Adam's repentance in Vita is also found in rabbinic sources (PRE 20). On the first Sunday after his expulsion from paradise, it is said in this Midrash (Zohar I, 55b, is based on PRE, and is not an independent source), Adam betook himself to the waters of the upper Gihon (a play on the words of the root גָּחַן "he bent down", *i. e.*, repented, and חָרַץ "the creeper" = "the serpent", comp. BR 16. 4), where he stayed, without food, up to his neck in the water, for seven weeks continually, until his body became perforated like a sponge. He then prayed to God, saying: "Pardon my sins and accept my repentance, so that all future generations may know that repentance is efficacious, and that Thou forgivest those who return to Thee." Whereupon God stretched out His right hand, forgave Adam's sins, and accepted his repentance. On the relation of PRE to the Vita, comp. Israel Lévi, *R.E.J.*, XVIII, 86, *seq.*, and his treatise *Le Péché Originel*, 24, *seq.*; Epstein in *Magazin*, XX, 252-253; Grünbaum, *Neue Beiträge*, 61, *seq.* All these writers are of the opinion that PRE goes back

to the Vita, and this latter work they consider as Christian. Comp., on the other hand, Ginzberg, *Haggada bei den Kirchenv.*, 51, seq., and *Jewish Encyclopedia*, s. v. "Adam, Book of", as well as Charles, *Pseudepigraphs*, 123, seq., with reference to the Jewish character of the Vita and the independence of PRE from Christian sources. The following remarks may be made here. Vita reads (6) that Adam commanded Eve to stand up to her neck in water (*usque ad collum*), corresponding to עַד צְאוּרֵי (PRE, *loc. cit.*). This shows that both sources go back to the old Halakah (comp. Yoma 87a), according to which a ritual bath can only purify when it reaches one's neck; but this does not prove the dependence of PRE on Vita, as is asserted by Epstein, *loc. cit.* Vita (10) remarks that Eve's body became like grass, because of her long stay in the water. This becomes intelligible only when we compare it with the Hebrew of PRE which reads: עַד שֶׁנֶּעֱשֶׂה נוֹפוֹ כַּמִּין יְרוּקָה (the Epstein manuscript and Makiri on Ps. 32, 206, have the correct text, whereas כִּבְרָה is the result of a learned "emendation", based on Ta'anit 22b; Yalkut I, 34, reads כִּלְבוֹ, which is meaningless, and is certainly a corruption of כִּלְרוֹ = נוֹמֵר, *i. e.*, the passage in the Yalkut is shortened from PRE), *i. e.*, his body became like a sponge (on יְרוּקָה comp. Löw, *Pflanzennamen*; Ginzberg, *Geonica*, II, 321). The translator of the Vita from the Hebrew did not understand this rare word, and thought that it meant a "herb" (like יֶרֶק). Adam's repentance is alluded to in a statement by R. Meir (about 150 C. E.), who remarks that Adam was very pious (חַסִּיד has often the meaning of ascetic), and when he saw that death was decreed against him and the human race, he separated himself from his wife for one hundred and thirty years, during which time he was covered with leaves of a fig-tree (they sting the body; comp. Irenaeus III, 23. 5, and note 70). See 'Erubin 18b; BR 20. 11 and 24. 6; Tan. B. I, 20; BaR 14. 12. According to another legend, if Adam had repented immediately after his fall, he would have been spared the punishment (comp. note 78). But he resolved to repent after he had learned that God forgave Cain's sin through repentance. Comp. BR 32 (end), and the passages cited in note 28 on vol. I, p. 112. Only Mishle 9, 64, speaks of Eve's repentance. The very old legend (comp. note 265 on vol. I, p. 289) that Adam and Eve shared the same sepulchre with the three patriarchs presupposes the idea that they had repented of their sins and died as "saints", otherwise it would have been against the Jewish sentiment to have the "pious" patriarchs buried together with the sinners; comp. Mishnah Sanhedrin 6. 6;

Tosefta 9. 9; Tehillim 26, 219 (Abrabanel, *Ma'yene ha-Yeshuah*, 6. 1, cites this passage of Midrash Tehillim from the Tosefta, which is due to the inaccurate quotation in Yalkut II, 704); Sanhedrin 47a. On a combination of 'Erubin, *loc. cit.*, with PRE, *loc. cit.*, are based the statements concerning Adam's repentance in Hasidim 23 and Zohar Hadash Ruth 97b (ר' נחמיה פתח). Comp. further *Ha-Kaneh*, 103d. On Adam's repentance in Arabic literature, comp. Grünbaum, *Gesammelte Aufsätze*, 511, and *Neue Beiträge*, 65. See also note 138.

<sup>107</sup> 'Abodah Zarah 8a, where, though it is not explicitly stated, it is to be understood that Adam noticed the increasing night during the time of his repentance; comp. Ginzberg, *Haggada bei den Kirchenv.*, 51-52. Concerning Adam's fear of darkness see further vol. I, p. 86, and the following note. In Yerushalmi 1, 39c, the term *Calandae* (accusative *Calandas*) is explained as *καλὸν* "beautiful" and *dies*, "day" (comp. *Eshkol* III, 116, and R. Hananel on Babli *loc. cit.*), and it is remarked that when Adam observed the increasing day, he exclaimed: "Beautiful day", for his fear of darkness vanished on this account. In the same passage a Hebrew etymology is given of *Saturnalia*, which is said to mean "hatred and revenge", namely, of Esau (=Rome) against Israel. It may be worth while to cite the statement of Yerushalmi that when Adam saw the increasing darkness, he became possessed of fear that the serpent might attack him.

<sup>108</sup> 'Abodah Zarah 8a; ARN 1, 7. A similar statement is found in some of the versions of the Adam Book (comp. Preuschen, *Adamschriften*, 30, 541). On this legend and the others related to it, in which the mythological conception of the serpent (comp. the preceding note and vol. I, p. 86) which swallowed the sun is easily recognisable, comp. Grünbaum, *Gesammelte Aufsätze*, 130-143.—The wonderful one-horned ox, which Adam offered as a sacrifice is frequently alluded to. In addition to the passages cited, comp. Shabbat 28b and Yerushalmi 2, 4d; PR 33, 154a; Koheleth 1. 9; Tehillim 39, 256. It has absolutely nothing to do with the fabulous ox of the Persians (*gajomarth*) with which it is identified by Kohut, *Z.D.M.G.* XXV, 78. Comp. also note 146 on vol. I, p. 31; ARN, *loc. cit.*, reads further: The ox which Adam offered, the bullock which Noah offered (upon leaving the ark), and the ram which Abraham sacrificed (instead of Isaac) got their horns prior to their hoofs. The idea implied is that these animals belong to primordial creations, that they came to the world completely developed (comp. note 21), so that when these ani-

mals came forth from the earth, they put out their heads first, with their horns on them.

<sup>109</sup> BR 24. 9; PRE 23 and 31; Targum Yerushalmi Gen. 8. 20. Adam's house of prayer, alluded to in the Apocalypse of Moses 5 and Vita Adae 30, is perhaps nothing more than the Christian substitute for the altar at Jerusalem given in the Jewish original of these writings. That Adam erected an altar on mount Moriah cannot be considered strange, since not only was the dust, used for the formation of his body, taken from the same place (comp. note 16), but it was also this mountain on which he landed after the expulsion from paradise, because the gate of Moriah is found in the proximity of paradise. Comp. PRE 20; Targum Yerushalmi Gen. 3. 23. It is hard to tell whether the midrashic view of Gen., *loc. cit.*, according to which Adam settled in the east of paradise, after his expulsion (comp. Septuagint, *ad loc.*; BR 22, 9; Tan. B. V, 16; Ginzberg, *Haggada bei den Kirchengew.*, 55), is connected with Adam's stay in Jerusalem or not. Comp. Luria on PRE. The statement in 2 Enoch 68. 5 that, after Enoch's translation, his sons erected an altar in the place called Ahuzan, is also related to the account of Adam's stay in Jerusalem, where he erected an altar. That this Ahuzan (*i. e.* אַחֲזָא; comp. the description of Jerusalem as אַחֲזָא in Ezek. 48. 20, *seq.*) is no other place than Jerusalem may be seen from the Melchizedek fragments 3. 35, where Melchizedek declares that he, "king and priest shall be in the place Ahuzan, that is to say, in the middle of the earth where Adam was created". Jerusalem is the centre of the earth (vol. I, p. 12), and Melchizedek was both king and priest of Jerusalem (vol. I, p. 233). On the connection of the Golgotha legend with this cycle of legends, comp. note 137. On the idea that paradise is in the proximity of Jerusalem, comp. also the Armenian version of Vita Adae in Preuschen, *Adamschriften*, 27, where Jerusalem is designated as the city of the fallen angels. This is not due, as Preuschen believes, to an anti-Jewish tendency, but because the holy city is both the gate of paradise, as well as of Gehenna (see note 55 on vol. I, p. 15, and Index, *s. v.* "Gehenna"), where the fallen undergo their punishment.

<sup>110</sup> Sefer Raziel (beginning). This book which came down to us in its present form from the thirteenth century, and is probably the work of R. Eleazar of Worms, contains, in its many parts, old geonic mysticism. Another version of the legend how the Book of Raziel was given to Adam is found in Zohar I, 55b. According to this version, God caused a book to come to Adam through the angel Raziel (Raz,

“secret”; El, “God”), while he was still in paradise, by means of which he was able to master all the seventy-two kinds of wisdom, as well as the heavenly mysteries which were unknown even to the angels. The angel Hadarniel, accordingly, remarked to Adam: “Thou art in possession of thy Master’s treasures, with whose contents not even the dwellers of heaven are acquainted.” After the fall (this is the only passage in rabbinic literature which speaks of Adam’s stay in paradise for a longer time; comp. note 97), this book disappeared from Adam’s presence, and he received it back from Raphael’s hands only after he had repented (comp. note 106; read עבדין גופיה חולדין, according to Yerushalmi Shebi’it 9, 39d; BR 79. 6; Koheleth 10. 8; PK 10, 88b; Tehillim 18, 134; Esther R 1. 9). When Adam died the book came into the possession of Seth, and afterwards it was handed over to Noah and Abraham. Comp. also Zohar I, 37b, and 118a. On the different versions of the legend concerning the mysterious book of Adam, comp. vol. I, pp. 154–157, and the notes appertaining to them. It is noteworthy that the older rabbinic literature knows nothing of such a book belonging to Adam or composed by him. The statement in Baba Mezi’a 85b (below; comp. the sources cited in note 27) concerning the book which God had shown to Adam implies only that God revealed to Adam all the future generations of mankind and has no reference to a book composed by him or given to him. It is interesting to note that R. Hai Gaon (about 1000) never heard of any Adam book; comp. his remarks on Baba Mezi’a, *loc. cit.*, in Responsa of the Geonim (Harkavy’s edition, 103), Müller, *Responsen Lehrer des Ostens*, No. 31, and Horowitz, *Toratan shel Rishonim* II, Nos. 1 and 3 (this passage has מרוי instead of the incorrect מרוי). 2 Enoch 33. 9–10 mentions, together with the Enoch writings, also those of Adam, Seth, Kainan, Mahalalel, and Jared, which writings God gave to two angels to take care of.—On the statement of Sefer Raziel that the fear with which Adam had inspired the animals disappeared after his fall, see note 113. Concerning the assertion made in the same source that wisdom abandoned Adam as a consequence of his having eaten the forbidden fruit, comp. PRK (Schönblum’s edition, 43b), where among the blessings Adam forfeited as a result of his sin (comp. note 105), wisdom and knowledge (דעה וחכמה) are enumerated. The forbidden fruit gave him human knowledge and discernment, but he lost true knowledge and God-like wisdom through it.

<sup>111</sup> Vita Adae 30; Apocalypse of Moses 5–6. Here it is pre-

supposed that in Adam's time illness came only as the immediate forerunner of death. Comp. on this point vol. II, p. 131, and vol. IV, pp. 274-275. In connection with the ante-diluvian generations, BR 26. 5 observes that they spent their lives without suffering any pain or disease. On Adam's place of prayer see note 109.

<sup>112</sup> Vita Adae 31; Apocalypse of Moses 6. In rabbinic sources illness is not regarded as the direct consequence of the fall, very likely because it is considered as the beginning of death; comp. the preceding note. On the number of diseases comp. note 129.

<sup>113</sup> Apocalypse of Moses 9-12; Vita Adae 24-39. The tree of life is identified in these, as well as in other Jewish and Christian writings, and also among the Gnostics, with the olive-tree; comp. 2 Enoch 8. 7 and 22. 8, as well as 66. 2; 5 Ezra 2. 12; *Evang. Nicod.* 18; *Descent of Christ* 3; *Recognitiones*, 1. 45; Hippolytus 5. 2; Origen, *Contra Celsum*, 6. 27, where the words of Celsus certainly go back to Ophitic writings. As has already been observed in note 70, no definite determination of the tree of life can be found in rabbinic literature, nor does it know of the life-giving oil. The resurrection of the dead, according to the statements found in this literature, will be brought about through the "dew of light" (Is. 26. 19); comp. Hagigah 12b; PRE 35 Yerushalmi Berakot 1, 9b; Apocalypse of Baruch 29. 7 and 73. 2. Comp. further note 12 on vol. IV, p. 197; vol. IV, pp. 333 and 360. In 2 Enoch 25 the view of the Rabbis is combined with that of the Apocalyptic writers about the life-giving oil; hence the following description of this oil: "The appearance of that oil was more than a great light, and its anointing was excellent dew." On the "dew of light" among the Gnostics, comp. Preuschen, *Adamschriften*, 63. On the tree of life comp. also Enoch 24. 4, where it is identified with the palm. Comp. also BR 69. 8 and PRE 35, concerning the oil which came down from heaven for Jacob's sake, with which he anointed the site of Luz, whose inhabitants live forever; comp. vol. IV, p. 30.—In the legend concerning the meeting of Seth with the wild beasts the idea implied is that Adam lost his power over animals through his sin; hence the pious need not fear them. Moreover, in Messianic times (comp. note 105) the old relations between men and animals will be restored. Reference may be made here to the numerous parallels to these views from rabbinic sources: Sifre N., 1 (end) and Sifre D., 50; Sifra 26.6; Tosefta Shabbat (end); Babli 151a; Yerushalmi 14, 14b and 14c; Tosefta Berakot 3. 20; Yerushalmi 5, 9a; Babli 33a; PK 5, 44b; PR

15, 68b; Shemuel 18, 97; Midrash Shir 29a; Koheleth 5. 10; Aggadat Bereshit 15, 32; DR 4. 4; 2 ARN 45, 117; Targum Yerushalmi Gen. 3. 15. Comp. further vol. I, p. 71 (end of section); vol. I, pp. 90, 98 (top); vol. II, pp. 204, 221; note 104 on vol. IV, p. 334. Philo, *De M. Opif.*, 28, observes, with respect to the conditions before the fall: And all those who were very wild by nature became meek and submissive... for everything that is mortal He subjected to him. Philo thus agrees with the Rabbis who do not consider the wildness of animals as the consequence of the fall of man (as do the pseudepigraphic writings referred to at the beginning of this note), but is due to the fact that they cease to be submissive to man. BR 34. 12 reads: The animals' fear and terror of man came back after the flood, but not man's dominion over them. The latter came back in the time of Solomon. While the old rabbinic literature (in agreement with Sibylline Oracles 3, 788, *seq.*) maintains that the wildness of the animals will disappear in Messianic times (basing the view on Lev. 26, 6), the medieval philosophers do not support this view. Comp. Ginzberg, *Compte Rendu* 34=*R.E.J.*, 68, 148. The instinctive shyness of certain animals in the presence of a living man (but not of a dead one; comp. BR, *loc. cit.*, and parallel passages) is ascribed to the fact that man has his star (*i. e.*, guardian angel; comp. notes 20 and 101); see Baba Kamma 2b, 41a, and Meiri's remarks in *Shita Mekubbezet* on the first passage. The view that even wild animals fear and obey the saints, etc., occurs quite frequently in Jewish as well as in Christian legends; comp. Günter, *Christliche Legende*, index, s. v. "Tiere". Comp. Ginzberg, *Haggada bei den Kirchenv.*, 80-81.

<sup>114</sup> Apocalypse of Moses 13; Vita Adae 40-42. On the distribution of the food of the tree of life in the world to come, comp. the sources cited in note 96. See further Enoch 25. 4-5; 12 Testaments, Levi 18. 11; Lekah, Gen. 2. 9.

<sup>115</sup> Apocalypse of Moses 14; Vita Adae 44. On the number and names of the sons and daughters of Adam, comp. ps.-Philo (beginning); Josephus, *Antiqui.*, I, 2. 3.

<sup>116</sup> Apocalypse of Moses 15-30. Vita Adae, which is closely related to this source, does not contain any details on the fall of Adam, while, on the other hand, the former, but not the latter, has a description of the fall of Satan; comp. note 35. It may be remarked here that PRE 14, which some scholars consider dependent on Vita (comp. note 106), puts the fall of Satan after the fall of Adam, or more accurately, makes the former a consequence of the latter; but in Vita,



on the other hand, the relation is reversed. The fact that in PRE Sammael appears as the seducer instead of Satan is, of course, no variant, since in rabbinic literature these two were regarded as identical in quite early times. The etymology of Sammael as the "blind one" (סומא), who does not see the pious, is found in the *Acts of Andrew and Matthias* (towards the end), as well as in kabbalistic sources. Comp. 'Erke ha-Kinuyim, s. v. סומא, where = סמא, סמא אחרא, i. e., Sammael. In Enoch 69. 6 it is the fallen angel Gadriel "who showed the children of men all the blows of death, and who led Eve astray, and showed all the weapons of death to the children of men." Gadriel very likely stands for Katriel, and is connected with Aramaic קטר "he intrigued", "revolted."

<sup>117</sup> Apocalypse of Moses 16. "Became a vessel" is a Hebraism = כלי לדברוח; comp. Taylor, *Sayings of the Jewish Fathers*, 26; Ginzberg, *Unbekannte Sekte*, 39. The view prevalent in this source that Satan was the real seducer, but employed the cunning serpent as his servant, represents the transition from the older literal conception of the biblical report concerning the fall (comp. note 50) to the allegorical interpretation which identifies the serpent with Satan; comp., e. g., Revelation 12. 9; note 83, and index, s. v. "Serpent", and "Dragon". Origen, *De Princ.*, 3. 21, and PRE 13 practically agree with the harmonizing view of the Apocalypse of Moses. Comp. note 119.

<sup>118</sup> Apocalypse of Moses 17-18. The transformation of Satan into an angel is alluded to in 2 Cor. 11. 4. On the serpent's slanderous accusations against God, comp. the rabbinic parallels in vol. I, pp. 72-73, and notes appertaining thereto.

<sup>119</sup> Apocalypse of Moses 19. The three sacred objects by which she swears certainly belong to the pre-existing things, and when we consider the fact that the tree of life is the same as paradise (comp., e. g., PRK, 43b, where only paradise is mentioned, while MHG I, 126, reads paradise and the tree of life), the view of this writing concerning pre-existing things agrees with that of the Rabbis. Comp. Excursus I. That the serpent climbed up the tree of knowledge, and plucked the fruit for Eve is also found in ARN 1 (both versions). Comp. note 63 and ps.-Tertullian, *Adversus Omnes Haereses*, 2. On the view that the serpent injected the evil inclination (=sexual desire) into Eve, see note 131 and notes 3-4 on vol. I, pp. 105-106.

<sup>120</sup> Apocalypse of Moses 20. The haggadic interpretation of ערומים (Gen. 3. 7 and 10) is: "And they became aware that they

were bare of good deeds." This Hebrew idiom occurs frequently in the Talmud; comp., e. g., Shabbat 14a; Megillah 32a (end). Comp. BR 19. 6; PRE 14; Targum Yerushalmi Gen. 3. 10 (a different interpretation of ערום, 3. 7); MHG I, 93. Preuschen, *Adamschriften*, 54, note 1, is to be corrected accordingly.

<sup>121</sup> Apocalypse of Moses 21. On the withering of the leaves of all trees, see note 125 and vol. III, p. 163; note 50 on vol. II, p. 236. See further the remarks in note 82 concerning the eclipse of the sun at the time of the fall. BR 15. 7 states that the trees refused to give their leaves to the transgressors. Comp. vol. I, p. 75.

<sup>122</sup> On the identification of the forbidden fruit with the fig, comp. note 70.

<sup>123</sup> Concerning this function of Michael, comp. note 246 on vol. I, p. 283.

<sup>124</sup> The rabbinic sources (BR 20. 4; BaR 14. 12; Tadshe 10; comp. also the quotation from Yerushalmi in *Imre No'am*, end of Mishpatim) speak of the heavenly court consisting of seventy-one members (this number corresponds to that of the Great Synhedrion; comp. Sanhedrin 1. 6) which God appointed to judge the serpent. Comp. also note 84.

<sup>125</sup> Comp. note 121, and further Yoma 39b, which reads: The trees of the temple withered when the heathen entered the sanctuary, but they will bloom again in Messianic times. Comp. also Apocalypse of Moses 38.

<sup>126</sup> Apocalypse of Moses 23. That God's residence is under the tree of life is also stated in 2 Enoch 8. 3. In kabbalistic writings the same statement is made with regard to the Shekinah; comp. vol. I, p. 123. God's speech to Adam is almost literally identical with the one found in rabbinic sources; comp. note 76.

<sup>127</sup> Apocalypse of Moses 24. This source appears to count the ten curses which God pronounced against Adam; comp. vol. I, p. 79, and the note appertaining to it. On the loss of the dominion over the animal world, comp. note 113.

<sup>128</sup> Apocalypse of Moses 25. On the text comp. Ginzberg's remarks in the *Jewish Encyclopedia* I, 70, where reference is made to the almost literal parallel passages in BR 20. 7 and Niddah 31b. The text of the Hebrew original very likely read: ובשעה שחברע ללד חסכן נפשך מרוב צער ויסורים והשבע ותאמר לא אוקס עוד לאישי הצילני זקק לאישה והוא ימשל בך. The expression

is a frequently used euphemism for conjugal relations, but the translator erroneously read לפשעי instead of לנשי. Comp. note 131 (end).

<sup>129</sup> Vita Adae 34; Apocalypse of Moses 8. The number of diseases which came upon man in consequence of the fall amounts to seventy or seventy-two (the rivalry of these two numbers is of frequent occurrence; comp. Index under these numbers); comp. Nega'im 1. 4; Sifra 13. 4; ER 5. 25; midrashic citation by Ibn Sabba 53b on Gen. 43. 16. A sentence employed in amulets reads: "And mayest Thou, O God, protect him against the seventy-two kinds of diseases, which afflict this world"; comp. Midrash Talpiyyot, s. v. מלחמ. See also the seventy kinds of deaths in Testament of Abraham 20 (longer recension), and Ginzberg's remarks on it in *Jewish Encyclopedia*, I, 95. Other views with regard to the number of diseases are found in Berakot 8a, according to which there are 903 kinds of deaths (*i. e.*, diseases which cause death), and in Baba Mezi'a 107b, where it is said that the bile, when it is in a diseased condition, may cause 83 kinds of death.

<sup>130</sup> Apocalypse of Moses 26. On the expression "vessel of . . ." comp. note 117. The designation of Satan as ἀχάριστος, literally "the ugly one", corresponds with his nickname in rabbinic writings, in which he is known as מנוול, "the ugly one"; comp. *e. g.* Kiddushin 30b. It is hard to say whether we should take it in its literal meaning, in accordance with the legend which ascribes an ugly form to the angel of death (who is identical with Satan; comp. vol. I, p. 306), or in a figurative sense.

<sup>131</sup> Apocalypse of Moses 26. A tenfold punishment of the serpent seems to be presupposed here. Comp. vol. I, pp. 77-78, where (see also the sources cited in note 83) the ten punishments are enumerated, in partial agreement with the account given in the Apocalypse. The first sentence "until the day of judgment" corresponds with the paraphrase of Gen. 3. 15 in Targum Yerushalmi. This Targum, as well as the Apocalypse, identifies the punishment decreed against the serpent with that against Satan; comp. notes 116 and 120. Besides the sources cited in these two notes, comp. further Enoch 69, 6 (where it is said that the fallen angel Gadriel seduced Eve, comp. note 119); 2 Enoch 21. 4 (where Satanel, *i. e.* Satan, caused the fall), and similarly Wisdom 2. 24 (where death is ascribed to the jealousy of the devil). The serpent is not mentioned in any of these three writings. The Apocalypse of Abraham 23 describes Azazel as being like a serpent in appearance, having hands and feet like a man, and twelve wings. Here the serpent is identified with Satan (in this

pseudepigraph Azazel is employed instead of the latter), not in the allegorical sense, but it ascribes the form of the serpent to Satan. As far as this form is concerned, it is almost identical with that of the serpent in paradise as described in rabbinic sources; comp. vol. I, pp. 71-72. Concerning the wings see vol. I, p. 63, as well as Apocalypse of Moses, *loc. cit.*, which speaks of the wings of the serpent. The description of Satan in the Greek Baruch 4. 8 is closely related to the one in the Apocalypse of Abraham. We may thus trace the development of the conception of the "old serpent": 1) The serpent resembled man both in mind and body, before the fall, and being jealous, it resorted to corruption (this is the view of the old rabbinic literature; comp. note 60). 2) The fall was brought about not by the serpent, but by Satan, who made use of the cunning serpent (Apocalypse of Moses; PRE). 3) Satan, who had the appearance of a serpent, was the cause of the fall (Apocalypse of Abraham and Greek Baruch). 4) Satan, or some other fallen angel, brought about the fall (Books of Enoch). 5) The view of the allegorists (Philo, Revelation, medieval Jewish philosophers), according to whom it was the sensual desire which seduced man. It may be noted further that the sentence *καὶ διὰ τοῦτο . . . λόγον σου* in the Apocalypse of Moses 25 is misplaced; it belongs to the end of 26, where God says to the serpent that He will put enmity between him and man, because "I will judge thee according to thy actions (*על דברתך*, a Hebraism, which the Greek translator incorrectly rendered by *λόγον σου*), on account of the enmity which the enemy (=Satan; comp. Sukkah 52a) had injected into thee. Satan sowed enmity in the heart of the serpent against man (comp. Apocalypse of Moses 16), and as a punishment for this, eternal enmity shall reign henceforth between thee and them (i. e., Adam and Eve)". Comp. the similar idea in Tosefta Sotah 4. 18; BR 20. 5; Sotah 9b; ARN 1, 5.

<sup>132</sup> Apocalypse of Moses 31-32. This angel is described as "the angel of mankind", or "the angel of the Lord resembling man in appearance". The Hebrew very likely read: *מלאך אחד מן האישים* (= "men"). On this class of angels comp. Maimonides, *Yad ha-Hazakah, Yesode ha-Torah*, 2. 7, and *Masseket Azilut* (beginning); comp. also *Mishle* 8, 58. Adam's words ("pray to God . . . , we do not know when we shall appear before our Creator, whether He will pour out His wrath on us, or He will turn to us in mercy") remind one of the last words of Rabban Johanan b. Zaccai (*Berakot* 28b; ARN 25, 79).

<sup>133</sup> Apocalypse of Moses 33-36. On the eclipse of the heavenly bodies in God's proximity, comp. vol. I, p. 25, and note 105 appertaining to it. Different is the reading in Vita Adae 26, according to which the sun, moon, and stars did not shine for seven days as a sign of mourning for Adam's death. Comp. Sukkah 29a; note 89.

<sup>134</sup> Apocalypse of Moses 37-39; Vita Adae 46-47. The bathing of the soul in the stream of fire is most likely of Greek origin (comp. Fuchs and Wells, *ad loc.*). But it is also found in the later midrashic literature and in the Kabbalah; comp. Elleh Ezkerah (end), where it is said that the souls bathe in the waters of the Shiloah, whereas according to the Kabbalists (Zohar III, 16b, below; Zohar Hadash, Balak, 66a, אֵשׁ וָאֵשׁ; 'Emek ha-Melek, 117a), all souls must pass through the river of fire (comp. note 69 on vol. I, p. 17, and Index, s. v. "Dinur"); the pious are purified in this manner, while the wicked are judged there. Another view is given in Konen 29, which reads: The souls of the pious bathe, before entering paradise, in 248 rivers of balsam—a river for each member of the human body.

<sup>135</sup> Apocalypse of Moses 40; comp. also 42. In Vita Adae 48 it is Michael and Uriel who inter Adam (Gabriel probably fell out). The older tradition knows of an hierarchy consisting of three angels (comp. note 13), and hence only three angels occupy themselves with the burial of Moses; comp. vol. III, p. 472. It may also be noted that according to Zohar III, 88a, three heavenly messengers are present at the death-bed of every man. But Zohar II, 256a, on the other hand, speaks of four. The various texts of the pseudepigraphic writings cited above also differ from one another respecting the numbers and the names of the angels who took charge of Adam's burial.

<sup>136</sup> Apocalypse of Moses 40 and Vita Adae 48; comp. further Preuschen, *Adamschriften*, 45, and Book of Adam 1. 79. The rabbinic legend knows of a number of facts about the burial of Abel by his parents (comp. vol. I, p. 113, and note 130 appertaining to it), but does not seem to be acquainted with the details given in the pseudepigraphic works. Jub. 4. 29 states: He (Adam) was the first to be buried in the ground. This alludes to the legend given in the Apocalypse of Moses and kindred sources.

<sup>137</sup> Apocalypse of Moses 40. Since according to a well-known Haggadah (see the sources cited in note 16), the dust for the formation of Adam's body was taken from the place of the altar in Jerusalem, the Apocalypse necessarily locates Adam's grave on the site of the temple of Jerusalem. To be sure, here and in Vita Adae, *loc. cit.*,

the grave is erroneously placed in paradise (*מִקְדָּשׁ הַקָּדוֹשׁ*), which must not be taken literally, but should be understood to mean near Jerusalem. This is due to the fact that according to note 109, Jerusalem, or mount Moriah, forms the gate to paradise. This is clearly stated in the Melchizedek fragment 2. 35-36: In the centre of the earth, where Adam was created, there shall be his (Melchizedek's) grave... where Adam buried his son Abel. It is also stated in Zohar I, 56b, that Adam chose a place for his grave (in accordance with the rabbinic legend, the cave of Machpelah is here referred to; comp. P.R.E. 20 and further below) near paradise, where God buried him. All this is also found in Zohar Hadash, Ruth 97b, beginning *וַאֲמַר ר' רַחוּמָא*, which gives also the different view that Seth took care of his father's burial. Seder 'Olam (beginning) reads: Enoch buried Adam. Comp. also Yashar, Bereshit 11b: And Seth and his sons, Enoch and Methuselah his son buried him—Adam. In note 32 on vol. IV, p. 354, an attempt is made to prove that rabbinic literature also knows of the legend that the site of the altar is Adam's grave. The prevalent view among the Rabbis, however, is that Adam and Eve were buried in the cave of Machpelah. It is for this reason that Hebron is called Kiryat Arba', "The City of the Four", because in this city four pious men (Adam and the three patriarchs) as well as the four mothers (in other places this designation usually applies to the four wives of the three patriarchs), that is, Eve, Sarah, Rebekah, and Leah, were buried. Comp. BR 58. 4 and 8 (it is stated here that God had to roll up Adam's corpse, since even after the fall his height reached a hundred cubits; comp. also BR 19.8 and Tan. B. I, 13); 'Erubin 53a; Sotah 13a; Baba Batra 58a; PRE 20 and 36; Jerome on Gen. 23. 2 (comp. also vol. I, pp. 288-289). In the Christian legend of Golgotha Adam's burial-place is identical with the place of the crucifixion of Jesus. This is a Christian adaptation of the Jewish legend, according to which Adam was created in the centre of the earth, and was buried in the same place, *i. e.*, in the site of the altar at Jerusalem. Instead of the site of the altar, the Christian legend introduced the place of the crucifixion of Jesus (which is the Christian altar). Comp. Ginzberg, *Haggada bei den Kirchenv.*, 26-30 (some of his remarks are to be corrected in accordance with the material given here); Preuschen, *Adamschriften*, 45-46. It should also be observed that in rabbinic sources (comp. the reference given in note 32 on vol. IV, p. 354), where mention is made of the corpse found near the site of the altar, the word *גִּלְגֹּלְתָא*, "Golgotha", *i. e.*, "skull", is used which ap-

pears again in Golgotha, the place of the crucifixion of Jesus. Finally, some other reasons may be given why Apocalypse of Moses and Vita Adae cannot be said to regard paradise as Adam's burial-place. According to Apocalypse 37, paradise is located in the third heaven, where Adam's soul but not his body could be placed. It is further said that God sealed Adam's grave, so that nobody could approach his remains. This is only intelligible if Adam was buried outside of paradise, a place accessible to men and beasts. If his grave were in paradise, there would be no necessity to protect it.

<sup>138</sup> Apocalypse of Moses 41-45. The statement that Adam died six days before Eve is related to the view (comp. note 22) that Adam's body has been in existence since the first day of creation, whereas Eve was not created out of his rib until Friday; comp. the sources cited in note 97. Adam was not only interred by the angels with great pomp and honor, but God also expressly promised him resurrection. In this presentation it is presupposed that Adam was entirely or partly forgiven because of his repentance (comp. vol. I, pp. 86-89). These views are shared by the rabbinic sources cited in notes 106 and 142. Now and again we meet in rabbinic literature with an unfavorable view about Adam. It is said that he was driven out of paradise forever, and will be excluded from it even in the world to come. Comp. BR 21. 8 and 8, where Tannaim and Amoraim differ with respect to Adam's fate in the world to come. The most prevalent view, however, is favorable to Adam. Comp., in addition to the sources cited in notes 106 and 142, the association of Adam and Eve with the three patriarchs and their wives alluded to in the preceding note. The unfavorable view about Adam is most likely to be ascribed to the opposition to the exaggerated glorification of Adam by the Jewish gnostic circles, as reflected *e. g.* in the Clementine writings. It is worthy of note that Adam's merits are hardly ever alluded to in the liturgy (there seems to be but one exception, that of a later Selihah סליחות משה חתן מרים 43a). Comp. Ha-Zofeh, VI, 325.

<sup>139</sup> Apocalypse of Moses 42-43; Vita Adae 50-51. According to Jewish law, mourning is to last for one week (Mo'ed Katan 3. 5, and other passages); but in reality only six full days are observed; comp. Pesahim 4a, and the parallel passages cited on the margin concerning the rule "A fraction of a day counts as a whole day." A reminiscence of a three days' mourning is still to be found in Vita Adae 51 (the Hebrew text read: וידעי ביום הרביעי לאבלם, *i. e.*, after the lapse of three days), and also elsewhere; comp. Ecclu. 38. 17,

and Ginzberg in *Nöldeke-Festschrift*, 625, as well as Yerushalmi Mo'ed Katan 3, 82b. Comp. the following note (end).

<sup>140</sup> Apocalypse of Moses 43; Vita Adae 51. According to Yashar Bereshit 11b, mourning for the dead was first introduced upon the death of Adam, whereas ER 16, 81, makes the peculiar statement that the day of Adam's death was celebrated by his descendants as a festival, that is, they rejoiced that man is mortal, for otherwise he would not do the will of his heavenly Father.—The symbolic description of the world to come as the "great Sabbath", or as the "day of the Lord", is of frequent occurrence in Jewish, as well as in old Christian, literature, in which it is also brought into relation with the millennium; since the "day of the Lord is a thousand years" (comp. notes 28 and 72), hence His Sabbath is the seventh thousand. Comp. Tamid (end); the passage concerning the daily song does not originally belong to the Mishnah; comp. Ginzberg, *Tamid, the Oldest Treatise*, 283; Rosh ha-Shanah 31a; ARN 1, 5; Tehillim 92, 402-403 and 405; PRE 18; Mekilta Shabbeta 1, 103b; Mekilta RS, 160 (it is stated in the Mekiltas that the Sabbath offers a foretaste of the life in the world to come; comp. Berakot 57b); ER 2, 6-7; Sanhedrin 97a; 'Abodah Zarah 9a; Sifra 26. 6; 4 Ezra 8. 30; Barnabas 15. 4; Clemens Alexandrinus, *Stromata*, 6. 16; Clementine *Homilies*, 18. 9; Victorinus, *De Fabrica Mundi*; Hippolytus, Dan. 4. According to 2 Enoch 33, the millennium will only take place after the completion of seven thousand years. This is probably based on some learned interpretation of Gen. 2. 2, which considered the seventh day as one of the days of creation; comp. note 102. According to Alphabet R. Akiba 19, the Sabbath of the Lord will take place 6093 years after creation. Bousset, *Religion*, 341, understands Apocalypse of Moses, *loc. cit.*, to say that the soul departs from the body after seven or three days (comp. 4 Ezra 7. 101, and the rabbinic sources cited in note 20). It is for this reason that mourning must not last longer than this period.

<sup>141</sup> Tan. B. I, 21, and IV, 124. Comp. also the kabbalistic sources referred to at the beginning of the following note. In rabbinic literature frequent mention is made of the book which contains the record of the deeds of men, as well as the witnesses who appear for or against man in the heavenly court. Comp. Abot 2. 1; Sifre D., 307; Ta'anit 11a; PR 8, 29a. See also the sources cited in note 20.

<sup>142</sup> Tan. B. I, 21, and IV, 124; Zohar I, 54b, 81a, 65b, and 127a;



Zohar Hadash, Balak, beginning אָבִיבָה 'רַ אָבִיבָה, 66a; 'Emek ha-Melek 117a. Comp. also the legend given in vol. I, p. 69, which, in addition to the sources cited in the note appertaining thereto, is likewise known to *Abkat Rokel* II, 1. Closely related to our legend, especially in its kabbalistic form, is the one found in both versions of the Testament of Abraham (13, 11 respectively), concerning Abel, before whom every soul must appear to be judged. Judgment takes place after Enoch, the heavenly scribe (this agrees with most of the pseudepigraphic sources, whereas in rabbinic writings Elijah is the scribe, or secretary; comp. note 35 on vol. IV, p. 201) fetches, out of the many books entrusted to the Cherubim, the one relating to the soul in question. By means of this book he establishes the record of the soul during its life-time. The rabbinic form of this legend, at the same time, expresses the view prevalent among the Rabbis that "no death occurs without sin". Adam is not responsible for any other death except his own. Every man could live forever, if he should lead a sinless life. Comp. Shabbat 55a-56b; 'Arakin 17a; Tehillim 92, 412; Tan. B. IV, 60, and the parallels cited by Buber; Justin Martyr (he gives this as the view prevalent among the Jews), *Dialogue*, 95. Comp. Ginzberg, *Haggada gei den Kirchenv.*, 45-47, and Israel Lévi, *Le Péché Originel*. The legend makes use of this theory, and accordingly maintains that there are a number of men who (because they did not sin) have not tasted death, but entered paradise while yet alive. Comp. note 67. The popularity of this view is proved by the fact that *Recognitiones*, 1. 52, also speaks of those that entered paradise because they were absolutely without guilt. It is true that rabbinic literature knows also of the opposite view (particularly represented by 4 Ezra and the Apocalypse of Baruch), according to which there is "hereditary death", but no "hereditary sin", so that death is absolutely conceived as a penalty imposed on Adam, which must be suffered also by the innocent. Comp. Sifre D., 339; BR 21. 1; ER 5, 24; Baba Batra 17a. See also Tan. B. I, 17 and vol. II, pp. 259-260. It should be mentioned that in the Prayer of Manasseh 7, the three patriarchs are designated as mortals who never sinned. This is, however, denied in 'Arakin, *loc. cit.* A third view on the origin of death is that man was created mortal. Had it not been for the fall, however, death would not have been so terrible and painful, but a joyful incident in man's career. Comp. EZ 3, 175, where this view is clearly expressed, and further BR 21. 3 (see the parallels cited by Theodor), where the expression "man was destined to die" is to be taken in this

sense. Wisdom 1. 13 and 2. 23 appears to express opposition to the theory that man is mortal by his very nature. 2 ARN 34, 74, seems to be of the view that the fall of man caused an early death; that is, even if Adam had not sinned, man would not have been immortal, but he would have lived a much longer period. Similar views are found in medieval philosophical writings and biblical commentaries; comp. Nahmanides on Gen. 2. 17, and Bekor Shor on Gen. 3. 23. Quite singular is the view expressed in BR 9. 5 and Baba Batra 75a, which reads: Adam was not deserving of death for his sin, but God, who had foreseen that there would arise men like Nebuchadnezzar and Hiram claiming to be gods (comp. Index, s. v. "Deification"), decreed death on the entire human race. According to this idea, it is not the descendants of Adam who have to atone by death for his sin, but, on the contrary, it was he who died on their account. In view of the favorable opinion of Adam expressed in these and in other passages (comp. notes 106 and 138), it is not surprising that the legend accords a special place of honor to Adam in Messianic times. In allusion to Micah 5. 4, it is asserted in the old rabbinic literature that when the Messiah is about to start his work of salvation, he will be furnished with a council of fourteen members to assist him. One half of these members will have the title of "shepherds", and the other half will be "princes". The shepherds will be David, as president, and Adam, Seth, Methuselah, on his right, and Abraham, Jacob, and Moses, on his left. The princes are: the Messiah as the head, and Samuel, Saul, Jesse, Elijah, Amos, Zephaniah, and Hezekiah (this is more probable than Zedekiah, as given in some texts). Comp. Sukkah 52b; PRK (Grünhut's edition, 78 and 82; Schönblum's edition, 37b and 38; BHM VI, 150; Shir 8. 10; Sa'adya Gaon, *Emunot we-De'ot*, 7, 150; BaR 15 (beginning). In the last passage it is said: Opinions differ as to the identity of the "seven shepherds", or the "eight princes" who are Messiahs. Nowhere else in rabbinic literature are these princes called Messiahs. Comp., however, Jerome on Micah, *loc. cit.*, who refers to Symmachus, who renders נסיכי ("princes") by *χριστοί* ("Messiahs"). Jerome, *loc. cit.*, appears to have known the rabbinic interpretation to which he gives a Christological coloring: the seven shepherds are the patriarchs and prophets, whereas the eight princes represent the great men of the New Covenant; comp. Matthew 19. 28; Luke 22. 30; I Cor. 6. 2; Rev. 20. 4; Sibyl. 3. 781-782; 12 Testaments, Benjamin 10. 7; ShR 30. 18. Besides the seven shepherds

and eight princes of the Messianic times, the Talmud (Sukkah, *loc. cit.*) knows of four distinguished personages as Messiahs. These are: Messiah the son of David; Messiah the son of Joseph; Elijah; the priest of justice (Melchizedek?). Comp. also BaR, *loc. cit.*, where, instead of the last, a Messiah appears who is a descendant of Manasseh. A fuller discussion of this point is to be found in Ginzberg's *Unbekannte Sekte*, 334-352. In Kimhi on Micah, *loc. cit.*, Enoch is substituted for Adam as one of the seven shepherds. This is rather a later correction, as the older rabbinic literature does not include Enoch among the saints; comp. note 59 on vol. I, p. 130.

### III. THE TEN GENERATIONS

(103-142)

<sup>1</sup> Abot 5, 22; ARN 32, 92 (a view is cited here, according to which some among them were God-fearing, and it was they who prevented the flood from coming for some time), and the second version 34, 92. The tenth belongs to God; Noah was the tenth after Adam, and Abraham the tenth after Noah; Tan. B. V, 27. So also Philo, *De Congressu Quaerendæ Eruditionis Causa*, 17. That these sinful generations nevertheless lived longer than others has its good reasons: their longevity enabled them to study the movement of the heavenly bodies, so that they bequeathed their astronomical knowledge to later generations (BR. 26. 5; comp. vol. I, p. 121. below, and Josephus, *Antiqui.*, I, 3). They likewise received, during their long and care-free life, their reward for their good deeds which was due to them, so that after their death their punishment was severe; BR 16. 5. Furthermore, God wished to test these generations; He therefore granted them long life in order to give them the opportunity to show kindness to one another. But they did not stand the test. The sons were ready to care for their parents, but not for their grand-parents, and Noah was the only one who was willing to care for his grandfather and all his ancestors; ER 16, 80. God spoke to no one in this generation until Noah came (BR 34. 5 and Koheleth 7. 19), just as Abraham was the first to whom God spoke during the ten generations from Noah to him; BR 39, 4; Koheleth *loc. cit.* This seems to be directed against the view prevalent in pseudepigraphic writings that Seth, Enoch, Shem, and other patriarchs were the bearers of God's revelations; comp. Index under these names; comp. also Luria's note 4 on PRE. 22.

<sup>2</sup> BR 28. 4; Hagigah 13b; ARN 31, 93; Shabbat 88b; Koheleth 1. 15 and 4. 3; Tan. Lek 11 and Yitro 9; Tehillim 90, 392, and 105, 449; Aggadat Bereshit 49, 100; Zebahim 116a; ER 2, 9; 6, 33; 13, 61 and 68; 26, 130; Targum (from a manuscript quoted by Levy, *Chaldäisches Wörterbuch*, I, 186) on Job 22. 16. The version found in some of the sources just cited, according to which the Torah was

written down 974 generations prior to the creation of the world, is a comparatively recent presentation of this Haggadah, which, in its original form, has nothing to do with the doctrine of the pre-existence of the Torah. Comp. note 5 on vol. I, p. 4.

<sup>3</sup> PRE 21 (on the text comp. Luria, *ad loc.*, and MHG I, 88–89, and 105); Shabbat 146a (top; the filth with which the serpent infected Eve clung to the rest of humanity, but was removed from Israel as soon as they received the Torah); Yebamot 103b; 'Abodah Zarah 22b; Targum Yerushalmi Gen. 4. 1 and 5. 3; BR 19, end (on the text comp. Theodor, *ad loc.*, and Recanate Gen. 3. 13); Zohar I, 31a and 54b; III, 117a (the heavenly origin of Cain and Abel as stated here agrees with the heresies of Archonites in Epiphanius, *Haer.*, 40. 5); Hippolytus, *Haer.*, 5. 21; Irenaeus, I, 30. 7; Epiphanius, *loc. cit.* Comp. further 1 John 3. 12; Augustine, *In Epistolam Joan. ad Parthos*, 5: 3, and *Quaestiones ex Novo Test.*, III, 2282 (Migne's edition). Tertullian, *De Patientia*, 5, has no bearing on the subject discussed here, and the statement in Ginzberg's *Haggada bei den Kirchenv.*, 59, is to be corrected accordingly. This passage of Tertullian is to be translated: Impatience, conceived of the devil's seed, produced, in the fecundity of malice, anger as her son. Comp., however, Tertullian, *Haer.*, 2, concerning Abel, who was born of an ignoble spirit. But independent of the legend concerning Eve's sexual intercourse with the serpent is the statement that the original sin consisted in this that the serpent had awakened in her a sexual desire. Comp. Apocalypse of Abraham 23; Philo, *De M. Opif.*, 56; Slavonic Apocalypse of Baruch, 97; WR 14. 5; *Protevangelium of James* 13. Comp. vol. I, p. 96, and the following note., as well as note 131 on vol. I, p. 98. The view that serpents still have the desire to have intercourse with women, just as the first serpent felt violent passion for Eve (comp. note 60 on vol. I, p. 72), is found not only in Shabbat 110a, but also in 4 Macc. 18, where it is stated that the serpent not only sullied the maidenhood of Eve but also that of other women. The assertion of the Gnostics mentioned by Epiphanius in *Haer.*, 26. 5 (*idipsum—lignum vitae—de menstruis mulierum profluviis interpretatur*) is found among the Kabbalists, with this difference that the latter connect it with the tree of knowledge (is the reading τῆς ζῶης in Epiphanius a scribal error for τοῦ γινώσκου?). Comp. Recanati on Gen. 3. 6. and note 85 on vol. I, p. 78. The latter Kabbalah (comp. the reference in Yalkut Reubeni on Gen. 4. 1) allegorizes the legend of

Cain, "the son of Satan"; he was Satan's spiritual son, since Eve followed his false doctrine. It should also be noted that among the various etymologies of the word Eve (חַוָּה) there is one, according to which it means "serpent": she was Adam's serpent; see BR 21. 11 and 22. 2; note 48 on vol. I, p 69.

<sup>4</sup> Vita Adae 18. Comp. the more detailed description of these events as given in vol. I, pp. 88-89. The Vita, as well as its numerous Christian versions (comp. Preuschen, *Adamschriften*, 41; Book of Adam and Eve 73. 90-91), and the Church Fathers (Jerome, *Adv. Jovinianum*, 1. 16; Slavonic Palaea, and others; comp. Ginzberg, *Haggada bei den Kirchenv.*, 57) presuppose that not only the birth of the children of Adam and Eve took place after the expulsion from paradise, but that the first "human pair" lived in paradise without sexual intercourse. The older Haggadah, as found in Jub. 4. 1 (Cain was born when Adam was seventy, and Abel seven years later, while the expulsion of Adam from paradise took place after he had spent his first seven years there) and some utterances of the Midrash (BR 22. 1 and 2; comp. Ginzberg, *Haggada bei den Kirchenv.*, 57-58, as well as Zohar I, 60b-61a, on the pure, spiritual married life which Adam might have enjoyed in paradise, and the immortal children that he might have begotten there if he had not sinned) practically make the same assertion. Later, however, in opposition to the Christian view which considers married life as a consequence of the original sin (BR, *loc. cit.*, even asserts that the animal world, following Adam's example, copulated before the fall), and prefers celibacy to marriage, the prevalent Jewish view was that the married life of Adam and Eve preceded their fall; BR 18. 6; Sanhedrin 38b; PRE 11 (before the fall, but also before their arrival in paradise); ARN 1, 5 (where נִוְרִינָה, however, need not necessarily imply married state) and 6. Comp. vol. I, p. 72, and Theodor on BR, *loc. cit.*, as well as Apocalypse of Baruch 56. 6. The legend prevalent in the Haggadah, according to which Cain and Abel and their twin-sisters were born on the day on which their parents had been created (BR 22. 2; Sanhedrin, *loc. cit.*; PRE 11; ARN 1, 6), has no connection with the question whether their birth took place before or after the fall, since according to the Haggadah, the stay in paradise lasted only a few hours; comp. vol. I, p. 82.

<sup>5</sup> Vita Adae 19-21 (on the "virtutes", powers, virtues, comp. Ginzberg, *Jewish Encyclopedia*, I, 179), and its various Christian versions. Midrash Aggada Gen. 4. 1, on the contrary, emphasizes,

the fact that Cain's birth was without pain. This accords with the view that his birth took place before the fall; comp. the preceding note.

<sup>6</sup> Vita Adae 21, according to which Adiaphotus in Apocalypse of Moses 1 should be changed to Diaphotus, "full of light". On Cain's luminous countenance comp. PRE 21 (Eve saw that his countenance was heavenly) and Targum Yerushalmi Gen. 4. 1. The similarity of Cain (קַיִן) to Kewan (כַּיִן) "Saturn" may have given rise to this legend about the shining countenance, particularly if one considers, on the one hand, the relationship between Cain and Sammael (=Satan; comp. vol. I, p. 105), and, on the other hand, the fact that Saturn represents the star of evil which brings misfortune to Israel. Comp. PR 20, 96a, and 203a, as well as Baraita de-Mazzalot 27a.

<sup>7</sup> Vita Adae 21-22. The name of Cain is also explained as כַּאִין, "as nought" (MHG I, 105 very likely dependent on PRE), as נֶקֶפ, "the wrathful one" (Wisdom 10.3), and as קַוָּה "who sought to seize everything" (Philo, *Cain* 20). Comp. also the preceding note, as well as notes 6, 8, 20, 41, 53. On the view that Cain was able to run about immediately after his birth, see vol. I, p. 59, which has a similar statement with reference to Adam, and see also vol. I, pp. 152-153, the legend about the ante-diluvian generations, as well as the legend about Moses in vol. II, p. 264, and vol III, p. 468.

<sup>8</sup> Yashar Bereshit 9a; Josephus, *Antiqui.*, I, 2. 1, which reads: Abel which signifies sorrow, a midrashic explanation which is based on the similarity of sound of אֶבֶל and אָבֵל, "sorrow". This is already found in Philo, *De Migr. Abrah.*, 13. Amilabes in Apocalypse of Moses 1, as a name for Abel, is very likely a corruption of אֶמְלָבֵל "the destroyed one". According to some, Cain and Abel were twin brothers; BR 22. 2 and 3 (comp. Theodor on 205, 5); PRE 21.

<sup>9</sup> Vita Adae 22; Apocalypse of Moses 2; comp. Preuschen, *Adamschriften*, 42.

<sup>10</sup> Theodotion on Gen. 4. 4; Aggadat Shir 6. 40 (this heavenly fire came down again at the time of Noah's sacrifice when he left the ark; at the time of the consecration of the Tabernacle when it consumed Nadab and Abihu; at Manoah's sacrifice; at Solomon's consecration of the Temple; at Elijah's sacrifice on mount Carmel. It will come down again when the temple will be erected in Messianic times. Comp. Index, s. v. "Fire, Heavenly"); MHG I, 107; Yashar Bereshit, 9a; Rashi and Lekah on Gen. 4. 4 (most likely based

on an old source; Aphraates, 63; Jerome on Gen., *loc. cit.*; Ephraim, I, 143 D; Cyril of Alexandria, *Glaphura.*, 1. 3. Comp. Ginzberg, *Haggada bei den Kirchenv.*, 62-63; Theodor on BR 22. 6 (p. 209, 4), and note 13. Philo, on Gen. 1, 63, reads: Cain noticed from the sad mood that came upon him at the time of the sacrifice, instead of the expected sense of joy, that "God did not accept his sacrifice." On the religious importance of sacrifice in general, comp. *Haserot Witerot* in Batte Midrashot I, 33-34; *Kad ha-Kemah*, Sukkah, 16b.

<sup>11</sup> PRE 21 (on the text comp. MHG I, 106-107); Targum Yerushalmi Gen. 4. 3; differently in BR 22. 4, where two views concerning the day of the sacrifice are given; according to one it was on Pentecost, while according to the other, Hanukkah. It may, however, be noted that both views are based on the supposition that Abel did not live longer than fifty days, and the difference of opinion is due to the controversy whether the world (*i.e.*, Adam and his two sons; comp. note 97 on vol. I, p. 82, and note 4) had been created in the month of Tishri or Nisan. According to Tan. Bereshit 9, Cain and Abel were forty years old at the time they brought their sacrifice; comp. also Preuschen, *Adamschriften*, 33 (Cain was thirty, and Abel forty), and Book of Adam 77 (end), where the age of the brothers is given as fifteen and twelve, respectively. See also ps.-Philo, 1 (end): Cain was fifteen years old when he did these things. By these things are meant his marriage and becoming a father. According to Zohar Hadash, 25a, on Gen. 4. 2, they offered their sacrifice on New Year. Comp. Ginzberg, *Haggada bei den Kirchenv.* 64 and 71.

<sup>12</sup> BR 22. 5; PRE 21 (hence the prohibition against using flax and wool together: the sacrifice of the wicked Cain should not be brought in contact with that of the pious Abel; comp. Zohar III, 87a); Tan. Bereshit 9; Targum Yerushalmi Gen. 4. 3; Yashar Bereshit, 9a; Philo, *Sacrific. Abel.*, 13 (Cain did not offer the first-born, nor did he do it in proper time) and 20; Ambrose, *De Cain*, 2. 10; Ephraim, II, 313 E. Comp. further Philo, *Confus. Ling.*, 25; Josephus, *Antiqui* I, 2. 1; *Hadar*, Gen. 4. 3 and 4, as well as *Imre No'am*, *ad loc.*, and Midrash Aggada Gen. 4. 2. The Haggadah endeavors to prove that Cain, through selfishness and lack of fear of God, had incurred God's displeasure. Zohar Hadash 24a, on Gen. 4. 2, reads: Cain offered his sacrifice haughtily, Abel with humility; but the real sacrifice to God is with a contrite spirit; Ps.



51. 19. Abel's tragic end is to be ascribed to the following circumstance. When he brought his sacrifice he looked too much at the appearance of God, and therefore Moses, profiting by this lesson, hid his face (Exod. 3. 6), when God appeared to him; Recanate on Gen. 4. God prefers the persecuted; hence Abel having been persecuted by Cain, was favored by God, and his sacrifice was graciously accepted; WR 27. 5; Koheleth 3. 15; Tan. B. III, 91; Tan. Emor 9; PK 9, 76a. Here it is presupposed that Cain had been hostile to his brother even prior to the sacrifice incident, as is described in detail in the Book of Adam 76; comp. note 17. On the basis of the Septuagint on Gen. 4. 7 ("hast thou not sinned if thou has brought it rightly, but not rightly divided it?"), Philo asserts that Cain on account of his greed only brought part of his gift to the altar, whereas Abel sacrificed the whole gift without taking any of it home; *Quaestiones*, Gen. 1, 62. The rabbinic sources (BR 22. 5; Yerushalmi Megillah 1, 72b; Zebahim 116a; WR 9. 6; BaR 13.2; Shir 4. 16; PR 5, 16b) cite two views on the question whether Abel brought a whole offering or a peace-offering (of this kind of sacrifice the one who brings it consumes the greater part).

<sup>13</sup> BR 22. 6 (this statement is based on וַיִּפְּלוּ=וַיִּפְּלוּ "and it became dark"); comp. Preuschen, *Adambücher*, 34; ps.-Tertullian, Gen. 184, and Emerson, *Legends of Cain*, 848, concerning the smoke which almost suffocated Cain. The rising of the smoke as a sign of acceptance, and its descending as a sign of rejection, alluded to in the old-English legend, quoted by Emerson, is also found in Jewish sources; comp. Tan. Tezawweh 15; Midrash Shir 28b (below). The blackening of the face is perhaps to be taken as a contrast to its original heavenly splendor; comp. also Peshitta, *ad loc.*, and note 6.

<sup>14</sup> BR 22. 6; Targum Yerushalmi Gen. 4. 7; MHG I, 107 and 109. On the basis of Gen. 4. 7, the Rabbis state that the evil inclination is born with man (according to others, at the time of conception), whereas the good inclination does not arrive until the age of thirteen *i. e.*, when one attains majority; comp. BR 34. 10; Yerushalmi Berakot 3, 6d; Sanhedrin 91b; ARN 16, 62-64; Koheleth 4. 13; Tehillim 9, 82; MHG I, 107-109. Philo, *Confus. Ling.*, 22, asserts, on the contrary, that the good inclination comes at the time of man's birth. Comp. note 25 on vol. I, p. 60.

<sup>15</sup> On this point comp. vol. I, pp. 4 and 5.

<sup>16</sup> Yerushalmi Targumim Gen. 4. 8, and this is very likely the source of Lekah and Midrash Aggada, *ad loc.* Philo, *De Migrat.*

*Abrah.*, 13, as well as *Quod Deterius Potiori Insidiari Soleat* 1, 10–11, and 14, also speaks of Cain's challenging Abel to a dispute, to convince him, by mere force, using all plausible and possible sophisms. It may be noted that Philo, like the Targumim, finds this challenge to a dispute in the worlds of Gen. 4. 8: "Let us go into the field" (Septuagint, the Samaritan, the Targumim, the Peshitta, and others read or add here: ונצא השדה). Like the Targumim, Philo, too (in his second book 10 cited above), takes the subject of the dispute to have been whether everything is to be ascribed to God (Abel's view), or to man (as maintained by Cain).

<sup>17</sup> BR 22. 7; PRE 21; Ephiphanius, *Haer.*, 40. 5; Irenaeus, *Haer.*, 1, 6; Theodoretus, *Haer.*, 1, 11; Schatzhöhle, 34; Clementine, *Homilies*, 3. 25 (hence he was called Cain, because he was jealous of his brother on account of his wife; comp. *ibid.*, 26 and 42, concerning the meaning of the name Abel; see further note 7); Book of Adam 76, and comp. Malan, note 44, on the later statements of Christian and Mohammedan writers concerning the struggle of the brothers on account of their sister. See also Grünbaum, *Neue Beiträge*, 68–70, as well as Rönsch, *Buch der Jubiläen*, 373–374. According to another version in BR, *loc. cit.*, it was the first Eve about whom the brothers could not agree; but it is not clear what is meant by "the first Eve"; comp. Theodor, *ad loc.*, and Ginzberg, *Haggada bei den Kirchenv.* 60–61. This passage is somehow related to the gnostic doctrine concerning the first mother Sophia-Prunicus (comp. Preuschen, *Adamschriften*, 60, *seq.*, and 78, *seq.* It may likewise be noted here that Jaldabaot = לרוא בהיחם "the progenitor of shame"). Along with the view that Abel had two twin-sisters, there is also another which maintains that each of them had one twin-sister only; a third view states that Cain, but not Abel, had a twin-sister. Comp. BR 22. 2 and 61. 4; PRE, *loc. cit.*; Yebamot 62a, and Yerushalmi 11, 11d; Sanhedrin 58b, and Yerushalmi 5, 22c, as well as 9, 26d; ARN 1, 6; Sifra 20. 7; Targum Yerushalmi Gen. 4. 2 (thus the passage is to be understood that Cain was born with a twin-brother, and Abel with a twin-sister; Abel's twin-sister became Cain's wife; comp. PRE, *loc. cit.*); Zohar I, 54b and III, 44b. See further note 42 concerning the names of this daughter of Adam.—That Abel died in the state of unsoiled chastity is emphasized in *ps.-Matthew* 7, which corresponds to the old Haggadah (Jub. 4. 1 and 8, as well as Sifra, *loc. cit.*), which knows only of Cain's wife. See, however, note 172 on vol. I, p. 37. Some sources (BR 22. 7;

Tan. Bereshit 9, and Mishpatim 13; ShR 31. 17; Aggadat Shir 7, 43, and 91-92) ascribe the enmity between the brothers to the circumstance that they divided the possession of the world in such a manner that the older brother took the soil, and the younger all the movable things. This division naturally could not be maintained for any length of time. Comp. on this point Siegfried, *Philo*, 150-151, and Ginzberg's *Haggada bei den Kirchenv.*, 69. According to a third view cited in BR, *loc. cit.*, the subject of their quarrel was concerning the territory on which the temple would be erected.

<sup>18</sup> Yashar Bereshit, 9a (based on old sources; comp. BR 22. 7; Tan. Bereshit 9, and Mishpatim 13; ShR 31. 17; Yerushalmi Targumim Gen. 4. 8).

<sup>19</sup> BR 22. 8; Tan. Bereshit 9; Aggadat Shir 7, 43, and 91-92. Philo, *De Migr. Abr.*, 13, and *Quod Deterius Potiori Insidiari Soleat*, 11, and 14, as well as one of the versions of Vita Adae (in Preuschen, *Adamschriften*, 34-35), reports that Cain knew how to overcome his brother by cunning. See further Ephraim, I, 41. According to a Jewish legend, cited by Jerome, Ezek. 27. 18, Cain killed his brother in Damascus (= *sanguinem bibens*; Jerome, Is. 17; comp. Philo, *Quis... haeres sit*, 11), which is undoubtedly the well-known city in Syria, in the proximity of which primitive man is supposed to have lived (comp. Amos 1. 5, and Grünbaum, *Gesammelte Aufsätze*, 160). It is a whimsical idea of John a Lapide (*commentarium in Genesim*) to assume that another Damascus in the neighborhood of Hebron is meant here. Comp. also the Greek legend about the founding of Damascus recorded by Stephanus Byzantinus, *s. v.*, according to which one of the giants, whose name was Askos was killed by Hermes on the same place where he flayed him (Darmaskus = *Δέρμα "Ασκου*). Abel hid himself for some time, for he feared the wicked Cain. The latter, however, searched for him, and told him what God had said to him (Gen. 4. 6-7), and thereby won his confidence, and believed that Cain abandoned his wicked life; *Hadar*, Gen. 4. 5.

<sup>20</sup> BR 22. 8 (three views are given: 1) with a stone; 2) a cane = a play on the words יק and קק; comp. vol. I, p. 106, and notes 6-8; 3) he cut Abel's throat with a sword, having seen that Adam slaughtered one of his sacrifices in this manner); Sanhedrin 37b; Tan. Bereshit 9; PRE 21; Targum Yerushalmi Gen. 4. 8; Yashar Bereshit, 9b (with the iron part of the plough-share); Zohar I, 54b (bit him with his teeth to death), and II, 231; Lekah, Gen. 4. 8 (with a club; this is the

meaning of מִלֵּךְ, and not sword, as Buber, *ad loc.*, takes it); Jub. 4. 31; Book of Adam 79 (he first tried to flog him to death with a stick; comp. Lekah, *loc. cit.*); Preuschen, *Adamschriften*, 33. In the last passage, as in BR, *loc. cit.*, is described how Cain discovered what kind of blow would kill his brother; comp. note 43. That Cain did not believe in God's omniscience, and sought to conceal, by denial, the real facts, is remarked by Josephus, Philo, and the Midrashim; comp. notes 6 and 24.

<sup>21</sup> BR 22. 9; Mishnah Sanhedrin 4. 5, and Babli 48b; ARN 31, 91; 2 Targum Yerushalmi Gen. 4. 10; Apocalypse of Moses 40 (here it is stated that the earth did not receive Abel's remains); comp. further Aggadat Shir 7, 43, and 91, which reads: God showed Cain the place, where he had killed Abel, where the blood bubbled (comp. vol. IV, p. 304), and where nothing grows till this day. In view of this passage and the one of Apocalypse of Moses, *loc. cit.*, one is justified in taking BR, *loc. cit.*, and Sanhedrin 4. 5 to mean that the blood remained clinging to the wood and stones without being absorbed. This, however, is not only against Targum Yerushalmi, Gen. 4. 10, but also against the literal meaning of the Bible; comp. ps.—Philo, 16D, and notes 23 and 31.

<sup>22</sup> Tan. Bereshit 9; BR 22. 10 (two views are given: 1) the curse consisted in that the earth did not yield to Cain; 2) that the earth lost its former fertility; comp. vol I, pp. 112-113); MHG I, 112 (below; it had a different text of Tan., *loc. cit.*); Sifre N., 161.

<sup>23</sup> Yashar Bereshit, 9b. The old sources (Mekilta Shirah 9, 42a; Tehillim 22, 189; Ekah 1, 74) speak only of the receiving of the blood and not of the remains; comp. note 21. Josephus, *Antiqui.*, I, 2. 1, and PRE 21 (comp., however, Luria, *ad loc.*) speak of hiding the remains in the ground. Ephraim, I, 41, reads: He hid the remains under the high ears of grain and the earth. By this is very likely meant that the lower part of the body was hidden in the earth and the upper part under the ears.

<sup>24</sup> Tan. Bereshit 9; MHG I, 113; *Shitah Hadashah* (Judah); Josephus, *Antiqui.*, I, 2, 1; Philo, *Quaestiones*, 1, 69. Comp. also BR 22. 11; Tan. B. I, 19; DR 8. 1.

<sup>25</sup> BR 22. 11. In this passage, as well as in many other Midrashim (comp. the sources cited in the preceding note) and Targumim (Onkelos and Targum Yerushalmi, Gen. 4. 13), מְנַשָּׂא is explained "that it could be forgiven", in agreement with Septuagint, Philo (*Quod Deterius Potiori Insidiari Soleat*, 41), Peshitta, and Vulgate.

Comp. further Sanhedrin 101a and PRE 21; Tan. B. (introduction), 157. In the last passage the interpretation favored by modern exegetes is also given: "Indeed, very grievous is my sin, that I can hardly bear it."

<sup>26</sup> Tan. B. (introduction), 157, and I, 19; Tan. Bereshit 9; BR 22. 12-13. On Cain's repentance, which was not sincere, and therefore his sin not entirely forgiven, see further PK 25, 160a-160b; PR 47, 188b (repentance removes only half of the punishment decreed on account of a sin); Yelammedenu 45; Sanhedrin 101a; WR 10. 5; DR 8. 2; Josephus, *Antiqui.*, I, 2. 1; comp. note 28. On the arguments of the heavenly court of justice in favor and against Cain, comp. Yalkut Reubeni and Yalkut David on Gen. 4. 16 (both are based on the same source, the Sefer ha-Tagin, in manuscript).

<sup>27</sup> PRE 21; Targum Yerushalmi Gen. 4. 15. This is somewhat different from Sefer ha-Tagin in Yalkut Reubeni, *ad loc.*, which reads: He received the letter ט (nine) on his arm (not on his forehead; likewise in PRE) as a sign that he will not die before he has begotten nine descendants (comp. Gen. 4. 17-22). On the sign of Cain comp. the following note, and further Zohar I, 36b.

<sup>28</sup> BR 22. 12-13, where seven different views are given on the sign of Cain: 1) God caused the sun to rise (as a sign that Cain was not to be slain by animals); 2) He marked him by inflicting leprosy on him; 3) He gave him a dog to protect him against animals; 4) He marked him with a horn on his forehead (as a degradation of his human form?); 5) He punished Cain as a sign (=warning) to future murderers; 6) He partly pardoned his sin as a sign (=example) for future sinners who repent; 7) He allowed him to live until the flood. Some of these views are also to be found in Tan. Bereshit 10, where an eighth is given: the Sabbath, the sign between God and Israel (Exod. 31. 13), came in and saved Cain from death, as it had formerly done in the case of Adam (comp. vol. I, pp. 85-86); BaR 7. 5; Yelammedenu 43 (leprosy was inflicted as a punishment upon those who devoted their lives to the acquisition of possessions, as in the case of Cain, Job, and king Uzziah; on this point see BR 22. 3; Mekilta RS, 92; Tan. Noah 13 = Makiri on Is. 6. 50. Comp. further vol. III, p. 214, as well as Ecclus. 10. 13); Preuschen, *Adamschriften*, 35 and 43. Comp. note 43.

<sup>29</sup> Yerushalmi Targumim and Midrash Aggada on Gen. 4. 16. Comp. the following note.

<sup>30</sup> Tan. B. (introduction), 158; Genizah fragment in the li-

brary of Cambridge University, published by Ginzberg in *Ha-Goren* IX, 58—59 and 66; Shulhan Arba' I, 9d; Shu'aib, Bereshit 5d. Oh the wonderful fertility of the earth in Messianic times, when conditions will be the same as before the fall, comp. Apocalypse of Baruch 29. 5; the Papias Apocalypse (a conversation of Jesus) cited by Irenaeus 5. 23 (as a parallel to the statement "And when one of the saints will take hold of a grape, another will exclaim: I am a better grape, take me; praise the Lord through me", one may cite the Haggadah: If some one will try to pick a fig on the Sabbath, in the time to come, it will exclaim: "It is Sabbath"; Tehillim 73, 335); Enoch 10. 19; Revelation of St. John (beginning); Visio Pauli 22; Ketubot 111a-112a; Sifre D., 317. Comp. further note 105 on vol. I, p. 86; Index, s. v. "Wine"; Alfred Jeremias, *Babylonisches im NT.*, 332-33.

<sup>31</sup> Tan. Bereshit 10; PRE 21; BR 22. 8 (this is, however, not found in the manuscripts; comp. Theodor, *ad loc.*); Slavonic Palaea, 52; comp. Ginzberg, *Haggada bei den Kirchenv.*, 66. In contrast to the rabbinic legend about the burial of Abel, it is recorded in Apocalypse of Moses 40, and in the literature dependent on it (Christian Book of Adam; Preuschen, *Adamschriften*, 45), that the earth did not receive Abel's remains until Adam's body was returned thither; comp. note 21 and vol. I, p. 100. The earth, which originally consisted of a level surface, became mountainous as a punishment for having received Abel's blood; Wa-Yosha' 53 (comp. vol. I, pp. 14, below, 18, and 80, top, for other opinions concerning the origin of mountains), and the earth will not become level again until Messianic times; vol. IV, p. 234. The conception that the mountains did not originally belong to the earth's form is prevalent in legend; comp. Dähnhardt, *Natursagen*, I, index, s. v. "Gebirge". See further Mishle 8, 59. Abel is the type of the pious (12 Testaments, Issachar 4. 4), and in the heavenly court he is the one appointed to judge every soul entering there, and decide whether it should be punished or rewarded; Testament of Abraham 12-13; comp. note 142 on vol. I, p. 102. Abel's soul, according to the Kabbalists, came to the world again in the persons of Jacob and Moses; comp. the numerous quotations from kabbalistic writings in Yalkut Reubeni on Gen. 4. 1, *seq.* Abel's soul appeared as the accuser against Cain, until the latter and his seed were destroyed from the face of the earth; Enoch 22. 7; comp. vol. III, p. 101. A combination of two legends concerning Abel's burial is found in the Slavonic Enoch

(addition to 4, 91), where it is said that the bird from which Adam learned to bury the dead was the "jack-daw." On the raven comp. vol. I, p. 39.

<sup>32</sup> On this point comp. vo. I, p. 118. Concerning the darkness which came upon Adam after the fall, comp. note 108 on vol. I, p. 89.

<sup>33</sup> The seven products mentioned in Deut. 8. 8 are here referred to. Comp. Berakot 6. 4.

<sup>34</sup> Instead of *ולוהון תרין ראשין כתרין בישין* read *ולוהון תרין ראשין*. On the two-headed Cainites comp. vol. IV, p. 132; Zohar I, 9b, and II, 80a. In the first passage of Zohar mention is made also of the two monsters Afrira and Kastimon, who were placed as rulers of the abode of the Cainites, and are the cause that Naamah (=Lilith) appears to men in sleep. The entire passage is rather obscure, but this much is certain that the Zohar conceives the Cainites as a species of genii, demons, and monsters. This view is prevalent in the legends of medieval Europe; comp. Emerson, *Legends of Cain*, 878, as well as the sources cited in note 36, and further *Otot ha-Mashiah*, 58 (below).

<sup>35</sup> Comp. Greek Baruch III, and vol. I, p. 180 on the part of the earth near to Gehenna.

<sup>36</sup> Zohar Hadash Bereshit 8a-8b (instead of *דאכלי לבני* read *דאכלי דאכלי*); Zohar Ruth, 97b (beginning *וואמר ר' רחומאי*); Zohar I, 9b, 39b-40a, 54b, 157a, and additions to I, 3a-3b; II, 41b, and 80a; III, 9b-10a. For further details on the monsters, half-men and half-animals, in the nether-world (to which reference is made in the last passage), comp. note 34, as well as vol. I, pp. 10-11. On the thirst of the inhabitants of the nether-world, comp. note 135 on vol. III, p. 54 and Dietrich, *Nekyia*, 97, *seq.*, where reference is made to the prevalent view concerning the thirst of the dead. Of Greek origin is the conception of the place of "forgetfulness"; comp. Rohde, *Psyche*, II, 310, and 390-391. See the following note.

<sup>37</sup> Zohar (additions) I, 3a-3b; Zohar Hadash Bereshit 8a-8b and Ruth 97b (beginning *וואמר ר' רחומאי*); Yalkut Reubeni Gen. 3 (end) cites the description of the "seven worlds" from the Zohar, in the Hebrew language, whereas in our texts of the Zohar it is in Aramaic. In many details this Hebrew presentation deviates from the Aramaic. The view that the punishment was inflicted upon Cain in the seventh generation (*i. e.*, Lamech; comp. vol. I, p. 116) is based on Gen. 4.14, and 24, where *שבעתים* is explained in this sense; comp. Onkelos and Targum Yerushalmi, *ad loc.*; BR 23. 4 (comp. Theodor, *ad loc.*);

Tan. Bereshit 11; MHG I, 118; Theodoretus, *Quaestiones in Gen.*, 43; Jerome, *ad Damasum*, 125 (explicitly in connection with the Lamech legend), who adds that, according to Jewish tradition, 77 descendants of Lamech perished at the time of the flood, in fulfilment of the words of Gen. 4. 24. Comp. Josephus, *Antiqui.* 1, 2, 2 and note 42. Somewhat different is the (Jewish?) tradition cited by Ephraim, I, 43 E, that seven generations of Cain perished with him, whereas the Midrash speaks only of the four generations of Cain (corresponding to the four generations which Abel should have reared); comp. Tan., *loc. cit.* Jerome cites another Jewish tradition, according to which the Bible speaks of the seven sins, which Cain had to atone for: 1) He did not divide his sacrifice properly (comp. note 12); 2) he was jealous of his brother; 3) he deceitfully lured him to death (comp. note 19); 4) he killed his brother; 5) he denied this act; 6) he asserted that his sin could not be forgiven (*i. e.*, he doubted God's mercy?) comp. note 25; 7) he did not repent of his sin during his long life, which God granted him in order to make amends; comp. note 26. The Haggadah in 12 Testaments, Benjamin 7. 1-5 on Gen. 4. 24, is somewhat confused: instead of the seven generations of the rabbinic sources, this passage has "seven centuries", during which Cain suffered for his sins so that every century brought its plague with it until he perished in the flood at the age of 900. That Cain perished in the flood is also stated in rabbinic sources; BR 22. 12 and 32.5; ShR 31.16 (here it is stated that wherever Cain came he was driven away by the inhabitants); Koheleth 6. 3; Koheleth Z. 106; Tan. Mishpatim 13 (in an abbreviated form; the hundred sons of Cain are also alluded to in the three last-named sources). Comp. 43 and Ginzberg's *Haggada bei den Kirchenv.* 65-69.

<sup>38</sup> Midrash Aggadah Gen. 4. 17, according to BR 23. 1 and Tehillim 9, 85. Comp. further Rashi and Lekah, *ad loc.*

<sup>39</sup> Yashar Bereshit, 9b.

<sup>40</sup> Ps.-Philo, 2, where the name of these cities, that of Cain's wife (Themach = תמח "may she be destroyed"); in 35 A, the same name is given of Sisera's mother), and those of his three sons (besides Enoch) and two daughters are given. Cain, it is further recorded here, begot Enoch at the age of 15, and died 730 years old. But Jub. 4. 1 and 31 read: Cain died 930 A. M., which, according to the chronology of this book corresponds to the statement that Cain lived 860 years; comp. notes 11, 37.

<sup>41</sup> Josephus, *Antiqui.* I, 22. The observation of Josephus that Cain was the first to introduce weights and measures is based on the



haggadic interpretation of the name קנה = קין "the measuring rod". Comp. notes 7, 20 and 53.

<sup>42</sup> BR 23. 2. Here Lamech (comp. also vol. I, p. 117) is also counted among the sinful descendants of Cain, whereas Josephus, *Antiqui.*, I, 2,2, designates him as a prophet who had predicted that he would have to atone for the murder committed by his forebear Cain. This interpretation of Gen. 4. 24 is closely related to the Haggadah given by Jerome; comp. note 37. On the wickedness of the Cainites, comp. vol. I, pp. 121 and 151.—The verse Ps. 89. 3, which, according to the rabbinic view, is to be translated: "The world has been established by love", refers, according to the Haggadah, to God's goodness, who had provided Cain with a sister whom he could marry. For without God's goodness this is forbidden by the law; but this marriage was permitted to Cain in order to insure the propagation of the human race. Sifra 20. 17; Yerushalmi Yebamot 11, 11d; Yerushalmi Sanhedrin 5, 22b, and 9, 20d; Babli 58; PRE 21. On the translation of Ps., *loc.cit.*, see Targum and Peshitta, as well as ARN 4, 21. Comp. further Aphraates, 455 and Ginzberg, *Jewish Encyclopedia*, I, 665, note. These sources presuppose (comp. the polemic against this view in Philo, *De Posteritate Caini*, 11) that only Cain married his sister (הבל נשאה אחותו) in Yerushalmi is a later addition based on the legend of the twin-sisters; comp. note 17), whereas Seth married his niece, Cain's daughter. The high esteem in which Jub. holds all the patriarchs, from Adam to Noah (comp., on the other hand, note 1 about the adverse opinion of the Rabbis), precludes this book from referring to the union of Seth or his descendants with the wicked Cainites, and hence it is stated that Seth, Enoch, and Mahalalel married their sisters. The fictitious names frequently found in this pseudepigraphic work and in ps.—Philo (particularly the names of the women of ancient times) are entirely unknown in old rabbinic literature (comp. the adverse comment on such vagaries in Baba Batra 91a, which are regarded as a specialty of the heretics, גי'י'ן), and are only found in the writings of the Arabic period (Yashar, and already in PRE), when the Jews became more familiar with the Christian and Mohammedan pseudepigraphic writings. The three lists of the wives of the ante-deluvian patriarchs, which we possess in Hebrew sources, Algazi's *Toledot Adam*, 2a-2b, Damascus manuscript, published by Harkavy in *Ha-Pisgah* I, 58, and Munich manuscript (published by Perles in his *Beiträge zur Geschichte heb. . . Studien*, 90), are never-

theless important for the history of these names, since they enable us to establish their Hebrew forms, which very often cannot be recognized from the Greek and Ethiopic transliterations. The following examples will illustrate this point. Adam's oldest daughter, whose name has been transmitted in no less than twenty-two forms (comp. Rönsch, *Buch der Jubiläen*, 373; MHG I, 106; Theodor on BR 22. 2, pages 205-206), is called Azurah in Jub. 4, written עֲצוּרָה in Hebrew, in agreement with Kiddushin 6a, where עֲצוּרָתִי "my wife" occurs. In PRE 2 is עוּרוֹ, "his wife", an allusion to Gen. 2.18. Noah's wife is Emzaru in Jub., *loc. cit.*, and אִמְזוּרַע in Hebrew (this is how it should be read in Algazi, instead of אִמְזוּרַע; in Munich manuscript it is abbreviated to מְזוּרַע, *i. e.*, "mother of the seed of man"). The theophorous names, as Razuyal רִצּוּאֵל and Azrial, עוּרִיאֵל, Jub., *loc. cit.*, and 8. 1 (with Algazi, Sason is to be read instead of Susan; שוּשׁוֹן not שוּשׁוֹן) appear in the Hebrew texts in their original forms רִצּוּיָה and עוּרִיָּה. Later on the termination יָה, so frequently employed in proper names, was substituted by אֵל. Noah's mother is properly called in Dam. MS. בַּת אֲנוּשׁ (in order not to mistake it to mean "the daughter of Enosh", the word שְׂמָה is added; this word, therefore, must not be emended to שְׂמָחָה, as is done by Marx, *Orient. Lit.*, IV, 358, on the basis of Baidawi), corresponding to Betenos in Jub., *loc. cit.* On the other hand, the names of Noah's daughters-in-law appear (Jub. 7. 14-16, where Adataneses = אֲדַתְנֵסַס "princess of women") to be badly corrupted in the Hebrew sources. The names of Jacob's daughters-in-law in Dam. MS. are entirely different from those of Yashar (comp. vol. II, pp. 37-39), and this source deserves closer investigation. The same source knows also the name of Ishmael's wife, Gigit (comp., for another view, note 218 on vol. I, p. 269), and the name of the prophet Jonah's wife, who is called Yoam the daughter of Azen; comp. note 39 on vol. IV, p. 253.

<sup>43</sup> On the sign of Cain, comp. note 28.

<sup>44</sup> Tan. Bereshit 11 (on the text comp. Yalkut I, 38; MHG I, 118-119; Rashi and Midrash Aggada on Gen. 4. 23-24); Yashar Bereshit, 10b-11a; BR 23. 4; Jerome, *ad Damasum*, 125; Ephraim, I, 26D; Book of Adam 2. 13; Preuschen, *Adamschriften*, 35-36; Schatzhöhle, 78. Comp. Fabricius, *Codex Pseudepigraphicus*, 120-122 (this passage contains the views concerning the death of Cain found in the works of the chronologists Johan Malala, and Michael Glycas); Grünbaum, *Neue Beiträge*, 71-72. According to Jub.

4. 31, Cain met his death in the following manner: his house fell in over him. Just as he had slain Abel with a stone (comp. note 20), even so was he killed by the stones of the house which fell in. Aggadat Bereshit 26, 53-54, reads to the same effect. Philo, *Quod Deterius Potiori Insidiari Soleat*, 48, seems to explain allegorically a legend, according to which Cain never died. This may be compared with the legend about the immortality of the giants; comp. vol. III, p. 269. It would not be surprising if Philo already knew of the legend that Cain was the son of Satan (comp. note 3) and his celestial origin would explain his immortality. EZ 2, 174, appears to be an allusion to an unfamiliar Lamech legend; but perhaps we ought to read קין = אביו = אב, and the passage merely implies that Lamech, who was mourning over the death of his grandfather, was endowed with long life and other blessings. It is difficult to ascertain what ps.-Philo 2 wishes to record concerning Lamech, since the text is obscure, and very likely corrupt. Comp. note 37.

<sup>45</sup> BR 23. 2-3; Yashar Bereshit, 10b; Yerushalmi Yebamot 6, 7c (on the meaning of the name Zillah comp. Philo, *De Posteritate Caini*, 33, whose explanation agrees with Yerushalmi); Yalkut I, 47 (in the Oxford MS. מ"ט מדין is given as the source; comp. also Theodor on BR 22. 3); ps.-Philo, 2 (the sentence *et coepit... psalterii* should be read after *organorum*, and the words *et corrumpere terram* before *indigna est deus*); Theophilus, II, 30. Opinions differ concerning Naamah, Tubal-cain's sister. According to one, this Naamah, "the lovely one", was Noah's wife (BR, *loc cit*; comp. also Mishle 31, 111, where it is said that the piety of Noah's wife was like that of her husband), whereas another view maintains that it was another Naamah whom Noah married. Naamah, Tubal-cain's sister, is further identified with the beautiful woman to whose charms the angels became victims; comp. MHG I, 118 (this is very likely based on PRE, as remarked by Schechter); Zohar I, 55a; Zohar Ruth 99a (beginning פתח נחמיה פתח פתח); Midrash Aggada Gen. 4. 22. Whatever has been said in other sources concerning Istehar (comp. vol. I, p. 149) is referred to Naamah in the last passage: she did not consent to gratify the desire of the fallen angels. But in the kabbalistic sources cited above (comp. further Zohar III, 76b, as well as Kaneh 103b; for more details see Grünbaum *Gesammelte Aufsätze*, 57, seq. and 447, as well as Ginzberg's article "Ashmedai" in *Jewish Encyclopedia*) Naamah, the sister of Tubal-cain, is said to be the wife of Shamdan, from whose union sprang forth Ashmedai (=the devil

par excellence), who together with Lilith strangles little children (comp. vol. I, pp. 65-66), while Naamah, like the latter, fools men in their dreams. On Naamah the musician, and the influence of her sensual music which corrupted humanity, comp. further Yerushalmi Targumim Gen. 4. 22; Gröbaum, *Neue Beiträge*, 72-74; note 14 on vol. I, p. 152.

<sup>46</sup> BR 23. 4; Tan. Bereshit 11; BaR 14. 2; 'Erubin 18b; Tan. B. I, 20. The justification of Adam's celibacy in the text is taken from the last passage (this statement presupposes that Abel scarcely lived a few months; comp. note 11), whereas in 'Erubin his celibacy appears to be as an atonement for his sin, and it is also presupposed that the first two sons were born before the fall, or at least begotten before that occurrence. Comp. note 4.

<sup>47</sup> 'Erubin 18b (ל'ל"י "spectres", as in Apocalypse of Baruch 10. 8); Tan. B. I, 20; BR 20. 11 and 24. 6. Only the last mentioned source contains the assertion that Eve likewise became the mother of spirits through her union with male spirits; see Zohar I, 54b, and III, 76b, where it is said that even now the propagation of this species is continued by virtue of the union of men with spirits in their sleep. Comp. note 45. It is possible that this conception of the origin of spirits (evil ones? comp., however, BR 20. 11) is intended to oppose the assertion of the Persians that the redeemer "Saoshyant" will spring up from the seed of Zarathustra that went to the ground. Comp. Bund. 32. 8, 9 and Yt. 13. 62.

<sup>48</sup> Concerning this number of languages comp. note 72 on vol. I, p. 173.

<sup>49</sup> Ma'aseh-Buch 143, 40a-40b and the Hebrew from a MS. collection of legends, published in *R. E. J.*, XXXIII, 239, seq. The long-winded biography of R. Haninah, or, as the Hebrew version reads, R. Johanan, in this source is identical with the narrative found in Arabian Nights concerning the gratitude of three animals (the fish, the dog, and the raven) towards their human benefactor. This narrative, as is well known, is based on an animal fable found in *Pantschatantra*. On the acquisition of language through swallowing its written characters see *Bet Nekot ha-Halakah* I, 58, and Goldziher in *Berliner-Festschrift*, 150.

<sup>50</sup> BR 23. 4-5; PK 5, 43b; PR 15, 67b; Ruth R. 4, 12; Makiri, Prov. 14. 28. Ruth Z. 55; Tan. B. I, 20. In allusion to the words of Scripture ל' שח (Gen. 4. 25), the name שח is interpreted as "plant" (= שחיל); Aggadat Bereshit (MS. additions), 37. Is the legend con-

cerning Seth and the branch of the tree of life in various compilations of the *Vita Adae* (comp. Preuschen, *Adamschriften*, 41 and 46) related to this interpretation of the name? The name Seth is also connected with  $\text{נש}$  "foundation": he became the foundation of mankind; BaR 14. 12; MHG I, 119; Lekah and Midrash Aggada on Gen. 4. 2.

<sup>51</sup> ARN 2, 12; Tan. Noah 5; Tan. B. I, 32; Tehillim 9, 84. Comp. note 318 on vol. I, p. 306.

<sup>52</sup> PRE 2. Hardly anything is known in the older rabbinic literature of the glorification of Seth, which has prevailed for some time, as may be seen from the existence of a gnostic sect, the Sethiani, who identified him with the Messiah (comp. Preuschen, *Adamschriften*, 48-51; Fabricius, *Codex Pseudepigraphicus*, 141, 143, 145). Certain traces of this glorification have been retained by Josephus, *Antiqui.* 1, 2, 3, and in the apocryphal and pseudepigraphic literature (Ecclu. 49. 16; Jub. 19. 24; Enoch 85. 8-9; 2 Enoch 33. 10. See also index, *s. v.* "Seth, Descendants of"). Only in kabbalistic writings has this view, supposedly favored by BR 23. 5 and PRE 22, attained importance. Hence, for instance, it is asserted that the soul of Seth entered into Moses and will again reappear in the Messiah. The account by Syncellus, 1. 16-17 concerning the translation of Seth to the angels, who instructed him about the fall of the angels, the fall of man, the deluge, and the advent of the Messiah, seems to go back to an apocryphal book of Seth (very likely of Jewish origin). Comp. note 1 and the following note.

<sup>53</sup> Josephus, *Antiqui.*, I, 2. 3. On the astronomic studies of the ante-diluvian generations comp. also BR 26. 5. The chronologists Suidas (*s. v.*  $\Sigma\eta\theta$ ), Michael Glycas, *Annales* 228-233, and Johannes Malala 1. 151, Joel, *Chronographia*, p. 3, know not only to report about Seth's astronomical knowledge but also about his invention of the Hebrew characters, as well as the division of time into weeks, months and years. He received his knowledge from the angel Uriel who came to him (Syncellus 1. 16-17, on the other hand, speaks of Seth's stay among the angels), and revealed to him this knowledge, as he subsequently did to Enoch. The legend concerning the two tablets, which Seth and his children respectively made, reads differently in *Vita Adae* 50. 1-3. For a detailed discussion concerning this legend, see Ginzberg's Hebrew essay  $\text{מבול של אש}$  (reprinted from *Ha-Goren* VIII, 35-51), which also contains a discussion on the conception about the conflagration of the world mentioned by Philo (*Moses*, 2. 36, Mangey's edition, 175) and the

Rabbis. See also Bousset, *Zeitschrift für NT. Wissenschaft*, 1902. It should also be noted here that Josippon 2. 8 (which was borrowed by Yashar Bereshit, 10a, below) considers these tablets as the work of Seth's grandchild Kenan. Josippon knows also to report that these tablets with their Hebrew characters could still be seen on some island in India in the time of Alexander the Great. It is further maintained that in that place there is a city, full of all kinds of treasures, which Kenan had founded but which no one can enter, because he rendered it inaccessible by means of astronomical and astrological knowledge and witchcraft. Kenan's bewitched town appears to be based on Arabic sources. Kenan is already described in Jub. 8. 3 (comp. the references to the chronologists by Charles) as a master of great wisdom (comp. note 41 on קִין = קנה, which also signifies "writing stylus"). This, however, refers to Kenan the son of Arpachshad who is known to Jub. as well as to Septuagint, but not to the masoretic text. Aggadat Bereshit (introduction) 37, on the other hand says of Kenan that through him his generation came in possession of evil (קִין = קנה "possessed"; comp. note 7), since he induced them to worship idols. His son Mahalalel, on the contrary, repented of his sins, and returned to God, whom he praised (ללהלל) and extolled. On Mahalalel comp. Jub. 19. 4 (one of the seven pious men of the pre-Abrahamic times: Adam, Seth, Enosh, Mahalalel, Enoch, Noah, and Shem) and 2 Enoch 33. 10, which mentions the books composed by Adam, Seth, Enosh, Kenan, Mahalalel, Jared, and Enoch. These books were guarded by the angels Arukh and Parukh. Comp. Yerahmeel 24. 7, and the parallel passages cited by Gaster, where Tubal-Cain is described as the one who had made the tablets.

<sup>54</sup> Yerahmeel 23. 6, and in a somewhat abbreviated form in *Hadar*, Gen. 4.26. Comp. also PRE 45, with respect to the golden calf: Sammael roared out of the mouth of the calf in order to mislead Israel. The origin of idolatry occupied the minds of the Greeks, and the Jewish-Alexandrian schools accepted, with some modifications, the theory of Euhemerus, according to which its origin was due to the worship of dead heroes. Through the Jewish writers this theory reached the Church Fathers; comp. Wisdom 14. 12-13; Clementine *Homilies* 9. 5 (which reads: This is the beginning of idolatry: When Nimrod, later known as Zoroaster, was struck by lightning, the masses perceived in it a special distinction, and therefore erected a temple on his grave. Whereupon the princes of var-

ious countries laid claim to similar glory; comp. note 85 on vol. I, p. 178); Jerome on Ezek. 23. 12 and Hos. 2. 10 (Ninus, after a victorious struggle against Zoroaster, placed his father Belus among the gods). Comp. further the sources cited in Grünbaum, *Gesammelte Aufsätze*, 198-199. The statement frequently found among Church Fathers that the demons and the fallen angels, respectively, seduced men to idolatry (comp. e. g. Minucius Felix, *Octav.*, 26. 7; Justin Martyr, *Apologia*, 2. 15; Clementine *Recognitiones*, 4. 13-15; Tatian, *Or. Ad Graecos*, 8; Athenagoras, *Legat. Pro Christianis* 24; Lactantius, *Institutiones*, 2. 16), and taught them the making of images and statues, goes back to pseudepigraphic writings of the Jews (comp. e. g. Enoch 66. 6 and 99. 7; Jub. 11. 4) but is entirely unknown to the older rabbinic literature. This view is only found in later writings (comp. e. g. the legend in 'Aseret ha-Dibrot 71) and especially in the Kabbalah. Comp. Grünbaum, *Gesammelte Aufsätze*, 93. The beginning of idolatry, according to the older rabbinic sources, based on their interpretation of Gen. 4. 26, took place in the time of Enosh (hence his name is "sickly", i. e., mankind became ill in his time; Aggadat Bereshit, introduction, 37; Yashar Bereshit, 10a); Sifre D., 43; Shabbat 118b; WR 23. 3; Mekilta Bahodesh 6, 67b; Midrash Tannaim 20 and 195; BR 2. 3; 5. 1 and 5; 23. 7; Tan. B. I, 52, and IV, 24; Tan. Noah 18 and Yitro 16; Tehillim 1, 11; 88, 380; Yerushalmi Targumim and Onkelos on Gen. 4. 26 (on the reading of Onkelos comp. Berliner, *ad loc.*). Jerome, *ad loc.*, knows of the rabbinic interpretation of this verse (Gen., *loc. cit.*) together with that of Septuagint, Aquila, and Peshitta with which Ecclu. 49. 16 is in agreement. See also Philo, *De Abrahamo*, 2, and *De Praemiis*, 2 (end), where Enosh is considered as the type of the pious. Comp. also Theodoretus, *Quaestiones in Gen.*, 247, who takes Seth as the subject of הַחַיִּים. It is noteworthy that the passages cited above, as well as other passages (comp. Ekah, introduction, 24, 26; PR 42, 178b and 193a), speak of the wicked generation of Enosh, but not of the wicked Enosh. Maimonides, however (*Yad ha-Hazakah 'Abodat Kokabim* 1. 1) observes (very likely on the basis of older sources; comp. Hekalot 6, 173, and Shabbat *loc. cit.*: כַּתְּנוּשׁ) that Enosh himself was an idolater. In Baraita 32 Middot (Yalkut I, 47; comp. note 45) it is explicitly stated that at the time of Enosh images and immorality were introduced by the descendants of Cain. Comp. vol. II, p. 260, and vol. III, p. 374. Comp. note 56 (end).

<sup>55</sup> BR 23. 6-7; Baraita 32 Middot (in Yalkut I, 47) reads: As soon as this generation committed three sins (idolatry, murder, and incest; comp. the end of the preceding note), three visitations came upon them: the ocean flooded a third part of the earth; there arose mountains, valleys, and rocky ground, whereas prior to that everything had been smooth and even (comp. notes 29, 30); man's stature was shortened. In Messianic times everything will regain its former position. The overflowing of the ocean in the time of Enosh is frequently alluded to; comp. Mekilta Bahodesh 6, 67b; Sifre D., 43; Midrash Tannaim 20 and 195; BR 5. 6; Shekalim 6, 50a; Tan. B. I, 52, and IV, 24; Tan. Noah 18 and Yitro 16; Tehillim 88, 300. On the transformation of men into apes comp. vol. I, p. 180, and the notes appertaining to it; Enoch 19. 2 (the women who seduced the angels were transformed into sirens); Koran 2. 60 and 7. 174.

<sup>56</sup> Hekalot 6, 172; *Hakam ha-Razin* in Yalkut Reubeni 25b-25c; Ziyoni, Gen. 4. 26. On the view that the Shekinah dwells under the tree of life comp. vol. I, p. 97. On the withdrawal of the Shekinah from the earth to heaven see vol. II, p. 260. Those who came near the Shekinah remained safe from vermin; comp. vol. III, p. 472, and IV, p. 242. On the opposition of the angels to the creation of man, see vol. I, pp. 53-54 and note 15 on vol. I, p. 152. On the subjugation of the heavenly bodies through the power of magic, comp. Tan. Bereshit 12 (read מורידין instead of רואין); MHG I, 131; note 15 on vol. I, p. 152. The two fallen angels bear the names of Uzza and Azrael, Azza and Azrael, Shemhazai and Azazel. The identity of Azrael with Azazel does not require any proof; but it has not hitherto been noticed that Uzza or Azza were originally the same as Shemhazai. Since nearly all the names of angels are theophorous (this was already noticed by the old Midrashim; comp. PK 12, 108b, and the parallel passage cited by Buber, which reads: The name of God is combined with every angle), Uzza and Azza are therefore to be taken as abbreviated forms of Jehouzza and Jehoazza (comp. the name עזיהו or עזיה in the Bible; on the abbreviation of theophorous names, particularly those containing the particles יהו and יה, comp. note 42). This abbreviation is due to the fact that it was not considered proper to combine the names יהו and יה with the fallen angels. Another way of avoiding this combination was the substitution of שם "the Name" for יהו. Hence the name Shemhazai, which differs only slightly from Jehouzai (ע and ח are often interchanged),



goes back to שמועני = יהויעני. On the ascending of the Shekinah amid the sounding of the trumpets, comp. Hanok, 114, and vol. II, 306. On Enosh as the originator of idolatry, see Zohar I, 56a, where, however, Helakot, *loc. cit.*, and Maimonides, *Yad ha-Hazakah*, 'Abo-dat Kokabim 1. 1, were very likely made use of. Comp. also Luria's note 4 on PRE. 22 and note 45 (end).

<sup>57</sup> Enoch 6-8, where two different sources were probably combined into one, since twenty archangels are enumerated in 6, whereas 8 has only ten (in our texts nine only are given, owing to the fact that one name fell out), and it is well known that the number of the members of the heavenly court is differently given in the different sources, as twenty, ten, and seven, respectively; comp. vol. I, p. 140, where, according to the Hebrew book of Enoch 176, the twenty archangels are enumerated. Comp. further Index, *s. v.* "Archangels". On the names of the angels in this part of Enoch (see the vast material given by Charles 17), the following may be noted: Artakifa = ארעא תקיף; Ramiel = רעמיאל (occurs also in the Hebrew book of Enoch, *loc. cit.*, as the "angel of thunder"); Tamiel = תדומאל, "angel of the deep"; Danel is a Greek scribal error, Δανειήλ for Δανειήλ = Δαλειήλ ליליאל "angel of the night", as in the Hebrew Enoch, *loc. cit.*; Batarrel stands for Matarel, מטריאל in the Hebrew Enoch, "angel of rain"; Zakiel is in Hebrew Enoch זקיאל "angel of storms", and similarly in the magic text published by Stube, *Jüdisch-babylonische Zaubertexte* 26. Satarel occurs in Berakot 57b as the name of a person. As the name of an angel it signifies "angel of hidden things", *i. e.*, the secrets of nature. It may, however, be remarked that עסתר, "Venus", appears in Jewish texts as an angel (comp. Montgomery, *Aramaic Incantation Texts*, index, *s. v.*). Accordingly Satarel may stand for עסתראל.—The fall of the angels plays an important part in Jewish folk-lore, as well as in Jewish theology, and the following summary of the development of this belief may therefore not be out of place. In connection with Gen. 6. 1-4 we find in Enoch (in addition to the passages cited above, comp. Charles' index, *s. v.* "Angels", as well as Bousset, *Religion*, 328, *seq.*, and 560, *seq.*) a legend concerning the angels who in the time of Jared (on the play of the word ירד "descended", comp. Jub. 4. 15 and Midrash Aggada Gen. 5, 18, as well as Aggadat Bereshit, introduction 37, not in reference to the angels, but the generation which "sank low") rebelled against God and descended from heaven to earth where they were degraded (2 Peter 2. 4 reads: "cast

them down", which is a midrashic interpretation of נפילים, Gen. 6. 4, deriving it from the Hifil and not from the Kal. This interpretation is also known, along with others, to BR 27. 7. Comp. also Aggadat Bereshit, Introduction 39, where it is connected with פלג, according to which it means "the distinguished"), because they had sexual intercourse with the daughters of man. These fallen angels are the originators of all evil; through them witchcraft, astrology, and idolatry came down to man. They themselves were judged by God, and in accordance with His judgment, are awaiting punishment in the infernal regions at the end of time. But their descendants do mischief as spirits and demons all the time; they entice man to idolatry, immorality, and all kinds of sins (comp. note 54, and Bousset, index, s. v. "Daemonen"), and lure them on to their destruction. Jub. 4. 15, 22, and 5. 1, also speaks of the sexual intercourse between the angels and the daughters of man, and likewise ascribes the origin of evil to the demons (comp. especially 10. 1, seq.), the descendants of these sinful unions; but no mention is made of any rebellion of the angels in this pseudepigraphic work. On the contrary, it is stated there that these angels were sent by God to the earth (4. 14), "that they should instruct the children of men and that they should do justice and uprightness on earth", but having been lured by the beauty of women, they fell victims to them. The same view is to be found also in Apocalypse of Baruch 66. 11-15. Still more striking is the agreement between Jub. and the elaborated legend concerning the fall of the angels in the Clementine *Homilies*, 8. 11-15. This was also known to Commodianus, *Instructiones* 3. On the fall of the angels comp. also vol. I, pp. 148, 149, and note 10 appertaining thereto. In 2 Enoch 18 the fall of the angels at the time of Jared seems to be taken as a continuation of the original rebellion of Satan and his hosts (comp. on this point vol. I, pp. 14, 18, 53-54, 62-64, and the notes appertaining thereto, especially note 34 on the last passage), and this may be compared with Enoch 18. 15-16, where the rebellion of the stars (=angels) at the beginning of creation is spoken of. The literal interpretation of Gen. 6. 1-4 is found not only in the above-mentioned pseudepigraphic works, but also in the Septuagint (on the correct reading of this text comp. Frankel, *Ueber den Einfluss*, 46-47, and *Vorstudien* 67. See also Dillmann in commentary on Gen., *ad loc.*); Philo, *De Gigant.*, 2; Josephus, *Antiqui.*, I, 3. 1; Aquila and Peshitta, *ad loc.*; 2 Peter 2. 4; Jude 6. The older Church Fathers follow this

view, and make use of it in their explanations of the existence of evil in this world (comp. above and note 54); see *e. g.*, Justin Martyr, *Apologia*, 11, 5, and *Dialogue*, 79; Clementine, *Homilies*, 8. 11, *seq.*; Clemens Alexandrinus, *Stromata* 5, 1, 10; Tertullian, *De Virgin.* 7 and *De Idol.* 9; Lactantius, *Institutiones*, 2. 15. The first attempt at a different interpretation of this Gen. passage is found in 12 Testaments, Reuben 5. 6. Here the intercourse of the angels with the women is described in the following words: "They (the angels) transformed themselves into the shape of men, and appeared to them when they (the women) were with their husbands. And the women, lusting in their minds after their forms, gave birth to giants." The giants, therefore, are not the physical descendants of the angels, but for their size they are indebted to their mothers whose imaginations were filled with the beauty and tallness of the angels (on their high stature, see vol. III, p. 268; hence in the Testaments: "for the watchers appeared to them as reaching even unto heaven"; this is in agreement with the explanation given by the Rabbis of the name ענקים as שמעניקין החמה בקומתן; comp. Sotah 34b; BR 26. 7, and many of the parallel passages cited by Theodor, *ad loc.*). The same view is also explicitly stated in Kallah 2, 8a, and the obscure passage in Tan. B. I, 26, is very likely to be explained accordingly. BR 27. 7 is a rationalistic interpretation (comp. Theodor, *ad loc.*) of this verse. While the literal meaning of "the sons of God" is still adhered to in the 12 Testaments, Reuben, *loc. cit.*, as well as in the 12 Testaments, Naphtali, 3. 5, Philo interprets this phrase to signify "virtuous men", and "the daughters of man" as "wicked and corrupted women" (*Quaestiones in Gen.*, 1, 92). In the authoritative writings of the Synagogue great stress is laid on the fact that Scripture does not know of any sexual intercourse between angels and women. "The sons of God" is declared to signify "distinguished men", particularly the ante-diluvian generations, who enjoyed happy and long lives, like the angels. See Sifre N., 86; Sifre Z., 194; BR 27.2-5; Symmachus, Onkelos, and Targum Yerushalmi on Gen. 6. 2 and 4; Trypho, as quoted by Justin Martyr, *Dialogue*, 79. The first Christian author who discarded the literal interpretation of "the sons of God" was Julius Africanus (according to a quotation by Cyncellus, I, 34; comp. Charles, *Jub.*, 4.15; Origen, *Contra Celsum*, 4. 31, a contemporary of Africanus, knows that מלךים may mean "judge", but does not assign this signification to אל, in Gen. 6. 2), who lived

one hundred years later than Trypho and R. Simon (comp. BR, *loc. cit.*). These two Rabbis expressed themselves most decisively against the myth of the angels' intercourse with the women. On the interpretation of the "sons of God" as the descendants of Seth, met with among the later Church Fathers, comp. note 14 on vol. I, p. 152. On the traces of the myth of the fallen angels in the non-authoritative writings of the Synagogue, comp. vol. I, pp. 148-150, and note 10 appertaining thereto. The designation of Adam as "the son of God" in Luke 3. 38 (in a genealogical sense) shows that already in the early days of Christianity the conception of the incarnation of a God-like being was not confined to Christ. The rabbinic sources (Tan. B. V, 77; BaR 16. 24 and parallel passages) find in Ps. 82. 6-7 the contrast expressed between "the sons of the Most High" and Adam.

<sup>58</sup> Enoch 12-16; Jub. 4. 17-23. Numerous legends are extant in the first mentioned pseudepigraphic work, as well as in 2 Enoch and in the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs, concerning the person of Enoch. He is the inventor of all sciences and knowledge; he has intercourse with angels in heaven, and is finally translated into paradise or heaven where he dwells and performs the function of heavenly scribe or secretary. All these legends left no trace in the authoritative rabbinic sources, but are well known to the Church Fathers (comp. the numerous references in Schürer, *Geschichte*, III, 284-286, to which many more may be added; see, e. g., *Recognitiones*, 4. 13), and other Christian writers of ancient and medieval times; comp. e. g., *Visio Pauli* 20, and extracts from Christian literature by Fabricius, *Codex Pseudepigraphicus*, 106-223. In the entire Tannaitic literature and in both Talmudim no mention is made of Enoch. This name, however, is found two or three times in the older Midrashim (PK 23, 155a = WR 29. 22; BR 25. 1), but without the glory conferred on it by pseudepigraphic and Christian literature. It is stated in BR, *loc. cit.*, that Enoch was not translated, as the heretics (Christians or Jewish-Christians) assert, but that he died like any other human being. He even died before his time, because he had not been of a steadfast character, and God preferred that he should die young while he was yet righteous. Comp. also Koheleth 7. 15. But even pre-Christian authors like Wisdom 15. 11, and especially Philo, *Quaestiones in Gen.*, 1, 82-86, as well as *De Abrahamo*, 3, and *De Praemiis*, 3, not only deny the translation of Enoch, but know to report that he was or-

iginally a sinner, but subsequently followed the right path. The remark in PK, *loc. cit.*, concerning Enoch as the seventh since Adam who pleased God (like everything else "that was seventh") is almost literally found in Enoch 93. 3 and Jude 14. But all the Midrash wants to say is that Enoch was better than the six previous patriarchs and this is no particular merit; comp. note 1. The superiority of Abraham's piety to that of Enoch and Noah is emphasized in an old source from which Lekah on Gen. 5. 24 is an extract (it is another version of the Haggadah recorded in BR 30. 10; Tan. B. I, 81). Septuagint on Gen. 5. 24 is very likely to be understood to mean that Enoch was translated to heaven, which is stated also in Ecclu. 44. 16 and 49. 14 (פנים in this verse stands in some relation to its use in later mystic literature, where the designation of Enoch-Metatron as שר הפנים, "angel of the face", occurs frequently), as well as by Josephus, *Antiqui.*, I. 3. 4, and Hebrews 11. 5. Hence Enoch and Elijah are the only two "witnesses" (comp. Revelation 11. 3) in Christian legends, because they were the only two that did not die (see the material collected by Bousset, *Antichrist*, index, s. v. "Zeugen"). In Ascension of Isaiah 9. 9, Isaiah sees Enoch in the seventh heaven, the residence of the righteous since the time of Adam. In view of the fact that no distinction is made here between Enoch and the other pious men it may be assumed that according to this apocryphal work Enoch came to heaven after his death. This would be in agreement with the official doctrine of the Synagogue (comp. above, and Onkelos Gen. 5. 24). Jub. 4. 23 and Enoch 70. 3-4 explicitly state that paradise was the abode of Enoch (comp. also Preuschen, *Adamschriften*, 37-38). This is also the opinion of later rabbinic writings. See further on this point note 61. The difference of opinion concerning Enoch's abode after his translation corresponds to that about Elijah; comp. note 32 on vol. IV, p. 200. MHG I, 123, quotes the following from a supposedly tannaitic source (the introductory formula is תמנא): Three men ascended to heaven to perform service (*i. e.*, they served as angels, מלאכי השרת); they are: Enoch, Moses, and Elijah. This statement is followed by a remark that all the pious, after their death, are transformed into angels. This is certainly a later addition. On Moses comp. vol. III, p. 473, and on Elijah see vol. IV, p. 201.

<sup>59</sup> Yashar Bereshit, 11a-13a, and thence it was incorporated in BHM IV, 129-132. No real parallels are found in the older pseud-

epigraphic and rabbinic literature to this description of the activity and translation of Enoch (the fiery horse, of course, goes back to 2 Kings 2. 11), although the books of Enoch, Jub., and other writings (comp. the preceding note) know to report a good deal about Enoch's piety and wisdom. He is mentioned as the father of astronomy and calendation also in PRE 8, where it is stated that Noah received instruction from him after his translation (Luria, *ad loc.*, is to be corrected accordingly). 'See also Midrash Aggada Gen. 5. 24; Eupolemus, 419. In the source of Yashar mention was very likely made also of Enoch's temporary stay with the angels concerning which the books of Enoch speak in detail. The idea that Enoch's countenance was awe-inspiring, and could cause death, is probably related to 2 Enoch 27. 38, whose Enoch legends Yashar employs also elsewhere; comp. vol. I, pp. 136-137, and the following note. The view that Enoch solemnly buried Adam goes back to Seder 'Olam 1 and Baba Batra 121b, whereas according to another legend, it was Seth who attended to his father's funeral. Comp. vol. I, pp. 99-100.

<sup>60</sup> An extract from Slavonic (=2) Enoch. The Ethiopic book of Enoch, though it is older than the Slavonic, is not of a uniform character. It consists of a series of revelations which were made to Enoch during the time of his wanderings through heaven and earth and his intercourse with the angels. These revelations, varied in their contents, embracing the laws of nature, as well as the history of the kingdom of God, were entered into this book by Enoch to teach mankind. Six quotations from "the book of Enoch" are found in Zohar (I, 37b; 72b; II, 55a; III, 240a; 248b; 253b); but, as may be seen from the nature of their contents, they were taken from a much later kabbalistic book, which has nothing in common with the pseudographic work bearing that name. Comp. further Kaneh 19b and 107a (this passage is identical with Zohar I, 37b, where *בספריה* is to be deleted) concerning "the book of Enoch preserved in heaven, which no eye can see." On the other rabbinic books of Enoch, comp. the following note.—Some parallels to the Slavonic Enoch from rabbinic and other sources may be mentioned here. Enoch had three sons (1. 10); so Yashar Bereshit, 11b. The statement about the two hundred angels, which guide the stars (4. 1), is related to the corresponding number of rebellious angels in Enoch 6. 5; the stars had already revolted at the beginning of creation; Enoch 18. 15, comp. note 57. On the oil and the tree of life (6; 8.

7; 22. 8; 56. 2), comp. note 113 on vol. I, p. 93. The description of the fallen angels reads (7. 3): Who obeyed not the commandments of God, etc. This is found literally in Zadokite Fragments, 2. The tree of life as God's residence (8. 3) is also met with in rabbinic sources; comp. vol. I, p. 23. Similarly the view that this tree covers the entire paradise (7. 4) is also found in Perek Gan 'Eden, where, as in this pseudepigraphic work (7. 5), the four streams, of honey, wine, milk, and oil are mentioned; comp. vol. I, p. 20, and note appertaining thereto. The hell-fire burns and freezes (10. 2); so also in Seder Rabba di-Bereshit, 17. Concerning the chariot on which the sun is riding, and on the angels which accompany it, comp. the parallels in vol. I, pp. 24-25. The phoenixes and Chalkadri (more accurately, Chalkydri *χαλκύδρα*, "brazen serpents") on the chariot of the sun (13) are unknown in rabbinic literature; but on the view that the singing of celestial beings causes the birds to sing their morning songs (15), comp. vol. I, pp. 44-45, and the note appertaining thereto. That there are angels, who, unlike the Cherubim, possess twelve wings (12. 1), is also stated in PRE 13. The seven hosts of angels who arrange the course of the heavenly bodies and guide the universe (19. 1, *seq.*) are met with in Jewish magic texts as seven archangels; comp. Stube, *Jüdisch-babylonische Zaubertexte*, 22, where *מהפכין* means "setting in motion", and not "transforming", as Stube translates. The idea that there is "an angel over each single blade of grass" (19.4) occurs also in rabbinic writings; comp. BR 10. 6 (Mazzal=angel; comp. Tehillim 104, 440, which reads: Everything has an angel in charge of it. See further Zohar II, 80b and 171b; III, 86a, and note 101 on vol. I, p. 85). The division of the angels into ten groups (20. 1) is very often referred to in rabbinic literature; comp. note 64 on vol. I, p. 16 (below). Michael, the chief captain (22. 6), is based directly on Dan. 12. 1, whence also the title of the archangel in Hullin 40a, whereas Tosefta 2. 18 reads *שר צבא הגדול*. Instead of Vretil, the angel who becomes Enoch's teacher (22. 12), read Uriel, in accordance with Enoch 10. 1. The remark (24. 1): "Sit thou on my left hand with Gabriel" proves the antiquity of the view, found in rabbinic writings (PRE 4; comp. further note 440 on vol. III, 231-232), concerning Gabriel's position on the left. The "song of triumph" of the angels, mentioned in 31. 2 and 42. 4, is perhaps due to a misunderstanding which goes back to an erroneous translation of *שיר נצח* ("eternal song") as

"song of triumph", comp. the similar phrase, ולנצח נצחים קדושהך נקדש, in the Amidah. The statement (33. 4) "My word is reality" literally corresponds to BR 44. 22; comp. note 2 on vol. I, p. 49. The names of the two angels (33. 6) are perhaps composed of שמיה and ארעא with אל; the angel of heaven and the angel of earth were charged to accompany him on his journey from earth to heaven and back. The angels who watch over the book of Enoch, Oriokh and Mariokh (33. 11) have no connection whatsoever with the fallen angels Harut and Marut of the Arabic legend (supposedly Persian; comp. Bousset, *Religion*, 560); they rather seem to be theophorous names with י and יה, or similar abbreviations of the first part of the Tetragrammaton. Thus אוריו means "God is light" (comp. אוריה, אוריאל, אוריה) and מריו signifies "God is master". In order to avoid the pronunciation of God's name, people said "iok" instead of "io" (to this very day Jews say אלקים instead of אלהים). The parable about the appearance before a prince (38. 8) is found almost literally in Berakot 28b and ARN 25, 79, where it is ascribed to the dying Rabban Johanan B. Zaccai (comp. also note 132 on vol. I, page 99). The fact that Enoch finds Adam and Eve, as well as his other ancestors, in the lower world (41. 1 and 42. 5) has nothing to do with the Christian doctrine (not the Jewish, as Charles asserts) of the damnation of mankind until the advent of the Messiah. It merely wishes to say that Enoch's ancestors were there as a punishment for their sins. This author, on the other hand, admits the possibility of absolute sinlessness (45. 2). On the view that God formed Adam with His own hands (44. 1), comp. vol. I, p. 49. On the rejection of the oath (49.11), see the rabbinic parallels in Ginzberg, *Unbekannte Sekte*, 130-132. On the protest against the belief in the intercession of the dead (53. 1), comp. vol. IV, p. 39, and note 19 appertaining to it. Concerning the attitude of the Synagogue on this important point it is not uninteresting to note the following words of the first paitan of the Synagogue, Jose b. Jose. This paitan, after enumerating the pious men of the Bible and describing the reward they received from God, who always accepted their prayers, observes: "O God, I trust in Thee, and not in the distinguished pious men; for they are in the grave, but Thy name is everlasting" (Zikronot in the Ashkenazic Mahzor). The great reverence for the pious, especially for those of biblical times, has not gone so far as to make them intercessors between God and Israel. In his prayers the Jew knows only his God, and thinks of no inter-



cessors among the angels or the pious.—On the transformation of Enoch from man to angel (see 22.9–10; 37; 56) comp. the preceding note, as well as vol. I, p. 140. With respect to the reward and punishment of animals (mentioned in 55. 5), comp. 4 Ezra 7. 66, and Index, *s. v.*, "Animals". The Halakah that animals must be bound at the time of slaughter (59. 3) is not altogether new; comp. Tamid 4. 1, and Shabbat 54a, with respect to the temple sacrifices (where, however, binding in the manner prescribed in this pseudepigraphic work is prohibited); with regard to other animals, see *Eldad*, XLIV and Ginzberg, *Tamid, the Oldest Treatise*, 206. The parting scene (64 and 67) is related to the one given in Yashar (comp. vol. I, pp. 129–130). The view that the entire creation was for the sake of man (65. 3) is also frequently mentioned in rabbinic sources; comp. vol. I, p. 49. It is questionable whether the words "and God set him before His face" (67. 2) are related to the usual designation found in geonic mysticism of Metatron-Enoch (comp. the following note) as the "prince of the face", or not, since in this pseudepigraphic book the phrase "to be found in God's presence" is of frequent occurrence; comp. 21. 1; 22. 6; 52. 4. The assertion that Enoch was translated to heaven on the anniversary of the day and the hour on which he was born (28) goes back to a view prevalent in rabbinic writings that the pious die on their birthday. Comp. Tosefta Sotah 11. 7–8; Babli 13b; Kiddushin 38a; Seder 'Olam 10, according to the reading of the older authors (see Ratner, note 12). The statement that it was the sixth of Sivan on which Enoch was born, and later translated, certainly proves that by this author this day was considered the day of the Revelation (comp. Seder 'Olam 5; Tosefta 'Arakin 1. 9, and the detailed discussion appertaining to it in Shabbat 86a–88a). In other words, this author regards Pentecost as the Festival of Revelation, a view with which we meet for the first time in the rabbinic sources of the middle of the second century of the common era. It may be remarked that the text is not quite in order, since if Enoch (68) reached heaven on the first of Sivan (one text reads Nisan; comp. also 1. 2 where the first month = Nisan), remained there for sixty days, and after a stay of thirty days on earth was translated for ever, his translation must have taken place in Elul (as in the case of Moses; comp. vol. III, p. 339). The number of books composed by Enoch (68) is given as 366, which is very likely to be corrected to 365 as it is connected with the 365 years of Enoch's life; comp., however, *Liber*

*Johannis Apocryphus*, 890 (in a passage, where our pseudepigraphic work is made use of, the number of books given is 66). Ezra, to whom, in 4 Ezra, Enoch's part is ascribed, wrote seventy books; comp. vol. IV, p. 358. By the place Achuzan (68.5; also written Aruzan; comp. the Melchizedek fragment in the appendix to the Slavonic Enoch, 88) Jerusalem is to be understood as may be seen from the above-mentioned fragment 91, which reads as follows: He (Melchizedek) shall be priest and king in the place Achuzan, that is to say, in the middle of the earth where Adam was created; there shall at last be his grave. Since Melchizedek was king of Jerusalem (vol. I, p. 233), and the dust of the forming of Adam's body was taken from the site of the altar at Jerusalem (vol. I, pp. 55, 101), there cannot be any doubt about the identification of Achuzan. Moreover, Jerusalem is said to be the centre of the earth (vol. I, p. 12). The only difficult question is about the etymology of the word (Achuzan; comp. note 109 on vol. I, p. 89. It is perhaps to be emended to Arauna, since the site of the altar at Jerusalem belonged to Arauna the Jebusite; comp. Index, s. v. This is, of course, no proof that this pseudepigraphic work had a Hebrew original; still less would it prove that it is of Palestinian origin, although both assumptions appear probable. These two questions, it is hoped, will be discussed more fully in some other connection.

<sup>62</sup> Hekalot 6, 170-171 (abbreviated in *Sefer Hanok*, 114-116). The seventy names (on צ"ב שמות, Hanok, p. 116, comp. Alphabet R. Akiba ed. Wertheimer, p. 13) of Metatron, which are very important for the history of mysticism, are given in *Sha'ar ha-Heshek*. To the Metatron-Enoch literature belong also both versions of Alphabet of R. Akiba, as well as the different Hekalot books. The oldest source assuming the identity of Enoch and Metatron (to this still enigmatic name of the angel, which occurs very frequently in the Talmud, the Syriac מטטרן אפי'תרוניי, λόγοι ἐπιθρόνοι is closely related) is Targum Yerushalmi Gen. 5. 24, where the text, however, has certainly not been preserved in its original form, as may be seen from אַתְּנוּיָד, "was carried away." Comp. 2 Targum Yerushalmi, *ad loc.* On the Enoch-Metatron cycle of legends, comp. especially the numerous extracts from the older kabbalistic literature in *Yalkut Reubeni Gen. 5. 24*; Kanah, 106d (Midrash Aggada, Gen., *loc. cit.*, is based on this passage or on an older source from which both borrowed independently). See further Jellinek, *Einleitung* to *BHM* II, 30-32; IV, 41-43, as well as Theodor on

BR 25. 1. It is questionable whether in BaR 12. 12 Metatron is identical with Enoch, or not. The designation of Metatron here as the "youth" is independent of this identification; comp. Tosafot on Yebamot 16b and Hullin 60a. The relation of the Metatron-Enoch legend cycle to the legends found in the pseudepigraphic books of Enoch is not quite clear. There can be no doubt that there exists no literary relationship between the so-called rabbinic books of Enoch (the term "rabbinic" is here employed in absence of a better name; as a matter of fact the "Rabbis" were opposed to this literature) and with pseudepigraphic literature bearing the same name. This is quite obvious to any one familiar with both literatures. Yet as has been pointed out in the preceding note many conceptions are common to both, as, for instance, Enoch's transformation into an angel (mentioned in 2 Enoch and in Hekalot) on his entrance into heaven. This, however, proves only that, despite the fact that the leaders of the Synagogue had no high respect for Enoch (comp. note 58, where reference is likewise made to Wisdom and Philo; hence this need not necessarily be ascribed to anti-Christian tendencies), the older esteem of Enoch was not only retained in popular circles, but it was even enlarged until it reached its highest pinnacle in the identification of Enoch with Metatron. The Babylonian Nebo, the heavenly scribe, gave Enoch to the Palestinian, Metatron to the Babylonian Jews, and nothing could be more natural than the final combination of Enoch-Metatron. It is quite probable that a number of other elements were added to this combination, as, for instance, Philonian speculations on the Logos, and possibly also Christological conceptions; it is thus extremely difficult to separate it in its original component parts. Between the "official" depreciation of Enoch and his apotheosis in popular-mystical literature, some of the rabbinic sources have retained a middle course, and basing their views on the literal interpretation of Gen. 5. 24, maintain that Enoch belonged to those few (various numbers are given: seven, nine, ten, thirteen) who entered paradise during their life-time; comp. Derek Erez Zuta (end); PRK, 83; 2 Alphabet of Ben Sira 38; Yalkut I, 42, and (two sources) Ezek., 367; Aggudat Aggadot (Carmoly) 12; Kimhi on 2 Kings 2. 1. Comp. on these "immortals" note 67 and note 307 on vol. I, pp. 74 and 297 respectively. None of the sources just cited can be designated with certainty as old. It is true that Derek Erez Zuta is old (comp. Ginzberg in *Jewish Encyclopedia*, IV, 528-529),

but it is doubtful whether the original text counted Enoch among the "immortals"; comp. Tawrogi, *ad loc.*, and further Mahzor Vitry, 721, whose author does not seem to have had the passage about the immortals in his text of Derek Erez Zuta. The view, however, that Enoch's abode is in paradise is old (comp. note 58), and is frequently found in Christian legends; comp. Irenaeus 2. 66 (Enoch is said to have taught the disciples of the apostles); the Gospel of Nicodemus 9 (Latin version), etc. In Christian legends it is stated that Enoch and Elijah will also die at the end of time (it is even said that the anti-Christ will kill them); see History of Joseph the Carpenter 31-32 (as "immortals" are mentioned here: Shila and Tabitha); Nicodemus, *loc. cit.*; Revelation of John (beginning). In Midrash Alphabetot, 89a, it is stated that before the creation of the new world, everything, even the most high angels, will disappear, so that God's unity will be seen by all. Comp. also Tertullian, *Adversus Hermog.*, 34, and Sanhedrin, 92a-92b.—On the twenty angels enumerated in Hekalot 175, (Sammael, the head of all the Satans, is described as "the greatest of all the angels"; read מלאכי instead of מלכיות; comp., however, *Seder Ruhot*, 179, where Satan is distinguished from Sammael, "the prince of Rome"; see also DR 11. 9, which reads: Sammael, the head of all the Satans), comp. note 57. It is noteworthy that these angels are exclusively in charge of natural phenomena and heavenly bodies. Furthermore, it is strange that Michael is not mentioned among them, and that all the stars are assigned to the charge of one angel. On the other hand, an old tradition states (Al-Barceloni, 247) that each one of the seven planets has its own angel as follows; the sun has Raphael; Venus, Aniel; Mercury, Michael; the moon, Gabriel; Saturn, Kafziel; Jupiter, Zadkiel; Mars, Sammael. These seven planets and their seven angels, it is further said, correspond to the seven hours (? Read, perhaps, שרים "princes" or משרחים "attendants"); these are: Kewan, Nebo, Shamsha, Bel (instead of כיל read בייל), Sin, Belti, and ארים. The last-named must not be changed into ארמי, Hermes, since this text contains the chief gods of the Babylonian Pantheon. On the functions of the seven planets, comp. Shabbat 156a; Baraita de-Mazzalot, 27-28; Pick, *Assyrisches und Talmudisches*, 17-19. Al-Barceloni's words are: ואלו הם כוכבים בעולם חנכ"ל שצ"ם אלו שבעה מושלים יסודי עולם כנגדן ז' שעות כון נבו שמשא כיל (בייל) בלחי ארים ועליהם ז' ממונים ז' מלאכים חמה מלאכו רפאל וכו'.

<sup>62</sup> Yashar Bereshit, 13a, where it is said that the sinfulness of the generation of the flood did not begin before the end of Methuselah's life. The Melchizedek fragment 1-2 in appendix to 2 Enoch states that Methuselah was installed as ruler and leader after his father's translation, and that man's apostasy did not take place till after his death, as God had previously told him. The election of Methuselah had been announced through a clear sign that it was acceptable to God; for while he was praying, the altar shook, and a knife leaped into Methuselah's hand in the presence of all the people. The Jewish legend (comp. the following note) about Methuselah's wonderful sword is, of course, not to be dissociated from this "knife", and is closely related to the name Methuselah, since שלח may mean both "he sent" and "sword". Is the statement made in an anonymous Midrash (cited in Yalkut II, 367, Ezek. 27) that Methuselah is one of those whom death did not destroy (in addition to him, there are: Enoch; Eliezer, Abraham's servant; Hiram, king of Tyre; Ebed-melech; Bithiah, Pharaoh's daughter; Serah, Asher's daughter; the three sons of Korah; Elijah; the Messiah, and R. Joshua b. Levi, comp. preceding note and note 67 on vol. I, p. 74), connected with the etymology given by Philo (*De Posterit. Caini*, 13) "sending away of death" (= מִיַּחַד מְשׁוּלַח־חַי)? It is more probable, however, that we have here a reminiscence of a Christian legend. According to the chronology of the Septuagint with regard to the ante-diluvian patriarchs, Methuselah was still alive at the time of the flood. Now, since according to the Bible he was not among the inmates of the ark, the only solution of the difficulty was that he was taken away from this world to live in paradise at least for some time. Comp. Jerome, Gen. 5; Fabricius, *Codex Pseudepigraphicus*, 224-227; *Shalsholet*, 93b.

<sup>63</sup> Yerahmeel 23. 1-4; *Sifte Kohen*, Bereshit (end) and Noah, 4d. A Genizah fragment in the library of Cambridge University containing this legend in detailed form was published by Ginzberg, *Ha-Goren* IX, 66-68. Comp. also Vital, *Likkute Torah*, Bereshit (end), about Methuselah's sword. See further Yalkut David on Gen. 12. 1, who cites *Sifte Kohen*, as authority for the statement that Abraham came in possession of this sword, with which he conquered the kings, and further that Esau thus received it, as heirloom, from Isaac, since he was the first-born. This sword passed to Jacob when he purchased the birth-right. This is not found in *Sifte Kohen*, but something similar occurs in other sources. Comp. vol. I, p. 321, and further the quotation

from MS. in *Midbar Kedemot*, s. v. מְחוּשֵׁלָה. Agrimus is identical with Angro-Mainyu, also called Ahriman, the lord of Daeves, of the Persians. Comp. Ginzberg, *Ha-Goren*, loc. cit. 59–61.

<sup>64</sup> Yerahmeel 23. 5–6; Midrash Aggada, Gen. 5. 25; an anonymous Midrash in Yalkut I, 42 (in later edition Abkir is given as the source); Aggadat Bereshit (introduction), 38; Sikli, who cites *Huppah Eliyyahu* as the source in his MS. work Yalkut Talmud Torah (comp. Poznanski, *Ha-Zofeh* III, 11–12, and Ginzberg, *ibid.*, IV, 28; the latter refers to Sabba, Bereshit, 9a, who is acquainted with a similar legend). Comp. further *Kad ha-Kemah* s. v. אַבְל, 12a–13a, who made use of the same source as Sikli, and not the one of the Yalkut. All the sources state that the flood, was postponed for a week in order to allow the people to mourn for a week for the “righteous Methuselah”; comp. Tosefta Sotah 10. 3, and the passages cited in note 20 on vol. I, p. 154. Of the ante-diluvian patriarchs, Jared and Methuselah lived the longest, because both of them were very modest and humble, as their names indicate: Jared = “he who condescended”, and Methuselah = “he who is humble (שח), even as though he were dead” (קח). The shortest lives were those of Enoch and Lamech, because they bore the same names as the wicked descendants of Cain; Hasidim 247. The later Kabbalists (comp. Yalkut Reubeni, Gen. 5. 22, end of 27a) assert that Enoch was a shoe-maker who praised God with every stitch he made. I venture to suggest that instead of Enoch, Methuselah should be read, as this is very likely based on the fact that the numerical value of מְחוּשֵׁלָה בֶן חֲנוּךְ corresponds to the value of the words הוּא הִיָּה חוֹפֵר בּוֹעֵלִים “he made shoes”. Attention is to be called to the fact that שֶׁלַח in mishnaic Hebrew means skin; comp. also note 62. Maimonides, *Guide of the Perplexed*, II, 39, speaks of Methuselah and his court of justice; Maimonides’ source is not known.

#### IV. NOAH

(pp. 143-181)

<sup>1</sup> Light at the birth of heroes is a favorite motive of legend; comp. vol. II, p. 264, and the note appertaining to it. Shu'aib, Noah 4d, reports the same incident concerning Noah. See note 3.

<sup>2</sup> On the speech of new-born babes, comp. vol. II, p. 264, and vol. III, p. 464. In the Melchizedek fragments it is stated that Melchizedek, immediately after his birth, spoke with his lips, and blessed the Lord; comp. note 16.

<sup>3</sup> On the idea that light is a sign of heavenly origin, comp. vol. I, pp. 105, 106. See also note 1.

<sup>4</sup> Enoch 106-107. While in this pseudepigraphic work it is Methuselah who learns everything about the future and imparts the knowledge thereof to his son, in rabbinic sources it is Lamech, Noah's father, who, as a prophet at the time of the birth of his son, foresaw that his son was destined for great things; comp. *Da'at* and *Hadar* on Gen. 5. 29, and Sabba, Bereshit, 9b; Ephraim, I, 47. Whether Lamech to whom a pseudepigraphic work is ascribed (comp. Schürer, *Geschichte*, III, 358) is Lamech the father of Noah, or his name-sake, the descendant of Cain, is doubtful; comp. Josephus, *Antiqui.*, I, 22, where this Cainite is credited with the gift of prophecy and comp. also BR 23. 2; comp. note 6. It is an old tradition that Noah was a prophet; Seder 'Olam 21; Philo, *Quis...Haeres Sit*, 52. Comp. further his remarks in *Quaestiones*, Gen. 1, 87, with reference to the naming of Noah by his father, according to which, the patriarchs (*i. e.*, the ante-diluvians) prophesied sometimes. Philo agrees on this point with Jub., according to whose author (8. 18), not only Noah, but also Adam, Seth, Enosh, Mahalalel, Enoch, and Shem were prophets, as may be inferred from 19. 24. Comp. Ginzberg, *Unbekante Sekte*, 296-297. On the meaning of the name Noah, comp. the following note.

<sup>5</sup> Aggadat Bereshit (introduction) 38; Yalkut I, 42, quoting an unknown Midrash (later editions give Abkir as source, but this is not found in the first edition); Sikli in his MS. work Yalkut Tal-

mud Torah (comp. Ginzberg's note in *Ha-Zofeh* IV, 28-29) quotes this legend from *Huppat Eliyyahu*; *Da'at* on Gen. 5. 29; Vital, *Likkute Torah*, Bereshit (end). The last author adds that at the time of Noah's birth, the magic sword of Methuselah (comp. vol. I, p. 141 and note 63 appertaining thereto), with which he destroyed demons and evil spirits, lost its power. That is the reason why Methuselah feared the power of witchcraft. According to Yashar Bereshit, 13b, Methuselah named his grandson Noah, because the earth was appeased, while Lamech called him Menahem, "a consolation", as stated in the Bible, *loc. cit.* The explanation of the name Noah as given in the Bible did not satisfy the later readers, since נִחַמְנוּ, "he will console us", could only apply to מְנַחֵם or a similar name. BR 25. 2 gives no less than five explanations of the name Noah. He was called "he that caused rest"; 1) because it was in his time that the rebellion of animals against man came to an end; 2) because the earth then enjoyed rest from the waters of the sea (vol. I, p. 147); 3) because the heavenly bodies rested during the time of the flood; comp. note 41; 4) because the ark was at rest. According to others, this name signifies "the pleasant one" (נַח = נִחַח), because his sacrifice was pleasant to God. Some of these explanations are also found in pseudepigraphic and patristic literature; comp. Enoch 106. 18 (the Ethiopic version reads: Call his name Noah, for he shall be left to you, thus connecting נַח with הֵנִיחַ "left behind", while the Latin version reads: *Qui Interpretatur requies quia requiem praestabit in Arcam*, and accordingly connects נַח with הֵנִיחַ "caused one to find rest"), and 107. 3, which reads: Noah, for he will comfort the earth after all the destruction; Philo, *Aleg.*, 3. 24; *De Abrahamo*, 5; *Quaestiones in Gen.* 1, 87; 2, 245; Theophilus, 3. 19; Ephraim, I, 47 F; Jerome, Gen. 5. 29. Comp. also Tan. Bereshit 11. The translation of the Septuagint, *διαναπαύσει ἡμᾶς* does not render נִחַמְנוּ but נִינְחוּ; comp. BR, *loc. cit.* 2 (he should have called him נִינְחוּ). See Ginzberg, *Haggada bei den Kirchenv.*, 73-74, and vol. I, p. 16.

<sup>6</sup> Tan. Bereshit 11 (this implies that Lamech was no prophet, but had good reasons to call his son 'comforter'; comp. note 4; BR 25. 2; Abkir in Yalkut I, 42). The last-named Midrash is introduced in *Pa'aneah*, Gen. 5.29, as a source for the legend that until Noah the hand of human beings consisted of one piece, the fingers not having been separated from one another. Seeing the new form of Noah's hand, his father Lamech concluded that henceforth men would have to till the ground, for which they would need flexible



fingers. Before this time they did not cultivate the ground, and therefore they did not need such fingers. For the legend itself, without Abkir as its source, see Tosafot and R. Asher, in *Hadar* on Gen. *loc. cit.*, who cite R. Judah Hasid as their authority. See also Zohar I, 38a and 58a-58b. The curse on the earth after Adam's fall lasted till his death, which took place not long before the birth of Noah; *Hadar* (Pesikta de-R. Eliezer is cited as source; but neither Pirke R. Eliezer, nor Pesikta R. Tobiah b. Eliezer has it) and *Da'at* on Gen., *loc. cit.* On those born with the sign of the Abrahamic covenant on them, see note 318 on. vol. I, p. 306.

<sup>7</sup> BR 25. 2. On the dominion of man over the animal kingdom, comp. vol. I, pp. 71, 94, and notes appertaining to them. Concerning the overflowing of the sea, comp. vol. I, p. 123. On the ten famines see vol. I, p. 221, as well as Yashar Bereshit, 13a.

<sup>8</sup> Yashar Bereshit, 13a. Comp. note 62 on vol. I, p. 141.

<sup>9</sup> Enoch 9-10. Comp. further 67-69 for the exact description of the sins of the angels. On the angels mentioned in the last passage the following is to be remarked. Yikon = יִקוֹן, *εικόνη*, image, and is employed in the sense of the Hebrew פֶּסֶל "idol", a name properly applied to the ring-leader of the rebellious angels. Peneme is, as has already been noticed by others, פְּנִימִי, and it should be added that in Tan. B. I, 17, and BR 21.1, פֶּנִי is the name of an angel. Kasbiel is practically the same as Kaspriel, and is derived from קַשְׁבִּי "sorcery"; hence it is the name of "the chief of the oath".

<sup>10</sup> An unknown Midrash in Yalkut I, p. 44 (in later editions the source is given as Abkir, but not in the first edition); Aggadat Bereshit (introduction) 38; *Pugio Fidei*, 837-838, whose text is more correct than that of Yalkut. The episode of the woman who was transformed into a star is found, with some variations (she caused the angels to give her wings, with which she flew up to the heavenly throne, in order to seek shelter with God, who rewarded her for her constancy by transforming her into the star Virgo), in *Hadar*, Gen. 6. 2 and 28. 13 (also in BHM V, 156, with the erroneous reference to the source). This passage also adds that both of these angels had to remain behind on earth, because they had given away their wings to the virgin, and only reached heaven by means of Jacob's ladder. According to this version of the legend, it is assumed that, though the angels had entertained evil thoughts, they never carried them out, otherwise their return to heaven would hardly have been conceivable. Accordingly the Midrash found in Yalkut,

*Pugio Fidei*, and Yerahmeel 25, concerning the fall of the angels, is composed of different sources. Concerning the old legend about the angels opposing the creation of man, comp. vol. I, pp. 52-54. See also Hekalot VI, 172, where it is said that Uzza and Azzael, during the sinful generation of the flood, called attention to the fact that their opposition to man's creation was justified (the text is not entirely in order; the expression *לא מבניהם הללו שנאבדו בימי המבול* clearly proves that this passage was borrowed from an Ascension of Moses; comp. vol. III, pp. 109-110). Whereupon (this is to be added) these angels descended on earth in order to prove that they were by far superior to man. This motive for the descent of the angels is rather old, since it is already found in the Clementine *Homilies*, 8. 11-12; comp. further ER 29, I62; EZ 25, 49 (the fallen angels are: Azza, Uzzi, and Azzael. This is surely the combination of a double reading, as we find the pair Azza and Azzael next to Uzza and Azzael; comp. note 56 on vol. I, p. 124); PR 34, 159a; DR (end). The transformation of the chaste virgin into a star is rather a later legend, and is hardly of Jewish origin, as may be seen from her foreign name Istehar. The account that Metatron, as God's messenger, was sent to the fallen angels is a later version of the part ascribed to Michael (in Enoch 10. 11-12). This corresponds to the angelology of the Babylonian Talmud, which transfers to Metatron all the functions that had formerly been ascribed to Michael. Hiwwa and Hiyya, the sons of the fallen angels, are directly borrowed from Niddah 61a, where Shemhazai's son is called Ahiah. Hence also the remark in *Pugio Fidei*, *loc. cit.* (where the names are written חייא and חייא) that these were the ancestors of Sihon and Og (comp. vol. III, p. 340). Although the Talmud knows only of a son of Shemhazai, but not of one of Azazel, the dependence of those works on the Talmud is obvious. In opposition to this statement that Shemhazai suspended himself between heaven and earth as a sign of repentance (one foot on the ground, and the head in heaven), it is affirmed in DR (end) that these fallen angels have been suspended by God between heaven and earth as a punishment. This has been amplified in later sources, which assert that these angels were fastened to the "mountains of darkness" by chains, and they teach witchcraft to those who seek them. Comp. Aggadat Bereshit (introduction) 39; Zohar I, 96 and 126a; III, 208a and 221a; Zohar Ruth, 99a (beginning *נחמיה* 'ר); 'Emek ha-Melek, 107c. Comp. further EZ 25, 19, as well as Enoch 7. 3. Azazel as the seducer

to sensuality is not only found in Enoch 8. 1, but also in Yoma 67b, where also the ceremony of the scapegoat on the Day of Atonement is explained on the basis of this legend. It may, however, be noted that neither in this talmudic passage nor in Niddah 61a, where Shem-hazai is mentioned, is he or Azazel designated as a fallen angel. Another legend has it that Azazel was originally an angel, and once on the day of Atonement he accused Israel before God, saying: "Why hast Thou mercy on them when they provoke Thee? Thou shouldst rather destroy them." And God replied: "If thou wouldst be among them (men), thou wouldst also sin." Azazel then requested to be tested. When, with God's permission, he descended on earth, the evil inclination overcame him and he fell a victim to Na'amah (comp. the following note), a very beautiful woman. Thereupon God said: "Since he sinned and cannot return to heaven, he should remain in the desert until the end of time, so that he should close the mouths of the accusers; for they will be warned by his fate, and will be silent." On the Day of Atonement, therefore, the scapegoat is sent to the desert, the dwelling-place of Azazel, in order to remind the accusers of his fate. *Imre No'am*, Ahare Mot (end). Comp. also Yoma 20a, and PRE 46, with respect to the silencing of Satan "the accuser" on the Day of Atonement. *Imre No'am* gives the source of this legend in a very vague manner (כחוב בהגדרה), and the text is somewhat obscure. The accusation of Israel by Azazel is certainly to be understood to mean that, in the beginning of creation, he was the one to oppose the forgiving of Israel's sins on the Day of Atonement as foreseen in the Torah. The view given in Zohar I, 23a, 25a, and 37a, concerning the fall of Azza and Azrael goes back to a source identical with the one found in Aggadat Bereshit (introduction) 38. This source is *Huppah Eliyyahu*, which is explicitly named by Sikli in his MS. work, Yalkut Talmud Torah (comp. Ginzberg's note in *Ha-Zofeh*, IV, 29-30). Besides the passages referred to in this note and in the two that follow, there is hardly any other passage in rabbinic literature dealing with the fall of the angels. On the whole question of the fallen angels comp. Grünbaum, *Gesammelte Aufsätze*, 59-61, 63-66, 75-70, 442-448; see also note 57 on vol. I, p. 125. Comp. also note 35 on vol. I, p. 64.

<sup>11</sup> PRE according to reading of Nahmanides on Gen. 4. 2; comp. MHG I, 118; Zohar I, 155a; Zohar Ruth, 99a (beginning פחח נחמיה ר'); Aggadat Bereshit (introduction) 38. See further note 45 on vol. I, p. 118; *Imre No'am*, Ahare Mot (end); Kanah 105b;

Grünbaum, *Gesammelte Aufsätze*, 58 and 447. Na'amah, Noah's wife, was the daughter of Enoch, and is not to be confounded with the sinner bearing the same name, the daughter of the Cainite Lamech; Yashar Noah, 14b. Comp. note 42 on vol. I, p. 116.

<sup>12</sup> PRE 22; Zohar I, 58a; Zohar Hadash Ruth, 99a (beginning (ר' נחמיה), which has the addition that they could not return to heaven because they had been absent for more than a week. A passage which literally corresponds with one in PRE is that in *Ketab Tamim* 61, cited from Tosefta Sanhedrin. This is very likely based on an error, for our text of the Tosefta has no trace of this passage. Moreover, in view of the strong opposition of the authoritative rabbinic sources to the doctrine of the fall of the angels (comp. note 57 on vol. I, p. 125) any reference to this doctrine in the Tosefta is quite inconceivable. Aggadat Bereshit (introduction) 38, asserts that the angels, after their intercourse with the daughters of man, wished to return to heaven, but God said: "Ye have become defiled, and ye cannot become pure again." Similar words occur also in Clementine *Homilies*, 8. 13. Comp. further Kallah 3, 8a.

<sup>13</sup> BR 26. 7 (on the text comp. *Hadar*, Deut. 2. 20); DR 1. 24; Tan. B. V, 6. On the tallness of the giants, comp. Enoch 7. 2; Zadokite Fragment, 2. See further vol. III, pp. 268-269 and 340; Clementine *Homilies*, 8. 15. Josephus, *Antiqui.*, V, 23, like his contemporary Rabban Johanan b. Zaccai (Tan., *loc. cit.*), undertakes to prove, from the skeletons found in the caves, the extraordinary tallness of the giants. The number of giants who perished in the flood, as given in the Greek Baruch 4. 10, amounts to 409,000.

<sup>14</sup> Yerahmeel 24. 10-12. On the identification (supposed in this passage) of "the sons of God" with the descendants of Seth, and that of "the daughters of man" with the generation of Cain (the last idea occurs also in PRE 22), comp. note 45 on vol. I, p. 118, and Gaster, *ad loc.*, as well as Ginzberg's *Haggada bei den Kirchenv.*, 75-76; Zohar Hadash Bereshit (end); *Hadar*, Gen. 6. 2. The description of the gradual fall of the descendants of Seth, given by Yerahmeel, essentially agrees with the Evangel of Seth (Preuschen, *Adamschriften*, 37-38 and 82, *seq.*). On Damascus as the place where Abel is supposed to have been slain, comp. note 19 on vol. I, p. 109. According to another view, "the sons of God" are the descendants of Cain. They were called so because their ancestor Cain (comp. vol. I, p. 105) was of heavenly origin. After they had mingled with the descendants of Seth, they begot children who possessed the physical strength and

beauty of the Cainites, but also their demoralized nature; Aggadat Bereshit (introduction) 38-39 (comp. Ginzberg's note on this passage in *Ha-Zofeh* IV, 29-30); Zohar I, 37; Kanah 102d and 107a. See further Hasidim 455, and Kozari II, 14.

<sup>15</sup> Tan. Bereshit 12. The care-free and happy life which the ante-diluvian generations enjoyed, is frequently alluded to in the Haggadah, in order to show that the excess of good things has its bad consequences for mankind; Tosefta Sotah 3. 6; Mekilta Shirah 2, 35b; Sifre D., 43; Mekilta RS, 58; Midrash Tannaim 36; Sanhedrin 108a; BR 26. 5; 28. 6-7; BaR 9. 14; PK 27, 169b-170a; EZ, 10, 190. Comp. Clementine *Homilies*, 8. 15, where it is said that God had given manna to the ante-diluvian giants, "suited to their various tastes" (comp. vol. III, p. 44), so that they should not be eager to eat meat. See also note 19. On the subjugation of the heavenly bodies by means of witchcraft, comp. EZ, 25, 49, and vol. I, p. 124.

<sup>16</sup> BR 36. 1; WR 5. 1 (the expression גליני לאימ"ך is also found in Koheleth 2. 20, and the Hebrew שזוק באמ"ך occurs in PR 14, 56b); Aggadat Bereshit 10, 24; PRE 22 (only this passage has the statement that they begot six children at one time; see note 4 on vol. II, p. 245); comp. the sources cited in the preceding note, and Grünbaum, *Gesammelte Aufsätze*, 86. The crowing of the cock drives the demons away; comp. Yoma 21a. The well-known legend that heroes speak immediately after their birth (comp. note 2) is here transferred to the entire race of the ante-diluvians.

<sup>17</sup> BR 26. 5; Yerushalmi Sotah 1, 17a; BaR 9. 33; Tan. Bereshit 12; WR 23. 9; Tan. B. I, 16 and 23-24. In some of these sources the immoral life of this wicked generation is minutely described, and it is furthermore remarked that they exhibited their shamelessness by appearing naked in public; comp. PRE 22; EZ 10, 190. See further, Singer, *Buch der Jubiläen*, 82, note 1, where the talmudic passages concerning the prohibition of uncovering the body are given, comp. further note 67. That unchastity was the cause of the deluge (as well as the destruction of the sinful cities; comp. vol. I, p. 253) is maintained by 2 Enoch 34, which with regard to some details agrees with the Midrashim. In Jub. 7. 21 three sins are recorded: immorality, idolatry (uncleanliness = טומאת עבודה זרה), and violence as the causes of the flood. Similarly BR 31. 6. Comp. PRK, 69; Halakot Gedolot (Hildesheimer's edition, 588; five sins caused the flood); ER 15, 74 (eight sins); Shu'aib, Noah, 5a (the trespassing of the seven Noachite com-

mandments); ShR 30. 13. See further notes 36 and 32; vol. III, p. 381; vol. IV, p. 369; Index, s. v. "Immoral Life."

<sup>18</sup> BR 31. 3-5; Sanhedrin 108a; Koheleth 1. 13; Tan. Noah 4; Wehizhir I, 92. Comp. vol. I, p. 245, the description of the sins of the Sodomites.

<sup>19</sup> Sanhedrin 108a-108b (the measures against fire and water, of which they boasted, are mentioned, but the meaning of the words used in the description is obscure); BR 30. 7; Tan. Noah 5; Tan. B. I, 25 (God could have saved Noah without the ark; but its construction was to serve as a warning to the sinners to arouse them to repentance); Aggadat Bereshit 1, 2; Koheleth 9. 14; Koheleth Z., 125; PRE 22 and 23 (here it is stated that the construction of the ark took fifty-two years); Yashar Noah, 14a-14b, where Methuselah and Noah are said to have endeavored to induce the sinners to repent. The 120 years are of course inferred from Gen. 6. 3, which these sources as well as others (Sifre N., 43, end; Midrash Tannaim 39; Mekilta Shirah 5, 38b; Mekilta RS, 32; EZ 2, 174; ER 16, 80; Onkelos and Yerushalmi Targumim on Gen., *loc. cit.*) understand to say that God made this time an allowance to the sinners in order that they should repent and that Noah should exert his influence as an admonisher and preacher. This conception is also prevalent in ancient Christian literature; comp. Aphraates, 138; Origen, *Contra Celsum*, III, 41; ps.-Tertullian, 3, 30; Julius Africanus (cited by Syncellus, 21); Ephraim, I, 47 E-F; Christian-Palestinian Homilies in *Anecdota Oxon., Semitic Series* I, part IX, 56; Methodius, *Symposium*; Ewangel of Seth (in Preuschen, *Adamschriften*, 39); Jerome, Gen., *loc. cit.* Some Church Fathers like Origen, ps.-Tertullian, and Julius Africanus, speak of a 100 years, during which the ark was constructed. This is not an inaccuracy, but, as was explicitly stated by Africanus, it wishes to convey that the word of God (Gen., *loc. cit.*) reached the wicked generation when the youngest of them was twenty years old (this is to be explained in accordance with note 69 on vol. I, p. 326), and to these the opportunity of 100 years for repentance was extended. The reason for this view is to be found in the chronological difficulty which Gen., *loc. cit.*, offers; comp. Rashi, *ad loc.* Zohar I, 62, speaks of 300 years during which Noah was active as a preacher for repentance. On Noah's preaching for repentance, comp. further Clemens "First Epistle," 7. 6; Clemens Alexandrinus, *Stromata*, 1, 21; *Visio Pauli*, 50 (the construction of the ark lasted 100 years); Theophilus, 3. 19; 1 Peter 3. 20. Comp. also Ginzberg, *Haggada bei den Kirchenv.*, 77-78. The

view that Gen., *loc. cit.*, wishes to say that henceforth the duration of a man's life will not be longer than 120 years is given by Philo, *Quaestiones*, Gen., 1, 91; Josephus, *Antiqui.*, I, 32; Lactantius, *Institutiones*, 2. 14–15. This is also the view of later rabbinic writers; comp. Ibn Ezra, *ad loc.*—On the changes of the course of the sun, comp. Ascension of Isaiah 4. 5; Enoch 80. 4–5, where this and similar miracles as preparations for the last day are mentioned. Shabbat 156b (top) reads: God causes the planet Jupiter to appear in the east instead of in the west in order to teach Abraham not to attach any importance to astronomy. Comp. Steinschneider, *Hebräische Bibliographie*, XVIII, 61–62, concerning similar statements in Arabic literature. On the additional week, after the lapse of the period of respite, during which he was granted the anticipation of the enjoyment of paradise, comp. Yerushalmi Targumim on Gen. 7. 4 and 10; Tosefta Sotah 10. 3–5; ARN 32, 92; Ephraim, I, 5. 2 E, and the sources cited in the following note and note 15.

<sup>20</sup> Tosefta Sotah 10. 3–5; ARN 32, 92–93; Sanhedrin 108b (on the text comp. Lekah, Gen. 6. 3, where the reading seems to be מַחֲחִי instead of הַסְפֵּדֵן, according to which it is said that the death of the pious has the atoning power to avert impending misfortunes for some time; comp., however, Lekah, Gen. 7. 4); BR 3. 6 (in the week of mourning for Methuselah God caused the primordial light to shine) and 32. 7; Yerushalmi Mo'ed Katan 3, 82c; Tehillim 26, 220 (God did not wish Methuselah to die at the same time as the sinners); Yashar Noah, 14a–14b (compiled from different sources. First it is said that Noah and Methuselah were the only pious persons left one hundred and twenty years before the flood; then it is asserted that the pious people died five years before the flood; finally it is remarked that Lamech, Noah's father, died about the same time, but that he followed the path of his father and son whole-heartedly; on Lamech comp. note 64 on vol. I, p. 142, and note 4). Comp. also Philo, *Quaestiones*, 2. 13, who, together with the explanation given in rabbinic sources concerning the seven days of respite to induce the sinners to repent, mentions the view that the last week before the destruction of the world corresponds to the first week of the creation, in order to show that both came from God. The same explanation is found in Lekah, Gen. 7. 4. The last week is regarded as a week of "mourning" for the men destroyed in the flood; BR 27 (end) and 32. 7; Mo'ed Katan, *loc. cit.*; Tan. B. I, 30, and III, 21; Tan. Shemini 1; ER 31, 162. God, of course, knows everything beforehand; when Scripture

says (Gen. 6. 6) that He repented because He had created man, it merely implies that He repented in the same manner as a father rejoices at the birth of a son, although he knows that sooner or later he must die; for joy, as well as mourning, has its time. Comp. on this point BR and Tan., *loc. cit.*; Philo, *Quaestiones, ad loc.*; *Quod Deus sit immutabilis*, 5; Clementine *Homilies*, 3. 39. See further Sukkah 52b, and PRK, 19b, concerning four and six things, respectively, of which God repented of having created them; they are: The evil inclination, idolatry, the generation of the flood, the Chaldeans, the Ishmaelites, and Israel's captivity in Babylon. It should be observed that, with the exception of ARN, *loc. cit.* (upon which Yashar, *loc. cit.*, is dependent), which makes mention of the pious and the righteous of the antediluvian generations, the other sources know only of the pious Methuselah. Maimonides, *Guide of the Perplexed*, II, 39, cites the following expressions, from unknown sources: "The court of justice presided by Methuselah" and "the house of learning of Methuselah". He rightly remarks that these terms mean persons who taught their contemporaries, and endeavored to guide them in God's ways. Comp. notes 1 and 64 on vol. I, pp. 105 and 142, respectively.

<sup>21</sup> BR 31. 13 and 32. 11. On the plan of the ark comp. further BR 31. 11; Sanhedrin 108b; PRE 23; Targum Yerushalmi Gen 6. 14-15; Philo, *Moses*, 2. 11; Josephus, *Antiqui.*, I, 3. 2. It is to be noted that the two last-named authors speak of the four stories of the ark. The question as to how the different stories were divided according to the various species of animals is very exhaustively treated, and the sources differ greatly from one another as to the details; comp. also ps.-Hippolytus, 2-3. The construction of the ark was so difficult, that the "ark itself took part in the act"; BR 31. 11. Comp. Evangel of Seth 39, which reads: And when he had built the ark, the axe, the hammer, and the wood exclaimed: "Behold, there will come a flood which will destroy the earth." Concerning the question how room could be found in the ark for so large a number of animals and food for them all, comp. Origen, *Contra Celsum*, 4. 41, and the Melchizedek fragment 5, where the view is expressed that the cubit mentioned in the Bible, with regard to the measurements of the ark, is different from the ordinary one. It is further added that "according to this number the Jews keep this measure of the ark of Noah, as the Lord said to him, and so they made each measure and each rule, even up to the present time." On this point comp. BR 30. 10 with reference to אמה חיבקיין "the ark cubit".



<sup>22</sup> This legend was published by Ginzberg in *Ha-Goren*, IX, 38-41, from a compilation of legends in a MS. of the library of the Jewish Theological Seminary of America. On the attempt of the angels to worship Adam, comp. vol. I, p. 64.

<sup>23</sup> Sefer Noah, 150-160, of which three recensions are extant. According to one, Noah received, after the flood, a medical book from the archangel Raphael (vol. I, pp. 173-174); according to the second Adam, after the fall, received a book from Raziël, out of which all mysteries could be ascertained (vol. I, pp. 90-93), and it is this book from which Enoch derived his wisdom; later Noah received it from the angel Raphael, in order to be able to erect the ark. The third recension does not seem to know of any connection between Noah's book, which Raziël had handed over to him before the flood, and the book given by this angel to Adam who later transmitted it to Enoch. Based on the legend recorded in vol. III, p. 119, this recension adds that the sapphire on which the book was engraved gave the light necessary for the inmates of the ark (comp. vol. I, p. 162, below). See Jellinek, *Einleitung* to BHM, III, 30-33. The second recension was made use of in Zohar I, 37b and 58b, and perhaps also 72b. 2 Enoch 33. 12 also seems to speak of the book of Enoch which was revealed by the angels to Noah and his descendants. In Enoch 10. 1-3 it is Uriel who informs Noah beforehand of the coming of the flood, and who advised him about the erection of the ark; but 67. 2 states that the angels erected it; comp. 89. 1 and BR 31. 11. Comp. also Zohar Hadash Terumah beginning of last paragraph.

<sup>24</sup> PRE 23; Targum Yerushalmi Gen. 5. 20; Philo, *Moses*, 2. 12; BR 32. 8; Tan. Noah 12; Zebahim 116a; Ephraim, I, 52 C-D; Augustine, *Civitas Dei*, 15. 27; Theodoretus, *Quaestiones in Gen.* 18 (comp. on this passage Ginzberg, *Haggada bei den Kirchenv.*, 80-81); Evangel of Seth 39. In all these sources it is emphasized that the animals of their own accord, by God's command (according to PRE and Targum Yerushalmi, *loc. cit.*, they were assembled by the angels), came to the ark. Comp. also the following note.

<sup>25</sup> Yashar Noah, 15a-16a, apparently based on old sources; comp. BR 31. 13 (whenever the male ran after the female, Noah took the pair into the ark; if the female ran after the male, they were excluded from it) and 32. 8; Tan. B. I, 36; Tan. Noah 7. On the 121 years, during which Noah preached for repentance, see note 19. It should be observed that Josephus, *Antiqui.*, I, 3. 1, also knows of Noah's activity as a preacher. He, how-

ever, adds (this occurs nowhere else) that when Noah realized that he failed in his efforts, he emigrated to another country. By this he probably wishes to explain how the ark came to the ridge of Ararat in Armenia (comp. note 47), though Noah, like all ante-diluvian patriarchs, had lived in Palestine. On the eclipse of the sun during the flood comp. Philo, *De Abrahamo*, 8, and vol. I, p. 162 (below). On the attempt of the sinners to enter the ark by force, comp. also Evangel of Seth, 39; Shu'aib, Noah, 5b; Targum Yerushalmi Gen. 7. 16; PRE 23; Aggadat Bereshit 4, 10; Yalkut I, 57 (the first part perhaps from Abkir). With respect to the animals which were included in the ark, comp. also note 32.

<sup>26</sup> Sanhedrin 108b; Rosh ha-Shanah 12a; Zebahim 113b; Yerushalmi Sanhedrin 10, 29b; WR 7. 6; Koheleth 9. 4; PRE 22; Yelammedenu in Yalkut II, 508, on Is. 64. 1 (according to this passage, punishment by fire came upon the generation of the flood because of the robberies they had practised; comp. also Jerome, on Is. *loc.cit.*, who reproduces this tradition somewhat inaccurately); Hashkem 15a; Tan. B. III, 13; Tan. Zaw 2; Tehillim 11, 100; Targum Yerushalmi Gen. 7. 10; Aggadat Bereshit 4. 10. On the sexual dissipation of this generation (onanism, sodomy, and other abominations), comp. the sources cited in note 17, as well as BR 26. 4-5, 30. 2, and 32. 7; Zohar I, 62a and 66a. See further note 39. The punishment by fire during the flood is connected with the conception of the world-conflagration which then took place for the first time; comp. Ginzberg, *מבול של אש*, 19 = *Ha-Goren IX*, 51.

<sup>27</sup> Tan. B. I, 35-36; Tan. Noah 7; Aggadat Bereshit 4, 10; Makiri, Nahum 10; Targum Yerushalmi Gen. 7. 12.

<sup>28</sup> BR 28. 9 and 30. 9 ("the one-eyed is regarded among the blind as keen-sighted"; Noah was the pious one when all others were sinners); Sanhedrin 108a; Tan. B. I, 31-32; Tan. Noah 5; Philo, *De Abrahamo*, 7 (also Philo's haggadic remark that "the generation of Noah" stands for his pious deeds, and that Noah is called "man" in Scripture on account of his piety, is found in rabbinic literature; comp. BR 30. 6-7; Tan. B. I, 29; Tan. Noah 2; see further the utterance of the Rabbis which is frequently quoted and usually misunderstood: Israel is called "man" אדם, but not the other nations; Yebamot 61a, and parallel passages; comp. notes 6, 8 on vol. I, p. 50); Jerome, Gen. 5. 9. Midrash Tannaim 226 asserts that Noah survived only on account of the merits of Moses (the latter lived 120 years, as announced to Noah; comp. Gen. 6. 3). Had Noah perished,

there would have been no Moses. Comp., on the other hand, *ibid.* 62, where it is said that the idolatrous nations existed only on the merits of Noah. In the Talmud, as well as in the Midrashim cited above, another view is also given to the effect that Noah, despite the wickedness that prevailed in his days, was a pious man. Had he lived in a better generation, he would have certainly been righteous. BR 29. 4 and Tan., *loc. cit.*, in contrast to Midrash Tannaim 62 and Jub. 4. 19, maintain that God was gracious to Noah for the sake of his descendants, *i. e.*, for the sake of the later patriarchs, prophets, and other pious men; comp. BR 30. 10, where the superiority of Abraham to Noah is emphasized. For the opposite view see Tan. B. I, 32. Noah's sons (including Ham) are similarly mentioned as pious men; Tan. B. I, 31 and Tan. Noah 2; 4 Ezra 3. 11; Clemens' First Epistle, 7. 6; comp., on the other hand, Jub., *loc. cit.*, and Aggadat Bereshit 10, 24. The title צַדִּיק applied to Noah (Gen. 6. 9) signifies one who gives alms, because he cared for all the living during the time of the flood; Tan. B. I, 31; Tan. Noah 5; Yelammedenu quoted by Recanati on Gen., *loc. cit.* Comp. Alphabet of Ben Sira 13a; Gerson, *Justinus Martyrer und die Agada*, 46-47. See also the following note.

<sup>29</sup> BR 32. 6; an anonymous Midrash quoted by Shu'aib, Noah, 4b. Comp. Matthew 24. 38 concerning the lack of faith of this generation, which remained obstinate until the coming of the flood. According to PRE 23 and Alphabet of Ben Sira 12b-13a, Noah, on the contrary, spent a whole week in the ark before the flood came. According to the prevalent Haggadah (BR 32. 8; comp. vol. III, pp. 444-445) Noah entered the ark in full day-light, in the presence of his wicked surroundings, in order to show that because of his faith in God he feared no one. This expresses a rather favorable view of Noah. On Noah's wife, whose good deeds equalled those of her husband, comp. BR 23. 3; Yashar Noah, 14b; Mishle 31, 111; Tobit 4. 12, where Noah is mentioned along with the three patriarchs, who married their kin. This remark wishes to convey that Noah did not marry any of the Cainitish women. According to Jub. 4. 33, Noah's wife was called Amzara, אַמֶּזָרָה (in the Evangel of Seth 39, she is called Noamzara = נְעָמָה זֶרַע), and was the daughter of Bakiel, his father's brother. Comp. note 42 on vol. I, p. 116 and note 11.

<sup>30</sup> Tan. B. I, 25-26; Yashar Noah, 14a-14b, where Japheth is said to be the oldest, Ham the second, and Shem the youngest. In the older sources there is a difference of opinion whether Japheth or

Shem was the first-born. The following authorities consider Shem the oldest: Jub. 3. 33; PRE 8; Origen, Gen. 12, 10d; Augustine, *Civitas Dei*, 16. 11; Clementine *Recognitiones*, 30; Cyprian *Epistolae*, 62.3. But most of the Rabbis consider Japheth to have been the oldest and Shem the youngest; Midrash Tannaim 73; Sanhedrin 69b; BR 26. 3; 36. 7; 37. 7; BaR 4. 8; Tan. B. I, 142; Targum Yerushalmi, Gen. 10. 21. With this view agree Septuagint, Gen., *loc. cit.*, and Philo, *Quaestiones in Gen.*, 2, 79. Comp. MHG I, 142 and 176; Aphraates, 234; see also the following note.

<sup>31</sup> BR 26. 2; BaR 14. 12; Tehillim 1, 11-12. These sources assume that Noah had been married long before he begot children, whereas the sources mentioned in the preceding note (comp. also Evangel of Seth 39, where it is said that he was compelled by an angel to marry against his will and that he preferred celibacy; this is a Christianization of the old Jewish legend) assert that he married late in life.

<sup>32</sup> Sanhedrin 108a, 108b (with the exception of "Tushlami", the animals gave up their previous manner of living after the flood); Tan. B. I, 36 and 45; Tan. Noah 12; BR 28. 8-9 (even the earth became untrue to its nature, so that when wheat was sown there grew darnel instead); Yashar Bereshit (end); 2 Alphabet of Ben Sira 35b-36a; Jub. 5. 2. Since it was man who set a bad example to the animals, he was the one to be destroyed first in the flood; Tosefta Sotah 4. 11; Sifre N., 18; Sifre Z., 25; BR 50. 8; BaR 9. 18. Comp. on this idea vol. II, p. 353. The corruption of the animal world readily explains its destruction in the flood. Another explanation is that the whole world was created for the sake of man (vol. I, p. 49), and when man, with the exception of Noah and his family, was destroyed, the animal world was no longer entitled to exist. Those animals which were saved were spared for the sake of Noah and his descendants. Comp. BR 28. 6 (this passage gives the interesting view that the animals allured man to the eating of meat; hence they were destroyed because they were instrumental in causing sin; comp. Clementine *Homilies*, 8. 15); MHG I, 132-134, 151, 158-159 (where various old sources are cited, all of which express the same idea that the existence of the animal world depends on the existence of man); Philo, *Quaestiones in Gen.*, I, 94, and 2, 9. With regard to the animals which were found worthy of entering the ark, the following statement is made in Sanhedrin, *loc. cit.*, and Zebahim 116a: Noah caused the animals to pass in front of the ark, and those which

remained firmly rooted in the ground (קולטו) is thus to be understood) were admitted into the ark.

<sup>33</sup> PRE 23, where the sum total of the animals is given. The text is not quite correct; comp. Luria, note 10, and Shua'ib, 5a-5b, who quotes, from PRE, the sentence, found in Hullin 65b, concerning the numberless kinds of birds. The unclean animals mentioned in Gen. 7. 2 are described in the negative (אשר לא טהורה), and not positive (טמאה), though the latter is the shorter way. Hence it is inferred that one must be careful not to use improper language; Pesahim 3a; PR 14, 57b, and the parallel passages cited by Friedmann.

<sup>34</sup> BR 31. 13 (according to one view, the young of the Re'em were in the ark); comp. also Shu'aib, 5a (below, which also has the statement that all the animals, which were intended for the ark, were born shortly before they entered there); Zebahim 113b; Sanhedrin 108b, according to the reading of some MSS. (comp. Rabinowicz, note 2), and MHG I, 150, note 53. Concerning the Re'em see Index, s. v. A less fabulous description of this animal is found in Lekah, Num. 23. 22: its size is larger than that of a camel, its horns, which are as sharp as a sword, are five cubits long, so that no animal can resist it.

<sup>35</sup> PRE 23; Targum Yerushalmi Deut. 2. 11 and 3. 10 (a more detailed description of this legend, taken from the Targum, is found in Yalkut Reubeni on Gen. 7. 22); Zebahim 113b. In the last passage it is further remarked that the giants, who had not been carried off by the waters on account of their size, perished from the heat (concerning this point see vol. I, p. 159). The Re'em and Og had such gigantic strength that the heat had no effect upon them. Different is the version of this legend in MHG I, 159: The men of the generation of the flood were fifteen cubits high, and they tried to save themselves on the lofty mountains when the flood broke forth (comp., however, Yoma 76a and BR 32. 11), for which reason God caused the waters to rise fifteen cubits over the high places. Comp. also Tan. B. I, 36; Tan. Noah 7; Aggadat Bereshit 4, 10. On Og comp. also note 54, and vol. III, pp. 340, 343.

<sup>36</sup> Tehillim 6, 68-69 (instead of מתקן read מתנה "stipulating"). Comp. also PR 24, 125b, and EZ 3, 175, which reads: God created everything with the exception of falsehood and deceit, which man invented. See further ps.-Tertullian, *Adversus Omnes Haereses*, 2.

<sup>37</sup> Sanhedrin 108b; MHG I, 160. Yalkut Reubeni, Gen. 7. 14, cites, from Sode Raza, the statement that Noah took care of the wild

animals, Shem of the domestic, Ham of the birds, and Japheth of the reptiles. The sources cited above assume that Noah took with him food for each species of animals, the kind of food fit for each one; but, on the other hand, some authorities (BR 31. 14; Tan. B. I, 29 and 37-38; Tan. Noah 2 and 9; Augustine, *Civitas Dei*, 15. 27) assert that the dried fig served as food for both man and beast. That all the animals of the ark became tame, so that Noah walked on snakes and scorpions without being injured, is asserted in Tehillim 91,400, and also in MHG I, 158 (comp. Schechter, note 25), whereas Tan. B. I, 38, states that Noah was struck by a lion, which made him lame for the rest of his life, because he once gave him food at a late hour. In the numerous parallels to this legend (BR 30. 6, and the sources cited in note 51) it is stated that Noah's encounter with the lion occurred on leaving the ark. On the many hardships, which Noah and his family underwent in the ark on account of the animals for which they cared, see note 223 on vol. I, pp. 270-271. On the animal Urshana (the writing is doubtful), comp. Grünbaum, *Gesammelte Aufsätze*, 23 and 162-163, as well as Güdemann, *Religionsgeschichtliche Studien*, 55, seq. The word is most likely of Persian origin, but it must not be identified with the phoenix, though both of them are considered among the immortals; comp. also Lewysohn, *Zoologie des Talmuds*, 224, 337, and 353, who misread the word "בר" "bran", as "פרי" "fruit".

<sup>38</sup> Yashar Noah, 16a; see also *ibid.*, 16b, where Noah's prayer, at the opening of the window of the ark, is given. Comp. further Tehillim 29, 233, which reads: God heard the prayer of the inmates of the ark. According to BR 32. 11, and the parallels cited by Theodor, Noah suffered very much from the cold, while the same source, 9, and Tehillim 1, 11, state that the ark, despite the mass of water, rested quietly "as a ship in port". Comp. also BR 33. 7, concerning the eleven cubits of the depth of the ark. Zohar I, 68a-68b and 69a, states that Noah by hiding in the ark escaped the angel of death.

<sup>39</sup> PRE 23. Just as the wicked generation indulged in unnatural sexual passions, even so was their punishment unnatural: The female waters rose from the abyss, and united themselves with the male waters which came from above; BR 32. 7. Comp. also note 42. The view that the flood was brought about by the union of the male and female waters is found also in Enoch 54. 8-9, and goes back, as has already been remarked by others, to the Babylonian conception of Apsu and Tiamat. Comp. Yerushalmi Berakot 9, 14a; Yerushalmi Ta'anit 1, 64b, Babli 6b; Tosefta 1. 4; Tehillim

42, 267; PRE 5; Koheleth Z., 87. Comp. further the designation of the rain-drops and water bubbles as bridegroom and bride (Ta'anit 6b), and the explanation of this designation by Al-Fasi in his responsum cited by Abudrahim, Berakot 8 (end). See also Tan. B. I, 24 (באו עליהם המים כמין אשה) which likewise alludes to the female waters.

<sup>40</sup> Berakot 58b-59a; Rosh ha-Shanah 11b-12a; MHG I, 156-157; *Ma'yan Gannim*, 125-126. The last source speaks of the theft committed by כימה "Pleiades" in carrying off two children or stars of עייש "The Great Bear". Comp. Grünbaum, *Gesammelte Aufsätze*, 65-66.

<sup>41</sup> BR 25. 2, 31. 11, 33. 3, and 34. 11 (with reference to this legend concerning the name of Noah, comp. note 5); Sanhedrin 108b; PRE 23; Targum Yerushalmi Gen. 6. 16 (the glistening precious stone was fetched by Noah from the river Pishon, at God's behest; this is inferred from Gen. 2. 11-12); an anonymous Midrash in Yalkut I, 57; MHG I, 158. Comp. also vol. I, p. 157; vol. IV, pp. 24 and 249.

<sup>42</sup> BR 32. 5 and 33. 7. Comp. note 45, particularly concerning the chronology of the time of the flood. The forty days of punishment are brought into connection with the forty days of Moses' stay on Sinai; they did not obey the Torah, which Moses learned in forty days, hence they were destroyed in forty days. The other explanation of the forty days as given in the text (the author is the Amora R. Johanan; comp. Shemuel 20, 106) is also known to Philo, *Quaestiones in Gen.*, 2. 14, and Ephraim, I, 149E. Comp. note 97 on vol. I, p. 82. The tendency to find some relationship between the punishment inflicted on the wicked generation and the sins they committed is to be noticed in several passages of the Midrashim; comp. vol. I, p. 159, and note 39, where various reasons are assigned why they were punished with water. In all these Haggadot the idea of "measure for measure" is noticeable; comp. Sifre N., 43; Midrash Tannaim 36; Mekilta Shirah 2, 35b; Mekilta RS, 58; Tosefta Sotah 3. 9; Sanhedrin 108a; BR 32. 7; Tan. Beshallah 12; MHG I, 150-151. Opinions differ as to whether fish were among the animals which perished, or not; according to one view, punishment was not inflicted on them; according to another, Noah brought a number of fish into the ark, whence many of them escaped to the ocean; Zebahim 113b; Sanhedrin 108a; BR 32 (end).

<sup>43</sup> BR 22. 12 and 32. 5; ShR 31. 16; Koheleth 6. 3; Koheleth

Z., 106. Comp. further particulars on the death of Cain in note 44 on vol. I, p. 117.

<sup>44</sup> BR 28. 3; Tan. B. I, 19. A further illustration of the power of the masses of the waters is given in BR, *loc. cit.*; mill-stones were entirely dissolved (this is also mentioned in BR 30. 8; WR 31. 1; Shir 4. 1), and so did the "almond bone" of the human body, which is otherwise never destroyed, so that it forms a nucleus for the new body in the time of resurrection (comp. Index, *s. v.* "Luz"). This legend wishes to convey that the generation of the flood will not be resurrected, as is explicitly stated in Sanhedrin 10. 3; Tosefta 13. 6; Babli 108a; Yerushalmi 10, 29b; Seder 'Olam 4; BR 26. 6; WR 4. 1; Tehillim 1, 12; ARN 32, 93. The source just cited differs as to whether these sinners will be completely destroyed, or will suffer eternal damnation; comp. also Zohar I, 69. The remark concerning Adam's remains is probably anti-Christian, since in the Christian versions of the Book of Adam (Book of Adam and Eve 3. 6, *seq.*; Schatzhöhle, *passim*; Preuschen, *Adamschriften*, 26; ps.-Hippolytus, 2-3) the removal of Adam's body from the "Cave of Treasures" into the ark plays a great part. In this source the corpse is made to speak. Yerushalmi Nazir 7, 56b, remarks that after 120 years Adam's remains were destroyed, so that only a spoonful of decayed matter was left. The same fate awaits every human being. Comp., on the other hand, Shabbat 152b, where it is asserted that the remains of the pious, particularly those who were never jealous, will endure in their perfect state, and will be turned into dust only shortly before their resurrection. The remains of all those who perished in the flood were carried down by the waters into the lowland of Babylon, where the soil was manured with those bodies; Shabbat 113b; Zebahim 113a.

<sup>45</sup> Seder 'Olam 4 (a different view is also quoted here, according to which the second month in which the flood broke out was Iyar, and by this calculation the entire chronology is to begin with the spring, and with this latter view Philo, *Quaestiones*, 2, 17, 45, and 47 agrees; see also Jub., where the year commences with Nisan); Rosh ha-Shanah 11b-12a; BR 33. 7; Targum Yerushalmi Gen. 7. 11 and 8. 4-5, 13; PRE 32; Josephus, *Antiqui.*, I, 3. 3. Comp. also note 97 on vol. I, p. 82. Just as the flood lasted twelve months, even so does, according to R. Akiba ('Eduyyot 2. 10; numerous parallel passages are cited by Theodor, BR 28, 9, 1), the punishment of the sinners in Gehenna last twelve months.



<sup>46</sup> Sanhedrin 108; BR 33. 5 (God bade Noah to receive the raven into the ark once more, because the bird was destined, on another occasion, to bring food for Elijah; comp. 1 Kings 18. 6); 2 Alphabet of Ben Sira 26-27 (which contains many additions; comp. vol. I, pp. 38-39); PRK 32b. For particulars concerning the raven see vol. I, pp. 166. Philo, *Quaestiones*, 2, 35, observes that the raven is a bird able to foresee the future (a similar statement about the raven is to be found in Gittin 45a, where, however, the same quality is also ascribed to the dove), and that is the reason why Noah sent him. Comp. also Zohar Hadash Noah, 28b-29a, where, among other things, it is said that Noah, by sending the raven, wished to indicate that God appeared cruel to mankind, even as this bird is cruel to his children (comp. vol. I. p. 39). Although it was very impious of Noah to think of God in this manner, he was not punished for it, for "a man is not held responsible for what he does, if he is driven to it by suffering." This adage is taken from Baba Batra 16b. Towards the end of the flood God's wrath was turned into mercy, and He remembered Noah's good deeds, who had cared for the animals for a whole year; He also thought of the clean animals which Noah had with him; BR 33. 3 (see the parallels cited by Theodor); Targum Yerushalmi Gen. 8. 1. BR *l. c.*: The wicked change God's mercy into severity, while the pious change this severity into mercy. Hence the name "י" in Gen. 6. 5 and אֱלֹהִים in 8. 11, since the Tetragrammaton stands for God's mercy and אֱלֹהִים for His severity. Philo, *Quaestiones*, 2, 28, in agreement with Targum Yerushalmi and Tan. B. I, 36-37, understands רוּחַ as "the spirit of God", *i. e.*, His mercy. Comp. Ginzberg in *Ha-Zofeh*, IV, 39; Targum Ps. 29. 10 and note 6 on vol. I, p. 4.

<sup>47</sup> PRE 23 (he who sends a message by an unclean person is the same as though he sent it through a fool; he who sends it by a clean person is as though he sent it by a faithful servant); BR 33. 6; WR 31 (end); Shir 1. 15 and 4. 1; Sanhedrin 108b; Zebahim 113a; 'Erubin 18b; Mishle 31, 109; Targum Yerushalmi Gen. 8. 11; MHG I, 163; Evangel of Seth 40 (the statement made here that the raven did not return is in agreement with Septuagint and Vulgate on Gen. 8. 7, which have the reading וְלֹא שָׁב; comp. Grünbaum, *Neue Beiträge*, 82-83); *Codex Naz.*, III, 72; Ephraim (Lagarde 80, 22.). That the dove found an olive-tree on the mount of Olives is to be explained by the fact that the flood did not reach the Holy Land, although the vapors of the hot water caused destruction also there (comp. vol.

I, p. 159). See ps.-Philo, 8D; Zebahim, *loc. cit.*, and the four Midrashim mentioned at the beginning of this note. Comp. further Yoma 67a (לְכוּלָא עֲלֵמָא) and vol. III, p. 63. According to those who think that the Holy Land was also visited by the flood, the olive-leaf came from paradise, whose gates opened themselves to the dove; BR, WR, and Shir, *loc. cit.*

<sup>48</sup> BR 39. 3; Koheleth 10. 4; Tan. B. I, 41; Aggadat Bereshit 7, 17-18. Of the hot springs which broke out at the time of the flood, three remained (in Palestine) open; Sanhedrin 108a; BR 33. 4; MHG I, 162. On the other traces of the flood comp. Zohar I, 63, and vol. IV, 156. On the place where the ark rested, comp. Josephus, *Antiqui.*, I, 3. 5-6; BR 33. 4; Onkelos and Targum Yerushalmi Gen. 8. 4. See further the literature cited by Dillmann in his commentary, *ad loc.* Reference may also be made to the following passages: Jub. 5. 28 (Lubar, one of the mountains of Ararat, is the same as in Sefer Noah, 155, beginning; for other sources dependent on Jub., comp. Rönisch, *Buch der Jubiläen*, index, s. v. "Lubar"); Epiphanius, *Haer.*, I, 1. 4, and the sources cited by Malan in his notes on the Book of Adam 239 and 241-242. It is noteworthy that the rabbinic sources (besides the sources quoted above, comp. also Onkelos Gen., *loc. cit.*; Abba Gorion 37; Tosefta-Targum 2 Kings 19. 37), with unusual accord, describe Kardu (Korduene in Armenia) as the mountain on which the ark rested, just as Berosus (Richter's edition, 56), in his account of the flood, makes Xisuthros come out of his ship in Korduene. Comp. also Julius Africanus, as quoted by Syncellus, I, 21.

<sup>49</sup> Zohar Hadash Noah, 29a; Zohar I (supplement), 4a and 68a; Sabba, Noah, 10d. Comp. further vol. III, p. 427, concerning Noah's selfishness, who was anxious for his own safety, for which he prayed to God (MHG I, 154), but did not trouble himself about all the other people when God revealed to him their approaching doom. While in the ark, however, Noah constantly prayed to God; comp. note 38. See further Tan. B. I, 42; Tan. Noah 9; Aggadat Bereshit 7, 18; PRE 23.

<sup>50</sup> BR 25. 2. On the signification of this name comp. note 5. The anthropomorphic expression "and God smelled the sweet savour" (Gen. 8. 21), against which the Clementine *Homilies*, 3. 39, strongly expressed themselves, is explained in BR 34. 9 to mean that God had accepted Noah's sacrifice mercifully for the sake of his pious descendants, Abraham, the three youths in the fiery furnace, as well

as many martyrs in the time of religious persecutions (in the time of Hadrian), who were ready to sacrifice their lives for the sanctification of God's name.

<sup>51</sup> BR 30. 6 and 36. 4; PK27, 168a; WR 20. 1; Koheleth 9. 2; Koheleth Z. 119; Tan. B. I, 38, and V, 7; Tan. Noah 9 and Wa-Ethanan 1. According to some of these sources, it was when leaving the ark that Noah was hurt by the lion; this assumes that during their stay in the ark all the animals were tame; comp. note 37, and further Book of Adam 3. 11. In 2 Alphabet of Ben Sira 29b and 35b-36a it is the eagle and the raven who, after leaving the ark, set an example of immorality and murder. It was the raven who advised the animals not to obey Noah's command to lead a monogamous life, and it was the eagle who was the first to slay a bird. At first even the rest of the birds tried to punish the eagle (God only enabled it to escape by means of its high flight), but gradually they got accustomed to it. On Shem, the priest, comp. note 102 on vol. I, p. 233. In Zohar Hadash Noah, 29b, it is said that God appointed Shem priest as a reward for his devotion to the study of the Torah, in which he first instructed his brother Japheth and subsequently Abraham. The latter then prayed to God that He should cause His Shekinah to rest in "the house of Shem" (*i. e.*, Jerusalem), and this request was granted to him. The knowledge of the Torah was directly transmitted to Shem by Enoch, who had received it from Seth, to whom Adam had imparted it. After the flood God decided that it would be better for man to observe a few important precepts of the Torah rather than possess the whole of it and neglect it on account of the vast number of the precepts. Whereupon He assigned to them seven Noachite laws, and waited for the advent of Abraham to observe the entire Torah. According to another view, Noah and his family forgot the Torah during the time of the flood because of their sufferings. After the flood God revealed to him the seven precepts. Comp. note 55 on vol. I, p. 71.

<sup>52</sup> BR 26. 1 and 34. 9; Tan. B. II, 127; Tan. Wa-Yakhel 6; ShR 50. 2; Tehillim 1, 11; PRE 23 and 31 (concerning the number of the sacrifices comp. Luria's note 70 on the first passage); Targum Yerushalmi Gen. 8. 20 and 22. 9; Ephraim I, 148B. Jub. 6. 1, *seq.*, connects this sacrifice of Noah, and the covenant appertaining to it which God made with him on this occasion, with the feast of Pentecost, and makes them both take place in the month of Siwan; comp.

note 60 on vol. I, p. 137. Mount Lubar is designated as the site of the altar (comp. note 48).

<sup>53</sup> BR 34. 12 (the complete dominion of man over the animals was not established until the time of Solomon; comp. note 113 on vol. I, p. 94); Midrash Aggada, Gen. 9. 2 (read וּמְשׁוּם שְׂדֵיָהּ); MHG I, 168. Noah did not wish to leave the ark, since the earth had no people at all. On account of this God said to him: "Be fruitful and multiply on earth". But Noah and his family were not inclined to comply with this command, for they feared another flood. They were finally calmed only when God promised him never to destroy the earth again; MHG I, 165 (comp. Schechter, note 20); BR 34. 6; Sanhedrin 108b (this is how לֹא הָיָה לָאֱדָמָה is to be explained; comp. *Pa'aneah* and *Hadar* on Gen. 8. 19; differently Midrash Aggada, *ad loc.*, according to which לְמַשְׁפַּח' indicates that only the young of the animals, which were born in the ark, left it, but not those which entered it; comp. the midrashic quotation in Shu'aib, 56); Zohar Hadash Noah, 28b; Midrash Aggada 8, 18.

<sup>54</sup> Sanhedrin 108b; BR 31. 12, 34. 7, and 36. 7; Yerushalmi Ta'anit 1, 64d; Tan. B. I, 42-43; Tan. Noah 11 and 12; PRE 23; an unknown Midrash in Yalkut II, 960 (end); it is related to, but not identical with PK 29, 189a; an unknown Midrash in *D'a'at*, Gen. 7. 7; ER 31, 162; MHG I, 165 (comp. Schechter, note 18); Philo, *Quaestiones*, 2, 49; Aristeeas 35; Origen, *Gen. Selecta*, 7. 19; Ephraim, I, 150 C and 54 B; Book of Adam 3. 11; Evangel of Seth 40; ps.-Hippolytus, 2-3 and 4. On the statement, found in Book of Adam 3. 8, that the women had quarters in the western and the men in the eastern side of the ark, comp. vol. I, pp. 94-95. On the underlying idea of this legend expressed in the saying "the individual should participate in the suffering of the community", comp. note 190 on vol. II, p. 77, and vol. III, p. 61. Regarding the three sinners, Ham, the dog, and the raven, the following may be noted. Shemhazael (sic!) shortly before the flood had intercourse with the wife of Ham, who, in order to protect his wife, trespassed the commandment of abstinence in the ark, and claimed the bastards Sihon and Og as his own children (comp. Index, s. v.); Yalkut Reubeni, Gen. 7. 7, and R. Bahya, Hukkat (end), who cites this legend in an abbreviated form. The dog followed Ham's bad example secretly (as a punishment the male remains attached to the body of the female after copulation). Finally the raven followed this example openly, and called upon the other animals to violate Noah's prohibition. See 2 Alphabet of Ben Sira 35b. Different is

the reading *ibid.*, 26b-27a, and in the older sources cited at the beginning of this note. Comp. also MHG I, 162 (end). On the punishment of the raven, comp. vol. I, pp. 38-39, and on that of the dog, note 178 on vol. I, p. 39.

<sup>55</sup> BR 35. 2 (מסין in MS. כ cited by Theodor means "going through" = "studying"; comp. רהט and סוניה); Yerushalmi Berakot 9, 13d; Ketubot 77b; PR 10, 87b; Tehillim 36, 252. On the question whether God's oath (comp. Shebu'ot 36a; MHG I, 172, and the sources cited by Schechter, on the sevenfold oath not to destroy the world), not to bring a flood again, precludes His destruction of the world by other means, or not, see Ginzberg, מכול של אש 14, *seq.*, where all the material bearing on this subject, found in ancient literature, has been collected. See further Philo, *Quaestiones*, 2. 63. The rainbow is a sign to the effect that God laid aside His weapon, the bow, with which He had destroyed the world during the flood: it was stretched at that time, but never again; Lekah, Gen. 9. 16, undoubtedly based on older sources; comp. the Midrash in MHG I, 172, where reference is made to Hab. 3. 9 concerning the bow as God's weapon. A different view is given in BR 35. 3, where the rainbow is conceived as the reflection of God's majesty. On the basis of an old tannaitic tradition (comp. vol. I, p. 83), according to which the rainbow, which first became visible in Noah's days, belonged to the primordial creations, we meet, in the old sources, the rationalistic explanation of Gen. 9. 12. This explanation takes this verse to mean that during the time of the flood, on account of the uninterrupted pour of rain, no rainbow was seen, since it is only visible in clear weather; comp. Sa'adya Gaon, quoted by Kimhi, *ad loc.*, who bases his view on BR, though our text of that Midrash contains nothing to that effect. See further MHG I, 173. Philo, *Quaestiones*, 2, 64, opposes the view which considers the rainbow as God's weapon.

<sup>56</sup> BR 36. 6 and 34. 13-14 (in the first passage the view is also cited, according to which animals are not punished); Sanhedrin 57a-57b; MHG I, 171; Onkelos and Targum Yerushalmi Gen. 9. 6. Comp. also DR 2. 25. On the seven Noachite laws, comp. note 51 and note 55 on vol. I, p. 71. On the reward and punishment of the animals, comp. Slavonic Enoch 58, and Ginzberg's *Compte Rendu*, 34. Some authorities contest the view that Adam was forbidden to eat meat; comp. BR 16 (end); Tan. B. I, 30; Tan. Shemini 8 (middle). The Church Fathers also differ on the point whether Adam was permitted to eat meat or not; comp. Justin Martyr, *Dialogue*, 20; The-

odoretus, Gen. 9. 3, and 29; Aphraates, 310. Comp. also note 56 on vol. I, p. 71. Justin Martyr and Aphraates, *loc. cit.*, as well as Clemens Alexandrinus, *Stromata*, 2. 1, oppose the Jewish dietary laws on the basis of Gen. 3. 3, and we have the answer to this in the Tanhuma, *loc. cit.*, as well as in Tehillim 146, 535, in the sentence that a son of Noah (*i. e.*, a non-Jew) was permitted to eat all kinds of meat; but on mount Sinai God gave laws and precepts to Israel, which restricted the enjoyment of meat, in order to grant them reward for the observance thereof.

<sup>57</sup> BR 36. 3 (on other men to whom agriculture caused injury, comp. note 28 on vol. I, p. 112); Tan. B. I, 46 (in the Tanhuma the designation "a man of the soil" is considered by some as a sign of honor; similarly Philo, *De Agricultura*, 1); Tan. Noah 13; PRE 23; Targum Yerushalmi Gen. 9. 20. That the grapes came from paradise is mentioned only in the two last sources; the opposite view is found in BR, *loc. cit.*; Tan. B. I, 48; Tan. Noah 15, which reads: Noah took along with him all the possible plants for the future cultivation of the ground, among them the seeds of the vine. Comp. note 59.

<sup>58</sup> Tan. Noah 18; Tan. B. I, 48; BR 36. 3-4; PRE 23; Abkir in Yalkut I, 61 (this passage speaks of the sheep, the lion, and the pig only), and in a MS. quoted by Epstein, *Ha-Eshkol*, II, 205; Shu'aib, Noah 5d (is probably based on a more correct text of Tan., and has the sheep, lion, ape, and pig); Midrash Aggada, Gen. 9. 21 (agrees with Shu'aib). *Hadar*, Gen., *loc. cit.*, quotes a somewhat different version of the legend, according to which the animals are: the pig, he-goat, sheep, and ape. In *Shalshelet*, 92b, it is the he-goat which became drunk on wild grapes. Whereupon Noah tried to plant grapes, and he washed the roots with the blood of a lion, pig, sheep, and ape. On the views of the old sources concerning wine, comp. 'Erubin 65a; Ketubot 65a; Sanhedrin 70a; BR 36. 4; Tan. B. I, 58, 50-51, and III, 24-26; Tan. Shemini 11; WR 12. 1; Mishle 23, 95-96. While intoxication is said in these sources to be the cause of all sins, and the ruin of individuals, as well as nations, and therefore severely condemned, the moderate enjoyment of the vine is not only permitted, but also recommended. Similar views on the use and misuse of wine are found in Greek Baruch 4.

<sup>59</sup> Sanhedrin 70a; Greek Baruch 4. 8; Apocalypse of Abraham 23; Enoch 32. 4. Comp. Ginzberg, *Haggada bei den Kirchenv.*, 38-45, and note 70 on vol. I, 75. Origen, Gen. 9. 20, maintains that Noah's vine was the offshoot of the tree of knowledge, and this view

seems to be shared by PRE 23 and Targum Yerushalmi, *loc. cit.* (comp. note 57). The whole earth is either watered from paradise or Gehenna (from their streams); where good wine grows, the soil is watered from paradise; but where bad wine grows, the soil is watered from Gehenna; BHM V, 67.

<sup>60</sup> BR 36. 4-5 and 7; Tan. B. I, 49; Tan. Noah 15; PRE 23; Targum Yerushalmi Gen. 9. 24-25; Midrash Haserot 50 (while intoxicated he ventured to have intercourse with his wife, which he would not have done if he were sober, owing to the fact that the lion had hurt him and rendered him incapable of conjugal relations; comp. BR, *loc. cit.*, and vol. I, pp. 165-166; but differently in BR 25. 1, where the evil that had befallen Noah is declared to have been the punishment for his refusal, after leaving the ark, to resume conjugal relations which had been interrupted during his stay there; comp. note 53 and BR, *loc. cit.*, where, according to one view, this abstinence of Noah is highly commended); Sanhedrin 70a (according to one view Ham committed sodomy); Clementine *Recognitiones*, 1. 30; Theophilus, 3.19; Book of Adam 3. 13. The emphasis laid in Jewish sources on the fact that Ham prevented his father from begetting a fourth son seems to be directed against the view found in the Book of Adam, *loc. cit.*, and in other Christian writings, according to which Noah begot several sons after leaving the ark; comp. Grünbaum, *Neue Beiträge*, 86-87. In the above-mentioned rabbinic sources, as well as in patristic literature (Justin Martyr, *Dialogue*, 139; Ephraim, I, 56 F, 57 A and B; Theodoretus and Origen, *Gen.*, *loc. cit.*), opinions differ as to whether the fault was entirely Ham's (yet he, having been blessed, could not be cursed; comp. note 85 on vol. I, 78) or whether Canaan, Ham's son, had a share in it; comp. the following note. Noah learned of the disgrace perpetrated on him by his son through a dream; Targum Yerushalmi, *loc. cit.* According to others (Shu'aib, Noah, 5b, quoting a Midrash, perhaps BR 37. 7: בְּנוֹ הַפְּסוּל׃), Noah took it for granted that only his immoral son could have committed this act (comp. vol. I, p. 166). On the interpretation of BR 36. 4 that "tent" is a metaphor for wife (אֶהְיֶה לָהּ אֹהֶל), comp. Mo'ed Katan 15b and BR 39. 16. A favorite metaphor for wife is house, comp. e. g. Shabbat 118b; Yoma 13a.

<sup>61</sup> BR 36. 7; Tan. B. I, 49; Tan. Noah 15. PRE 23 goes even a step further and asserts, in agreement with some of the Church Fathers (comp. the preceding note, and Ginzberg, *Haggada bei den Kirchenv.*, 84-87), that it was really Canaan who committed this

disgraceful act (the castration of Noah); Ham, however, divulged the secret. Sforno, Gen. 9. 25, quotes a similar version from Berossus the Chaldean. Comp. also Philo (*De Ebrietati*, 2, 7, and 10; *Quaestiones*, 2, 65, 70, 77), who, in agreement with the Rabbis, makes Canaan participate in his father's disgraceful deed, and is also acquainted with the haggadic interpretation of BR 36. 2 and 7 concerning Gen. 9. 18 and 24 (Ham and Canaan, because they are both equally base in character, are designated as father and son; hence  $\text{מְבִזְיוֹן}$  signifies "the debased"). It is probable that similar statements of the Church Fathers go back, directly or indirectly, to Philo.

<sup>62</sup> Pesahim 113b. PRK (Schönblum's edition, 15b and 19a) has: Love sleep, and hate work, as a part of the Testament of Canaan; comp. also Pesahim 40b, below, as well as Kiddushin 49b, concerning the indolence of slaves; see note 292 on vol. II, p. 115.

<sup>63</sup> BR 36. 6 (they walked with their eyes closed); Tan. B. I, 48-50 (even after they had covered their father, they did not turn round); Tan. Noah 15. Comp. note 59 on vol. IV, p. 269, concerning the "death by fire" to which the army of Senacherib was doomed. Shem is already praised in Ecclu. 49. 16, and the rabbinic legend which identifies him with Melchizedek (comp. vol. I, p. 233, and MHG I, 187) does not only praise his piety, but considers him a prophet, who had in vain admonished the nations for 400 years about their wickedness. But he received his reward, for God blessed him with Abraham as his descendant; ER 20, 114; 24, 126-127; 28, 141-142; EZ 2, 174. The "house of study" and "court of justice" of Shem and Eber are frequently mentioned in the talmudic and midrashic literature; comp., e. g., BR 63. 10, 85. 12; Makkot 23b, etc. That Eber was a prophet is already found in Seder 'Olam 1 (comp. Rattner, *ad loc.*). See vol. III, pp. 355-356.

<sup>64</sup> MHG I, 177-178; BR 26. 3. Comp. vol. I, pp. 375 and 414, concerning the combining of God's name with that of a person.

<sup>65</sup> BR 36. 8; Tan. B. I, 50; Tan. Noah 15; Targum Yerushalmi Gen. 9. 27; Jerome on Gen., *loc. cit.* (who naturally conceives it in a Christian sense), and Irenaeus, *Haer.*, III, 5. 3. The Church Fathers follow the old versions (including Onkelos), which translate  $\text{מִתְּוֹלָדוֹ}$  "stretching out"; this is perhaps the view of the Midrashim just cited. Comp. the following note.

<sup>66</sup> Yoma 9b; PR 35, 160a; BR 36. 8; comp. further Onkelos, *ad loc.*; Jub. 7. 12; Philo, *De Ebrietati*, 13. The last-named author wavers between the explanation which takes Japheth to be the sub-



ject of שכן, and that which refers this verb to God. The view that the Shekinah was absent from the second temple is widespread; comp. note 341 on vol. III, p. 161, and note 36 on vol. IV, p. 355. Very popular is the interpretation that Noah's blessing contains the prophecy concerning the translation of the Scriptures into Greek: "The beauty of Japheth, the Greek translation, will be used in the tents of Shem, the houses of study of the Jews"; Megillah 9b; Yerushalmi 1, 71b; BR, *loc.cit.*; DR 1. 1.—Wise sayings of Shem are given in *Ben ha-Melek* 21, according to Arabic sources.

<sup>67</sup> Jub. 7. 13-39. Concerning Noah's daughters-in-law, comp. note 42 on vol. I, p. 116; ps.-Hippolytus, 2; in Sibyll. 3. 826 the Sibyl describes herself as one of them. Verse 20 of Jub. is perhaps an inaccurate translation of the Hebrew original, whose text may have read: וְהוֹדִירָם עַל הָרִין עַל גְּלוֹי עֲרוּהָ וְעַל בְּרַכַּת הַשֵּׁם "And he commanded them to mete out justice, not to commit incest, and not to blaspheme God"; comp. Sanhedrin 56b, where these are included among the seven Noachian precepts. On גְּלוֹי עֲרוּיָה (literally "uncovering the nakedness"=incest or unchastity), see the dictionaries on the Talmud, s. v.; comp. note 17.

<sup>68</sup> Jub. 8. 10-30, where the possessions of each of the sons of Noah are described in detail. The parallels to this legend of Jub. (some are directly borrowed from it) in Christian literature are given by Charles, *ad loc.* Comp. further Clementine *Recognitions*, 1. 30; Ephraim, I, 153 C. This legend is entirely unknown in rabbinic sources (PRE 24 does not belong here; comp. Ginzberg, *Haggada bei den Kirchenv.*, 88), but Sibyll. 3. 114 seems to have made use of Jub., *loc.cit.*; comp. note 71. On Jerusalem, or rather the site of the altar, as the centre of the earth, comp. vol. I, p. 12, and the Melchizedek fragment 3. On Palestine as the rightful possession of Israel, the descendants of Shem, comp. note 73.

<sup>69</sup> Seder 'Olam 1; BR 37. 7, where one view is given, according to which at the birth of Peleg (comp. Jub. 8. 8) the earth was divided and his father therefore gave him a name alluding to this event. Concerning Eber, comp. also note 63 and Jerome, Gen. 10. 25.

<sup>70</sup> Yashar Noah, 17a. A different view is given in BR 6. 4 and 37. 7, according to which Joktan signifies "the modest one". As a reward for his modesty he became the progenitor of thirteen tribes. However, many of his descendants lived in great poverty. The inhabitants of Hazarmaveth lived only on herbs, and wore clothes made of paper, and daily awaited death; BR 37. 8.

<sup>71</sup> Jub. 9. 14-15; Midrash Aggada Gen. 12, 6. Comp. note 73 and vol. III, p. 368.

<sup>72</sup> MHG I, 182, from an unknown source. The text is corrupt in several places, and it is therefore only possible to restore some of the names to their original form. Instead of *מ' צ"ט אייהם ס'ט* read *מ' צ"ט*; for *קפרקי* read *קפדקי* "Cappadocian"; and probably instead of *צרדי* read *צורי* "Tyrian". Less probable is the emendation of *פקפילי* to *פניקי* "Phenician", whereas *רהומי* for *ררומי* "Roman" (this is the usual orthography in Syriac) is very likely only a printer's error. It is very strange that "Jebusite" is ascribed to the Japhethic and Persian to the Hamitic system of writing, particularly in view of Gen. 10. 16. It is unknown what *גוטאוכי* is; it seems to be Persian. Accordingly we may say with certainty that the systems of writing known to this source are: Roman, Cappadocian, Greek, and Median, which were employed by the Japhethites; the Hamites employed the Persian, Agogian, African, Syrian, and Phenician writings; whereas the Semites used Egyptian, Libnian (comp. Sanhedrin 21b: *כחב (ליבונאח)*), Assyrian, Hebrew, and Chaldean. On the biblical table of nations in rabbinic literature comp. Krauss, *Monatsschrift*, XXXIX, 1-11 and 49-63; Schürer, *Geschichte*, II, 406, note 42, as well as Ginzberg, *Haggada bei den Kirchenv.*, 90. The number of nations or "tongues" (*אומות* and *לשונות* are used synonymously in this connection) is given in the source employed in MHG, as seventy-two. This agrees with Hippolytus 10. 26; Clemens Alexandrinus, *Stromata*, 1. 26 and other Christian authors; comp. Schürer, *loc. cit.* Other rabbinic sources usually speak of the "seventy nations of the world"; comp. vol. I, p. 314; vol. II, p. 214; vol. III, pp. 97, 161, 351, 371, 493; vol. IV, pp. 6, 247, 360, 382, 391. See further ER 15, 76; 19, 111, 126; 31, 156; EZ 15, 175 (uses, with one exception on p. 111, *לשון* and *לשונות* instead of *אומות*); DR 4. 9; Shir 1. 2 (end); Targum Song of Songs 1. 2 and 9; Midrash Tanna'im 190; Targum Yerushalmi Gen. 11. 7 and Deut. 32. 9; PRE 24; Midrash le-Hanukkah 135 (second version, 141); Sukkah 55b; PK 30, 194a, and 31, 195b; Tan. B. IV, 156; Tan. Pinehas 16; BaR 21, 24; Shir 4. 1; Tehillim 109, 465, and 9, 84. In the last-named passage a more detailed account of this number is given, in which it is asserted that the descendants of Japheth enumerated in the Bible are 14, those of Ham are 30 (with the omission of the Philistines who are designated in 10. 14 as a mixed people), and those of Shem are 26. The total is thus seventy. Different is the reading in Baraita 32 Middot in Yalkut I, 61, on Gen. 9. 18, and similarly

Ephraim I, 51 J (comp. Ginzberg, *Haggada bei den Kirchenv.*, 91-92), according to which Japheth and Ham, and even the Philistines are included in the number, but Shem, Arpachshad, Shelah, and Eber are excluded. The descendants of Noah thus amount to seventy. With the exception of the last-mentioned four, all of them were wicked; hence these four, who were pious men, were not included. The number 72 is very likely based on the assumption that Asshur named in 10. 11 must not be identified with the person bearing the same name mentioned in 10. 22. On the basis of Song of Songs 6. 8, some authorities speak of 140 nations (comp. Sifre, D., 311; Midrash Tannaim, *loc. cit.*; Shir 6. 8; Midrash Shir 43b; BaR 9. 14 and 14. 10. Comp. further vol. III, 205 and 209), of whom sixty have their own languages and scripts, while the remaining eighty only have languages but not scripts. MHG I, 178-179 contains an unknown Midrash which endeavors to prove that these sixty nations are in accordance with the table of nations of Gen., where ten names are those of individuals (this is, however, done in a very forced way), while the remaining eighty sprang up later, as, for instance, the descendants of Keturah, the Ishmaelitic tribes, *etc.* Comp. also vol. I, p. 314, according to which the number of seventy nations was only completed by including Israel and Edom. It is possible that originally the seventy-two nations stood for the seventy descendants of Noah and these two. Aggadat Bereshit 14, 32, reads: Isaiah and Obadiah (the first is one of the greatest of the prophets, and the second the least important) uttered their prophecies in seventy-one languages. If we should include the Philistines in the table of nations, we would have 71 nations and languages. Comp. de Rossi, *Meor 'Enayim*, 455, who refers to 72 languages in Augustine, *Civitas Dei*, 16. 3 and 11. Comp. Steinschneider, Z.D.M. G., IV, 145-170, and LVII, 474, *seq.*; Krauss in Z.A.T.W., XIX, 1-4, and XX, 38-43; Poznanski, *ibid.*, XXV, 301-308. Comp. also the following note.

<sup>73</sup> MHG I, 179-180, quoting an unknown source. This, like the Haggadah referred to in the preceding note concerning the number seventy of Noah's descendants, is based on Deut. 32. 5. The one passage refers "the number of the sons of Israel" in this verse to the family of Jacob at the time of entering Egypt, which according to Gen. 46. 27, was 70, while the other refers it to the twelve sons of Jacob. The source of MHG is unknown. It is probably a tannaitic Midrash of which traces may be found in Sifre D., 39; Batte Midrashot 1, 4 (but there mention is made of the division of the entire earth into twelve parts,

and not of Palestine; comp. note 33 on vol. I, p. 11); RShBM and *Hadar* on Deut., *loc. cit.* In the last-named source it is explicitly stated that twelve Canaanitish tribes had charge of the Holy Land prior to the time of Israel's settlement; but the Canaanites never owned it, for "whatever the slave possesses belongs to his master", and Canaan was made the slave of Shem, the progenitor of Israel. This is to serve as a rejoinder to the complaint against Israel for having despoiled the Canaanites of their possessions. Another Haggadah goes even further, and asserts that Canaan was the unlawful possessor of Palestine; comp. vol. I, pp. 219-220. The Torah, observes a widespread Haggadah (BR 1. 2 and parallels cited by Theodor), begins with the creation of the world, and not with the legal sections, in order that Israel should be able to retort to the accusation of the nations. The latter would assert that the Israelites were robbers, who despoiled the inhabitants of Palestine of their possessions. But Israel replies: "The world and everything therein belongs to God who created it. When He wished, He gave it to you; when He willed otherwise, He took it away from you and gave it to us." *Comp. Sanhedrin 91a.*

<sup>74</sup> Sefer Noah, 155 (it is really the first chapter of the Asaf book; comp. Venetianer, *Asaf Judäus*, Budapest, 1915. XXXVIII *Jahresbericht der Landes-Rabbinerschule*), apparently in agreement with Jub. 10. 114; comp. also Clementine *Homilies*, 7. 18-19, concerning the instructions which the angels gave to the demons (the souls of the giants who perished in the flood) after the flood. In the Zadokite Fragment 16. 5, too, Satan is called Mastemah, or to be accurate, "the angel Mastemah."

<sup>75</sup> Sefer Noah, 155-156. The legend cited by many authors of the Middle Ages concerning the sages who sought to acquire, in India, certain plants of paradise, but perished miserably in their attempt, goes back, directly or indirectly, to the Asaf book (comp. the preceding note). See Nahmanides, *Torat ha-Adam* 30 (*Sha'ar ha-Gemul*), 102a, who refers to the book of healing of the old Greeks and to the Jew Asaf; Shu'aib, Bereshit, 3a, and Haazinu, 119a; Recanati, Gen. 3. 24; Ziyoni, Lev. 18. 21. R Makir, *Abkat Rokel*, 2. 1 (end), narrates the story of the attempt of the sages in a way which suggests, as his source, a different version of the Asaf book. This R. Makir is not, as Venetianer, p. 36 (of the book referred to in the preceding note) maintains, identical with the scholar bearing the same name who flourished at Narbonne about the beginning of the ninth century. The author of *Abkat Rokel* not only quotes Rashi (1. 2)

and Bahir (2. 1), but he also made use of the Zohar, from which book (comp. note 4 on vol. II, p. 5) his explanation of the title *Zaddik* ("the just") given to Joseph is taken. Accordingly the tradition which considers this R. Makir as a pupil of R. Jacob b. Asher is well founded, at least in so far as it fixes the time.—An entirely different version of the origin of the books of healing is found in TShBZ, No. 445. The stay in the ark brought many diseases upon Noah and his family, apart from the discomfort caused by the bad odor of the spirits, demons, and Liliths. After the flood an angel took one of Noah's sons (*i. e.*, Shem) to paradise, where he revealed to him all kinds of remedies, which the latter wrote down in a book. This is the book of healing which Hezekiah (comp. vol. IV, p. 277) made use of. The motive of the legend concerning Noah's book of healing is to establish the fact that all wisdom originated with the Jews, and that the philosophers and the physicians of the Greeks have no claim to originality; comp. vol. IV, p. 97, respecting Socrates, the disciple of Ahitophel, and the widespread legend of the relationship of Plato and Aristotle to Jeremiah and other Jewish sages, from whom they received their wisdom. Shu'aib, Re'eh, 107c, knows to record that Pythagoras (he is described as a small and ugly person) originally came from Haran. The legend wishes thereby to convey that he imported his wisdom (the gift of foreseeing the future is also ascribed to him) from the Hebrews, whose original seat was in Haran. On Kangar the son of Ur; see Graetz, *Monatsschrift*, VIII, 150–152, who correctly suggests the reading Kantar, who enjoyed a great reputation among the Sabeans (comp. Chwolson, *Szabier*, II, 514). Comp. note 95 on vol. I, p. 81. A mystical "book of Shem" is mentioned in geonic times; comp. Graetz, *loc. cit.*, 150.

<sup>76</sup> Ps.—Philo, 5 A, 6 D–8D. Comp. also 3 (below) and 4 (top; the leader of the Japhethites is called Thanat and Theneth; perhaps תחנת?), and Yerahmeel 28–29, who had a considerably better text of ps.—Philo before him than the printed one. But not even his text was entirely free from errors. The dependence of Yerahmeel on the Latin text of ps.—Philo becomes strikingly apparent from the names of the twelve pious men whose Hebrew names Yerahmeel did not recognize in every case. These were, as ps.—Philo clearly asserts, relatives of Joktan, and, with the exception of Abraham, Nachor, Lot, and Reu, correspond to the names given in Gen. 10. 26–29, whose Latin forms (Esar = חצר מות in חצר; Tenute and Zaba are Latin corruptions for Evila and Uzal = חויל and אוחל, respectively; comp. ps.—

Philo, 4D) Yerahmeel reproduces. As to the legend given in ps.-Philo, we have in it one of the oldest forms of a widespread legend concerning the rescue of Abraham from death by fire (comp. vol. I, pp. 201 and 216-217, as well as the notes appertaining thereto), which is brought in relation with the erection of the Tower of Babel, just as the rabbinic sources would have it that Abraham tried to dissuade the wicked generation of the Tower from their enterprise (Tan. B. I, 99-100; PRE 24; BR 38. 6). The puzzling remark occurring in ps.-Philo, 8C, that the place where Abraham was saved from the fire was called, in the Chaldean language, Deli, "quod interpretatur deus", is very likely a haggadic interpretation of Ur (read Uri instead of Deli); comp. Eupolemus, 418d, where instead of biblical Ur, the form Uria is given which is most likely a corruption of Ura = אור־יהוה, "the light of God"; comp. Baba Ba'ra 25a and see further Jub. 11. 3. The depravity of mankind, according to Jub. 11. 2, *seq.*, began in the time of Serug, who is designated as an idolater, whereas ps.-Philo, 5A, excludes him and his household from the general demoralization. Comp. vol. I, pp. 185-186.

77 Pesahim 94b, in an utterance of Rabban Johanan b. Zaccai's, who, connecting the name Nimrod with מרד "rebelled", maintains that it signifies "he who caused man to revolt against God". BR 37. 2-4; Megillah 11a; Tehillim 105, 449; Esther R. 1. 1; Philo, *De Gigant.*, 15 (he employs almost the same words as Rabban Johanan, his younger contemporary, in explaining the name Nimrod), and *Quaestiones*, 82 (here Nimrod is connected with נמר "spotted", hence: "nomen...interpretatus Aethiope"); ps.-Philo, 4C ("ipse initiavit esse superbus ante dominum"). Comp. also the sources cited in the following notes 78-88, concerning the wickedness of Nimrod, as well as Yerushalmi Targumim on Gen. 10.8. Another view given in a source which was made use of by Targum Yerushalmi 10. 11 (but not by 2 Targum Yerushalmi), states that Nimrod emigrated to Assyria because he refused to participate in the building of the tower. For this he was rewarded by God, and received four cities as an addition to his dominions, corresponding to the number of cities which he owned in Babylon, and which he abandoned in his emigration. A similar Haggadah is found in Ephraim, I, 15A, who states that Nimrod fought for the sake of God, against the generation of the building of the Tower. Ephraim also mentions another view, according to which, he betook himself to hunting in order to provide food for the builders of the Tower. Comp. BR 37. 4, and Ginzberg, *Haggada bei den Kirchenv.*, 88-89,

as well as note 34 on vol. I, p. 201. In Yashar Noah, 17b-18a, also two different sources are found; according to one Nimrod went (comp. *ibid.* 17. concerning the explanation of the name Nimrod: because man at the time of his birth rebelled against God) hunting in order to prepare sacrifices for the altar he erected to God. But afterwards we read that he was instrumental in causing man to forsake God. Midrash Aggada Gen. 10. 8, asserts that Nimrod was the first who ate meat.

<sup>78</sup> Yashar Noah 17a. On these garments, comp. PRE 24 (this is the source of Yashar); Pesahim 44b; notes 39 and 89 on vol. I, pp. 319 and 332 respectively. Comp. the following note.

<sup>79</sup> PRE 24; Midrash 'Aseret Melakim, 38-39; Zohar I, 73b and 142b; Sabba, Toledot, 28a; R. Bahya, Gen. 3. 21 (from Adam they came down to Cain, and after his death Nimrod took possession of them); *Hadar* and *Da'at* on Gen. 25. 32 and 27. 15. These splendid garments which Adam and Eve received at the time of leaving paradise were made of the skin of the female Leviathan (comp. vol. I, p. 27); *Hadar* and *Da'at* on Gen. 3. 21. Comp. BR 20. 12; Tan. B. I, 18, and Abkir in Yalkut I, 44, concerning these garments of Adam which served to the former generations as priestly garments. Comp. the preceding note.

<sup>80</sup> Yashar Noah, 17b; Zohar I, 73b-74a.

<sup>81</sup> PRE 24. According to ps.-Philo, 5A, Nimrod was only the chief of the Hamites, whereas the Japhethites and Semites had their own chiefs; comp. vol. I, p. 175 (top).

<sup>82</sup> Yashar Noah, 17b-18a; comp. also 23a concerning Nimrod's war enterprises and the founding of the cities; see further vol. I, p. 229, about the identity of Nimrod with Amraphel. On the Haggadah concerning the rulers of the world, a number of versions are extant. PRE 11 reads: God, at the time of the creation of the world was the first ruler; then Nimrod, Joseph, Solomon, Ahab, Nebuchadnezzar, Cyrus, Alexander of Macedon, the Messiah, and at the end of time God, who was the first ruler, will also be the last. *Maamar 'Aseret Melakim*, 54-55, and *Ma'asiyyot* (ed. Gaster, beginning) go back directly to this source; both of these books are to be used for a correct text of PRE. A version of this legend closely related to that found in PRE is that of Midrash 'Aseret Melakim, 38-55, whereas 2 Targum Yerushalmi 1. 1, which has (instead of Joseph, Solomon, Ahab, Cyrus, and Alexander) the following names: Pharaoh king of Egypt (either the one who ruled in the land in the time of Joseph

or the Pharaoh of the Exodus), Israel, Ahasuerus, Greece, and Rome. At the end of this verse Targum has a second version, according to which there were only four rulers over the world, two Jews (Solomon and Ahab), and two non-Jews (Nebuchadnezzar and Ahasuerus). This is apparently based on Megillah 11a, according to the modification of the talmudic statement in *Panim Aherim*, 56. Esther R. 1. 1 cites David, Solomon, Ahab, Nebuchadnezzar, Cyrus, and Darius as the rulers of the world. To this list are probably to be added the first, as well as the last two names mentioned in PRE, in order to complete the number ten. 'Aktan, 12 gives the following rulers: Nimrod, Pharaoh, Solomon, Ahab, Nebuchadnezzar, Ahasuerus, Cyrus, Alexander, Vespasian, Adarshan. Comp. vol. III, pp. 146, 355; vol. IV, pp. 125, 186, 333, 407. See further *Otot ha-Mashiah*, 50 (on the expression לְכִיפָה לְכִיפָה see Megillah, *loc. cit.*), and 59; on Edom's (=Rome's) dominion of the world shortly before the advent of the Messiah for the duration of nine months. Comp. Sanhedrin 98b, top.

<sup>83</sup> Yashar Noah, 18a and 23a. Comp. note 77 for the older sources concerning Nimrod, "the one who seduced men to evil". *Recognitiones*, I, 30 and 4. 28-29, asserts that Nimrod whom the Greeks call Ninus, after whom Nineveh is named, taught the Persians to worship fire. For this purpose he made use of magic, since otherwise he could not lead men astray from God to whom they were naturally devoted. However, the first sorcerer was Ham, who was later called Zoroaster (= "living star", in Greek) by his worshippers. He was called so because by magical manipulation of a demon he tried to draw sparks from a star, and was burned. The foolish crowd, instead of discerning God's punishment in Ham's death, believed to have perceived a particular significance in his death by fire, and began to worship him as a living star (Zoroaster). Having been reduced to ashes, Zoroaster was worshipped by the Persians as the celestial fire. In Clementine *Homilies*, 9. 4-6, Nimrod is identified with Zoroaster, and is designated as the one "who chose, giant-like, to devise things in opposition to God, and who, after his death by fire, was worshipped by the ignorant populace. This was the beginning of the worship of idols. Subsequent rulers demanded similar adoration to that which was accorded to Nimrod." On hero-worship as the source of idolatry, comp. note 54 on vol. I, p. 123. The view that Nimrod was one of those who claimed to be gods is frequently found in rabbinic literature; comp. the following three



notes, and vol. I, p. 191. On the worship of fire in connection with Nimrod in the different versions of the Abraham legends, see BR 38. 13, and the parallel passages cited by Theodor, as well as Index, s. v. "Fire". On Ninus=Nimrod, comp. note 88.

<sup>84</sup> Josephus, *Antiqui.*, I, 4. 1-2.

<sup>85</sup> BR 37. 2; Pesahim 94b (top).

<sup>86</sup> Yerushalmi Targumim Gen. 10. 9; 2 Targum Yerushalmi states that Nimrod demanded of the people to abandon Shem's teaching and to follow his own (יְרִי in this place is used in its Arabic sense, and means "religion").

<sup>87</sup> MHG I, 188; *Ma'asiyyot* (Gaster's edition, 2). This legend is only a somewhat different version of Hiram's "heavenly seat"; comp. vol. IV, p. 335, and the note appertaining to it. See further vol. II, p. 347, concerning the deification of Pharaoh, as well as *Ma'asiyyot* (Gaster's edition, 6), and MHG II, 57. The legend found in the Christian Book of Adam 3. 23 and 25 about Nimrod as a god is based on Clementine writings (comp. note 83). When the old rabbinic literature speaks of Nimrod's rebellion against God (comp. BR 42 [41]. 4, and the parallels cited by Theodor), it primarily refers to his activity as the originator of the building of the tower; comp. the following note. On Nimrod=Amraphel, comp. vol. I, p. 229. It may be remarked here that Augustine, *Civitas Dei*, 26. 17, identifies Amraphel with Ninus. This presupposes the identity of Nimrod with Amraphel. Comp. note 83. See also Eusebius, 484d, and Yerahmeel 32.

<sup>88</sup> Yashar Noah, 20b-21a, based on older sources. That Nimrod was the instigator of the building of the tower, see Hullin 89a; 'Abodah Zarah 53b (where the tower is called "the house of Nimrod"); Pesahim 94b; 'Erubin 53a; BR 23. 7, 26. 4, and 42. 4; PRE 34; Josephus, *Antiqui.*, I, 4. 2. Instead of Nimrod some sources (BR 38. 8; Tan. B. I, 53; Tan. Noah 1) speak of other Hamites, such as Cush (but according to BR 42. 4, this is only another name for Nimrod; see further Philo, *Quaestiones*, 2. 82), Put, Mizraim, and Canaan, who were the builders of the tower. These men are also meant by Lactantius, *Institutiones*, 2. 15, when he declares that the Hamites were the first idolaters. The three parties among the builders of the tower are already referred to in Sanhedrin 109a; Tan. Noah 18; Alphabet R. Akiba, 46-47 (where two contradictory views of the Talmud are combined into one); Tehillim 1, 12. In these, as in other haggadic passages, the reasons for building the tower are alleged to

have been the revolt against God and the attempt to prevent a second deluge; comp. BR 38. 1, 5, 7 (the midrashic interpretation of מִקְדָּם occurs also in Origen, *Contra Celsum*, 5. 30), and 8; Mekilta Mishpatim 20, 101a; Tan. B. I, 55; Josephus, *Antiqui.*, I, 4. 2. Comp. particularly the detailed description of this wicked plan in Tan. B. I, 100 (on Abraham's attempt to prevent them from sinning, and the curse he pronounced against them when he failed in his effort, comp. BR, *loc. cit.*, 6; PRE 24; Tehillim 1, 12; 'Aseret ha-Dibrot, second commandment), and Yerushalmi Targumim on Gen. 11. 4. In ER 15, 74, eight sins (comp. Index, s. v. "Sins, Eight") are enumerated, which caused the destruction of this generation. The view given in Hellenistic literature that the building of the tower was a revolt of the giants against God (ps.—Eupolemus; comp. Freudenthal, *Hellenistische Studien*, I, 92–93; Philo, *Confus. Ling.*, 2) is closely related to this Haggadah and it is most instructive that as late as the ninth century this view was still championed by Ḥiwi Al-Balkhi, according to whom the builders of the tower were the *Nefilim*; comp. Davidson, *Saadia's Polemic against Ḥiwi al-Balkhi*, 54–56. In the Bible the name Babylon is associated with the building of the tower. The Haggadah goes a step further, and also finds in the name of the place Shinar (2 Targum Yerushalmi Gen. 11. 2 identifies it with Pontus) some reference to wicked Babylon; comp. Yerushalmi Berakot 4, 7b; Shabbat 113b; BR 37. 4; Ekah (introduction) 23; Koheleth 12. 7. The oldest haggadic interpretation of Shinar is the one found in Jub. 10. 26, where, in agreement with rabbinic sources, Shinar is connected with נֶעַר "emptied" (not Babel, as Charles wrongly interprets it), and hence the explanation: "And they called its name Overthrow." That the place was called Shinar in the Bible before the destruction of the tower, offers no difficulty to the Haggadah, since "God knew beforehand what would happen afterwards"; comp. BR 42. 7. In the 43 years (Jub. 10. 21), during which they were occupied with the building, they succeeded in erecting the tower, but not the city which they undertook to build; BR 38. 8. The tower was of extraordinary dimensions, particularly its height; comp. Jub., *loc. cit.*; Greek Baruch 3; BR, *loc. cit.*; Tan. B. I, 54; Tan. Noah 1; ER 21, 118; PRE 24 (this is the source of Yashar which, to be sure, does not state that the height was 70 miles, as maintained by PRE, but takes it to have been ten thousand; one year's journey is, according to Pesahim 94a, about 10,950 milés); 'Aseret ha-Dibrot (second commandment), which was incorporated in Midrash Abraham

46. The last-named source also speaks of the seventy stairs (so is מעלות to be understood, and not "steps") in the east, for the purpose of ascending, and seventy stairs in the west, for the purpose of descending, that is, one stair for each nation (comp. note 91), because all the seventy nations participated in this enterprise under the direction of a thousand kings; Targum Eccl. 7. 28. When one considers the extraordinary dimensions, one marvels at the rapid progress of the building. God caused the enterprise to prosper, in order to be able to mock later at the builders all the more. First the building was erected, and then He caused it to be destroyed, Tan. B. I, 55; BR 38. 8. But they would never have succeeded in their undertaking, were it not for the fact that they found the books of wisdom of the ante-diluvian generations in the valley of Shinar, which had been carried thither by the flood (comp. note 44), and from which they derived their knowledge for the erection of the tower; comp. Zohar I, 76a, bottom. Respecting the books of wisdom comp. Berosus, 56, 39, who also states that after the flood Xisuthros found the ante-diluvian books at Sippara (Babylon). Each one of the builders of the tower engraved his name on a brick, of which they made use (this is a midrashic interpretation of ונעשה לנו שם, Gen. II. 4); ps.-Philo, 6 D, and hence Yerahmeel 29. 2. Comp. vol. III, p. 56 (bottom). The passage in the text concerning the pregnant women is from the Greek Baruch 3 (that they wished to bore a hole in the heavens is found in Sanhedrin 109b); comp. vol. II, p. 372, about Rachel the daughter of Shuthelah. The story about the blood-stained arrows (Yashar, *loc. cit.*) occurs also in the Titus legend, Gittin 56b. The rest of the account in Yashar occurs literally in the older sources, Sanhedrin 109a; Tehillim 1, 12; PRE 24; Targum Yerushalmi Gen. 11. 7-8; Tan. Noah 18; BR 38. 10 (on the thirty nations which perished, after the flood, on account of their sins, comp. also Tan. B. I, 123, where it is likewise remarked that Abraham was made the father of thirty nations, in order to compensate for the loss of these thirty nations); Yelammedenu in 'Aruk, s. v. ורף; 'Aseret ha-Dibrot (second commandment); Ma'aseh Abraham, 46; Greek Baruch 2 and 3; ps.-Philo, 8C. In the last-named passage, however, "mutavit eorum effigies" refers to the various complexions and features of the races of mankind, and not to their transformations into apes and monsters, as maintained by the rabbinic sources and Baruch. On transformation into apes as a punishment see vol. I, p. 123. The German mystics (comp. Ziyioni, end of Noah) identify

the woodmen, werewolves and similar monsters, known in German folk-lore, with the builders of the tower (their descendants<sup>2</sup>), and further maintain that they were Japhethites, who were punished in this manner; comp. also note 34 on vol. I, p. 114. Midrash Aggada, Gen. 11. 8, remarks that when the tower fell, some of the people found inside were thrown into the water, others into the forest, while still others into the desert; the first became water-sprites, the second apes, and the third demons.

<sup>89</sup> Sanhedrin 109a (on the text, comp. MHG I, 186); BR. 38. 11.

<sup>90</sup> BR 38. 6; ARN 12, 52; MHG I, 186; comp. against this view, Josephus, *Antiqui.*, I, 4. 1, who considers that the sin of this nation consisted in their disobeying God's repeated demand to spread out into colonies. This commandment of God was for their own benefit, so that there should not be any strife between them in case they were to settle on a small tract of land. Comp. ER 31, 158. In many rabbinic passages the great prosperity enjoyed by this generation is dwelt upon. This brought about their ruin, as had formerly happened to the generation of the flood (comp. note 15); Tosefta Sotah 3. 10; Mekilta Shirah 2, 35b; Mekilta RS 58; Sifre D. 43; Midrash Tannaim 36-37. Sanhedrin 10. 3 and Tosefta 13. 7 maintain that this generation forfeited its share in the world to come; but, on the other hand, it will be punished on the final day of judgment. Comp. note 44. That the tower was overthrown by means of a violent wind is asserted in many of the oldest sources; Sibyll, 3. 101; Jub. 10. 26; Mekilta Beshallah 4, 30b (God's judgment on the generation of the flood and later on the sinful cities was executed by means of storms); Theophilus, 2. 31. This judgment was carried out after the men refused the opportunity offered to them by God to repent; BR 38. 9; Mekilta Shirah 5, 38b; Tan. B. I, 56; Noah, 18. Comp. also Tertullian, *Adversus Marcionem*, 2. 25.

<sup>91</sup> PRE 24; Targum Yerushalmi Gen. 11. 8 and Deut. 32. 8-9; Zawwaat Naphtali (end; second version, 12-14); 'Aseret ha-Dibrot 65; comp. vol. II., pp. 214-215. See further Midrash Tannaim 190-191. In the last passage the distribution of the nations between God, whom Israel chose, and the angels, whom the Gentiles chose, is said to have taken place at the time of the revelation at Sinai. This passage, however, reads like a learned reflection on the popular notion of the distribution of the nations by lot between God and the angels. With this learned presentation agree DR 2. 34 and Pkai 3, 133,

where the entire legend is so changed that it can scarcely be recognized. The official rabbinic writings contest the conception that Deut. 4. 19 admits the justification of the worship of the heavenly bodies and the angels by the Gentiles. It is maintained that later on the sages who translated the Bible into Greek permitted themselves a very free rendering of Deut. *loc. cit.*, in order to obviate any misunderstanding; comp. Mekilta Shirah 14, 16c; Yerushalmi Megillah 1, 71d, and Babli 9a; Soferim 5; Tan. Shemot (end). Comp. further the remarks of Trypho in Justin Martyr, *Dialogue*, 55 and 121, as well as 'Abodah Zarah 55a. It is true that "the angels of the nations" are mentioned several times in authoritative sources; but this must not be understood to mean that the nations were placed under the care of the angels, whereas Israel is God's portion in accordance with the statement of the pseud-epigraphic works (Jub. 15. 31-32; Enoch 88 and 90. 22; comp. further Septuagint Deut. 32. 8-9) and the widespread view (besides the sources cited at the beginning of this note, it is frequently to be met with in the kabbalistic literature; comp. also Clementine *Recognitiones*, 2. 42 and 8. 50, where the distribution among the angels is set for the same time as that given in the rabbinic Haggadah) in popular Jewish literature. It rather wishes to convey that as each individual person has his own guardian angel (comp. Index *s. v.*), so also each nation, including Israel whose guardian angels are Michael and Gabriel, or according to some, Michael and Metatron; comp. Index under these names, as well as '*Erke ha-Kinnuyim*, *s. v.* מטטרון; see vol. I, p. 385. The authoritative view-point of the Synagogue is emphasized by Sa'adya against the popular conception championed by his opponent Hiwi al-Balkhi; comp. Davidson, *Saadia's Polemic against Hiwi al-Balkhi* 58. The presence of the angels at the time of the destruction of the tower is also referred to in Jub. 10. 23 and this view is based on the use of the plural (גורדה) in Gen. 11. 7. Comp. BR 38. 9, and the remarks of Theodor, *ad loc.* That Hebrew was the original language of mankind until the time of the confusion of languages, and that Eber was the only one who retained it, is a widespread view; comp. BR 18. 4 (נברא העולם signifies: God made use of this language at the time of the creation of the world which came into being when He uttered His word), 31. 8, and 42.8; PRE 24 (here it is said that each angel brought a language and a script for his respective nation) and 26; Targum Yerushalmi Gen. 11. 1 and 8; Tan. B. I, 56; Jub. 12. 25-26 ("tongue of creation" = שבו נברא העולם in BR 18. 4). This view is also assumed explicitly or tacitly in patristic literature; comp.

Charles on Jub., *loc. cit.*, See further Clementine *Recognitiones*, 1. 30; Origen, *Con. Cels.*, 5. 30; Zohar I, 75; Shu'aib, Noah (end), which reads: All the languages therefore contain some Hebrew words. On the view current among some Jews and Christians to the effect that Aramaic was the primitive speech, comp. Charles on Jub. 3.28; Grünbaum, *Neue Beiträge*, 63, and Ginzberg, *Haggada bei den Kirchenv.*, 91-93.—On the descent of God to the earth, comp. vol. III, p. 93, and note 206 appertaining thereto.

## V. ABRAHAM

(pp. 183–308)

<sup>1</sup> Abot 5. 3; ARN 32 (36 of the second version). The number ten is obtained by including Noah, who, at the same time, is the tenth after Adam; comp. vol. I, 105. According to a quotation from an unknown midrashic source, mankind, up to the appearance of Abraham, was poor in good deeds; comp. Poznanski, *Kommentar zu Ezechiel von Eleazar aus Beaugency, Einleitung*, 228. In a passage found in an old liturgy Abraham is described as one whom God chose out of twenty generations (beginning with Adam); see *Hemdah Genuzah*, 161, and Warnheim, *Kebuzat Hakamim*, 107.

<sup>2</sup> BR 12. 9; Tan. B. I, 11 and 62; Tehillim 104, 444. Despite the statement found in tannaitic sources that the three patriarchs were of equal rank (Mekilta, beginning; Tosefta Keritot, at the end; BR 1. 15), in the legends Abraham is regarded as the favorite, and ranks above his son and grandson; comp. the numerous statements exalting him; Yelammedenu cited in Yalkut, Joshua 15 (God had performed all the miracles for Israel on account of the merits of Abraham); Abot 6. 10; EZ 9. 187 and 17, 20, as well as 25, 45–46; ShR 28. 1; Berakot 7b; Tan. Toledot 4; WR 31. 4; Shir 7. 6. At the same time, however, there are passages in which the view is expressed that Jacob was the most prominent of the patriarchs; comp. note 35 on vol. I, 317, and also Beer, *Leben Abrahams*, p. 87ff.

<sup>3</sup> Ps.–Philo 4D. Serug's mother is called Milcah in this pseud-epigraphical work (comp. Genesis 11. 26); in Jub. 11. 7 she is named Ora.

<sup>4</sup> Already in 2 Chron. 20. 7 Abraham is styled the friend of God; but in post-biblical Hebrew literature the adjective אָוֶהֶב is employed; the former word is probably preferred on account of Jeremiah 11.15, מֵה לִיִּרְדִי, which is taken as an allusion to Abraham. Comp. Menahot 53b; Tosefta Berakot 7. 13 (see Tosafot on Menahot 53b and Shabbat 137b); Sifre N. 115 and D. 352; Mekilta Bo 18, 22a (אָוֶהֶב in Mekilta Shirah 10, 44a, is obviously a quotation from an old liturgy; see morning prayer, Baer's edition, 45); Ekah,

Introduction, 24, 26; ER, introduction, 80, and 24, 127. This appellation occurs also in the Hellenistic and pseudepigraphic writings as well as in Christian literature; comp. Jub. 21. 15, 20; 4 Ezra 3. 14; Prayer of Azariah 12; Philo, *De Abrahamo*, 17; I, 401 (as a quotation from Gen. 18. 17 = Targum Yerushalmi רחמי רחמי); James 2.23; Clemens, *Instructor*, III. 2; *Stromata* II. 5; Clemens, *First Epistle*, 10. 1. One is therefore inclined to read in Sibyll. II. 245: Abraham the great friend of the Most High and the great Moses; comp., however, Origen, *Princip.*, III, 2. 5, where Moses is styled the friend of God; see also ARN 43, 121 (second version), where five bear the title of friend of God (ידיד): Abraham, Israel, Benjamin, Solomon, and Jerusalem; to a similar number is applied the title "beloved of God" (אהובים): Abraham, Jacob, Israel, Solomon, and Jerusalem. In the Ethiopic *Mota Muse*, Moses bears the title of friend of God; but among the Arabs (already in the Koran 4. 124) this title is exclusively applied to Abraham; comp. Beer, *Leben Abrahams*, notes 427, 431, and 950; Grünbaum, *Neue Beiträge*, pp. 118, 121; Malter, *Monatsschrift* 51, 713; Ginzberg, *Unbekannte Sekte*, 14-15. See also *Gedulat Mosheh* 3b (משה אהוב יי').

<sup>5</sup> Jub. 11. 1-14. The beginning of the monarchy dates from Nimrod (comp. vol. I, 176-177), hence not long after the birth of Abraham. The name Serug is taken to be a contraction of סר and טו turned away, that is, from God. Comp. Ps. 14. 3 and 53. 4. According to ps.-Philo 4A, Serug and his sons were God-fearing, despite the wickedness of their generation. The meaning ascribed to the name Terah in Jub. is obscure, and is probably connected with the Aramic תרי was emaciated. For other explanations see Charles, *Jub.*, *ad loc.*, and Baer, *op. cit.*, 95-96.

<sup>6</sup> Baba Batra 91a, which is the source for Yashar Noah, 18a and Yerahmeel 27. 7; but the Palestinian Midrash PRE seems to be independent of the Babli passage, which does not have the statement that she died in Haran. The name is written אמחלאי, אמחלא (the variant איתמולאי given by Rabbinowicz, *Variae Lectiones* to Baba Batra, *loc. cit.*, is of no value); it is uncertain whether the first part of the name is אימא (mother) or אמתא (servant); the first explanation seems more probable. Comp. Beer, *Leben Abrahams.*, 96, 97; Güdemann, *Religionsgeschichtliche Studien*, 41-49, where additional literature is cited; Kohler, *Testament of Job*, 288. The explanation of this name as well as its relation to Greek Ἀμάλθεια is quite obscure; it is probably of Babylonian origin, like the name ברנובו (possibly ברנובו, *i. e.*, Bar-



nabas, the son of Nebo; comp. בְּנֵי נֶבֹ, Tosefta Pesahim 2. 20, and Rabbinowicz, *Variae Lectiones*, Pes. 57a as well as Yashar, *loc. cit.*). Some other names are assigned to Abraham's mother and grandfather in Jub. 11. 14.

<sup>7</sup> For further details concerning the appearance of Abraham's star, comp. vol. I, p. 207, and note 48. On the source of the following legends see note 34.

<sup>8</sup> The story of the slaughter of innocent children is modelled after the story of Moses, and is not influenced by the New Testament story about the birth of Jesus.

<sup>9</sup> Pregnancy becomes outwardly noticeable after the third month; comp. Tosefta Niddah 1. 7; BR 85. 10; comp. note 88 on vol. II, p. 34.

<sup>10</sup> The same is described as קוֹלְצָאֵי (but the manuscript reads קוֹלִיגִי), which seems to be Spanish. Grünbaum, *Neue Beiträge*, 128, compares it with the Italian *calcinaccio*, that is, a hardening of the belly.

<sup>11</sup> Comp. vol. I, p. 178.

<sup>12</sup> In consequence of an inaccurate translation of the Arabic word *Wadi*, which signifies both *brook* and *valley*, the word נַהַר (*stream*) instead of נַחַל (*valley*) occurs a few times in the printed text as well as in the manuscript of this legend. This supposition is attested by the words מַעְרָה אַחַד בּוֹהַ הַנְּהַר (27, line 10), since it is impossible that a cave should be in a river. The legend speaks below of a spring whose water Abraham used; but no mention is made of a stream; comp. also 27, line 16 שְׂבָאָה לְוַה הַנְּהַר which is hardly possible, while לְוַה הַנַּחַל would suit admirably.

<sup>13</sup> PRE 26 reads: When Abraham was born, Nimrod's courtiers wanted to put him to death; so he was kept in a hiding-place beneath the ground for thirteen years, during which time he did not see the sun nor the moon. A different account of Abraham's youth is given in Yashar; comp. vol. I, p. 209. Still another version of this story is found in 2 'Aseret ha-Dibrot 2; *Ma'as.*, G. 3; *Ma'aseh Abraham*, Horowitz edition, 43. According to the latter sources, Abraham lived in a cave for three years. Comp. Nedarim 32a; BR 30. 8; BaR 18. 21; Shir 5. 16; PR 21, 105a; Tan. Lek 3 and Behar 1; Tan. B. I, 60; III, 105; Esther R 2. 5. In almost all of these passages two views are given, one that Abraham had recognized his Creator at the age of three, the other that this took place in Abraham's forty-eighth year (Maimonides, *Yad*, 'Abodah Zarah, 1. 3, seems to have read "forty", which is perhaps based on Pirke Abot 5, at the end).

A statement in Rokeah (*Hasidut, Zakuyyot 'Arum*), which is apparently derived from an unknown version of the Sefer Yezirah, maintains that Abraham, at the age of forty-eight, was moved by the deeds of the generation of the Tower of Babel to reflect on God and the universe. He first studied three years by himself, afterwards, by the command of God, he was taught by Shem, until he became so wise that he composed the Sefer Yezirah. Then God appeared unto him, took him unto Himself, kissed him, called him His friend, and made a covenant with him and his descendants forever. A similar statement is quoted by Judah b. Barzillai (in his commentary on the Sefer Yezirah, 268) from an old text of the Sefer Yezirah.

<sup>14</sup> In the Abraham legend in BHM II, 118, we read that two spouts (read סלונות instead of חלונות) sprang up, one flowing with honey, the other with milk.

<sup>15</sup> Comp. above, note 12. Other heroes, too, like Abraham, are supposed to have been able to walk, talk, and think in their infancy. See Index under "Cain", "Noah", and "Moses". Such "wonder children" are also known in the Christian legends, and unusual precocity is ascribed to Jesus and others; comp. Günter, *Christliche Legende*, 134 seq.

<sup>16</sup> That Abraham discovered the true faith by meditating on nature we are told in so early a source as the Apocalypse of Abraham (comp. vol. I, pp. 212-213), and about six versions of this legend are extant. Comp. BR 38. 13; 2 'Aseret ha-Dibrot 2; *Ma'aseh Abraham* (Hor. edition, 43-44); *Ma'aseh Abraham* (BHM II, 118); Yashar Noah, 20a-20b; *Ma'as. G.* 3, 4; MHG I, 189. The oldest form seems to be that of BR, where we are told that Abraham, by observing how one element subdues another, becomes convinced of the error of worshipping the elements. But even this form is not the original one, as can be seen by comparing it with the statement of R. Judah (about 150 C.E.) in Baba Batra 10a, and Koheleth 7.26. Benfey, *Pantschatantra* I, 376, 377, attempts to trace this legend to a kindred Indian fable. This is, however, not likely, as the Jewish sources recording this legend are extremely old. *Recognitiones*, 7, as well as Aristides, 3-6, seems to have known it, and it is quite probable that Josephus (*Antiqui.* I, 7. 1) gives a rationalistic interpretation of it.

<sup>17</sup> Comp. above, note 15, and Ginzberg in *Jewish Encyclopedia*, II, 608A.

<sup>18</sup> Fabulous numbers of a similar character are also found elsewhere; comp. vol. IV, p. 267.

<sup>19</sup> The verb חמה is here used, as sometimes in biblical Hebrew, in the sense of "being horror-struck", whereas in mishnic Hebrew it denotes "was astonished, marvelled."

<sup>20</sup> No mention is made in this legend of the place where Abraham and Nimrod were until now; comp. Eupolemus in Eusebius, *Praep. Evang.*, IX. 17, 418d, who gives "Camarinu, a city also known as Uria" as Abraham's birthplace. Uria is the biblical Ur, which the Talmud (Baba Batra 91a) identifies with a Babylonian locality in talmudic times (the text of that passage is in a bad condition; but כוחא is very likely the name borne by that place; see Rabbino-wicz, *Variae Lectiones*); this name is likewise found in Arabic sources, Istahri M., 54; Maras II, 519. According to the Talmud, Abraham was kept prisoner by Nimrod for ten years, first in כוחא and then in קרדו or כרדו; Beer, *Leben Abrahams*, notes 5 and 108.

<sup>21</sup> For a similar legend, comp. vol. IV, p. 348.

<sup>22</sup> As may be seen from p. 28, 1.2 from below, where the gates of Babylon are spoken of, the reference is to the city, not the land of Babylon; מדינה instead of עיר is very frequently found in works which were influenced by Arabic; this use of מדינה is also found in the Bible; comp. Ginzberg, *Geonica*, I, p. 26.

<sup>23</sup> Despite the agreement of the manuscripts with the printed text, the reading עצמי for עצמך (p. 29, l. 2. from below) is presupposed here; the latter can hardly be correct.

<sup>24</sup> That idols fall to the ground at the command of the righteous is frequently recorded in Jewish as well as in Christian legends; comp. *ps.-Matthew 23*; *Gospel of the Saviour's Infancy* 10; vol. IV, p. 165.

<sup>25</sup> For Abraham's native town, comp. above, note 20.

<sup>26</sup> The episode relating to the age of the idols as compared to that of the purchaser is excerpted from ER 5. 27 (it was taken over verbatim in Yerahmeel, 71-72; Zohar I, 77; this was overlooked by Gaster, *ad loc.*) and in the text it is interwoven in the account of *Ma'aseh Abraham*; other versions of this episode occur in BR 38. 13; *Ma'as. G.* 3; MHG I, 188; EZ 25, 47-48. Comp. also vol. I, p. 210 and Philo, *De Decalogo*, 14. 192.

<sup>27</sup> I read שבר עיניו (p. 32, line 4) instead of סמא עיניו. According to Baba Kama 8. 1, the correct reading of this passage is: קטע את ירו

שבר רגליו סמא עיניו. The printed text as well as the manuscript, which offers some variants, is corrupt, as רגליו is repeated.

<sup>28</sup> The imprisonment of Abraham is already mentioned in the Talmud (comp. above, note 20) and PRE 25; according to these sources the imprisonment lasted ten years.

<sup>29</sup> Christian legends, too, frequently tell of angels bringing food and drink to needy saints; comp. *Protevangelium of James* 8. 1. Despite the manuscript, מודל instead of גודר (p. 32, l. 22) is to be read, as may be seen from the word ביוח which follows.

<sup>30</sup> There is a similar incident in the Moses legend; comp. vol. II, p. 282.

<sup>31</sup> According to the manuscript, לא חכבה is to be read instead of אינו מכובה of the printed edition (p. 34, line 16).

<sup>32</sup> The text is somewhat obscure. Abraham, fastened to the catapult, prays to God, and the angels intercede in his behalf; then follows the scene in which Abraham's mother takes part; and then come the words: "And when it came to pass, that they threw him into the catapult". ושימו להשם should probably be read instead of ושימו. The entire passage would then become quite clear.

<sup>33</sup> Literally: *May cooling and comfort be granted to My servant Abraham*; this is a literal translation of Koran 21. 69, as has already been observed by Grünbaum, *Neue Beiträge*, 129. In the old sources (Pesahim, 118a; BR 44. 13; ShR 8. 5; DR 2. 29; Shir 1. 12; Tan. B. II, 100=Introduction 144; Tan. Tezawweh 12; Tehillim 119. 48) it is stated that Gabriel (according to some, Michael) hastened to come to Abraham's assistance, but God checked the angel, and He Himself delivered Abraham. But according to one view given in BR it was Michael who delivered Abraham. In *Ma'aseh Abraham* (Horowitz's edition) the latter part of the text is corrupt, as two conflicting versions of Abraham's deliverance are given. The text may be emended in accordance with 2 'Aseret ha-Dibrot 2, by adding the sentence which fell out through homoioteleuton.

<sup>34</sup> *Ma'aseh Abraham*, published by Jellinek in BHM, I, 25-34; this edition, which is rather inaccurate, is taken from *Shebet Musar* of Elijah ha-Kohen who used a Constantinople edition of this Midrash; comp. Porges, *Zeitschrift für hebräische Bibliographie*, X, 159, and Ginzberg, *ibid.*, IX, p. 125. I cannot state with certainty whether the MS. of this Midrash, found in the library of the Jewish Theological Seminary of America (No. 33 Steinschneider), goes back to the Constantinople edition or not, as only Elijah ha-Kohen's ed-

ition is accessible to me. The MS. text differs from that given in *Shebet Musar*, but is not always superior to it. As was already remarked by Jellinek, *op. cit.*, *Einleitung*, 16, and Grünbaum, *Neue Beiträge*, 130, *seq.*, this Midrash is a translation from the Arabic. This supposition may be proved by the phrase אָמַר הַמֶּנִּיר (= אֱלֹקָיִם) which is of frequent occurrence, and many other Arabisms. The author of the original, however, was a Jew, and not a Mohammedan, since parallels from rabbinic literature might be given to a great part of this booklet. Some of these parallels have already been pointed out in the preceding notes (see, *e. g.*, note 9). It may be further observed that the scene in the furnace is most likely a reminiscence of the Haggadah concerning the three youths in the furnace; comp. vol. IV, pp. 328-330, and the notes referring to them. Attention is drawn to the following details: The light at the birth of Abraham (p. 188) has its parallel in the birth of Moses and other heroes (comp. vol. II, p. 262). Gabriel appears to Abraham to show him a well of water which he needed for an ablution before praying; this is genuinely Jewish and not Mohammedan, as has been maintained by many; comp. Ginzberg, *Unbekannte Sekte*, 112. The appearance of Satan in human form (pp. 192 and 200) is frequently met with in Jewish legends; comp. note 226. The dark cloud, which separated Abraham from his enemies (p. 192), naturally goes back to Exodus 14. 19; comp. also vol. I, p. 420. The description of God as "He who sees but cannot be seen" (p. 199), though found in the Koran (6.100), is of frequent occurrence in rabbinic literature; comp., *e. g.*, Yerushalmi Peah 21b (towards the end); Hagigah 5b; Targum Yerushalmi, Gen. 4. 2; 2 Targum Yerushalmi Gen. 22. 14; Sibyll., Prooemium 8, and 4. 12. Recently an Arabic text closely related to that of the *Ma'aseh Abraham* has been published in *R.E.J.*, LXIX, 86 *seq.*—LXX, 36, *seq.*, by Shapira who claims Kob al-Ahbar as the author of this Abraham legend.

<sup>35</sup> The building of the tower, a veritable rebellion against God (comp. vol. I, p. 179), took place ten years after the death of Noah; comp. Seder 'Olam I.

<sup>36</sup> This is a midrashic explanation of Gen. 10. 11; comp. BR 37. 4; ER 20, 114; EZ 24, 45. Targum Yerushalmi, Gen., *loc. cit.*, takes אֲשׁוּר to refer to Assyria, and accordingly maintains that Nimrod emigrated to Assyria, because he did not want to participate in the building of the tower; God rewarded him for this pious act. In view of the fact that Targum Yerushalmi, in a preceding verse, des-

cribed Nimrod as a very wicked man, the sentence דלא בעי... חדייח is very likely to be regarded as a later insertion, based on the above mentioned Midrashim, and refers not to Nimrod but to Asshur. Comp., however, Ginzberg, *Haggada bei den Kirchenv.*, I, 88-89, as well as Targum Yerushalmi, *ad loc.* (אחוראה=אשור Asshur!), and PR 34, 156a. Comp. note 77 on vol. I, p. 177.

<sup>37</sup> Comp. vol. I, p. 200, and note 34.

<sup>38</sup> Ischah (Gen. 11. 29) is taken as another name for Sarah, who was so called on account of her prophetic gift (from שכה=סכה to look); comp. Josephus, *Antiqui.* I, 6. 5.; Sanhedrin 69a; Megillah 14a; Seder 'Olam 21; Jerome, *Quaestiones, ad loc.*; Ephraim I, 59E.

<sup>39</sup> Tehillim 118, 484; Hallel 107. The text of the first-named source is very corrupt (Buber misunderstood it entirely); nor is the second quite correct. A good text of Tehillim is found in Sikli's Talmud Torah; comp. *Hazofeh* III, 18, and Ginzberg, *ibid.*, IV, 32. Comp. also Yalkut I, 77, where the correct reading is found at the beginning and at the end of the quotations from Tehillim: twice במלו הרן של הרן. According to these sources, Haran was the younger brother of Abraham, and this is in agreement with the prevalent view of the Haggadah (comp. Seder 'Olam II; BR 38. 14; Sanhedrin 69b), which maintains that Abraham was one year older than Nahor, who was one year older than Haran; the latter, at the age of eight, begot Sarah. Yashar Noah, 17a and 18a, regards Nahor and Haran as twin-brothers who were much older than Abraham. BaR 4. 8 seems to agree with the latter view. The death of Haran, as a punishment for his vacillation, is already mentioned in BR 38. 13.

<sup>40</sup> *Recognitiones*, I, 31 (a Midrash on Gen. 11. 28) gives the explanation that Haran's death was a punishment for an "incestuous crime". This legend makes Haran suffer for the crime of his son Lot, or presupposes that the latter only followed in the footsteps of his father. The Midrashim (MHG I, 191; *Ma'as.* G. 5; Yelamedenu, according to the extract published by Ginzberg in *Hazofeh*, IV, 32, from Sikli's Talmud Torah; Zohar I, 77b; Lekah Gen. *loc. cit.*) explain Haran's premature death (Abel was killed by his brother, and his death cannot be regarded as a precedent to that of Haran who died by the hand of God) in different ways. He was punished for not being steadfast in his religion; comp. the preceding note; Yashar Noah, 25b; Targum Yerushalmi Gen., *loc. cit.* People believed that Abraham was delivered from the fire by means of Haran's witch-craft—or on account of the latter's piety—and his premature death

proved that they were wrong; comp. Yelammedenu, *loc. cit.*; Zohar, *loc. cit.*; Targum Yerushalmi, *loc. cit.* Haran attempted to extinguish the flames into which Abraham was cast, and thereby lost his life; comp. Lekah Gen. *loc. cit.* Jub. 12. 12 narrates that Abraham burned all the idols of his father; when Haran attempted to rescue them, he was himself consumed by the flames; comp. also Ephraim, I, 156D-157A, who very likely borrowed this legend from Jub. According to the Apocalypse of Abraham 8, Terah and his entire household were burned by a fire which came down from heaven as a punishment for their idolatry, which they did not renounce in spite of Abraham's exhortations to mend their ways. Yerahmeel 35. 1 reads: The Chaldeans came to immerse both Haran and Abraham in fire, for it was their custom to immerse their children in fire, as some mothers immerse their babies in water. Gaster refers to Comestor, Gen. 41, who has the same statement. Comp. also ps.-Philo 5A, where it is said that shortly before Abraham's birth mothers began to throw their children into the fire. Jerome, *Quaestiones*, 11. 28, says: Haran was burned because he refused to worship fire which the Chaldeans regarded as their god; Abraham, however, was saved by God. Bar-Hebraeus' statement concerning Haran (*Historia Dynastiarum*, 13) is directly borrowed from Ephraim, *loc. cit.*, which goes back to Jub., *loc. cit.*, and Charles on Jub. is to be corrected accordingly. Comp. note 76 on vol. I, p. 176.

<sup>41</sup> Yashar Noah, 27a. Ogi—so in editio princeps, but in later editions it was corrupted to עִי—*is no one else but Og*, who, already in old sources, is identified with Eliezer, while Yashar considers Ogi and Eliezer as companions. Comp. Index, s. v. "Og" and vol. III, p. 344.

<sup>42</sup> BR 40. 14; PR 43, 181a; Tan. Lek 12; Shir 1. 3; ARN 12, 53, and second version 26, 54; Onkelos and the Yerushalmi Targumim Gen. 15. 5; Sifre D. 32; Midrash Tannaim 25; BaR. 14. 11.

<sup>43</sup> Tan. Shemot, at the beginning.

<sup>44</sup> See the references given in note 38, to which is to be added Shu'aib, Hayye Sarah, 10d, who quotes an unknown midrashic source: Sarah who is also called Iscah, on account of her prophetic gift, foresaw Israel's history, and prayed to God to assist them in their tribulations.

<sup>45</sup> Yashar Noah, 27b-28a. Anoko (אֲנוֹק) is very likely identical with the poet-philosopher אֲנוֹקִי, mentioned in *Musare ha-Pilosofim* (Loewenthal's edition 3, 4); the latter is none other than Ib-

icus (א was misread as י) who is famous in Greek legends. The comparatively favorable opinion of Terah agrees with ER 5. 27, 28, where it is related that Terah left his native country in the north because its inhabitants were idolatrous; comp. note 47. This view is also found in Augustine's *Civit. Dei*, 17. 13; but a different opinion prevails in rabbinic sources. Comp. notes 50, 54 and end of 119. On Abraham's missionary activity, comp. the references given in notes 42 and 61, as well as Yelammedenu in Yalkut II, 296, on Jer. 17, and Zohar I, 79a. On the identity of Nimrod with Amraphel and on his death by the hand of Esau, alluded to in this legend, see note 85, as well as vol. I, pp. 229, 318, 319, and the notes referring to them.

<sup>46</sup> ER 5. 28. On the coins struck by Abraham, comp. Baba Kamma 97b and BR 12. 11. In the latter passage mention is also made of the coins struck by Joshua (a steer on the obverse and an antelope on the reverse), by David (a shepherd's crook, a bag, and a tower), and by Mordecai (a sack, ashes, and a golden crown). On Abraham as king, see Josephus, *Antiqui.* I, 7. 2, who quotes Nicolaus of Damascus to the effect that Abraham was king of Damascus, in the neighborhood of which there is a place called "The Habitation of Abraham." Comp. also BR 55. 1; BaR 15. 4; DR 3. 33; Tan. B. IV, 52; Tan. Beha'aloteka 9; Kohelet 2. 14. Philo, *De Nobilit.* 5, says: Abraham is designated as king (Genesis 23. 6), not because of the external circumstances, for he was really a private individual, but on account of the greatness of his soul, as he was possessed of a kingly mind. The Rabbis similarly remark that scholars are called kings; comp. Gittin 62a. See vol. I, p. 232, where it is related that Abraham declined the royal throne offered to him by the nations.

<sup>47</sup> Comp. note 114. MHG I, 188, adds that Terah decided to go to Palestine before God had instructed Abraham to do so; comp. note 45.

<sup>48</sup> Yashar Noah, 18a-19a; *Ma'aseh Abraham*, ed. Horowitz, 43; *Ma'aseh Abraham* in BHM, II, 18; 2 'Aseret ha-Dibrot, 2; *Ma'as.* G. 2, 3; MHG I, 188; see also the references given in note 13. The proverbial phrase of p. 208, line 9, is already found in Sifre N., 95. Yashar and 2 Alphabet of Ben Sira 22b recast the form of this phrase, and this rather shows the poor taste of these writings. Baraita di-Masseket Niddah 23 reads: In olden times children were brought up by their grandparents. When Abraham was four years old, his father Terah entrusted him to the care of Nahor, who attempted to teach him to worship idols; but in vain, for Abraham was



destined to devote himself to the service of God. Comp. Jub. 15. 8, where the wickedness of Abraham's grandfather is spoken of; comp. also note 5.

<sup>49</sup> Apocalypse of Abraham 1-7. On the text comp. Ginzberg, in *Jewish Encyclopedia*, I, 91, seq. On Marumath (מַרְמָתָא = מַרְמָתָא), see ZDMG 66, 590; Zucheus is very likely to be derived from מַרְמָתָא was magnificent, מַרְמָתָא splendid, magnificent (Syriac). Similarly Joauv (variants: Joavon, Juav, and Jav; comp. Bonwetsch, *ad loc.*) is connected with Hebrew יָפִי beauty, and has nothing to do with Gnostic Jao (= יָאוּ; comp. Irenaeus, *Haer.* I, 30; 4. 5). In *Sefer ha-Tappuah* the name of the idol that was chiseled by Terah was יָאוּ, which is described as the moon god (Juno?), to whom children were sacrificed. On the last point comp. note 40. Instead of "was rooted in the earth" (p. 212, line 12) the text reads: "was uprooted from the earth", which gives no satisfactory sense, and is very likely due to a faulty translation of the Hebrew שָׁרָשׁ which signifies both rooted and uprooted. The description which the Apocalypse gives of Abraham's discovery of God's existence and of his making the belief in idols appear ridiculous is very closely related to the midrashic legends dealing with the same incident (comp. vol. I, p. 189, seq., and the notes referring to them, especially note 16) and in Jub. 11. 16-12. 21. In the last-mentioned source we are told that Abraham, while yet a child (see above, note 13), became convinced of the wickedness of idolatry, and in order not to be forced to worship idols, he left his father at the early age (comp. PRE 26) of fourteen. It was then that, at Abraham's command, the ravens (comp. vol. I, p. 186; this is only found in Jub. and in Ephraim; comp. Ginzberg, *Haggada bei den Kirchenv.* 97, 98) ceased to despoil the earth. He also invented an instrument, by which the seeds were made safe against the ravens. After that he began to preach to his father and brothers about the wickedness of idolatry. Terah admitted that Abraham's arguments were sound, but at the same time admonished him to keep quiet, in order not to arouse the hostility of the people against himself. His brothers, however, became enraged against Abraham on account of his free speech. And in the night when Abraham threw his father's idols into the fire, Haran his brother (comp. note 40) attempted to rescue them, and thus lost his life. Whereupon Terah left the land of the Chaldeans, to settle in Palestine (comp. note 47), and on his way he stopped for some time in Haran. It is noteworthy that in all the sources (comp. the references given in notes 16 and 108) stress is laid upon the fact

that Abraham came to know God through his own reasoning about the universe and its ruler who must necessarily exist. BaR 14. 2 (comp. also PR 33, 150) enumerates three men who acquired the knowledge of God "by themselves". They are: Abraham, Job, Hezekiah, and the fourth will be the Messiah. This Haggadah probably wishes to call attention to the fact that although these pious men lived during a godless age, they did not succumb to the influence of their surroundings. Bonwetsch, *Apocalypse Abrahams*, 49-53, Charles, in his notes on Jub., *loc. cit.*, and Ginzberg, *Haggada bei den Kirchenv.*, 95-98, give many references to Christian sources where Abraham legends of Jewish origin are made use of. On Moham-medan parallels to these legends, see Grünbaum, *Neue Beiträge*, 90 *seq.*

<sup>50</sup> Yashar Noah, 23b-26b. The incident concerning the biggest idol with the hatchet in its hand (p. 215) is very frequently referred to in the Midrashim; comp. BR 38. 13, and the numerous parallels given by Theodor, *ad. loc.*; EZ 25. 47-48. Abraham, who, as a vendor of idols, nearly ruined his father's business (comp. vol. I, pp. 195-196) was made a priest by Terah. When, however, the idols refused to partake of the food offered to them, Abraham broke them in pieces, which he burned. Brought before Nimrod, Abraham asked him to change the course of the sun as a proof of his divinity, and this request not having been granted, he declared him an impostor. Nimrod ordered Terah to pronounce sentence upon Abraham, and death by fire was the verdict. In this legend Abraham is represented as a breaker of idols not as an iconoclast, while in the later legend he is both and this is an attempt to combine two different Abraham legends. On Terah comp. notes 45, 47, 54, and end of 114. comp. also note 76 on vol. I, p. 76.

<sup>51</sup> Yashar Noah, 27a. The continuation of this narrative is given in the first two paragraphs of vol. I, p. 203.

<sup>52</sup> Pirke Abot 5. 2; Jub. 19. 8. Opinions differ as to the events in Abraham's life which are to be considered as the temptations; comp. PRE 26; ARN 34, 94-95 (second version, 37, 94; here the Nimrod legend is disregarded!); Tehillim 18, 153, and 95, 420; for full details see Schechter's notes on ARN, *loc. cit.*; comp. further Ecclesiasticus 44. 20. I Maccabees 1. 52 is very likely dependent upon the last-named source. In 12 Testaments, Joseph 1. 7, it was Joseph who was tempted with ten temptations.

<sup>53</sup> MHG I, 201-202. partly after BR 39. 7; Philo, *De Abrahamo*,

14, also dwells on the great sacrifice made by Abraham in leaving his native country at the command of God.

<sup>54</sup> BR 39. 7 and 11. The opinion prevailing in rabbinic sources is that Gen. 12, *seq.*, refers to Abraham's emigration from Haran where he left his father. It is true that according to the Bible (Gen. 11.23), Terah died prior to Abraham's departure; but this statement of Scripture is taken figuratively, for the wicked are regarded as dead, even while they are yet alive; comp. BR, *loc.cit.*, and the parallels given by Theodor. See also Tan. B., II, 69; Tan. Yitro 1; MHG I, 527; Midrash Tannaim, 101; Mekilta RS, 127; note 72 on vol. I, 76. Acts 7.5 understands Scripture to speak of Abraham's emigration from the land of the Chaldeans, and this view is shared by Ibn Ezra, *ad loc.*; comp. note 114. Jub. 12.16 agrees with the rabbinic view, but remarks that Terah remained in Haran until Abraham had found a desirable residence in Palestine. Syncellus 1, 176, 18, *seq.*, accepts the rabbinic view in all its details.

<sup>55</sup> BR 39. 11; MHG I, 202-203; Targum Yerushalmi, Gen. 12. 2, *seq.*, is dependent on BR, *loc. cit.* Comp. also Theodor, *ad loc.* Philo, *De Somniis*, 28, says: The wise and virtuous is not only a blessing to himself, but is also beneficial to all men, etc. Comp. also Philo, *De Migratione Abrahami*, 19.

<sup>56</sup> Pesahim 117b; BR 39. 11; Tan. B. I, 62; Tan. Lek 4; BaR 11. 2. The legend refers to the fact that the first benediction of the 'Amidah concludes with the words: "Blessed art Thou, O Lord, the Shield of Abraham."

<sup>57</sup> MHG, I, p. 204, excerpted, perhaps, from Yelammedenu; comp. Sabba, Wayyera, 32a. Against the Christological interpretation of Gen. 12. 3 (see Galatians 3. 8) comp. the explanation of נָךְ in BR 39. 12 and MHG, I, 203. Shu'aib, Lek, 6b, quotes from an unknown Midrash a lengthy explanation of Gen. 12. 2. 3, according to which Abraham received three crowns; the crown of the Torah, the crown of priesthood, and the crown of kingdom (comp. Pirke Abot 4. 17, and parallel passages). Israel inherited them later from him.

<sup>58</sup> BR 39. 10; comp. note 230.

<sup>59</sup> MHG, I, 202. Ziyroni, Gen. 12. 7, on the other hand, maintains that God revealed Himself unto Abraham in the Holy Land for the first time; comp. Mekilta at the beginning; Mo'ed Katan 25a, Index s. v., "Revelation".

<sup>60</sup> BR 39. 8. In the extract from Yelammedenu published by Ginzberg in *Hazofeh*, IV, p. 33, it is stated that the inhabitants of Haran

were very wicked, despite Abraham's preaching and exhortations; whereupon God commanded him to depart from the sinners and go to Palestine.

<sup>61</sup> BR 39. 15, 16; Sanhedrin 44b; MHG I, 213. On the missionary activity of Abraham, comp. above, notes 42 and 43. To the references given in those two notes the following are to be added: Zohar III, 168a; II, 147b and 198a; ARN 33, 94. Abraham is contrasted with David: The former was first for love and then for justice, while the latter was the reverse.

<sup>62</sup> Jub. 10. 29-34. Midrash Aggada I, 27, and Rashi on Gen. 11. 6 quote a similar statement from a midrashic source; comp. note 73 on vol. I, p. 173.

<sup>63</sup> BR 41. 5; comp. note 228.

<sup>64</sup> BR 25. 3 and 40. 3; Ruth R. 1. 1; Shemuel 28; Targum Ruth 1. 1. In all these sources, except in the first-named, it is stated that the second famine occurred in the time of Lemech (the father of Noah; comp. vol. I, pp. 146, 147, and the notes referring to them), while in BR it is at first assumed that the second famine took place in Abraham's time (ב' בימי אברהם is the reading in MS א), and then a dissenting opinion is cited, according to which: א' בימי למך א' בימי אבר'. The commentators, whom Theodor follows, take the first passage to mean that two famines took place in Abraham's days. This interpretation is, however, unlikely. Probably ב' stands for שני and accordingly the second statement is an explanation of the first. PRE 26 maintains that the very first famine occurred in the time of Abraham; comp. also Tan. Lek 5.

<sup>65</sup> PRE 26; BR 40. 2; MHG I, 207; comp. Schechter's notes on the last-named source.

<sup>66</sup> Josephus, *Antiqui.* I, 8. 1, and Zohar I, 81b. In the latter passage Abraham is blamed for travelling to Egypt, and Israel's servitude in that country is said to be a punishment for that sin. Nahmanides on Gen. 12. 10 is of the opinion that Abraham's sin consisted in his lack of trust in God; for, out of fear of the inhabitants he did not acknowledge Sarah as his wife. In Baba Kamma 60b Abraham is praised for his going to Egypt, and on the strength of this action of his the rule is given: When a famine is in a city, move quickly away therefrom.

<sup>67</sup> Tan. Lek 5; Yashar Lek, 31a; Zohar I, 81b; comp. also Baba Batra 16a; Targum Yerushalmi, Gen. 12. 11.

<sup>68</sup> Tan. Lek, 5; BR 40. 5; Tan. B I, 65-66; Zohar I, 82b; Yashar,

Lek 31b. The sensuality of the Egyptians is frequently referred to in Jewish literature; comp. Sifra Kedoshim (end); Yerushalmi Sotah I (p. 17a); WR 23. 7 and 25. 7; Zohar I, 117a. On Sarah's beauty and its relation to that of Eve, see vol. I, p. 60. and the note appertaining thereto, as well as note 78.

<sup>69</sup> BR 40. 15; Tan. B. I, 66; Tan. Lek 5.

<sup>70</sup> Josephus, *Antiqui*, I, 8. 1.

<sup>71</sup> Yashar Lek, 31b.

<sup>72</sup> Tan. Lek 5; Tan. B. I, 66.

<sup>73</sup> Yashar Lek, 32a. Philo, *De Abrahamo*, 19, likewise mentions that Sarah prayed to God to save her from Pharaoh; the old Midrashim, too, refer to this incident; comp. BR 41. 2; Tan. B I, 66; Tan. Lek, 5. On Philo's remark that Sarah was the most beautiful of her sex, comp. above, note 68.

<sup>74</sup> PRE 26; Yashar Lek, 32a, 32b; BR 45. 1; Targum Yerushalmi Gen. 26. 1. Ephraim I, 65, says that Hagar was given to Abraham by Pharaoh; comp. Ginzberg, *Haggada by den Kirchengew.*, 108; Grünbaum, *Neue Beiträge*, 102, refers to similar statements concerning Hagar in Mohammedan writings. The expression שזחיה מוטב (BR) is also found in Sanhedrin 99b with reference to Timna. On Goshen comp. vol. II, pp. 122, 123, and note 325 referring to them, as well as MHG I, 208.

<sup>75</sup> BR 40. 2 and 52. 13; Tan. B. I, 66-67; Tan. Lek, 5; Zohar I, 82a. Pharaoh deserved his punishment because, though he was informed by Sarah of the true facts, he did not keep back from his sinful intentions; BR, *loc. cit.* MHG I, 207, on the other hand, maintains that the Egyptians would rather commit murder than adultery. Philo, *De Abrahamo*, 19, remarks that the Egyptians were punished for not having protested against Pharaoh's actions. Comp. below note 290 on vol. I, p. 403.

<sup>76</sup> PRE 26. In Zohar I, 82a, and III, 52, many more parallels are pointed out between Pharaoh's punishment and that of the Egyptians "in the night of redemption." The view that many important events in the history of the patriarchs and that of Israel took place during the first night of Passover is very old (comp. Index, *s. v.* "Nisan, Fifteenth of") and is a favorite topic with the paitanim; comp. *e. g.* Yannai's (about 600) piyyut ניסים רוב א in the liturgy of the Great Sabbath in the Ashkenazic Mahzor. Comp. also ShR 18. 12 and BaR 20. 12. Comp. note 170.

<sup>77</sup> Josephus, *Antiqui*, I, 8. 1. Similar statements in the writ-

ings of the Church Fathers are either directly derived from Josephus or are based on oral communications made to them by Jews; comp. Jerome and Theodoretus, Gen. 12. 17, as well as Ginzberg, *Haggada bei den Kirchenv.*, 100.

<sup>78</sup> Seder 'Olam I; Jub. 13. 11. The duration of Abraham's sojourn in Egypt is given as five years; but Artapanus (Eusebius, *Praep. Evang.*, 9. 18, 420b), states that Abraham stayed twenty years in that country.

<sup>79</sup> BR 41. 3; 'Arakin 16b. This explanation of לְמִטְעִי accords with Septuagint and Vulgate, though Jerome on Gen. 13. 3 rejects it. See Ginzberg, *Haggada bei den Kirchenv.*, 101.

<sup>80</sup> Josephus, *Antiqui.*, I, 8. 2; Artapanus (see above, note 78). The Kabbalists, on the contrary, maintain that Abraham learned witchcraft from the Egyptians, as "one appreciates the benefit of light after having been in darkness". See 'Emek ha-Melek, 135c; *Maggid*, Lek 7b, and comp. note 313. In 'Abodah Zarah 14b it is stated, on the authority of an old tradition, that Abraham composed a book on the laws concerning idolatry containing four hundred chapters, while the Mishnah tractate dealing with the same subject consists only of five chapters. Sotah 46b reads: Pharaoh accompanied Abraham four steps (comp. the same phrase in Sanhedrin 96a) and for this kind act the Egyptians were the masters of Israel for four hundred years. PK 7, 65b contains a view concerning Pharaoh's relation to Sarah which differs from the one expressed in the legend given in our text. According to that source, when Sarah arrived in Egypt, she was impressed into service as a handmaid, and was made to work like "a donkey in a mill". Buber attempted to emend the text of this Midrash, but there is absolutely no need for corrections. The expression כִּירוֹנוֹ לְרִיחִים corresponds exactly to the English expression "like a horse in a mill", except that in Hebrew the donkey takes the place of the horse. Comp. also PR 17, 80c.

<sup>81</sup> Yashar Lek, 29b-31a, which was incorporated in BHM VI, 121-123. A slightly different version of this legend was published from a MS. (R. Joseph Kimhi's commentary on the Pentateuch is given as its source) by Berliner (Hoffmann—*Festschrift*, 283-285), who was evidently unaware that he was dealing with a well-known legend. Kaufmann, *R.E.J.*, XVI, 144-146, and Lévi, *ibid.*, XVIII, 130-131, called attention to the fact that al-Biruni (Sacháu's edition, p. 280) has the same story, except that Haman takes the place of Rakyon, and in all likelihood this legend is of Arabic origin. Beer, *Leben Abra-*

*hams*, note 223, connects Rakyon with Naracho, the name ascribed to this Pharaoh by Malala, *Chronologia*, 71; but this identification seems rather far-fetched. On other names supposed to have been borne by this Pharaoh, comp. Beer, *loc. cit.* See further Theophilus 2. 31, who, in agreement with Yashar, maintains that this ruler of Egypt was the first to assume the title of Pharaoh. Comp. also note 430 on vol. II, p. 169.

<sup>82</sup> BR 41. 5-16; PR 3, 9b-10a; Yerushalmi Targumim Gen. 13. 7; Yashar Lek, 32b. The claim of the Canaanites to Palestine is here recognized as legitimate; see a different view in vol. I, p. 220, and comp. also p. 173. Shu'aib Lek, 7a, quotes the following passage from Yerushalmi (not found in our edition): "Strangers profit when brothers quarrel"; the quarrel between Abraham and Lot (not only between their servants alone; comp. *loc. cit.*) caused the Holy Land to remain in the possession of strangers. Comp. also Astruc, *Midreshe ha-Torah* 15, who used a similar source to that of Shu'aib. On Lot comp. note 171; on the comparison of Israel to sand see BaR 2. 13. The four kingdoms, *i. e.*, Assyria-Babylon, Media-Persia, Macedonia-Greece, Rome, are very often spoken of by the Rabbis; comp. the very instructive study by Senior Sachs, *Shire ha-Shirim*, 70, *seq.*, and Epstein, *Mi-Kadmoniyyot*, 31-35. Later the fourth kingdom was a designation of Edom and Ishmael, *i. e.*, Christianity and Islam; comp. Tehillim 6. 59. The four diasporas among the eight kingdoms are: 1) Babylon-Chaldea, 2) Media-Persia, 3) Macedonia-Greece, 4) Edom (= Rome) and Ishmael (= Arabia). Differently in Mekilta RS 118 (not tannaitic); BR 85. 8 (six kingdoms); Hallel 101; Midrash Aggada I, 20 and 155; *Hadar* 37a, where six, seven, and eight kingdoms are referred to.

<sup>83</sup> Zohar I, 108a; very likely dependent on an earlier source.

<sup>84</sup> MHG I, 215-216; very likely the same source made use of in Zohar I, 86, but not identical with BR 41. 3, where it is said that the war against Abraham was in truth a war against God. Comp. PR, 196b; Kallah 3, 7a, and Beer, *Leben Abrahams*, note 251.

<sup>85</sup> Yashar Noah, 29a, and Lek, 33a. The identification of Amraphael with Nimrod is already found in old sources; comp. 'Erubin 53a; BR 41. 1; Targum Yerushalmi Gen. 14. 1; Tan. Lek 6; PR 33, 151a. These passages give several etymologies of the name Amraphel. On Amraphel = Nimrod, see also note 82 on vol. I, p. 178. Augustine, *Civit. Dei*, 16. 17, identifies Amraphel with Ninus who is supposed to have been the grandson of Nimrod; comp. Yerahmeel 32. 3 and Gaṣṣar, *ad loc.*

<sup>86</sup> Bahya Gen. 14. 5, whose remarks are based on lost midrashic sources. On the meaning of the proper names occurring in Gen. 14, and the attempt of Jewish and Christian authors to identify them, see BR 41. 6; Kallah 3. 7a; Beer, *Leben Abrahams*, 248; Ginzberg, *Haggada bei den Kirchenv.*, 101-103.

<sup>87</sup> BR 41. 5-7; Targum Yerushalmi Gen. 14. 2, *seq.*; Jerome, *Quaestiones*, 14. 2-7.

<sup>88</sup> MHG I, 216; Zohar I, 86b; comp. note 84. The statement in Zohar that Lot looked like Abraham is very likely based on BR 14. 6.

<sup>89</sup> BR. 41. 7-8; DR. 1. 25; Targum Yerushalmi Gen. 14.13.

<sup>90</sup> PRE 27, where it is also stated that "the escaped" in Ezekiel 33. 21 likewise refers to the archangel Michael. Another legend identifies "the escaped", who brought Abraham the report about Lot's capture, with Og. Comp. vol. III, p. 343. On the designation of Abraham as "the Hebrew", comp. BR 41.8; Lekah 2, 144; comp. also note 31 on vol. I, p. 181.

<sup>91</sup> Tan. B. I, 72; Tan. Lek 13; Aggadat Bereshit 13. 28. Josephus, *Antiqui.*, I, 10. 1, says: Abraham undertook the war on account of his friendship with his neighbors, the inhabitants of Sodom, and in behalf of Lot. Comp. Zohar I, 112b.

<sup>92</sup> Nedarim 32a and BR 42. 2—two originally different explanations of חַנִּיכֵי (Gen. 14. 14). PRE 27 says: His three disciples (=Aner, Eshkol, and Mamre).

<sup>93</sup> Tan. B I, 73; Tan. Lek 13; Aggadat Bereshit 13. 29; BR 42. 2; Nedarim 32a; Yelammedenu in supplement to Yalkut (=BHM VI, 79); PK 8, 70a (below); PR 18, 91b; WR 28. 4; BaR 18. 21; PRE 27; Targum Yerushalmi. Gen. 14. 14; Tehillim 110, 466; ER 5. 28. Philo, *De Abrahamo*, 39, speaks of the three hundred warriors, all of whom were born in the house of Abraham (he had no other servants than these) and with whom, despite their small number, he undertook the campaign, trusting that God would help him. Following the method of the Jewish legend which, on the basis of the numerical value of the name Eliezer (אֱלִיעֶזֶר=318), identifies the three hundred and eighteen with this pious servant of Abraham, the Christian legend maintains that in these warriors there is an allusion to Jesus, the numerical value of whose name is three hundred and eighteen; see Barnabas, 9. 8, and Clemens, *Stromata*, 6. 11.

<sup>94</sup> PRE 17; comp. above, note 76.

<sup>95</sup> BR 42. 3; Tehillim 110, 466. Jewish tradition takes Ps. 110



to refer to Abraham (another view makes it refer to Hezekiah; comp. note 69 on vol. IV, p. 272), and hence the statement that Abraham, in order to be protected, was placed at the right hand of God (Tan. B. I, 74; Aggadat Bereshit 13. 29; Sanhedrin 108b; Tan. Lek 13).

<sup>96</sup> Sanhedrin 108b; Ta'anit 21a; BR 42. 3; Tan. B. I, 76; Tan. Lek 15; comp. vol. IV, p. 203.

<sup>97</sup> Tan. B. I, 73-74. Tan. Lek 13; BR 42. 3; Sanhedrin 96a; PRE 27; Aggadat Bereshit 13. 29; Soferim 20; PR, 196b. The Testament of Abraham also presupposes that Abraham was a giant; comp. the extract from this source on vol. I, p. 304.

<sup>98</sup> BR 42. 3; Shabbat 196b (God moved, for Abraham's sake, the star Jupiter from the west to the east); Sanhedrin 96a (on the angel Lailah, comp. note 20 on vol. I, p. 59); ER 5. 28. WR 1. 4 seems to be of the opinion that Abraham's victory was due to the direct intervention of God and not to the help of the angels. Zohar I, 86a, is very likely based on WR. Reminiscences of long-forgotten legends and myths which bring Abraham in some relation with the sun, are to be found in Tehillim 1. 5; PR 20, 96b and Baba Batra 16b.

<sup>99</sup> BR 42. 4-5; comp. ER 25. 128; Tan. B. I, 74, and see also note 46.

<sup>100</sup> Targum Yerushalmi Gen. 14. 20; BR 43. 9; Tan. B. I 74; Tan. Lek 13. Abraham was the first to declare God "the possessor of heaven and earth"; comp. Berakot 7a and EZ 25, 45.

<sup>101</sup> BR 43. 9; Lekah I, 66, and II, 279, with the additional remark that this law, promulgated by Abraham and Moses, had become obsolete in later times, and was restored in its full force by David; comp. I Sam. 30. 22-25.

<sup>102</sup> Tan. B. I, 75, 76; Tan. Lek 15. The identity of Melchizedek with Shem is presupposed in many Jewish and Christian sources; comp. Nedarim 32b (in a statement by a teacher who flourished about 100); BR 26. 4 and the parallel passages given by Theodor; Tehillim 76, 340; PRE 8 and 27; Yelammedenu quoted in Yalkut Nahum (here שלם = perfect, free from any blemish); Midrash Aggada I, 23 (read שָׁעֲשָׂאוּ כֹהֵן "he appointed him priest"); Targum Yerushalmi, Gen. 14. 18. Zohar Hadash Noah, 29b (from there in Gabai's 'Abodat ha-Kodesh II, 31, where the source is not given. On the study of Abraham in the Academy of Shem-Melchizedek mentioned in this source, comp. note 13), tells us that Shem received the name Melchizedek from God when He appointed him priest; comp. note 51 on vol. I, 166. The Church Fathers Jerome, *Quaestiones*, 14. 18,

## The Legends of the Jews

Ephraim I, 61 E and 79D as, well as Epiphanius, *Haer.*, 55. 6, speak of Shem-Melchizedek. The last-mentioned Church Father attributes this identification to the Samaritans, whereas "the Jews declare Melchizedek to have been the son of a prostitute." Later Christian authors somewhat modified the rabbinic view concerning Melchizedek and considered him a descendant of Shem. This latter view is shared by Mohammedan writers. Comp. Beer, *Leben Abrahams*, note 300; Ginzberg, *Haggada bei den Kirchenv.*, 103-105; Friedlaender, *Chad-hir Legende*, 258, *seq.* On the gnostic legends concerning Melchizedek, see the gnostic fragment published by Murfil-Charles as supplement to their edition of the Slavonic Enoch, 85-93. That the mysterious personality of Melchizedek occupied the fancy of the people at very early times may be seen from the 12 Testaments which, in its pre-Christian parts (Levi 17. 7), speaks of him in the highest terms of praise. The identity of Salem, Melchizedek's city, with Jerusalem, presupposed in the rabbinic sources enumerated above, is known also to Josephus, *Wars*, VI, 10; Theophilus 2. 3 (his dependence on Josephus may be proved by the phrase "the first priest" which he copied from Josephus); Clemens, *Stromata*, 1. 5; Jerome, *Epistola ad Evargium*, 73. Comp. also Thomsen, *Loci Sancti* I, 10. On the etymological explanation of the name Jerusalem and Salem see note 253. The Samaritans identify Salem with Shechem; comp. Eupolemus 9. 17 (p. 419) and Freudenthal, *Hellenistische Studien*, I, pp. 85 and 87. The remark in ARN 2. 2, that Shem-Melchizedek was born with the sign of the Abrahamic covenant on him is directed against the Christian polemics concerning circumcision. Comp. Note 318.

<sup>103</sup> BR 43. 6, 7, and the parallel passages given by Theodor; BaR 4. 8.

<sup>104</sup> Nedarim 32b; WR 25. 6. This Haggadah is very likely directed against the Christians who took Melchizedek to be a type of Jesus, the everlasting priest; comp. Hebrews 7. 1-3 and especially Justin Martyr, *Dialogue*, 33 and 96.

<sup>105</sup> ER 25, 128.

<sup>106</sup> Sotah 17a; BR 43. 9; Tan. B. I, 75; Tan. Lek 13. The Midrashim mentioned differ from the Talmud with regard to the nature of the two commandments which Israel received as a reward for Abraham's good deed. Sotah, *loc. cit.*; Hullin 88b; BaR 4. 8 mention two commandments which Israel received as a reward for Abraham's

humility in saying to God: "And I am but dust and ashes." Comp. Gen. 18. 27.

<sup>107</sup> BR 44. 4-5; comp. Yelammedenu in supplement to Yalkut (=BHM, VI, 79) and note 102. According to another view given in BR, God revealed Himself to Abraham (the first revelation ever granted to a human being; comp. MHG I, 324) long after the war against the kings. The Midrashim (BR, *loc. cit.*; Yelammedenu, *loc. cit.*; MHG, I, 225, 226) find in the words "thy reward is very great" (Gen. 15. 1) a hint of the reward which Abraham and his descendants are to receive in the world to come.

<sup>108</sup> BR 44. 8-12; Tehillim 2, 10, and 21, 179; 2 ARN 43, 122; Aggadat Shir 1. 5. The statement that God commanded Abraham not to rely on astrology is very frequently met with in rabbinic literature. Comp. Shabbat 150a; Nedarim 32a; Tan. Shofetim 11; PR 43, 179a; ShR 38. 6; BaR 2. 12; Aggadat Bereshit 28, 58, and 37, 73; see further Yoma 88b and Baba Batra 16a, as well as Philo, *Abraham*, 15 (in paraphrasing Gen. 15. 5 the expression צַדִּיק צַדִּיקוֹתָא found in the rabbinic sources mentioned above is employed here almost literally), *De Nobilitate*, 5 and *Quis rer. divin. haeres sit*, 20; Jub. 12. 16. PR 11, 45, and BaR 2. 14 explain Gen. 15. 5 in a different manner from that of the sources referred to, and in contrast to BR it is stated in DR 2. 7 that Abraham prayed to God to give him children.

<sup>109</sup> Targum Yerushalmi Gen. 15. 6; Mekilta Beshallah 6, 33b; Tan. Beshallah 10; Tan. B. II, 59; Shir 4. 8. Comp. next note. Against the Christian doctrine of justification by faith alone (Romans 4. 3) Zohar III, 148a, and Nahmanides on Gen. 15. 6 explain this verse as follows: And Abraham considered it as an act of grace.

<sup>110</sup> BR 44. 14. Owing to the uncertainty of the meaning of the word מַשְׁלַח, Gen. 15. 9 (comp. *R.E.J.*, 31, 176, and *Monatsschrift*, 41, 109) the Targumim and Midrashim differ as to the number of sacrifices brought on this occasion by Abraham; comp. Onkelos and Targum Yerushalmi, *ad loc.*, as well as BR, *loc. cit.*; WR 3. 3; PRE 28. Opinions also differ with regard to the question whether or not lack of trust in God is implied in Abraham's words: "Whereby shall I know that I shall inherit it?" (Gen. 15. 8). The Church Fathers agree with the view favorable to Abraham given in our text in accordance with BR. Comp. Origen and Theodoretus, *ad loc.*, as well as Ephraim I, 64B-C, and Augustine, *Civitas Dei*, 16. 24. The Church Fathers are perhaps directly dependent on Philo, *Quis rer. divin. haeres*

sit, 20, who remarks that he—Abraham—trusted God, but wished to know in what manner the promise made to him would be fulfilled. A somewhat different view is expressed by Philo in his *Quaestiones*, Gen. 2. 2. The view prevalent among the Rabbis is that Abraham is greatly to be blamed for his lack of trust in God. They even go further and assert that Israel's servitude in Egypt is the punishment for Abraham's sinful words; comp. Nedarim 32a; Tan. B. III, 79; Tan. Kedoshim 13; ER 13, 65, and EZ 2, 174; ShR 5. 22 and 30. 16; WR 11. 5; PRE 48; PR 47, 190a; Yelammedenu in Yalkut II, 819, on Psalm 78. Jerome, Is. 43. 27, accepts this view which, as may be seen from Yelammedenu, was known to the Tannaim. Shu'aib, Wa-Yesheb, 21, quotes an unknown Midrash to the effect that Abraham committed three sins: He emigrated from Palestine at the time of the famine (comp. note 66); he exposed Sarah to a great moral danger by stating that she was his sister; he further showed lack of trust in God by saying: "Whereby shall I know, etc." Comp. also vol. II, pp. 226 and 338, as well as vol. III, pp. 19, 89, and 480.

<sup>111</sup> Megillah 31b; Ta'anit 27b; WR 7. 3; PK 6, 60b; somewhat different in Berakot 17a, where fasts take the place of sacrifices; Tan. Zaw 14 (additions); Yelammedenu in Yalkut II, 382 on Ezekiel 43 (almost identical with Tan. *loc. cit.*) and 321 on Jeremiah 33. Al-Barceloni, 159, quotes the following passage from the Midrash: God said to Abraham: Make thy children occupy themselves with the study of the Torah which will give them light in this world and in the world to come. Comp. also Zohar I, 100a. All these passages are a defence of Judaism against the attacks of the Christian polemical writers who maintain that after the destruction of the temple, Israel is no longer in possession of the means of atonement. The judge, who, in a controversy with a Jewish scholar, insisted that after the destruction of the temple Israel's sins can no longer be forgiven (second Yelammedenu passage) was undoubtedly a Christian. Comp. also Justin Martyr, *Dialogue*, 97, to whose polemics the remark in BaR 14. 4 (prayers take the place of sacrifice) seems to be a direct answer. See further Menahot 110a and PK 15, according to the reading of Makiri Malachi 1. II. Rabban Johanan b. Zaccai, without any polemical or apologetical bias, remarks: We have something that secures atonement as much as the temple service, and this is loving-kindness (ARN 4, 21; *Ma'as. G.*, 133).

<sup>112</sup> BR 44. 14-22; PRE 28 (on the text comp. Tosafot Gen. 15. 10 *seq.*); Targum Yerushalmi Gen., *loc. cit.* In John 8. 56

and Acts 7. 7 it is presupposed that the course of Israel's history was revealed to Abraham on this occasion. Comp. also note 114.

<sup>113</sup> MHG I, 240, very likely from a version of PRE different from ours. Sa'adya Gaon was acquainted with a source similar to or identical with the one quoted in MHG; comp. Ginzberg's remarks in Geiger's *Kebuzat Maamarim* (edited by Poznanski), 414, and Davidson, *Saadia's Polemic against Hiwi*, 64. The reviving of animals is also mentioned in another Abraham legend (Testament of Abraham A 6) and in Christian legends, comp. *e. g.* *Acts of Pilate* 2 (MS. C.). In midrashic fashion this legend in MHG is derived from וַיִּשָּׁב (Gen. 15. 11), which is read as if its object were פְּנוּרִים, hence "and he made them fly." Another explanation of this word is "and he made them repent"; comp. BR, *loc. cit.*, 15, and Ephraim I, 64 B-C.

<sup>114</sup> BR 44. 21 and 49. 2; Mekilta ba-Hodesh 9, 71b; ShR 51.7; Tan. B. II, 130; Tan. Pekude 5 and 8; PK 5, 42b; PR 15, 67a; Tehilim 38, 254, and 52, 286; Targumim Yerushalmi Gen. 15. 17; Midrash Tannaim 84; Zohar III, 299; *Hadar*, 6b; Apocalypse of Baruch 4. 4, God showed Abraham the paradise at night between the pieces of the slain animals. 4 Ezra 3. 15 says: Thou revealedst to him—Abraham—the end of the times secretly by night; comp. note 112. On the explanation of the "smoking furnace" as Gehenna comp. Revelation 9. 2; 4 Ezra 7. 3; 12 Testaments, Joseph 2. 2 (but, perhaps, a false rendering of Hebrew אִשְׁתּוֹ בַעֲרָה "a foolish woman" as אִשׁ בַּעֲרָה "burning fire"); Kiddushin 40a and 81b. Philo, *Quaestiones*, Gen. 3. 15, sees in the smoking furnace the heavenly fire which came down to consume the sacrifices. In agreement with the Rabbis Theodoretus, *ad loc.*, considers the flaming torch an allusion to the revelation on Sinai. The most detailed description of the vision at the "covenant between the pieces" is that of the Apocalypse of Abraham, the main part of which (11-32) is a Midrash on Gen. 15. 9-14, with pronounced gnostic features. The archangel Jael (= יהוֹאֵל, the chief of the Seraphim in Masseket Azilut 21) leads Abraham to the highest heaven and shows him the glory of God reigning there. Clad in the garment of glory (comp. note 93 on vol. I, p. 80), Abraham becomes like "one of the glorified beings and takes part in the song of praise chanted by them in heaven to God." After Abraham has been shown the heavens and all that they contain, the angel Jael points out to him, from the heights of the heavens, the stars and the entire earth (similarly BR 44. 12 and parallel passages given by Theodor) with all that it contains, the abyss with its tortures (that is Gehenna),

paradise with the joys of the pious, as well as the leviathan and its abode. At the same time the angel reveals to Abraham the course of human history in the present aeon (comp. BR 44. 22, where two views are given; according to one, God showed him only this world, while according to the other also the world to come was shown to him; comp. Ginzberg, *Journal of Bibl. Soc.*, 1922 p. 133) from the fall of Adam to the advent of the Messiah. Peculiar to this book is the interpretation that the smoking furnace refers to Azazel=Satan, who attempted to lead Abraham astray. From chapter 12 we infer that this interpretation is partly based on the explanation that וַיָּ (Gen. 15. 11) means "counsellor" (=seducer), and accordingly, it may be safely assumed that this pseudepigraph is of Semitic—Hebrew or Aramaic—origin. Comp. Ginzberg in *Jewish Encyclopedia*, s.v. *Abraham, Apocalypse of*. On the 400 years of the Egyptian servitude, comp. II, p. 318, and note 124 referring to it. On Terah comp. BR 39. 7 (he died as a sinner), 30. 4, and 38. 12; Tan. B. II, 9; Tan. Shemot 18; ShR 2. 6; Ruth R. (end); Zohar I, 77b and 78b; Midrash Aggada 2. 6; Bahya on Gen. 11. 32; see further notes 45, 47, and 54, as well as vol. II, p. 314; vol. IV, pp. 264 and 281. On Ishmael, comp. sources referred to in connection with Terah, and further 2 ARN 27, 54; Baba Batra 16b; ER 13, 65 (Friedmann's explanation of this passage is faulty, as may be seen from EZ 2, 174, which passage makes it quite clear as to what is meant by the honor shown by Ishmael to his father); comp. also Hashkem, 3a-4a, where, in contrast to the views of the older sources (comp. Schechter on ARN, *ad loc.*), it is maintained that pious children sometimes save their wicked parents from Gehenna.

<sup>115</sup> According to Seder 'Olam and BR 39. 7 (see the parallel passages given by Ratner and Theodor), God made this covenant with Abraham when the latter was seventy years old. He then returned from Palestine to Haran, where he remained for five years until he settled permanently in the Holy Land. The war with the kings took place in the year when he returned to Palestine, and ten years later he married Hagar. The Apocalypse of Abraham is also of the opinion that the "covenant between the pieces" took place at the very beginning of Abraham's career, when he separated himself from his kinsfolk. Nedarim 32a, BR 44. 5, and in many other sources (comp. those referred to in note 102) give a different view, according to which this covenant took place after the war against the kings; this latter opinion, based on the order in which the events are narrated in the Bible, is also shared by Jub. 13. 17-14. 1. The covenant took place

on the first night of Passover; see PRE 28; *Panim Aherim*, 74; PR, 196b (Friedmann's explanation, *ad loc.*, is untenable, as the parallel passages, just quoted, show); but according to Jub. 14. 1, it was on the new moon of the third month, *i. e.* Siwan, the month in which the revelation at Sinai occurred. Comp. note 76.

<sup>116</sup> Yebamot, Tosefta 8. 4; Yerushalmi 6, 7c, and Babli 64a; BR 45. 2-3. The Haggadah assigns a number of causes for "the sterility of the mothers." The most favored explanation is that God in His love tried the pious fathers, in order that they, in their suffering, should pray to Him for help. Comp. BR 45. 4; Shir 2. 14; Tan. Toledot 9 and Wa-Yeze 7; Yebamot 64a; ER 18, 99. In later mysticism the doctrine that God "desires" the prayers of the pious plays an important part; this conception, however, is very old; comp. Hullin 60b. According to ER, *loc. cit.*, Abraham and Sarah were married for 75 years before the birth of Isaac; comp. also the preceding note.

<sup>117</sup> MHG I, 241, 242. Here also we have the statement that a childless woman is able to tell whether she or her husband is the cause of sterility, and accordingly Sarah knew that Abraham would beget children with another wife. In BR 45. 2 the sentence 'קבוע וכו' was entirely misunderstood and therefore corrupted in the editions and MSS.; it is to be translated: I know that it is my fault that we have no issue and not as they say: She—the childless woman—needs only a cup of *meon* (meum athamaticum) to be cured. קבוע or perhaps קובע is the masculine of biblical קבעה; comp. the phrase כוס של עקרים very often found in rabbinic literature. That *meon* is a cure for barrenness does not seem to be known to any other source. According to BR 25. 1, Sarah's barrenness was due to pathological defects—she had no womb.

<sup>118</sup> BR 45. 6; Targum Yerushalmi Gen. 16. 3.

<sup>119</sup> BR 45. 2; Yashar Lek, 34a; Yerushalmi Targumim Gen. 16. 3. On Hagar, the daughter of Pharaoh, comp. above, note 74. The statement of Targum Yerushalmi that Nimrod was the father of this Pharaoh is not found elsewhere, and, on account of its strangeness, 2 Targum Yerushalmi saw it advisable to modify it. We ought, perhaps, to read ולבר or ולעבר, *i. e.*, Eliezer who is said to have been a slave (son?) of Nimrod; comp. above, note 41. On the piety of Hagar see also BR 61. 4 and Philo, *De Abrahamo*, 42.

<sup>120</sup> BR 45. 2-4; Yashar Lek, 34a. Philo, *De Abrahamo*, 43, quotes the view of "thorough exegetes", according to which Abraham ab-

stained from having any conjugal relations with Hagar as soon as she became pregnant; this was due to his natural abstemiousness and to his respect for Sarah. The statement מביאה הראשונה עיברה that Hagar became pregnant on the bridal night (BR 45. 4), very likely implies this view. Comp. also vol. I, p. 298, where it is stated that Abraham remarried Hagar after Sarah's death. Comp. MHG. I, 244.

<sup>121</sup> Yerushalmi Targumim Gen. 16. 5 (comp. note 119); a different view is given in Yashar Lek, 34, according to which Sarah blamed Abraham for not having specified, when praying to God for children, that the children should be the offspring of his marriage with her. Had the prayer been formulated in this manner, God would have granted it.

<sup>122</sup> BR 45. 5-8. On the expression דליים ובנריות employed here, comp. 'Erubin 27b and parallel passages on margin, as well as Kid-dushin 22b. According to these sources, only slaves attend on a person in the bath-room, and Sarah, by making Hagar attend on her while bathing, wanted to show her that she was still a bondwoman; comp. also Mishle 26. 99. Opinions differ as to the number of angels that appeared to Hagar; comp. BR 45. 7 (five or four) and 'Arakin 17b (only three). On the pious who received their names from God, comp. Mekilta Bo 16, 19; BR, *loc. cit.*; PRE 32; Pirke Rabbenu ha-Kadosh, ed. Grünhut 35; Tan. B. I, 21, 22; Yerushalmi Berakot, I, 4a. The name of Isaac was never changed, because it had been given by God, whereas the names of his father and son (Jacob-Israel) were changed. With regard to Abraham, it is maintained that it is unlawful to call him by his original name, Abram; comp. Berakot, *loc. cit.*, and Babli 12b; another view is offered by Philo, *De Mut. Nomin.*, 13, 14. The Haggadah has a good deal to tell us about the meaning of the names Abram and Abraham and about the reason for changing the former into the latter. Abram means "The father of Aram", whereas Abraham denotes "The father of nations", *i. e.*, Ab (אב) = father, and Ham (המון) = nations, while א is disregarded) = "nations". Comp. Berakot, Tosefta 1. 13, and Babli 13a; Shabbat 105a (each letter of the name Abram is explained); BR 46. 7. Many explanations of the change of the names Abram and Sarai are given by Philo, *De Abrahamo*, 18; *De Mut. Nom.*, 8, 9; *Cherubim*, 2; *De Gigant.* 14, 15; *Quaestiones*, Gen., *ad loc.* The change of names brought about a change in the fortunes of Abraham and Sarah: it had been decreed that Abram should have no offspring, but this did not apply to Abraham. Comp. Rosh ha-Shanah 16b (this is explained rati-



alistically by Maimonides, *Yad, Teshubah*, 2. 4); BR 4. 10 and the numerous parallel passages given by Theodor. A different view is found in Mekilta Yitro I, 57a, and Mekilta RS, 85, where it is stated that the lengthening of a name is a mark of honor, while its shortening is a sign of degradation. Abraham, "the father of nations", is really the father of proselytes; comp. Matthew 3. 9; Yerushalmi Bikkurim I, 64a; see also Ginzberg, *Unbekannte Sekte*, note 3 on page 124. The numerical value of the word Abraham (אַבְרָהָם=248) corresponds to the number of the members of the human body; by being circumcised he became master of his entire body, and from that time on he was called Abraham (Nedarim 32b).

<sup>123</sup> BR 46. 3; Tan. B. I, 80; Tan. Lek 19.

<sup>124</sup> BR 41 [42]. 8; Tan. Wa-Yera 3; Aggadat Bereshit 19. 39; *Huppah Eliyyahu*, 15; comp. Ginzberg in *Hazofeh*, IV, 31. Mamre was rewarded for giving Abraham pious advice, as it was in Mamre's field that God appeared to Abraham (Gen. 18. 1). The legend sees no difficulty in the fact that Abraham consulted men concerning the fulfilling of a command given by God; but to later authorities it was incomprehensible that Abraham could for a moment hesitate in complying with a divine order, and they therefore attempted to invest this legend with a meaning which is entirely foreign to it; comp. *Hadar* and *Da'at* on Gen. 18. 1; and see also Zohar I, 98b.

<sup>125</sup> BR 22. 8 and 48. 9; PRE 28; see also Sifre D., 339.

<sup>126</sup> PRE 28. In the older sources the thirteenth or fifteenth of Nisan is the day on which Abraham's circumcision took place; comp. BR 48. 12 and the parallel passages given by Theodor, as well as Beer, *Leben Abrahams*, note 361. According to PRE, *loc. cit.* (comp. Luria, *ad loc.*), the operation was performed by Shem; but another view has it that Abraham circumcised himself with the assistance of God; comp. Tan. B. I, 80; Aggadat Bereshit 16, 35; and, as a later addition, BR 49. 2. Al-Barceloni, 58, quotes the last view from Yerushalmi (Palestinian Midrash?). According to Tan. Lek 17, the foreskin was removed by the bite of a scorpion. When giving Abraham the command of circumcision, God only hinted at the part of the body on which it should be performed; Abraham, however, on the basis of logical reasoning, drew the correct conclusion. Comp. BR 46. 4; Tan. B. 81; Tan. Lek 18, and see also Tosefta Shabbat 15. 9 and Babil 108a; WR 25. 6. Hadasi's quotation (Eshkol, No. 82, 36a), from a Midrash, concerning that point is not found in the extant midrashic literature, and is perhaps a Karaitic fabrication. Opinions differ as

to whether Abraham, along with the command of circumcision, received also that of פריעה (the uncovering of the corona) or not. Comp. BR 46. 12 and parallel sources given by Theodor; but in Yebamot 71b it is stated that פריעה was first introduced by Joshua.

<sup>127</sup> PRE 29; Targum Yerushalmi Gen. 18. 1; Tan. Wa-Yera 2; Baba Mezi'a 86b.

<sup>128</sup> Tan. B. I, 85; Tan. Wa-Yera 2; Aggadat Bereshit 19; Tan. B. I, 84.

<sup>129</sup> Baba Mezi'a 86b; BR 48. 8; Tan. B. I, 85; Tan. Wa-Yera 3; PRE 29.

<sup>130</sup> Baba Mezi'a 86b; BR 48. 8, 9. Abraham feared lest travelers should no longer make use of his hospitality because he had separated himself from the rest of the world through the sign of the covenant.

<sup>131</sup> Tan. Wa-Yera 2 and Ki-Tissa 15; Tan. B. I, 86 and 177, BR 48. 1; ShR 41. 4; Aggadat Bereshit 19. 39; Tehillim 18, 156. An allusion to this legend is to be found in the remark of Yerushalmi Rosh ha-Shanah I, 57a, (top): God said: I was the first to observe the command of standing up before an old man (Lev. 19. 32); the old man is Abraham. Comp. also PR 15, 72a. In PRE 29 it is said that as long as Abraham was uncircumcised he was unable to stand erect in the presence of the divine Glory; comp. note 43 on vol. IV, p. 146.

<sup>132</sup> Baba Mezi'a 86b; BR 50. 2; Yerushalmi Targumim Gen. 18. 2. Justin Martyr, *Dialogue*, 56, also refers to this Haggadah; comp. also Kallah 6, 13b. Josephus, *Antiqui.*, I, 11. 2, speaks of the three angels who appeared to Abraham, but he does not give their names.

<sup>133</sup> BR 48. 9; comp. vol. I, p. 270.

<sup>134</sup> Shabbat 127a. MHG I, 267, quotes the following passage from an unknown Midrash: He who receives his fellow-man kindly is regarded as though he had received the Shekinah, and accordingly in Mekilta Yitro I, 59a, we ought to read חבירו with MS, instead of חכמים of the editions. The Church Fathers quote an almost identical proverb from the Bible! Comp. Tertullian, *De Oratione*, 26.

<sup>135</sup> BR 48. 9-10; DE. 4; Philo, *De Abrahamo*, 22 and 25.

<sup>136</sup> Baba Mezi'a 86b, with the additional remark that because Abraham suspected the strangers in this manner, his descendants, the Ishmaelites (=the Arabs), as a punishment, practice this kind of

idolatry. BR 48. 9: One of the angels appeared disguised as a Saracen, the second as a Nabatean, and the third as an Arab.

<sup>137</sup> Zohar I, 102b, and thence by Sabba, Wa-Yera, 18b, without giving his source. The tamarisk of Abraham (Gen. 21. 33) came to him from paradise; see *Ba'al ha-Turim*, Gen. 9. 20. The oak (?) of Abraham formed a subject for popular fancy as early as the time of Josephus (comp. *Bell.* IV, 9. 7, and *Antiqui.* 1. 10), the belief having been prevalent that it was created at the beginning of the world. Yerahmeel 35. 5 quotes from Josippon that the oak of Abraham in the plain of Mamre existed until the reign of Theodosius, when it withered. Yet even then whoever took of its wood did not experience illness until the day of his death. Comp. also Jepp, *Jerusalem und das heilige Land*, I, 611-622, as well as *Palestine Exploration Fund* (Quarterly Statement, 1899, 39, 40).

<sup>138</sup> Baba Mezi'a 87a; Nedarim 21b; Tan. Wa-Yera 4; ARN 13, 57. In these Midrashim, as well as in BR 48. 10, it is shown in detail how God's kind acts towards Abraham's descendants corresponded exactly to Abraham's kind acts towards the three travelers. "Measure for measure" (comp. note 44 on vol. I, p. 163, and vol. II, p. 341 seq.) is God's guiding rule for reward and punishment; comp. 2 ARN 23, 47; ER 12, 59, 60, and Tosefta Sotah 4 (end).

<sup>139</sup> Targum Yerushalmi, Gen. 18. 5; comp. I, 271.

<sup>140</sup> Baba Mezi'a 86b; BR 48. 12-14; ARN 13, 57; Tan. Wa-Yera 4. Philo, *Questiones*, Gen. 4. 10, likewise dwells upon the lavish hospitality of Abraham, who, though possessing many slaves, prepared the meal himself for his guests. The old sources admit that, though Abraham observed the Torah before it had been revealed (comp. note 275), he nevertheless served meat and milk to the travelers, despite the later prohibition of this kind of food. Later, when the angels protested against the presentation of the Torah to Israel, requesting God to give it to them, (comp. vol. III, pp. 109-114, and note 248 appertaining to them) they had to admit that as Abraham's guests they partook of the forbidden food. Comp. PR 25, 128a-128b; Tehillim 8. 75. Later authorities maintain, on the contrary, that Abraham, in strict conformity to the commandments of the Torah, served first milk and then meat; comp. *Da'at* and *Sekel Tob* on Gen. 18. 8. Ziyoni, Exod. 24. 21, quotes from the Midrash a statement bearing upon this point which is not found in the extant midrashic literature; comp. also Yashar Wa-Yera, 35b.

<sup>141</sup> BR 48. 13; ARN 13, 57.

<sup>142</sup> Baba Mezi'a 87a; BR 48. 14; PRE 26; Tan. Wa-Yera 13. The defilement of the bread was caused by Sarah (comp. Gen. 18. 12) who busied herself with the kneading of the dough. Astruc (*Mid-reshe ha-Torah*, 25) quotes from an unknown Midrash the statement that instead of the fresh bread prepared by Sarah stale bread was served. On the uncomplimentary remark about the niggardliness of women, see also vol. IV, p. 242.

<sup>143</sup> Baba Mezi'a 86b; BR 48. 11 and 14 (paraphrased in MHG I, 269); Josephus, *Antiqui*, I, 11. 2; Philo, *De Abrahamo*, 23; Targum Yerushalmi, Gen. 18. 8; Justin Martyr, *Dialogue*, 57; Theodoretus, Gen. *loc. cit.*, and many other Church Fathers. Comp. Ginzberg, *Haggadah bei den Kirchenv.* 108. The old view was that angels may sometimes partake of food, and that they subsist on manna; comp. R. Akiba's explanation (Yoma 75b) of Ps. 78. 85, which agrees with the Septuagint, where לֶחֶם אֱבִירִים is rendered by ἄρτον ἀγγέλων; Tobit 12. 19 (comp. Müller, *Beiträge, ad loc.*); ER 12, 59 and the legends, vol. III, p. 142 and vol. IV, p. 147, as well as Zohar I, 102a, 104a, and 144a. Sa'adya in his *Polemic against Hiwi* 70, is very severe on those who maintain that angels partake of food. The omission of the visit of the angels is Jub. is very likely due to the strong anthropomorphic coloring of the biblical narrative in Gen. 18. 1-10. In many rabbinic passages the statement occurs that the angels subsist on the glory of the Shekinah; comp. PK 6, 57a (also with regard to Moses during his stay in heaven, 18, 173b); PR 16, 80a; Tan. Pinehas 12; BaR 21. 16. The last-mentioned source 10. 5 reads: The angels who visited Abraham partook of the food offered to them; but not the one who visited Manoah. Koran 11. 73 gives a clumsy representation of the view prevalent in Jewish sources concerning these three angels.

<sup>144</sup> MHG I, 272; *Da'at* and Ziyoni Gen. 18. 8; comp. also the extract from Testament of Abraham, given in vol. I, p. 303, where it is likewise said that a fire devoured the food; this view is very likely shared by Sa'adya in the passages quoted in the preceding note. Jud. 13. 16 probably gave rise to this view; comp. preceding note towards the end.

<sup>145</sup> BR 48. 19.

<sup>146</sup> Baba Mezi'a 87a; with reference to the dots over אֱלִי (Gen. 18. 9), comp. BR 48. 15, and the numerous parallel passages given by Theodor.

<sup>147</sup> Baba Mezi'a 86b (comp. note 132); MHG I, 274; Tan. B. I, 107; Tan. Wa-Yera 13; PR 6, 24b, and the numerous parallel pas-

sages given by Friedmann, *ad loc.* The angel's promise to return (Gen. 18. 10) refers to his presence at the 'Akedah; see Pardes 22d.

<sup>148</sup> BR 48. 16; Yerushalmi Targumim, Gen. 18. 10.

<sup>149</sup> Tan. Shofetim 18; comp. also BR 48. 17.

<sup>150</sup> BR 48. 17. These words were spoken by God Himself, and not by the angels who know not the thoughts of man; see *Sekel Tob* 27. Zohar I, 101b limits the knowledge of angels still more, and from this point of view explains the question of the angels about Sarah; comp. Gen. 198. 9. See also the sources referred to in note 146.

<sup>151</sup> MHG I, 276; a different view is given by Philo, *Quaestiones*, Gen. 4. 17: Abraham rejoiced over the good tidings (he thus renders *ויצחק*, Gen. 17. 17), whereas Sarah laughed at them because she did not believe them. As a punishment for her lack of faith in the message brought by the angels concerning the birth of Isaac, her death was caused by the message that Isaac was sacrificed by his father (comp. vol. I, p. 287); see *Hasidim*, 80. Women are disqualified from appearing in court as witnesses (Baba Kamma 1. 3; Josephus, *Antiqui.*, IV, 8. 15; Evangel of Nicodemus 7), because they are of a mendacious nature, for even one of the best of them, Sarah, attempted to tell an untruth; see Yelammedenu in supplement to Yalkut = BHM VI, 80 and MHG I, 276.

<sup>152</sup> BR 48. 18; Sifre N. 42; Yerushalmi Peah 1, 16a; Yebamot 65b; WR 9. 9; BaR 11. 7; Tan. B. III, 6. 18; Tan. Zaw 7 and Shofetim 18; *Perek ha-Shalom*.

<sup>153</sup> MHG I, 276; comp. Schechter, *ad loc.*

<sup>154</sup> BR 50. 2; Baba Mezi'a 86b; Tan. B. I, 96. An angel attends to one task only, and accordingly three angels had to be sent: Michael to bring the glad tidings of Isaac's birth, Gabriel to destroy the sinful cities, and Raphael to save Lot. Philo, *De Abrahamo*, 28, is acquainted with a similar Haggadah; comp vol. I, p. 241, and the sources referred to in note 132.

<sup>155</sup> Yashar Wa-Yera, 35b-38a; the last paragraph, concerning the riches and misery of the inhabitants of the sinful cities, reproduces the statement found in the older sources. Comp. Tosefta Sotah 3. 12; Sifre D., 43; Mekilta Shirah 2, 35b; Mekilta RS 58; Sanhedrin 109a; WR 4 and 5. 2; PK 27, 170, and 19, 187b; MHG I, 282; PRE 25. With the exception of the story about Hedor, which is probably of Arabic origin, Yashar hardly added anything new on this subject to the material contained in the older sources mentioned

above (comp. especially Sanhedrin 109a, 109b). On the wickedness of the Sodomites, see also ER 15, 74 and 21, 158; ARN 26, 106; BR 49. 5; Tan. Wa-Yera 7; Yerushalmi Sanhedrin 10, 29c (top); ShR 30. 19; Zohar I, 105b. The story about the bed of Procrustes in Yashar is directly taken from Sanhedrin, *loc. cit.* The register of the sins of the generation of the flood given in vol. I, p. 153 is mainly the same as that of the Sodomites. Attention is to be called to the fact that the expression "in the way of the Sodomites", frequently found in rabbinic literature, is employed to describe a high degree of parsimony and niggardliness; comp. *e. g.*, Pirke Abot 5. 10 and in a legal maxim, Ketubot 103a. Rather strange, therefore, is the statement (Tosefta Shabbat 7, end) that Lot settled among the Sodomites because they were cheerful and kind people. Philo, *De Abrahamo*, 27, remarks: The land of Sodom was full of innumerable crimes, particularly those which are the result of licentiousness and intemperance. On the licentiousness of the Amorites, see 12 Testaments, Judah 12. 2.

<sup>156</sup> Sanhedrin 109a, 109b; the other stories about the Sodomites, found in that passage, are given here in accordance with Yashar, see preceding note.

<sup>157</sup> Yashar Wa-Yera, 39a-39a, based on Sanhedrin 109a; BR 49. 6; PRE 25; Targum Yerushalmi, Gen. 18. 21; Midrash Aggada I, 42, 43; MHG I, 284. Bahya, Gen., *loc. cit.*, quotes from the "Midrash", the statement found in Sanhedrin, *loc. cit.*

<sup>158</sup> MHG I, 28; comp. vol. II, p. 280 and vol. IV, p. 240.

<sup>159</sup> Tan. B. I, 88-89 (here several reasons are given why God revealed to Abraham the impending destruction of the sinful cities); BR 49. 2; Tan. Wa-Yera 5; Aggadat Bereshit 21. 43. Shu'aib, Wa-Yera, 8c, quotes the following passage from an unknown Midrash: God did not punish Adam until a heavenly court consisting of seventy members had condemned him (comp. note 124 on vol. I, 97), and similarly a heavenly court consisting of sixty myriads of angels, assisted by Abraham, was to decide the case of the Sodomites. The angels marvelled at the distinction of Abraham, whose single opinion was regarded as equal in weight to that of the myriads of angels combined. God thereupon assembled an equal number of Jewish souls (sixty myriads of Jews left Egypt, and accordingly this is the standard number representing Israel), and the Sodomites were tried by equal numbers of angels and human souls. Shu'aib's quotation is derived from a kabbalistic source Zohar I, 104b-105a goes back to Tan. and BR,

*loc. cit.* On the participation of the angels in the trial of the Sodomites, comp. note 61.

<sup>160</sup> BR 39. 6 and 49. 9; PK 19, 139; here also Abraham is designated as "the merciful of the three fathers"; comp. note 61 and note 22 on vol. II, p. 256.

<sup>161</sup> Tan. B. I, 91-93; Tan. Wa-Yera 8 and Ki-Tissa 17; BR 49. 9; Aggadat Bereshit 22. 4-46. These sources give several explanations of חלילה (Gen. 18. 5); comp. also Sifre D., 311 and vol. III, p. 280.

<sup>162</sup> Targum Yerushalmi Gen. 18. 24; Rashi, Lekah, and Midrash Aggadah, Gen. *loc. cit.* (very likely depending upon an unknown midrashic source); BR 49.13, כדי כניסה, ps.-Rashi, *ad loc.*

<sup>163</sup> BR 49. 11.

<sup>164</sup> Targum Yerushalmi Gen. 18. 31, and comp. Theodor on BR 49. 12. According to a widespread Haggadah, there is no generation in the history of the world without at least thirty pious men, like Abraham, otherwise the world would be destroyed. See BR 38. 2 and 49. 3; Yerushalmi 'Abodah Zarah 2, 40c; Hullin 92a; PK 10, 88a; Tan. Wa-Yera 13 and Mikkez 6; Tehillim 5, 52 and 92, 409, below (here only three pious men); Shemuel I, 44; BaR 10. 5 (thirty-one). Shir 1. 3 speaks of the one pious person produced by the Gentiles every year. Jellinek, Introduction to BHM V., 46, compares the last-mentioned passage with Matthew 33. 15. Yoma 38b has the statement that the world exists on account of one godly person.

<sup>165</sup> BR 49. 13 (כדי כניסה) is paraphrased in Targum Yerushalmi 18. 32 by (ונבעי רחמין). On Lot comp. below, note 171.

<sup>166</sup> Tan. B. I, 92, 93; Tan. Wa-Yera 8; BR 49.14. These passages dwell upon the fact that the Shekinah did not depart from Abraham until he had finished his prayer for the sinners; comp. also ARN 32 (second version 40, 111). In BR 49. 7 and many parallel passages (see Theodor) it is stated that originally the text of Gen. 18. 22 read: "And the Lord stood before Abraham", *i.e.*, God waited for Abraham until he had accompanied his guests.

<sup>167</sup> BR 49. 6; Tan. Wa-Yera 10. Gen. 18. 21 is accordingly explained to mean: I shall give them an opportunity to repent, and I shall destroy them if they do not repent. This explanation of the biblical verse is also given by Aphraates, 293 (comp. further Clementine *Homilies*, 3.39); whereas Philo, *Quaestiones*, Gen., 15.24, remarks that with these words Scripture teaches us never to judge without a thorough

examination. Comp. a similar remark of the Rabbis in vol. I, p. 53; see further Mekilta Shirah 5, 38b-39a, and Tan. Beshallah 15.

<sup>168</sup> Tan. B. I, 93; Tan. Wa-Yera 9; vol. I, p. 153 and note 17 appertaining thereto. The punishment for certain kinds of immorality is by fire, according to Lev. 20. 14 and 21. 9. Comp. note 26 on vol. I, p. 159.

<sup>169</sup> BR 50. 1; Tan. B. I, 98.

<sup>170</sup> Tan. B. I, 93 and 98; BR 50. 3. Yelammedenu in Yalkut II, 723 on Ps. 85 reads: As the wicked commit their evil deeds in the darkness of the night, even so they receive their punishment at night. This is attested by the punishment of the Sodomites, the Egyptians, Haman, and Belshazzar. Comp. a similar remark (later, however, it was interpreted in a different manner; see above, note 76) in BaR 20. 12; BR 50. 23; Yerushalmi Rosh ha-Shanah I, 57a; PR 40, 167b; Tehillim 9. 87; MHG I, 287. In all these sources, with the exception of the first, attention is drawn to the fact that Israel is always judged by God during the day, whereas the Gentiles are tried at night. Philo, *Quaestiones*, 4. 30, agrees with the Rabbis in referring the night, or, as he accurately writes, the evening, spoken of in Gen. 19. 1, to the darkness of the judgment upon the sinners. Abrabanel, *Ma'yene ha-Yeshu'ah*, 7. 11, quotes Yelammedenu, *loc. cit.*, but very likely from Yalkut, and not independently.

<sup>171</sup> PRE 25 (לורין is an old scribal error for לוארין); MHG I, 288; BR 50. 4. The views of the various sources concerning Lot differ widely from one another. He is generally described as lascivious, ungrateful—towards Abraham—and is accused, among other things, of having been a usurer. Comp. BR 40. 7, 51. 6-10, and 52. 2; Nazir 23a; PR 3, 9b-10a, where he is called "wicked Lot"; Tan. Wa-Yera 12; Aggadat Bereshit 25. 50; Yelammedenu in Yalkut I, 785 (Mattot); Zohar I, 84a and 79a. In the last passage Abraham's kindness toward Lot is ascribed to the fact that Abraham foresaw by his prophetic gift that Lot was destined to become the ancestor—through Ruth the Moabitish woman—of David. The first Alphabet of Ben Sira, 4d, on the other hand, speaks of Lot as a "perfect and pious man". This must not be regarded, with Epstein (*Mi-Kadmoniyyot Ha-Yehudim*, 12) as ridiculing the view of the Haggadah, but as an old tradition. Comp. II Peter 2, 7; *Visio Pauli*, 27 and 49, as well as ps.-Tertullian, *Sodoma*, 41.

<sup>172</sup> BR 50. 4; Baba Mezi'a 87a; Tan. Wa-Yera 11; Origen, Gen. 19. 3; Philo, *De Abrahamo*, 22, and *Quaestiones*, Gen. 4, 33, 34. Lekah



Gen., *loc. cit.*, states that the angels came suddenly like lightning upon Lot, whereas Abraham discerned their arrival from afar.

<sup>173</sup> Tan. B. I, 98; BR 50. 6; MHG I, 289.

<sup>174</sup> BR 51. 5 and 50. 4 read: Because Lot's wife sinned in connection with salt, she became a pillar of salt.

<sup>175</sup> BR 50. 3-7; comp. note 168. The names of the judges given in BR 50. 3 are different from those in Sanhedrin 109b and Yashar. Comp. vol. I, pp. 246-247, and PRE, 25.

<sup>176</sup> Tan. Wa-Yera 12. PRE 25, on the contrary, is of the opinion that Lot was willing to expose himself and his family to any danger rather than leave his guests to their fate. Here also it is stated that the presence of the guests in the house was betrayed by a lad who saw them enter.

<sup>177</sup> BR 50. 9; PRE 25 (comp. Luria, *ad loc.*); Jerome, on Gen., 19. 14. Ephraim, I, 135, on the contrary, agrees with Josephus, *Antiqui*, I, 11 that Lot only had two betrothed daughters whose fiancés perished in Sodom; comp. vol. I, pp. 350, 351.

<sup>178</sup> BR 50. 9; MHG I, 290, 291.

<sup>179</sup> Tan. B. I, 93 and 99; BR 50. 2 and 11, as well as 51. 4 (comp. Theodor on the two last-named passages); MHG I, 290: Eighteen thousand destroying angels, under the leadership of Kemuel (comp. *Ma'ayan Hokmah*, 58), came down and destroyed the sinful cities in a moment. In numerous midrashic passages it is stated that the punishment was executed by God and His court of justice; comp. BR 51. 2 and the dozen of parallel passages given by Theodor, *ad loc.* Here also the rule is formulated that wherever the expression "יְהוָה מֵעַל הַלֹּד" "from the Lord" is employed in the Bible it refers to God and His court of justice. Sifre Z. 51, 52, on the other hand, explicitly states that God Himself executed punishment upon the generation of the deluge, the builders of the tower of Babel, the inhabitants of the sinful cities, the Egyptians, the Amorites, and Sennacherib. Philo, partly in agreement with the first view, maintains that the punishment of the Sodomites did not come directly from God. On this point, comp. vol. I, p. 5 and note 9 appertaining thereto. The punishment to be executed on the fourth kingdom (=Rome) will be identical with the one inflicted on Sodom; Yelammedenu in Yalkut II, 440, on Is. 34; Tan. B. II, 30.

<sup>180</sup> PRE 25, which has been incorporated in Yashar Wa-Yera, 39 (in these passages Lot's wife is called עֲדֵיתָּ Idit?). Luke 17.32 (the following verse is found verbatim, Tamid 32a) seems also to assume that Lot's wife was troubled about her relatives, and Clemens Alexandrinus,

*Exhortatio*, 94, states this view quite explicitly. Philo, *De Abrahamo*, 27, and 2 *Moses*, 10; Josephus, *Antiqui.*, I, 11. 4, and *Wars*, IV, 8. 4; Wisdom 10. 6, 7; Irenaeus *Haer.* IV, 31; ps.—Tertullian, *Sodoma*, 160-170 (the Church Fathers very likely derived their information on this point from oral communications made to them by Jews) also mention the fact that one might still see to-day the pillar of salt into which Lot's wife turned. Comp. also Berakot 54a and 54b (a tannaitic source) on the benediction to be pronounced on seeing Lot's wife (Maimonides in his *Yad* ignores this statement); see also Midrash Esther in Yalkut I, 256, end. Salt must not be used in performing certain religious ceremonies, since it was the cause of death in the case of Lot's wife; comp. 'Aruk, s. v. מ; Way-Ye-kullu 16b.

<sup>181</sup> BR 50. 11; PR 3, 10a; Aggadat Bereshit 25, 50.

<sup>182</sup> Shabbat 10a. Like the other sinful cities, Zoar was also destroyed when the measure of its wickedness became full; *Sekel Tob* 1. 38. Here also on the authority of an old source, etymological explanations of the names of the sinful cities are given.

<sup>183</sup> BR 50. 12.

<sup>184</sup> Mishnah Sanhedrin 10. 3 (according to one view, they were destroyed for ever, and their inhabitants will therefore receive neither reward nor punishment on the day of judgment); comp. Ginzberg, *Mabbul shel Esh* 17; Sanhedrin 10; Babli 109a; Yerushalmi 10, 29c; Tosefta 13. 8; ARN 36, 106, and 12, 52; WR 4. 1. Comp. also Matthew 10. 15 and 11. 24. Comp. further notes 44, 90 on vol. p. 163, 180 respectively. For the restoration of the sinful cities see Tan. B. 1, 99, as well as Tosefta Sukkah 3. 9, where the "healing" of the sea of Sodom is spoken of. 4 Ezra 5. 6 seems to allude to this legend. Hippolytus, *Haer.*, 2. 175, mentions the salutary quality of the waters of the sea of Sodom. This idea is very likely connected with the legend about Miriam's well which is supposed to be hidden in the sea; see vol. III, p. 54. Shabbat 67a, on the contrary, speaks of the destroying angels "dwelling at Sodom", that is, hovering over the sea of Sodom. Comp., however, Rashi, *ad. loc.* The poisonous quality of the "salt of Sodom" is often mentioned in the Talmud; see the lexica, s. v. מלח סדומית. On the fruit of Sodom, comp. Wisdom 10. 7; Josephus, *Wars*, 4, 8. 4; BR 51. 4. On the relation of the well of Shittim to that of Sodom comp. vol. III, p. 382, and Ginzberg, *Haggada bei den Kirchenv.*, I, 110.

<sup>185</sup> Berakot 26b. Comp. vol. IV, p. 361 and note 58 appertaining thereto.

<sup>186</sup> Ekah 1. 74.

<sup>187</sup> BR 51. 6.

<sup>188</sup> Nazir 23a; BR 51. 8, as well as vol. III, p. 6. Comp. also Theodor, *ad. loc.* The Messiah is not only a descendant of David who was the offspring of Ruth the Moabitish woman, but also the descendant of Solomon and his wife Naamah the Ammonite; Bereshit Rabbeti in *Pugio Fidei*, 714 (=Epstein 77); Maimonides' Commentary on Mishnah Sanhedrin 10. (article 12); Tan. B. I, 40; Origen, *Contra Celsum*, 4. 43.—Concerning Lot and his daughters the following is to be noted. Lot's daughters believed that the entire world, together with all the inhabitants were destroyed, and that the continuation of the human race depended on them; they therefore decided to bear children to their father; BR 51. 8; PR 42. 176a; Aggadat Bereshit 25, 51; Josephus, *Antiqui*, I, 11. 4; Philo, *Quaestiones*, 4. 56; The Church Fathers Ephraim and Jerome, *ad. loc.*; comp. Ginzberg, *Haggada bei den Kirchenv.*, 110, 111. In the cave of Adullam (Yashar, Wa-Yera, 39a) Lot's daughter found the wine with which they made their father drunk. God caused the wine to be put in that place in order that they should succeed in their plan; Mekilta Shirah 2, 36a; Sifre D., 43; BR 51. 8. Although Lot was not aware of what he was doing, he is regarded as of a lascivious nature; for if he were continent, he would have taken care not to become drunk a second time after he found out what had happened to him with his older daughter on account of his drunkenness; Nazir 23a; Sifre N., 69; BR 51. 8 and the numerous parallel passages given by Theodor, *ad. loc.* Comp. also Ginzberg, *Haggada bei den Kirchenv.*, 111-112. Lot is a warning example to men to avoid being alone with women, lest the latter should entice them to sin, as did Lot's daughters; Yelammedenu in *Rimze Haftarot*, Shelah. Hasidim, 461, and *Hadar*, 7b, quote, from unknown Midrashim, several statements concerning Lot's daughters; comp. also vol. III, pp. 351-352., 404-406.

<sup>189</sup> BR 55. 1-4; PR 43, 176b; Aggadat Bereshit 25. 49, 50. According to Yashar Wa-Yera, 39a, Lot settled "on the other side of the Jordan", that is, in the country which was later inhabited by the Moabites and Ammonites.

<sup>190</sup> Yashar Wa-Yera, 39a, 40a, partly after PR 42, 176b; comp. also below, note 202.

<sup>191</sup> Tan. B. I, 101; PRE 26; MHG I, 298: The angel Michael—or Gabriel—came with a drawn sword to kill Abimelech.

<sup>192</sup> BR 52. 6; PR 42, 176b; Tan. B. I, p. 101. The Rabbis entertained a very high opinion of Abimelech, whereas they utterly condemn Pharaoh, though the Bible tells the identical story of both these kings. Besides the sources, quoted above, which speak favorably of Abimelech, comp. MHG I, 299, where it is said that he was better than his nation; Tehillim 34, 246, and PRE 21 state that he desired to beget pious children and therefore wished to marry the pious Sarah.

<sup>193</sup> Baba Kamma 92a; PRE 26.

<sup>194</sup> BR 52. 7, 8; Tan. B. I, 101.

<sup>195</sup> MHG I, 300: We may well assume that he who is God-fearing will not sin, but he who is not God-fearing will not restrain himself from sin. Accordingly, Abraham was justified in his apprehension, though the inhabitants of Gerar were not particularly addicted to licentiousness; comp. MHG, *loc. cit.*, and the different view in Lekah, Gen. 20. 11.

<sup>196</sup> BR 52. 11; Targum Yerushalmi, Gen. 22. 13; see also Yerushalmi Megillah I, 71d.

<sup>197</sup> PRE 27, where the text is not quite complete, as may be seen from MHG I, 301.

<sup>198</sup> BR 52. 12 (comp. Theodor, *ad loc.*); Tan. B. I, p. 102; Aggadat Bereshit 25. 52-53; MHG I, 301, where several explanations are given of Gen. 20. 16 (חאמה is derived from Targum Yerushalmi, *ad loc.*); Lekah, *ad loc.*, where the words כל ונוכח are taken to be the names of a slave and a bondwoman!

<sup>199</sup> MHG I, 302, partly after Mishnah Baba Kamma 8. 7 and Tosefta 9. 29: The injured one should pray to God to forgive the injurer, even if he is not asked to do so. Thus did our father Abraham, who prayed for Abimelech; comp. DE 4; and also vol. III, p. 336.

<sup>200</sup> PRE 27; MHG I, 303.

<sup>201</sup> BR 52. 13; comp. Theodor, *ad loc.*

<sup>202</sup> PR 42, 177a: Also the other women at the court of Abimelech became pregnant and gave birth to sons. The sickness with which Abimelech and his subjects were afflicted consisted in the closing up of all apertures in the bodies of man and beast (Baba Kamma 92a; BR 52. 13; PR, *loc. cit.*, and 178a; Aggadat Bereshit 27, 57; a different view is found in Targum Yerushalmi, Gen. 20. 18), so that

no female was able to give birth to a child.—The king is to his country what the heart is to the human body, when the heart is sick the entire body suffers, even so when the king sins, all his subjects suffer; MHG I, 300, and see also the similar saying in *Ein anonymes Kommentar zum Hohen Liede*, in the *Steinschneider-Festschrift*, 55.

<sup>203</sup> PR 42, 177a-178a; Tan. B. I, 103-107; Tan. Wa-Yera 13-17; Aggadat Bereshit 28. 57-58; comp. also Baba Kamma 92b; PR 38, 165a, where attention is called to the fact that Abraham's wife was cured of her sterility as a reward for his prayer to God in behalf of Abimelech's wives who were unable to give birth to children; see also the preceding note. At the same time Sarah was rewarded for her trust in God; BR 53. 3.—Conflicting views are given in rabbinic sources concerning the date of Isaac's birth (according to Jub. 16. 13 he was born the fifteenth of Siwan), and these differences are due to the competition between the months of Nisan and Tishri for the highest place in the Jewish legend; comp. Rosh ha-Shanah 10b, 11a, and the quotation from the Midrashim given in Tosafot, *ad loc.* (caption אלה), as well as BR 43. 6 (here it is stated that Isaac was born at noon) and the numerous passages given by Theodor, *ad loc.* The attempts made to harmonize this point (the date of the visit of the angels, as well as that of another important event in the history of Abraham, depends upon this question) are in vain, as has already been noted by Shu'aib, Wa-Yera, 9b. Comp. also *Hadar*, 7c (the word בולמוד is incorrect, as no such statement occurs in the Talmud!); *Minhat Yehudah* and Tosafot, Gen. 18. 10, 11, and 21. 1.—At Isaac's birth all creation rejoiced, the earth, the heavens, the sun, the moon, etc., because had not Isaac been born, the world would have ceased to exist; Tan. Toledot 2. Philo, *De Praemiis et Poenis*, 4 and 5, likewise explains the name Isaac as "joy". The heavenly light at the birth of heroes is a favorite theme in legends; comp. vol. I, p. 188; note 1 on vol. I, p. 145, as well as note 256 on vol. I, p. 388, and vol. III, p. 264. Comp. also PK 22, 146a.

<sup>204</sup> Tan. Toledot 1; BR 53. 6 and 84. 8; Baba Mezi'a 87a; Tan. B. I, 176, which is the source of Makiri, Tehillim, 311, (61); Yelammedenu in Yalkut, II, 141, on 2 Samuel 3; MHG I, 304; Zohar I, 135a. Comp. also vol. IV, p. 118.

<sup>205</sup> BR 46. 2. Abraham received the commandment of circumcision in his old age in order that "the door should not be closed in the face of the proselytes", who otherwise might have refused to submit to the performance of this operation in advanced age; Me-

kilta Nezikin 18, 95; BR, *loc. cit.*, and parallel passages given by Theodor.

<sup>206</sup> PRE 29 (on the text, comp. Eshkol II, 131, and Luria, *ad loc.*); Lekah, *ad loc.*, I, 94 (quotation from PRE?); DR 1. 25.

<sup>207</sup> Yashar Wa-Yera, 40b; BR 53. 10; see note 210.

<sup>208</sup> Baba Mezi'a 87a; PK 22, 146b: The people said Isaac was Hagar's son; Hallel 92; BR 53. 9; Tan. B. I. 107; Tan. Toledot 3; PRE 52. The last-named passage adds that this was the second of the seven miracles, that were "visible to all", which occurred in the course of history, the first miracle being the delivery of Abraham from the fiery furnace. Lekah, *ad loc.*, I, 94, states that Sarah suckled a hundred babies on that occasion.

<sup>209</sup> BR 53. 9. Comp. the Antoninus legend in BHM VI, 131.

<sup>210</sup> BR 53. 10; DR 1. 25; Kohelet 7. 2.

<sup>211</sup> BR 53. 11; Sifre D., 31; Tosefta Sotah 6. 6. These sources quote a dissenting opinion, according to which Sarah noticed that Ishmael caught locusts and sacrificed them to the idols (that is to say, he was imitating adults, his locusts being "toy sacrifices"; comp. Shabbat 9. 6 end, but see also vol. IV, p. 154); according to another view Ishmael even committed adultery and murder. Jerome, Gen. 21. 9, is acquainted with these two haggadic views, whereas the Yerushalmi Targumim speak only of Ishmael's idolatry. Comp. PR, 193b; PRE 30 (this is the source of Yashar Wa-Yera, 40b); Aggadat Bereshit 37, 73-74, and 61, 122. The legend about Ishmael persecuting Isaac is found also in Galatians 4. 26; comp. also first Alphabet of Ben Sira 3b; DR 4. 5; Tan. Shemot 1; Josephus, *Antiqui.* 1. 12, 3.

<sup>212</sup> Philo, *Quaestiones*. Gen. 100.

<sup>213</sup> BR 53. 11.

<sup>214</sup> PRE 30. In Jub. 16. 17, *seq.*, it is stated, with reference to Gen. 22. 12, that God informed Abraham that only Isaac's progeny (that is, Jacob and his descendants) would be his true seed; comp. Nedarim 3. 11 and DR 4. 5. Jub. 17. 4 gives the following reasons for Ishmael's banishment: Sarah saw that Abraham rejoiced at Ishmael's playing and dancing, and she became jealous.

<sup>215</sup> BR 53. 13; PRE 30; ShR 3. 2; Tan. Wa-Yeze 5; Tehillim 5. 55; Targum Yerushalmi, Gen. 21. 15-16. On the unbrotherly actions of the Ishmaelites against the Jews, comp. vol. IV, p. 315. The statement that God treats man according to his deserts at each moment is very frequently found in Jewish literature; comp. (besides the sources given at the beginning of this note) Rosh

ha-Shanah 16b; Yerushalmi I, 57d; 4 Ezra 7. 132. Comp. Ginzberg, *Compte Rendu des Mélanges Is. Lewy*, 23-24 (= *R.E.J.*, 67, 137-138); see also MHG I, 309, as well as vol. II, 317. In Christian sources this statement is attributed to Jesus; comp. Ginzberg *loc. cit.*

<sup>216</sup> PRE 30; Targum Yerushalmi Gen. 21. 16; MHG I, 309; Midrash Aggada, *ad loc.*, I, 48: She worshipped a brick; this is very likely a reminiscence of the worship of the Ka'bah in Mecca; comp., however, 'Abodah Zarah 46a. According to Targum Yerushalmi, *loc. cit.*, Ishmael's fear was a punishment for his and his mother's idolatry (PRE knows only of Hagar's idolatry, and this is in agreement with the singular *עוהה* of verse 14); at the same time this fear brought them both back to God.

<sup>217</sup> BR 53. 14. The proverb "Throw the stick, etc." is very frequently quoted; comp. Theodor, *ad loc.* The sources differ as to Ishmael's age at the time of his banishment from his father's house; see BR 53. 13 and the sources given by Theodor, *ad loc.*, as well as Lekah I, 95, and Yashar Wa-Yera, 40b; comp. also note 211.

<sup>218</sup> Yashar Wa-Yera, 41a, 41b, which is very likely based on PRE 30, though our text of that Midrash does not contain this episode. The names of Ishmael's two wives are given in PRE, *loc. cit.*, as Aisha (*עִישָׁה*; *עִיפָה* and *עִדִישָׁה* are corruptions) and Fatima (*פַּטִּימָה*). This is the source for Targum Yerushalmi, Gen. 21. 21. These names were borne by Mohammed's wife and a daughter, respectively; comp. Nöldeke in Geiger's *Jüdische Zeitschrift*, V, 313, and Luria, *ad loc.*

<sup>219</sup> Yashar Wa-Yera, 42a. On the chronology of these events comp. BR 54. 6 and the parallel passages given by Theodor. Phichol, Gen. 21. 22, is taken by some to be the title of the first grandee of the land, "whose mouth directs everything" = *פִּי כָל*; comp. BR 54. 2.

<sup>220</sup> BR 54. 2-5; Shu'aib's quotation (Wa-Yera, 9a) from an unknown Midrash; comp. Toledot Yizhak, *ad loc.*, 25c. On the rising of the water comp. vol. I, pp. 293 and 354; vol. II, p. 291; vol. III, p. 53.

<sup>221</sup> MHG I, 312. On the Noachian commandments, comp. vol. I, pp. 70-71, and the notes appertaining to them.

<sup>222</sup> BR 54. 4; PK 10, 85a; Shemuel 12. 80-81; ER 7. 45. From Abraham to Moses there are seven generations, and accordingly Gen. 15. 16 can only refer to the four generations who were born in Egypt. Another explanation of the Gen. verse is that the generations of the

Amorites are meant; comp. MHG I, 238; RSBM and Bekor Shor, *ad loc.*

<sup>223</sup> Yashar Wa-Yera, 42b. In its main features this description of Abraham's hospitality follows ARN 7, 33-34, 163-164 where Job is the hero. Comp. vol. II, p. 229. It is true that ARN calls attention to the fact that Abraham by far surpassed Job, the latter having been hospitable to those who came to him, while the former went to the highways to look for strangers on whom to bestow his hospitality. A short description of Abraham's hospitality is also found in BR 54. 6; Sotah 10a; Tehillim 37, 252-253, and 110, 465; Berakot 58b; *Kad ha-Kemah, Orehim*, 5a (מדרש = ARN, *loc. cit.*, and בירושלמי = Bahir; Sabba, Toledot 27c also quotes this passage from Bahir with the introductory formula (בירושלמי); comp. note 133. Even to-day in the vernacular of the Jews of Eastern Europe a house with many doors is described as a "house with Avrohom Ovinu's (Father Abraham's) doors". Comp also the following two notes and *Neweh Shalom*, 48-49.

<sup>224</sup> Tan. Lek, 12; Tosafot (שנין) on Sotah 10b, quoting a source similar to, but not identical with, Tan. The prayer taught by Abraham (instead of צדקה we should very likely read תפלות, parallel to ברכות) is identical with the first benediction of Grace after Meals; comp. Yelammedenu in Yalkut II, 667, on Ps. 24. The great merit of the fathers consists in their lovingkindness (צדקה); comp. EZ I, 169, and Aggadat Shir 3. 22, *seq.*

<sup>225</sup> BR 54. 6. The Haggadot about Abraham's hospitality are introduced in connection with the word אשל (Gen. 21. 33), which is said to stand for אכילה food, שתיה drink and לוויה escort, provided by Abraham. In BR *loc. cit.*, the statement, based upon the literal meaning of אשל which is "tamarisk", is found that the middle bar in the midst of the boards of the tabernacle (Exod. 26. 28) was made out of this tamarisk. Comp. note 344 on vol. III, p. 164, and above, note 137.

<sup>226</sup> Zohar I, 10a-11b. On the great feast prepared by Abraham on Isaac's birthday, see vol. I, pp. 262, 263. Satan disguised as a beggar is a favorite subject of Jewish legends; comp. Kiddushin 81a; vol. II, p. 232; vol. IV, pp. 227, 228; note 34.

<sup>227</sup> Yashar Wa-Yera, 43b, where the diction is modelled after Job 1. 6, *seq.*

<sup>228</sup> Yashar Wa-Yera 43b, based on old sources; comp. BR 55. 4; Sanhedrin 89b. In the last-named passage, as well as in Yashar,



the accuser is Satan, while in BR the angels appear as accusers. In Jub. 18. 6 Mastema (=Satan) is the accuser. Comp. also the unknown Midrash in Yalkut I, 96, and Epstein in Ha-Eshkol VI, 201.

<sup>229</sup> Yashar Wa-Yera, 43b-44a, based on BR 55. 4; Sanhedrin 89b, and Tan. B. I, 108, as well as Tan. Wa-Yera 18 and Targum Yerushalmi, Gen. 22.2. Great emphasis is laid in the sources on the fact that although Isaac, at the time of the 'Akedah, was no longer a lad, but a grown-up man (different views are given as to his exact age; comp. Seder 'Olam I; BR 55. 5, and parallel passages cited by Theodor), yet he willingly submitted to his father's wish. In the 'Akedah legends two currents are to be distinguished; according to one, Abraham is the hero, while in the other Isaac is glorified. In the oldest reference to the 'Akedah in the liturgy (*Zikronot* in the Musaf for New Year) it is Isaac to whom credit is given, whereas medieval paitanim in their 'Akedahs sing Abraham's praises.

<sup>230</sup> BR 55. 7; Sanhedrin 89b; Tan. B., I, 11; Tan. Wa-Yera 22; PRE 31; PR 40, 169b and 193b. Philo, *De Abrahamo*, 32, and Josephus, *Antiqui.* I, 13. 1, likewise introduce the 'Akedah with a description of Isaac's virtues on account of which he was very dear to his father, and yet Abraham did not hesitate to bring him as a sacrifice to God as soon as he was commanded to do so.

<sup>231</sup> PR 40, 170a; A different view is given in BR 55. 7; comp. vol. I, pp. 233, 234, and the notes appertaining to them.

<sup>232</sup> Yashar Wa-Yera, 44a, 44b. Comp. the unknown Midrash in Yalkut I, 98. The old sources (comp. references in notes 15 and 758 on vol. III, 12 and 371, as well as Tan. Wa-Yera 22), dwell upon the speed with which Abraham, in his zeal to obey God's command, proceeded to carry it out.

<sup>233</sup> PRE 31; Yashar Wa-Yera, 44b; Wa-Yosha', 37; comp. below, note 236.

<sup>234</sup> Yashar Wa-Yera, 44b-45a, based on old sources; comp. Sanhedrin 89b; BR 56. 4; Tan. B. I, 114; Tan. Wa-Yera 22; PR 40, 170b; Wa-Yosha', 36-37; the unknown Midrash in Yalkut I, 98. In BR the tempter is Sammael, which is only a different name for Satan; comp. above, note 228. In BR 56. 4 it is stated that Abraham hid Isaac in a casket that Satan should not lay hands upon him and, by causing injury to his body, render him unfit for a sacrifice, which according to the law must be without blemish. MHG I, 315, gives the scene of the temptation by Satan in accordance with an unknown midrashic source; comp. also *Neweh Shalom*, 59-60. In Sanhedrin and

MHG, *loc. cit.*, it is related that Satan, having failed to sway either Abraham or Isaac, said to the former: "I have heard a voice from behind the curtain (see Index, *s. v.* "Curtain, Heavenly") proclaiming that a sheep, not Isaac, will be sacrificed." But even these words had no effect upon Abraham, who remarked: "It is the punishment of the mendacious not to be believed even when he tells the truth."

<sup>235</sup> Wa-Yosha' 36; a somewhat different version is found in Yashar Wa-Yera, 46b. Comp. also the unknown Midrash in Yalkut I, 98; and 99.

<sup>236</sup> Yashar Wa-Yera, 45a-45b, based on old sources; comp. BR 56. 2; PK 27, 170b; WR 20. 2; Kohelet 9. 7; Tan. B. I, 113, and III, 58; Tan. Wa-Yera 23 and Ahare 2; PR 40, 170b; PRE 21; Targum Yerushalmi, Gen. 22. 4; Aggadat Bereshit 31. 63. Comp. also Philo, *De Somniis* 11. Jub. 18. 4a reads: He made his companions abide at a well. According to a widespread Haggadah they remained at a mile's distance from the holy mountain; comp. Tan. B. I, 113 and 183; II, 15; III, 9 and 14, as well as the numerous parallel passages cited by Theodor to BR 53. 13; see further Berakot 63b; *Sekel* 61, and Mahzor Vitry, 110.

<sup>237</sup> BR 56. 2 and the sources referred to in the preceding note. Comp. also Theodor, *ad loc.*, and vol. II, p. 348.

<sup>238</sup> Yashar Wa-Yera, 45. The Midrashim contain numerous explanations of the word כֹּה (Gen. 22. 5); comp. BR 56. 2; Tan. B. I, 113; Targum Yerushalmi, Gen., *loc. cit.*; Aggadat Shir 1. 5 (this is the source of Al-Barceloni, 57); Tan. Wa-Yehi 7; BR 43. 8; MHG I, 320.

<sup>239</sup> BR 56. 2; Tan. B. I, 113; Tan. Wa-Yera 23; PR 40, 170b; Mo'ed Katan 18a; Ephraim I, 77B. 2 ARN 43, 118 (and from there in Midrash Aggada 1. 51), enumerates the "unconscious prophecies". John, 11. 51, and Herodotus III, 153, show that this conception is widespread.

<sup>240</sup> Yashar Wa-Yera, 45b (read בּוֹי instead of בּוֹה), based on old sources; comp. BR 56. 3-4; Tan. Wa-Yera 23; PR 40, 170b; Targum Yerushalmi Gen. 22. 8; PRE 31. The explanation of יָחַד (Gen., *loc. cit.*) in the sense of "in the same spirit", given in the above-mentioned sources, is also found in ps.-Philo, 41A. Comp. Josephus, *Antiqui.* I, 32. 1; MHG I, 321; vol. IV, p. 44.

<sup>241</sup> Yashar Wa-Yera, 45b; *Neweh Shalom*, 50; Wa-Yosha' 37; Tan. Wa-Yera 23. According to BR 56. 4; PR 40, 170; ER 28, 138; EZ 2, 174, Isaac did not participate in the erection of the altar. See also below.

<sup>242</sup> Wa-Yosha' 37-38 (text, 38, 2, is to be emended and read שְׂאֵמְרָתָם); PRE 31; *Neweh Shalom* 50-51; Yashar Wa-Yera, 46a (the expression תָּנָה כּוֹפֵר וּפְדִיּוֹן is an Arabism); Tan. Wa-Yera 23; Yerushalmi Targumim, Gen. 22. 9; see also the quotations from an unknown Midrash given in MHG I, 521-522, and Mahzor Vitry 330. The weeping of the angels is already referred to in the old sources; comp. BR 56. 6 (on חֲרָצָה. See Targum and Peshitta, Isa. 38. 7, which connect this word with Syriac חֲרִיצָא; hence the expression חֲרִיצָה הִיא בִּידֵיהֶּ becomes intelligible); PR 40, 171a; PRE 31; Aggadat Bereshit 31, 61-62; MHG I, 322 (here it is Metatron who pleads for Isaac's life, and it is he who is sent to restrain Abraham from slaying Isaac); Zohar I, 120b. Comp. also vol. IV, pp. 306 and 308, as well as 426. That the bluntness of his knife prevented Abraham from carrying out his intention, is alluded to also in BR 56. 7; Tan. Wa-Yera 23 (here Satan knocks the knife out of Abraham's hand; but, perhaps, הַמַּלְאֲךְ is to be read instead of הַשֵּׁטֶן); MHG I, 322. See also the following note. Isaac's resignation to God's will is also praised in 4 Maccabees 16. 20, whereas in 13. 12 and 14. 20 it is Abraham who is the hero of the 'Akedah. See note 299; comp. ps.-Philo 18C and note 240. The binding of Isaac by Abraham was in conformity with the law, which prescribes the binding of a sacrifice before it is slaughtered; comp. Shabbat 54a; 2 Enoch 59; Eldad 44. See also Ginzberg in *Journal for Jewish Lore and Philosophy*, I, 206. It is to be noted in this connection that Abraham observed all the sacrificial ceremonies while preparing to offer up Isaac. Comp. MHG I, 322; PRE 31; Hullin 16a. The repetition of Abraham's name by the angel is explained by Philo, *De Abrahamo*, 32, in the same manner as in PR and Wa-Yosha', *loc. cit.*, whereas BR 56. 7 and the parallel passages cited by Theodor consider it an expression of endearment. See also Jub. 18. 10.

<sup>243</sup> PRE 31; MHG I, 323; Wa-Yosha' 38; unknown midrashic sources in *Shibbole ha-Leket*, No. 18 (*Tefillah*), 17-18; Al-Barceloni, 125, based on PRE, *loc. cit.*, but with the additional remark that Isaac gave up his life at the appearance of the Shekinah. In BR 65. 9 Isaac's blindness is explained in a similar manner; comp. Hebrews 11. 19, and below, note 255. With regard to the oath taken by God, Philo, *Legum Allegor.* 71, remarks: The mere words of God are... laws and institutions... It is proper to say that all the words of God are oaths confirmed by the accomplishment of the acts to which they relate. Whether Hebrews 6. 13 is to be traced directly to Philo is doubtful. "The word of God is an act" is a favorite phrase with the

Rabbis; comp. BR 44. 22; Tehillim 107, 462. See also Philo, *Quaestiones*, Gen., 4. 170; note 1 on vol. I, p. 49.

<sup>244</sup> PR 40, 171b; MHG I, 323; Tan. B. IV, 72.

<sup>245</sup> Yashar Wa-Yera, 46b, based on old sources; comp. BR 56. 9 and parallel passages cited by Theodor, *ad loc.*, as well as PRE 26 and unknown Midrash in Yalkut I, 101. בְּיוֹם עִשׂוּתוֹ in Yashar is not to be taken literally; comp. note 99 on vol. I, p. 83, and Zohar I, 120b. According to another view, it was the bell-wether of Abraham's flocks that was sacrificed instead of Isaac. Abraham had called this pet animal Isaac, and it was therefore quite appropriate that Isaac, the ram, should take the place of the real Isaac; comp. MHG I, 323-324, and *Neweh Shalom*, 51, with the additional remark that Gabriel had brought the ram to the altar.

<sup>246</sup> PRE 31. On the trumpet at the advent of the Messiah, see vol. IV, p. 234, and note 116 appertaining thereto. Bahya on Exod. 19. 13, and Caro, *Toledot Yizhak* on Gen. 22. 13 (the latter is based on the former) state that the ram came to life again after it was sacrificed and burned to ashes. On the resurrection of animals, comp. vol. I, p. 236, and notes 113, 317.

<sup>247</sup> Tan. B. I, 114, and IV, 72; Tan. Wa-Yera 23 and Shelah 14; PR 40, 171a; BaR 17. 2; comp. also BR 56. 7 and 57. 14, as well as Sifre D., 313. In the sources herewith mentioned it is stated that God promised Abraham not to tempt either him or Isaac in the future. The temptations and sufferings intended for Abraham were accordingly assigned to Job.—The haggadic interpretation of 'תָּדַע, as 'תָּדַע' ("I made thee known") is already found in Jub. 18. 1, as well as in Peshitta and Vulgate Gen. 22. 12.

<sup>248</sup> Tan. B. I, 115; Tan. Wa-Yera 23; Yerushalmi Ta'anit 2, 65d; PK 23, 154b; WR 29. 10; MHG I, 325-326; an unknown midrashic source in *Hadar*, 8a; PR 40, 171b. Comp. also BR 56. 9, Yerushalmi Targumim, Gen. 22. 14. *Nispahim*, 47, reads: God forgives Israel's sins on New Year on account of the merit of Abraham who was willing to be burned in the furnace of fire by Nimrod in order to sanctify God's name. On the basis of the Haggadot which connect the ceremony of the blowing of the ram's horn on New Year with the ram sacrificed in lieu of Isaac, the view arose that the 'Akedah took place on that day. A different opinion, favored by the Kabbalists, maintains that this event occurred on the Day of Atonement. See Ginzberg in *Ha-Zofeh*, III, 186-188. Now and again one meets with

the view that the 'Akedah took place in Nisan; comp. ShR 15. 11, and see further note 126.

<sup>249</sup> BR 56. 10; Sifre D., 352; PRE 31; Targum Yerushalmi 22.15; comp. note 251. According to PRE 23, Abraham performed the rite of circumcision on his body at the site of the temple; see further note 283. In remembrance of the sacrifice of Isaac, God commanded that two sacrifices should be brought daily; ER 56. 36; WR 2. 11.

<sup>250</sup> BR 56. 7; Yerushalmi Ta'anit 2, 65d; PK 23, 154b; PR 40, 171b.

<sup>251</sup> PR 31; Targum Yerushalmi, Gen. 22. 9. The altar destroyed by the flood was rebuilt by Noah, but later demolished by the builders of the Tower; MHG I, 321.

<sup>252</sup> MHG I, 325; comp. the following note.

<sup>253</sup> BR 56. 10; Tehillim 76, 341-342; see note 102. The etymological remark of Lactantius, *Institutiones*, 4. 10, to the effect that Jerusalem was called after Solomon, is not based, as is generally assumed, on the Greek *ιερόν*, but on the Hebrew *ירושלם* [ת] *i. e.* "the possession of Solomon." Theophilus 2. 31 remarks: Melchizedek changed the name of the city from Salem to Jerusalem. Numerous are the etymologies given of the name Moriah, the Temple mount (2 Chron. 3. 1), which according to Jewish tradition, accepted by the Church, is identical with the place where Abraham was commanded to sacrifice Isaac; comp. BR 55. 7; Yerushalmi Berakot 4, 8c; Ta'anit 10a; Berakot 62b; Shir 4. 4; Tan. B. I, 112; PR 40, 169b-170a; Tehillim 30, 233; Targumim, Aquila, Symmachus, and Septuagint, Gen. 22. 2. Peshitta stands alone with its rendering of Moriah by Amorite '(אמוריה=מוריה) and yet the Syriac Fathers Ephraim (I, 100, 17c) and Aphraates (400) maintain that the 'Akedah took place on the holy mount of Jerusalem; see Ginzberg, *Haggada bei den Kirchenv.*, 113-114. Jerome, on Gen., *loc. cit.*, gives two etymologies of Moriah which agree with those of BR, *loc. cit.* Josephus, *Antiqui.*, I, 13, 2, knows of the identity of Moriah with the Temple mount, but gives no etymological explanation of the meaning of Moriah. See also the unknown Midrash in Yalkut I, 100.

<sup>254</sup> BR 56. 1. According to the reading of MHG I, 327, Isaac did not return with his father, but by himself, "in the stillness of the night, in order that his miraculous escape from death should not be the cause of provoking the evil eye." A different view is found in

Midrash Aggada I, 54, and Targum Yerushalmi 22. 19. The angels alluded to in the last source probably belong to another legend; comp. the following note.

<sup>255</sup> MHG I, 327. The purpose of Isaac's stay in paradise was to be cured from the injury inflicted by his father before the angel stopped him from completing the sacrifice; comp. the passage from an unknown Midrash *Hadar*, 10b; *Minhat Yehudah*, 13b (on Gen. 25. 27); Pa'aneah Raza, Gen. 24. 64; Yalkut Reubeni, Gen. 22. 2 (the reference to R. Bahya covers only the sentence 'קריית ארבע וכו'); Shu'aib, Hayye Sarah, 11b. *Shibbole ha-Leket*, No. 18 (*Tefillah*) 17-18, quotes an unknown Midrash to the effect that Isaac was burned to ashes, and then brought back to life. The old sources, however, explicitly state that God forbade Abraham to cause even the slightest injury to Isaac; for Abraham had intended to bleed him a little, in order thus to show his willingness to offer to God his most precious possession dearest to his heart; comp. BR 56. 7, and parallel passages cited by Theodor. It is therefore very strange that Mekilta RS 4 speaks of Isaac's blood brought as a sacrifice. See, however, ps.-Philo 18c: And for the blood of him—Isaac—did I choose this people; comp. note 243.—*Yalkut David* on Gen. 27. 27 quotes the Zohar with reference to Isaac's stay in paradise, but nothing of this kind occurs in the latter, and there can be no doubt that Yalkut Reubeni is to be read instead of Zohar, as the supposed quotation from the Zohar is actually found, word for word, in Yalkut Reubeni, *loc. cit.* For further details on this point see below, note 301, and note 92 on vol. I, p. 334. *Neweh Shalom* remarks: While Isaac was lying on the altar bound as a sacrifice, the angel of death took his stand opposite him, and said: "As soon as Abraham lays his hand on Isaac, and slays him, I shall take his—Isaac's—soul." But when he saw that all the angels were pleading for Isaac's life (comp. vol. I, p. 281), he remarked: "This man has no enemy, and I will therefore do him no harm."—Abraham was enjoined to carry out the commandment of the 'Akedah three days after it was given (Gen. 22. 4), in order that it should not be said that he fulfilled God's will while in a state of excitement and perturbation; BR 55. 6; Tan. B. I, 113; Tan. Wa-Yera 22; PR 40, 170a-170b; Aggadat Bereshit 31, 63-64; Ephraim I, 76E. The diffuse comments of Philo on the 'Akedah, which he explains as a protest against the sacrificing of children, show that Alexandrian Judaism, no less than Palestinian, attached great importance to this episode in the lives of the patriarchs.—The site of the Temple mount was orig-

inally a plain, but was "elevated" at the moment it was designated as the place for the 'Akedah; Tan. Wa-Yera 22; Yalkut I, 100.

<sup>256</sup> Yashar Wa-Yera, 46b-47a, based on old sources; Tan. Wa-Yera 23 and Ahare 2; PRE 32; PK 26, 170b; WR 20. 2; Kohelet 9. 7; Tan. B. IV, 53; Midrash Aggada I, 52 and 55; MHG I, 237. Comp. also Wa-Yosha' 26, and *Neweh Shalom*, 51-52. Sarah died in the month of Heshwan, *i e.*, shortly after the 'Akedah, which took place in the previous month (see note 248); Esther R 3. 7; Abba Gorion 25. The sound of the blowing of the Shofar on New Year is brought in relation with the sound emitted by Sarah at the moment of her demise; see Ginzberg, *Hazofeh*, III, 186-188. The words of resignation put into Sarah's mouth are modelled after the *Zidduk ha-Din* (comp. Baer, *Siddur*, 586), and the same remark applies to similar sentences in vol. II, p. 27, and vol. III, p. 451.

<sup>257</sup> MHG I, 346, based upon an unknown source; BR 58. 6.

<sup>258</sup> BR 58. 1; MHG I, 333-334. Shu'aib, Hayye Sarah, 11a, quotes the following unknown Haggadah: Sarah really lived only thirty-seven years—from the birth of Isaac to her death—for the years she spent as a barren woman cannot be regarded as life. The same authority, Wa-Yehi, 22d, quotes a similar Haggadah concerning Jacob, who is said to have lived only thirty-four years, the space of time his favorite son Joseph stayed with him. *Hadar*, 8a (Tosafot and RASh), and *Da'at*, 10c-10d, could hardly have been made use of by Shu'aib.

<sup>259</sup> MHG I, 346-347; on the eulogy spoken by Abraham upon Sarah, see *ibid.*, 341. In the word וּלְבַכָּהּ ("and to weep for her", Gen. 23. 2) the letter כ is small according to the Masorah; this indicates that Abraham did not weep very much for Sarah's death; so *Hadar* and *Ba'al ha-Turim*, *ad loc.*, whereas *Leket Midrashim* 21 gives a different explanation of the smallness of this letter. It is noteworthy that Philo, *De Abrahamo*, 44 (comp. also, *Quaestiones*, Gen. 4. 73) concludes from the biblical narrative of the death of Sarah that Abraham mourned for her a short time only, as immoderate mourning is not fitting for the wise who should not feel sorry when restoring to God the deposit entrusted to them. This last remark of Philo is often met with in Jewish writings; comp. ARN 14, 59; Mishle 31, 108; Tan. Bereshit 7; see also Wisdom 15. 8, 16.—Sarah died during Abraham's lifetime, her great piety notwithstanding, because she accused her husband of being unfair to her (Gen. 16. 5); by her premature death it was proved that her accusations were unfounded; Rosh ha-Shanah

16b; Baba Kamma 93b; comp. above, note 151. *Sifte Kohen* on Gen. 23. 2 quotes, from an unknown Midrash, the following legend about Sarah's death: Satan appeared to her and asked her whether she knew where Isaac was. "He went with his father to be instructed in the laws of sacrifices", was her reply. "No", rejoined Satan, "he himself is the sacrifice." She betook herself to the three giants, Ahiman, Sheshai, and Talmi (comp. vol. III, p. 268), and asked them to look into the distance, far, far away, and see if they could not discern an old man accompanied by two lads. They obeyed and informed her that they saw an old man with a knife in his hand and next to him a youth bound as a sacrifice. She was so terrified that her soul flew out of her body. A similar legend is found in the unknown midrashic source given in Yalkut I, 98.

<sup>260</sup> MHG I, 347; Jub. 18. 3-4; comp. also 2ARN 45, 124; WR 3. 7; vol. II, p. 339. With reference to these words of Abraham, Philo, *Quaestiones, Gen.* 4. 74, remarks: The pious feel like strangers in this world, they are at home in the other world only. See the identical words of the Midrash cited in vol. II, p. 122. In BR 58. 6, on the other hand, Abraham is made to say to the children of Heth: "If I wish, I shall claim the rights of the owner, since God promised this land."

<sup>261</sup> MHG I, 348; comp. also BR 58. 6, and the passage, from an unknown Midrash, cited in Makiri, Proverbs 30, 88a.

<sup>262</sup> BR 57. 7. This is very likely a haggadic interpretation of לפני (Gen. 23. 12), which is explained in the sense of *in the presence of*.

<sup>263</sup> PRE 20. The Cave of Machpelah being a double cave—hence its name מכפלה "double"—hid all the more Adam's body which was buried in the inner cave; comp. 'Erubin 53a and Philo, *Quaestiones, Gen.*, 3. 80. Abraham, knowing that at the time of the resurrection of the dead those buried in the Cave of Machpelah would rise first, wished to be buried there; comp. the passage, from an unknown Midrash, cited in *Yad Yosef* on Gen. 23. 9 and *Abkat Rokel* II, 5. See further details concerning the Cave of Machpelah in vol. I, pp. 69 and 101, as well as vol. II, p. 191, and note 7 appertaining thereto.

<sup>264</sup> Zohar Ruth I, 97b.

<sup>265</sup> PRE 26; Zohar Ruth I, 97c; Zohar I, 127a-128a. Concerning the light shining over R. Akiba's grave, see Mishle 9. 62.

<sup>266</sup> BR 58. 7; ShR 31. 17. Ephron, however, was not aware



of the great treasure in his possession, as the light of the Cave of Machpelah was invisible to him; Sabba, Hayye Sarah, 24a.

<sup>267</sup> BR 58. 7; PK 11, 95a-95b; ShR 31. 17; Tan. B. I, 103-104 and V, 20; Tan. Wa-Yera 4, Behar 1, and Reeh 10; comp. also MHG I, 349-350; Mekilta Yitro 1,57b; Mekilta RS, 85; Baba Mezi'a 87a; ARN 13,57; Yerushalmi Kiddushin I, 59d; Onkelos and Yerushalmi Targumim, Gen. 23. 16. The Haggadah in the afore-mentioned sources finds in the defective spelling of the name עִפְרָן (Gen. *loc. cit.*) an indication that the bearer of the name was morally "defective"; the same idea is maintained by Jerome, *ad loc.* The source of MHG is none of the Midrashim just quoted. As a reward for Abraham's humility, who twice bowed down before the children of Heth, the nations will bow down twice before Israel (that is, they will become Israel's subjects), once during the reign of Solomon and then again in the days of the Messiah; MHG I, 349, where a new source is introduced with the words בַּא וְרֵאָה; comp. Schechter, *ad loc.*, and see above, note 262.

<sup>268</sup> Yashar Hayye Sarah, 47a-48b, where the names of the witnesses on the bill of sale are also given; comp. vol. IV, p. 92. As a reward for the kindness shown to Abraham by the inhabitants of Hebron, this city remained in their possession for forty-seven years longer than they were entitled to it. The Jews took it from them forty years after the exodus from Egypt, whereas Zoan, that had been founded seven years later than Hebron (Num. 13. 22), was destroyed at the time of the exodus; Sifra 18. 2, 85c; MHG I, 347-348. The inhabitants of Hebron, who, in order to show the last honor to Sarah, closed their places of business, did not die before they participated thirty-eight years later, in the funeral ceremonies for Abraham; BR 58. 7 and 62. 3. Shem and Eber, who were present at Sarah's as well as at Abraham's burial, took care that the latter should be interred next to the former; BR, *loc. cit.*

<sup>269</sup> Zohar I, 128a-128b. Instead of זָמִין it is best to read צָלִי, though the former reading can be defended.

<sup>270</sup> Yashar Hayye Sarah, 48a; comp. above, note 56. Not long before Sarah's death Abraham lost his father Terah; BR 58. 5-6, where it is said: At the time of Sarah's death Abraham saw the angel of death draw his sword against him. The purport of this remark probably is that at this time some of Abraham's relatives met their death; comp. Mo'ed Katan 27b, below. Zohar I, 125a, maintains that Sarah died by a kiss from God, and not by the hand of the angel of death. Comp. Index, s. v. "Kiss from God".

<sup>271</sup> Tan. Hayye Sarah, 4; Tan. B. I, 118; Aggadat Bereshit 34, 67-69; MHG I, 352-353. The Midrashim give in this connection a homiletic comment on the last chapter of Prov., which they refer to Sarah, the ideal of the "woman of valor". MHG I, 334-339, and likewise Mishle 31 find in this chapter the praise of the twenty-two "women of valor": Noah's wife, Sarah, Rebekah, Leah, Rachel, Bithiah (the foster-mother of Moses), Jochebed, Miriam, Hannah, Jael, the widow of Zarephath, Naomi, Rahab, Bath-Sheba, Michal, Hazlelponith (Samson's mother), Elisheba (Aaron's wife), Serah (Asher's daughter), the wife of the prophet Obadiah, the Shunamite, Ruth, and Esther. Sarah, however, is the most prominent of these twenty-two "women of valor", and hence she is the only woman whose age, at her death, is given in Scripture.

<sup>272</sup> Baba Mezi'a 87a; Sanhedrin 107b; BR 65. 9; Tan. B. I, 118 and 128; Tan. Hayye Sarah 1, and Toledot 6; Aggadat Bereshit 34, 69; PRE 52 (with the additional remark that this was one of the seven great miracles); Yelammedenu in Yalkut II, 874, on Ps. 115; *Hadar*, 9a, quoting an unknown midrashic source. Comp. also Tan. B. 1, 47, which reads: Abraham was the first to show signs of old age, to lavish hospitality, to suffer pain, and to distribute, in his lifetime, his possessions among his children. On the last point see Gen. 25. 6. Abraham said to God: "If Thou hadst made known to the generation of the flood what pain is, they would never have rebelled against Thee." Whereupon God replied: "Thou shalt be the first to experience suffering." And Isaac became very ill at his very birth. To celebrate his son's recovery from the "first illness" (caused by the circumcision?) Abraham made the great feast mentioned in Scripture (Gen. 21. 8; comp. note 206 and vol. I, p. 262). See note 74 on vol. I, p. 329. On the Arabic version of the legend of the first illness, see Grünbaum, *Neue Beiträge*, 118.

<sup>273</sup> Tan. Hayye Sarah 4; Baba Batra 16b; BR 59. 6-7; Tosefta Kiddushin 5. 17-21; comp. also Theodor, BR, *ad loc.*, and MHG I, 353-354. According to one view given in the sources just mentioned, the great blessing bestowed upon Abraham consisted in his having no daughter, while in the same passage the opposite view is recorded to the effect that Abraham *was blessed* with a daughter whose name was Bakkol ("with all things"). Comp. also Philo, *De Abrahamo*, 7; Yerushalmi Sotah 5, 20c, and Berakot 9, 14b, as well as vol. II, p. 149; vol. III, p. 206; vol. IV, p. 103.

<sup>274</sup> BR 59. 5, where Ps. 24 is referred by the Psalmist to Abraham

who is the pattern for the picture of the righteous. God said to Abraham: "Thou occupiest thyself with showing loving-kindness to mankind, and art thus doing the same work as I. I shall therefore clothe thee with the same garments with which I am clad when appearing to the prophets" (comp. Dan. 7.9); BR 58. 9; MHG I, 362; Mishle 16, 38; Tan. Hayye 4; Aggadat Bereshit 32, 68.

<sup>275</sup> BR 59. 2, as well as 64. 3 and 95. 3; Tan. B. I, 58, 71, 211; III, 105; Tan. Lek 1 and 11, Behar 1; Aggadat Bereshit 13, 28; Tehillim I, 13 and 122; Yoma 28b; Yelammedenu in Yalkut II, 932, on Prov. 3. Comp. also Tosefta Kiddushin (end); ARN 33, 94 (second version 7, 21); Al-Barceloni 58-59. The Book of Jubilees sees its main task in furnishing the proof that the patriarchs—from Adam to Jacob—observed the laws that were subsequently revealed to Moses. But even this pseudepigraph has to admit that the Fathers did not observe all the laws of the Mosaic Code, and accordingly the revelation must be regarded as having taken place gradually. Comp. 33. 16, which passage was entirely misunderstood by Charles, *ad loc.*, as it has nothing to do with the Pauline doctrine, Romans 4. 15, but represents the thoroughly Jewish conception of a gradual revelation of the law. See on this point Jub. 36. 20 and the references to rabbinic writings below. Philo, *De Abrahamo*, 8. 46, seems also to be of the opinion that Gen. 26. 5 refers to the laws of the Torah which Abraham observed before the revelation on Sinai. In contrast to this view of the Haggadists concerning Abraham's observance of the Torah, we meet with statements by authoritative Tannaim and Amoraim to the effect that Abraham only observed the seven Noahian precepts, as well as circumcision which, towards the end of his life, he was commanded to perform. Comp. Hullin 7. 7; Yoma 28b; see also the very thorough study of Chajes in his *Torat Nebi'im*, 24-28b. In accordance with this view, Gen., *loc. cit.*, is explained by many rabbinic commentators to refer exclusively to the ethico-moral laws of the Torah; comp. Lekah, Nahmanides, and Ibn Ezra, *ad loc.*

<sup>276</sup> BR 59. 8; Tan. B. I, 120. The identity of the servant mentioned in Gen. 24. 2 with Eliezer is presupposed in many places in rabbinic literature; comp. Ta'anit 4a; WR 37. 4; Targum Yerushalmi, Gen. *loc. cit.*, and many other passages in the Talmudim and Midrashim. At the same time when the signs of old age were clearly visible in Abraham (comp. p. 291), Eliezer's appearance was also changed; MHG I, 355.

<sup>277</sup> Yoma 28b reads: Abraham was the head of an academy, and Eliezer "filled the cups" for the whole world with his master's wisdom. On זקן in the sense of "elder", *i. e.* scholar, comp. Sifra 19. 32, 91a; Kiddushin 32b; Philo, *De Abrahamo*, 46, as well as *De Sobrietate*, 4, and *Quaestiones*, Gen., VI, 4, 85.

<sup>278</sup> Yashar Hayye, 48b.

<sup>279</sup> BR 57. 3.

<sup>280</sup> MHG I, 327-328; comp. Schechter, *ad loc.*

<sup>281</sup> BR 59. 8; MHG I, 356.

<sup>282</sup> BR 59. 9 and 60. 2; WR 17. 5 read: Eliezer belonged to the accursed race (=a Canaanite); yet he was blessed by God on account of his faithful service to the pious, *i. e.*, Abraham.

<sup>283</sup> MHG I. 356-357. Here also we meet with the obscure statement: If thou takest him—Isaac—there—to Haran—the dominion will return to its old place. The meaning of this passage is that if Isaac leaves the Holy Land, his descendants will surrender their dominion over the world to the Elamites; comp. vol. IV, pp. 368-369.

<sup>284</sup> BR 59. 10; comp. below, note 286. The idea of taking an oath by the sign of the covenant is also found in Ephraim I, 78b, and Jerome, Gen. 24. 2; Philo, *Quaestiones*, Gen. *loc. cit.*, says: He made him—Eliezer—take the oath by the genital organ (?) to indicate that he—Abraham—was endeavoring to secure a wife for his son for the purpose of begetting children and not in order to enjoy carnal pleasures.

<sup>285</sup> Yashar Hayye, 48b; *Hadar*, 9c. He took with him ten of the very prominent of Abraham's slaves, in order that he should have the necessary quorum for the nuptial benedictions; comp. PRE 16.

<sup>286</sup> BR 59. 10; PRE 16.

<sup>287</sup> BR 59. 11; Sanhedrin 95a; Hullin 91b; Tan. B. I, 150; Tan. Wa-Yera 3; PRE 16; Pirke RHK, 16a and 26a; MHG I, 367. The Babylonian sources know of three men only (Eliezer, Jacob, and Abishai; comp. Index, *s. v.*), for whose sake such a miracle was performed, whereas the Palestinian passages count Abraham as the fourth fortunate person for whose sake this miracle occurred in the night of the war against the kings. In medieval Jewish legends, the miracle of קפיצת הדרך (that is, the *shrinking* of the road, not the *jumping*) is a favorite subject. Christian sources, too, narrate similar incidents; comp. ps.—*Matthew*, 22, and Günter, *Christliche Legende*, 104. Grünbaum, *Neue Beiträge*, refers to Mohammedan parallels.

<sup>288</sup> Josephus, *Antiqui.*, I, 16. 1. BR 59. 2 reads: It is possible

to ascertain the character of women from the barking of the dogs. Baba Kamma 60b shows that this statement is to be taken literally, and not, as Theodor, *ad loc.*, explains it, rationalistically. Concerning the well to which the pious repair on entering a new place, comp. Lekah, Gen. 24. 11, and MHG I, 352. PRE 26 (complete text in MHG I, 458) reads: It is a good omen to meet young girls on entering a place. According to Zohar I, 132a, the well at which Eliezer stopped was the well of Miriam.

<sup>289</sup> BR 60. 3; WR 37. 4; Ta'anit 4a; Hullin 95b; Pirke RHK, 32b.

<sup>290</sup> Josephus, *Antiqui.*, I, 16. 2; Philo, *De Posteritate Caini*, 44. On Bethuel as king comp. PRE 16 and BaR 14. 11. The remark in Lekah, Gen. 24. 16 very likely goes back to PRE. The contrast between Rebekah and the daughters of the Gentiles, who, though virgins, do not keep away from men entirely, is pointed out in BR 60. 5; Yerushalmi Ketubot I, 25b; Tehillim 125, 506. See also below, note 294. Rebekah was a very beautiful maiden, and surpassed Abishag in beauty; MHG I, 360.

<sup>291</sup> BR 60. 5-6; MHG I, 362. In the latter passage attention is called to the fact that Eliezer did not give the presents to Rebekah before he had found out that she belonged to Abraham's kindred, since the marriage was to be accomplished by these very presents; comp. Schechter, *ad loc.*, note 48.

<sup>292</sup> An unknown midrashic source in Yalkut I, 109, and a similar statement in MHG I, 364. Abkir in Yalkut, *loc. cit.*, reads: Eliezer noticed by Laban's running that he intended to attack him; whereupon the former pronounced the "Name", and he and the camels were lifted up in the air so that Laban was unable to attack him.

<sup>293</sup> BR 60. 7-8; ARN 8, 38 reads: Even Abraham's camels did not enter a place where there were idols; Aggadat Bereshit 67, 133; Targum Yerushalmi Gen. 24. 31. The name Laban ("white") is declared to be antiphrastic, the bearer of it being the "blackest of the black"; comp. BR, *loc. cit.*; Shemuel I, 45; Ruth R 3. 1; and comp. also MHG I, 363-364, where several etymologies of the name Laban are given.

<sup>294</sup> An unknown midrashic source in Yalkut I, 109; MHG I, 366 and 370; Midrash Aggada I, 59; Sekel, 81; Lekah, Targum Yerushalmi, and Rashi on Gen. 24. 33 and 55. Bethuel, who was the king of this place, introduced the *jus primae noctis*; comp. Herodotus IV, 168. His subjects declared themselves ready to submit to this out-

rage on condition that the king's own daughters should not be exempt from it. Now it was on that very day, when Eliezer arrived in Haran, that Rebekah was to be deflowered by her father (she had just reached the age of three years and one day; comp. Niddah 5. 3), and to spare her this humiliation God caused the death of Bethuel. See Yalkut *loc. cit.*; *Hadar* 9a, 9b (he was called Bethuel as an allusion to Bethulah "virgin"!); *Da'at* Gen. 24. 55; Soferim (end); BR 60. 12.

<sup>295</sup> MHG I, 366; PRE 16; BR 59. 11; Tan. B. I, 145; Aggadat Bereshit 45, 92.—Eliezer's first words were: "I am Abraham's servant" (Gen. 24. 34). These words are in more than one respect, characteristic of the man. "One should not wait till his shortcomings are found out by others, but should rather state them himself," is the very wise rule which guided Eliezer. He did not wait till Abraham's relatives ascertained everything concerning himself, but introduced himself to them as "Abraham's servant." Comp. BR 60. 9; Baba Kamma 92b. At the same time Eliezer was devoted to his master to such an extent that he considered it an honor to be the slave of Abraham rather than to be a free man; Hasidim 85; Zohar I, 103 and 146b. Eliezer's personality, as well as his adroit address, made a powerful impression on Abraham's relatives, who relinquished their evil intentions against him; MHG I, 366.—The Torah devotes more space to Eliezer's narrative than to some of the very important laws; from this it may be inferred that the history of the patriarchs is of extremely great moment; BR 60. 8.

<sup>296</sup> BR 60. 9-12.

<sup>297</sup> PRE 16. BR 60. 12 reads: They hinted to Rebekah to refuse Eliezer's request; she, however, said: "I will go with him even against your wish". From the scriptural words, "the thing proceedeth from the Lord" (Gen. 24. 50) the Rabbis infer that "marriages are made in heaven"; comp. Mo'ed Katan 18b; Tobit 6. 18. Comp. Abrahams in *J. Q. R.* II, 172, *seq.*, and note 20 on vol. I, p. 59.

<sup>298</sup> BR 60. 13; Shir 2. 14; MHG I, 370. According to PRE 16, the words uttered by Rebekah's relatives at her departure were the nuptial benedictions—On the presents given by Eliezer to Rebekah and her relatives, comp. BR 60. 11; Tan. B. I, 145; Aggadat Bereshit 45, 92.

<sup>299</sup> PRE 16; Targum Yerushalmi Gen. 24. 61; MHG I, 371. His speed on his return journey was due to the fact that it would have been unpleasant for Rebekah to spend the night in the company of a slave. But even then Isaac's suspicion of slaves was so deep-rooted

that he did not come near Rebekah until he had convinced himself that she was a virgin. Comp. the sources quoted above and the opposite view given in MHG I, 366. See also below, note 301.

<sup>300</sup> BR 60. 14-15; Mekilta be-Shallah 2, 28b; Mekilta RS, 45; Berakot 26a; 'Abodah Zarah 7b; Yerushalmi Berakot 4, 7a; Tan. Hayye 5 and Mikkez 9; Tan. B. I, 196; BaR 2. 1; Tehillim 55, 292, and 102, 430; Mishle 12, 93; Philo, *Quaestiones*, Gen. 4, 140, and *Quod Detcrius Potiori Insidiari Soleat*, 9; Onkelos, Targum Yerushalmi, and Jerome on Gen. 24. 63; Ephraim I, 173. Comp. also Tehillim 90, 394, and MHG I, 372. The place where Isaac used to pray was near paradise, so that its fragrance might reach him, and is identical with the field which Abraham bought from Ephron; Zohar II, 39b. Comp. vol. I, pp. 289 and 334, and the notes appertaining to them.

<sup>301</sup> An unknown midrashic source in Yalkut I, 109. The injury was of such a nature as to make Isaac suspect Eliezer of having done violence to his bride. The angel Gabriel, however, with irrefutable evidence in his hands, convinced Isaac that his suspicions were unjustified. To compensate Eliezer for the wrong done to him by Isaac, God permitted him to enter paradise during his life (comp. note 307); he changed places with Isaac, who shortly before that had left paradise where he had stayed for some time; Yalkut, *loc. cit.* See also note 255. Variants of this legend are found in *Hadar*, 9a (the birds watched over the blood which Rebekah had lost on account of her injury, and thereby enabled Eliezer to convince Isaac of his innocence; as a reward for their good deed, a law was promulgated commanding to cover the blood of birds; comp. Lev. 17. 13); *Da'at*, Gen. 24. 5; *Pa'aneah Raza* 34, 65; Shu'aib, Hayye, 11c; Lekah 24. 66 (in a rather abridged form); *Orehot Hayyim* II, 39b; Midrash Aggadah I, 60. Several of the sources herewith mentioned state in this connection that the dwellers of paradise walk on their heads (comp. vol. IV, p. 70), and this peculiarity Isaac retained on his leaving paradise. When Rebekah saw him walk in this strange manner, she exclaimed: "What man is this that walketh?" (Gen. 24. 65). See also *Minhat Yekudah*, Gen. 24. 64, and Ginzberg, *Compte Rendu des Mélanges Israel Lewy*, 26.

<sup>302</sup> BR 60. 16; Onkelos and Targum Yerushalmi Gen. 24. 67. Sarah's tent was not given by Abraham to any of his concubines; but, as the tent of the mistress, it remained unoccupied until Isaac married Rebekah; Zohar I, 133b; Hasidim, 294.

<sup>303</sup> PRE 32; MHG I, 373, where mention is also made of the

miraculous light shining in Rebekah's tent. See the sources quoted in the preceding note. On Isaac's studies in the "Shem academy", comp. the sources mentioned in note 255, as well as Targum Yerushalmi Gen. 24. 62, and Yashar, Hayye 48.

<sup>304</sup> Zohar I, 133a. Sarah appeared to Isaac after her death in the tent formerly occupied by her; Zohar I, 33b, which is very likely the source of Shu'aib, Hayye, 11c. Comp. Ketubot 103a for the similar story about Rabbenu Hakkadosh.

<sup>305</sup> PRE 16, where he is identified with Og; comp. vol. III, p. 344, and Index, *s. n.*

<sup>306</sup> BR 60. 7; WR 17. 5. In both places Eliezer is described as Canaan, which may mean a Canaanite; it may also imply that his identity with Canaan the son of Ham is assumed. In 2 Alphabet of Ben Sira 28b Eliezer is declared to have been the son of Ham.

<sup>307</sup> Derek Erez Zuta (end); 2 Alphabet of Ben Sira 28b; see Index, *s. v.* "Paradise, Entering Alive". Eliezer "the pious" is also found in Yelammedenu quoted in Yalkut, Supplement=BHM VI, 79.

<sup>308</sup> BR 60. 14 and 16. According to BR, the meaning of Beer-lahai-roi is *The well where she—Hagar—said to the Living One = God: "Look at my misery."* On the explanation of the name of this place see Targum Yerushalmi Gen. 24. 64; Tan. B. I, 123; Tan. Hayye 8. BR, *loc. cit.*, quotes Abraham's case in support of the rule that a widower with mature children should first marry them off and then, if he wishes, get married himself.

<sup>309</sup> BR 61. 4; Tan. B. I, 123; Tan. Hayye 8; Yerushalmi Targumim Gen. 25. 1; PRE 30. These sources contain explanations concerning the name Keturah, all of which are based on the assumption that it is another name for Hagar. Jerome, Gen. 25. 1, knows of the identification of Keturah with Hagar, but does not explain the former name. The opposite view that Keturah was Abraham's third wife is also found in the sources herewith quoted. On Hagar's piety see above, note 237, and Yelammedenu in Supplement to Yalkut (=BHM VI, 79). The etymology of Keturah—connecting it with קטורת *incense*—given by Philo, *Quaestiones*, Gen. 4, 147, occurs also in the rabbinic sources quoted above. Medieval authorities are at pains to explain the strange phenomenon that the offspring of this pious couple, whose marriage took place at the direct command of God (BR, *loc. cit.*), was Ishmael and the other sons of Hagar-Keturah, the progenitors of many wicked nations. See on this point the very interesting discussion



in Hasidim, 294-295. Yalkut Reubeni Gen. 26. 2, 36c, quotes a Midrash to the effect that Abraham married three wives, daughters (=descendants) of the three sons of Noah: Sarah the daughter of Shem, Keturah the daughter of Japheth, and Hagar the daughter of Ham. That Hagar was an Egyptian (=a daughter of Ham) is mentioned in Scripture.

<sup>310</sup> BR 61. 5 and Tehillim 92, 411-412 find in the names of Keturah's sons proof for their idolatry and wickedness. On the names of Gen. 25. 3, *seq.*, see also Onkelos, Targum Yerushalmi and *Imre No'am*, *ad loc.*, as well as MHG I, 383. Comp. Schechter, *ad loc.*

<sup>311</sup> BR 61. 7, and, with additions and amplifications, in MHG I, 378-379, as well as in Bereshit Rabbeti, 78. In the two last-named sources it is said that Abraham had admonished his sons by Keturah never to come near Isaac and his descendants (as any nation ruling over them will be punished in Gehenna) until the advent of the Messiah. When Solomon became king, the inhabitants of Sheba, the descendants of Sheba the son of Keturah (comp. Gen. 25. 3), thought that he was the promised Messiah, and came to pay him homage (מלכת in 1 Kings 9. 1 is read as מלכות kingdom; see note 20 on vol. II, p. 233). But when they realized their mistake, they returned to their country, where they will remain till the advent of the Messiah. Comp. also R. Joseph Kara, 1 Kings x. 1. Is this in any way connected with the Christian story of the worship of the infant Jesus by the Magi?

<sup>312</sup> Soferim (end). In this legend some traces of the Alexander legend and reminiscences of the Chinese Wall are discernible. Comp. Beer, *Leben Abrahams*, note 919, and Müller, *ad loc.* On the text of Soferim, comp. Yalkut Reubeni, Hayye (end).

<sup>313</sup> Sanhedrin 91a and, with many embellishments, Zohar I, 133b, 223a-223b (here they are identified with the children of the east, the renown of whose wisdom is referred to in 1 Kings 5. 10); Ziyoni and Recanati, Hayye (end). Al-Barceloni, 158, says: Abraham gave the esoteric books which he possessed (that is, the books on magic) to the children of the concubines, but the Torah he reserved for Isaac. The same statement is also found in Zohar I, 100b. Comp. note 80, and Index, *s. v.* "Balaam".

<sup>314</sup> Josephus, *Antiqui.*, I, 15. 1, citing an extract from a work by Alexander Polyhistor, which is a curious blending of pagan mythology with Jewish legend. See Freudenthal, *Hellenistische Studien*, 130-136 and 215. In this connection mention is to be made of a leg-

end which declared the Spartans and Lacedaemonians to be the descendants of Abraham; comp. 1 Maccabees 12. 10 and 21, as well as 14. 20; 2 Maccabees 5. 9. The Midrash quoted in note 309 maintains that Keturah was a daughter of Japheth, and since Japheth is said, Gen. 10. 2, to have been the ancestor of the Greeks (comp. also BR 36. 8, and the parallel passages cited by Theodor, on the beauty of Japheth = the Greek language), the descendants of Abraham from Keturah were, on their maternal side, Japhethites, *i. e.*, Greeks. Comp. also BR 37. 1, and parallel passages where the sons of Japheth are "the uncles" of Israel.

<sup>315</sup> Yashar Wa-Yera, 42b-43a. Already in the old sources Kemuel is identified with Balaam, or rather with his father Beor (comp. BR 57, end, and parallel passages cited by Theodor); hence Pethor, Balaam's city (Num. 22. 5) is said to have been founded by a son of Kemuel.

<sup>316</sup> BR 61. 6 and 39. 11; PK 31, 198b-199a; Tan. B. I, 63, IV, 33, and V, 53; Tan. Lek 4, Naso 9, and Ha-Berakah 5; BaR 11. 2; DR 11. 1; Tehillim 1. 6. In all these sources emphasis is laid upon the fact that before Abraham God Himself blessed the meritorious; but with the advent of Abraham He conferred upon him the power of bestowing blessings. Abraham, however, did not care to bless the sons of the concubines, knowing that their descendants would be wicked. He even refrained from blessing Isaac on account of Esau, who, as Isaac's son, would have to come in for his proper share in the blessings bestowed on his father. According to another view, Isaac received the blessings from Abraham when he was on the point of dying, and God confirmed them shortly afterwards. The sources cited above contain also the statement, according to which, Abraham, when on the point of dying, invested Isaac with the right of primogeniture which carried with it the possession of the burial place Machpelah. To obviate disputes among his children, he drew up a document to that effect; comp. vol. I, p. 343, and vol. III, p. 453.

<sup>317</sup> Extract from the two versions (A, B) of the Testament of Abraham. On the Jewish character of this work comp. Ginzberg, *Jewish Encyclopedia*, I, 93-96. A few additional remarks on this pseudepigraphon may be given here. The idea of trees speaking with a human voice (B 3) occurs also in the legend recorded in vol. IV, p. 164; see also the *Steinschneider-Festschrift*, 148. The changing of tears into pearls (3) is also found in rabbinic legends (see vol. IV, p. 84). A heavenly fire consumed the food offered to the angel (A 4); for

rabbinic parallel sources see above, note 144. The goat eaten by Abraham was brought back to life (A 4); a similar statement is found in rabbinic sources (see above, notes, 113 and 246). In this pseudepigraphon Abraham is described as a giant (B 9), and this is in agreement with the view of the Rabbis (comp. above, note 97). A parallel to the beautiful legend contrasting God's mercy with man's short-sightedness (A 10, B 12), is found in the Moses legend, vol. III, pp. 115-116. Grimm's tale about Peter and the smith is certainly based upon the legend in the Testament of Abraham. The episode about the fragrant herbs of paradise, mentioned in the Roumanian version of this pseudepigraph (10), which Abraham strewed over his house, becomes intelligible only if we take it in connection with the Jewish Machpelah legend; comp. notes 264 and 300.—The old sources have comparatively little to tell of Abraham's funeral and the mourning over him. On the day of Abraham's death, the chiefs of all the nations mourned for him, saying: Woe to the world that lost its leader, and woe to the ship that lost her steersman (Baba Batra 91a-91b; MHG I, 381). Yashar Toledot, 50b, reads: All the land of Canaan, men, women, and children, mourned a whole year (corresponding to the year of mourning customary among Jews; comp. Semahot 10; Mo'ed Katan 22b) for Abraham. They knew that he was pious toward God and kind to men, and that it was on account of his merits that God refrained from destroying them for the sins of the inhabitants of the earth. At Abraham's funeral Isaac was the chief mourner, and not his elder brother Ishmael, who willingly yielded all the honors to Isaac, in recognition of his piety and of the fact that he had been his father's favorite child. At the same time, it is recorded, that during Abraham's lifetime Ishmael repented of his evil ways (comp., however, Index, s. v. "Ishmael"), and when he died, deeply mourned by Isaac (Yashar Toledot, 44b), he entered paradise as a good and pious man; comp. Baba Batra 16b; BR 67. 3; Targum Yerushalmi Gen. 25. 8.

<sup>318</sup> 'Erubin 19a; BR 68. 7; Tan. B. I, 82; Tan. Lek 20 and Tazria' 5; MHG I, 251-252; EZ 25, 46; ShR 19. 4; Tehillim 1, 2, and 6, 58; Ekah 1, 56; Menahot 53b; Tan. quoted by Makiri, Prov. 31. 21; Yelammedenu in *Ma'aseh Rokeah*, 52; Zohar I, 8a (here it is Duma, the door-keeper of Gehenna, who takes the place of Abraham); Al-Barceloni, 58-59 and 141. In rabbinic literature the designation mostly employed for circumcision is the "covenant" (ברית) or the "covenant of Abraham" (בריתו של אברהם); see the lexica of Levy, Kohut, and

Jastrow, *s. v.* ברית. Its description as the holy covenant is only found in Maccabees 1. 15 and 63, as well as in the old formula of the benediction on circumcision (Tosefta Berakot 6. 13; Shabbat 173b; Siddur, 582). Comp. also *Zadokite Fragments*, p. 12, line 11, and the remarks on this passage by Ginzberg, *Unbekannte Sekte*, p. 111. The designation of a Jew as a son of the covenant, found in *Zadokite Fragments*, *loc. cit.*, as well as in the very ancient Mishnah Baba Kamma 1. 2-3, makes it very probable that this religious ceremony was regarded by the people as having a sacramental, or at least a semi-sacramental character. Hence the great prominence given to this ceremony in rabbinic literature; comp. especially Nedarim, Mishnah 3. 11, Tosefta 2. 4-7, Babli 31b-32a, and Yerushalmi 38b; Mekilta Yitro 1, 58a; Yelammedenu, in Yalkut II, 321, on Jer. 33, and in Supplement to Yalkut (=BHM VI, 79). The great importance of this ceremony may also be seen from the fact that it supersedes the Sabbath; comp. Shabbat 19. 5 and Jub. 15. 14. Charles, *ad loc.*, entirely misunderstands this Mishnah, and does not seem to know that to this very day circumcision is performed on the eighth day even if it be the Sabbath. A haggadic description of a dispute as to precedence between circumcision and Sabbath, and of the final victory of the former, is found in Yelammedenu, *loc. cit.* The phrase "to be in Abraham's bosom", found in the New Testament, and sporadically also in rabbinic literature (*e. g.*, Kiddushin 72b; Ekah 1. 85), has, however, nothing to do with the conception of the sacramental character of circumcision. The pious are gathered to their fathers (4 Maccabees 12. 17; BHM V, 50), and, accordingly, "to be in Abraham's bosom" is abridged from the complete expression "to be in the bosom of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob," the three patriarchs.—In reply to the attacks on circumcision by the Church Fathers, who especially dwell upon the fact that the "pious" before Abraham had not been circumcised (Justin Martyr, *Dialogue*, 19 and 33; Tertullian, *Adv. Marc.*, 5. 9, and *Adv. Jud.*, 4; it is to be observed that if this argument against circumcision were valid, it would apply with equal cogency to baptism; comp. Tertullian, *De Baptismo*, 13), the Jewish legend asserts that Adam, Seth, and Melchizedek were born with the sign of the covenant upon them. See ARN 1, 12, and parallel passages cited by Schechter, as well as BR 11. 6 and 46. 3. This statement was subsequently misunderstood, and in the Midrashim these three pre-Abrahamic patriarchs share this distinction with other pious men who lived after Abraham. In Jub. 15. 27 it is stated of certain angels of

a lower rank that "they were created circumcised." A similar statement occurs in the kabbalistic literature; comp. Tikkunim 47.—The old rabbinic sources are not concerned about the rational explanation of the ceremony of circumcision. BR 66. 3 and parallel passages recorded by Theodor remark that nature does not produce anything quite ready for use, but expects man to improve upon its creations. This applies also to a man's body which becomes perfect after its natural state has been improved upon by circumcision. A somewhat different explanation is given in Tan. B. III, 35, which is the source of Sa'adya in his *Polemic against Hiwi*, 62. Philo, very likely for apologetic motives, gives several reasons for circumcision (*De Spec. Legib.*, at the beginning, and *Quaestiones*, Gen. 3, 47-48), some of which are also found in the works of medieval philosophers; comp., e. g., Maimonides, *Guide of the Perplexed*, III. 49.—The rabbinic authors of the middle ages quote many a Haggadah concerning circumcision from the Midrashim which are not found in the literature that is still extant. Comp. *Menorat ha-Maor*, III, 3, 1, 1; *Kad ha-Kemah*, *Millah*. See also *Yalkut Hadash*, s. v. "Millah," and Glassberg, *Zikron Berit*, passim.

<sup>319</sup> *'Emek ha-Melek*, 14a-14b; Reischer, *Sha'are Yerushalayim*, 10.8 In this and in the following legend the beadle is the hero.

<sup>320</sup> Reischer, *Sha'are Yerushalayim*, 10.9.

## VI. JACOB

(pp. 309-424)

<sup>1</sup> Tan. Shemot 1; Tan. B. I, 128; Aggadat Bereshit 40, 79; ShR 1. 1. It is also said that through Isaac these virtues came to Jacob, and through him to Joseph; comp. MHG II, 4, and note 204 on vol. I, p. 262.

<sup>2</sup> MHG I, 387; comp. also *ibid.*, 388, and Sifre D., 312, as well as BR 63. 2, and the sources cited in note 1.

<sup>3</sup> MHG I, 388; comp. note 229 on vol. I, p. 274, and note 303 on vol. I, 297. Isaac's age at the time of the 'Akedah is variously given as thirty-seven or twenty-six, comp. sources cited in note 229 on vol. I, p. 274.

<sup>4</sup> MHG I, 388-389. According to another view she married at the age of three; comp. the sources cited by Schechter, *ad loc.*; Seder 'Olam 1; BR 57. 1, and parallel passages cited by Theodor; Yashar Hayye Sarah, 49a; MHG I, 770-771. She died at the age of one hundred and thirty-three; according to another view, she died at the age of one hundred and forty-four, or according to others at that of one hundred and forty-three. Comp. MHG (last-cited passage) and Midrash Aggada I, 62-63.

<sup>5</sup> BR 63. 4, WR 23. 1; Shir 2. 2. In view of the similarity between ארמי "Aramean" and רמי "deceiver", these sources remark with reference to Gen. 25. 20 that Rebekah came from a people of deceivers. Shu'aib, Toledot, 13a, understands this to mean that not only Laban, but also his sister Rebekah and her sons Jacob and Esau were not free from cunning and deceit; comp. Gen. 27. 6 and 40, as well as 30. 38.

<sup>6</sup> MHG I, 389.

<sup>7</sup> PRE 22, in accordance with Gen. 25. 20, 26. The statement of Targum Yerushalmi Gen. 25. 21 that Rebekah was without a child for twenty-two years of her married life is very strange. Comp. *Ha-Zofeh*, III, 136-138, and *Hadar*, Gen. 25. 27. Comp. also Midrash Aggada I, 63, and Tosafot, Yebamot 64a (beginning ליליף).

<sup>8</sup> Yashar Toledot, 50a-50b, partly following PRE 32. Ye-

bamot 64a states that the childless marriage was due to both of them and not to Rebekah alone. The same view occurs also in Targum Yerushalmi Gen. 25. 21, and Zohar I, 137b. See also the sources cited in note 10. Isaac's prayer was accompanied by a sacrifice on mount Moriah; PRE 32; Targum Yerushalmi, *loc. cit.* According to Zohar I, 137a, he brought a burnt-offering. The older sources, however, speak only of Isaac's prayer and the later Haggadah is based upon the combination of the interpretation of יִעָרָר given in BR 63. 5 with that of Sanhedrin 103a. On the reason of the sterility of the "mothers" see MHG I, 390, and the sources cited in note 116 on vol. I, p. 237.

<sup>9</sup> BR 63. 5; Shemuel 6, 64; Ruth R., 4. 12; Zohar I, 137b. A different view is found in MHG I, 389.

<sup>10</sup> Yebamot 64a-64b. MHG I, 390, on the contrary, maintains that Rebekah's prayer was as efficacious as that of Isaac.

<sup>11</sup> Yashar Toledot, 50b. Comp. PRE 32, and Luria's remarks, *ad loc.*

<sup>12</sup> BR 62. 6.

<sup>13</sup> BR 67. 6. The dispute of the brothers in their mother's womb is a favorite topic in the legends; comp. Tan. B. V, 36; Tan. Ki-Teze 4; Tehillim 58, 300; Targum Yerushalmi Gen. 25. 22; PRE 32; Zohar I, 137b and 138b. Luke 1. 41 may be cited as a parallel to it. "God makes known the future actions of the pious, as well as of the wicked, while they are still in their mother's womb"; MHG I, 390-391; Tehillim 58, 299; Yoma. 82a-83a. See also the following note.

<sup>14</sup> EZ 19, 26-27; *Da'at*, Gen. 43. 14. Ziyioni, Gen. 25. 22, connects this legend with the one given in vol. I, pp. 57-58, about the creation of man.

<sup>15</sup> Abkir in Yalkut I, 110. The statement of Jub. 25. 17 that Jacob's guardian angel is mightier than Esau's is very likely based on the assumption that Jacob's (= Israel's) guardian angel is Michael, while Esau's (Rome's) is Sammael. Comp. Index, *s. v.* "Michael" and "Sammael". Rebekah, who, as a prophetess (all the mothers were endowed with the gift of prophecy; comp. the sources cited in note 77), foresaw that in the future the Romans, the descendants of Esau, will slay the great Jewish scholars (comp. vol. I, p. 21 and note 85), prayed to God not to destroy all the scholars; MHG I, 391, and, in abridged form, *Nur al-Zulm*, 95. See also MHG I, 396.

<sup>16</sup> MHG I, 390-391. The injury Esau caused to his mother consisted in tearing her womb, as a consequence of which she never

bore any more children, though she was destined to be the "mother of twelve tribes"; PK 3, 23a-23b; PR 13, 48a; Tan. B. V, 36; Tan. Ki-Teze 4; BR 63. 6. A different view is found in Tan. B. IV, 221, and Aggadat Bereshit 72, 141.

<sup>17</sup> Yashar Toledot, 50. 6; *Pa'aneah*, Gen. 25. 22, maintains, on the contrary, that she did not go to Abraham in her distress, for she did not want to sadden his heart. This is in agreement with sources cited in the following note, which do not mention Abraham. The reference to Nimrod's mother occurs only in the midrashic fragment published by Ginzberg, *Geonica*, II, 326. Comp. also MHG I, 392.

<sup>18</sup> Tehillim 9, 83-84, and, with essential variants, MHG I, 392-393; partly also in BR 64. 6-7. Comp. further Yerushalmi Targumim Gen. 25. 22; Yelammedenu in supplement to Yalkut 16=BHM VI, 80; Zohar I, 137b; Ephraim, I, 61D; Theodoretus on Gen., *loc. cit.*; Jerome, Gen. 14. 18. Rebekah received the revelation through Shem or another medium, since, with the exception of Sarah, no woman was ever found worthy to receive a divine communication directly; Yerushalmi Sotah 7, 21b, BR, *loc. cit.*; Tehillim, *loc. cit.*, and parallel passages. Comp., however, note 15.

<sup>19</sup> BR 63. 7; Tehillim 9, 84; Yelammedenu in Supplement to Yalkut, 16=BHM VI, 80. The use of the names Edom, Seir, Esau, and similar ones, to describe Rome is very old, and was probably coined at the time of Herod, whose designation "the Idumean" was applied to his masters, the Romans. When Rome adopted Christianity, the same appellations were transferred to the Christians and Christianity. See the very interesting collection of material in Zunz, *Synagogale Poesie*, 437-452, and *Literaturgeschichte der synagogalen Poesie*, 620. In the Amoraic portions of the talmudic and midrashic literature the use of Edom for Rome is met with quite frequently; comp., *e. g.*, BR 9. 13-14; 10. 7; 63. 9 (the Haggadah concerning Edom-Rome occurs also in MHG I, 396, with which version 4 Ezra 6. 9-10 is closely related); 83. 4. The appellation of Edom for Rome is rarely found in tannaitic sources; comp., however, Midrash Tannaim 72 and Mekilta Amalek 2, 56a, where several Tannaim, who flourished about 100 C. E., in speaking of Rome, use the designation of Amalek for it. Early Christian authorities likewise apply these biblical appellatives to Rome; comp. *e. g.*, Jerome, Is. 21. 2, who, in agreement with R. Meir (Yerushalmi Ta'anit 1, 64a), explains the prophecies about Duma and Seir to refer to Rome. Accordingly the use of Edom for Rome in Peshitta, Ps. 12. 9, does not prove, as Duval, *R.E.J.*, XIV, 50,



maintains, its Jewish origin. Comp. also Abrabanel, *Mashmia' Yeshu'ah*, 18. 3, and Sa'adya's *Polemic against Hiriwi*, 76. Sa'adya, as a man with an independent mind, rejects the tradition that the Romans are descendants of Edom. See also vol. II, p. 158. On the descendants of Esau as rulers of Rome, comp. vol. II, p. 159, *seq.*, where Kitim = Rome.

<sup>20</sup> MHG I, 394. Comp. also the passages in BR and 4 Ezra referred to in the preceding note.

<sup>21</sup> BR 63. 7; Targum Yerushalmi Gen. 25. 23; MHG I, 393. In the last-named passage attention is called to the ambiguous phraseology in the verse of Gen., *loc. cit.*, which may also be translated: "And to the elder shall be servant the younger".

<sup>22</sup> BR 63. 8; MHG I, 391, which reads: Jacob should have been born first, but Esau threatened him that if Jacob did not grant him precedence he would kill their mother. Comp. note 16. Similarly BR, *loc. cit.*, emphasizes the fact that, though Jacob was born last, he was conceived first.

<sup>23</sup> Targum Yerushalmi, Gen. 25. 25. Comp. also BR 63. 7 and note 28.

<sup>24</sup> BR 63. 8; MHG I, 395. See also the quotation, from an unknown Midrash, in Yalkut Reubeni, Gen., *loc. cit.*; *Pa'aneah*, Gen., *loc. cit.*; Hasidim 71.

<sup>25</sup> *Hadar, Da'at*, and *Shu'aib* (the last named gives a wrong source) on Gen. 25. 25. The designation of Esau as the "uncircumcised one", in Tan. B. I, 158, does not belong here, but refers to the widespread legend that Esau removed the sign of the covenant by means of an operation (epispasm); comp. Tan. B. I, 127; BR 63. 13; PRE 29 (on the text see *Eshkol* II, 132, according to which read *ועשו ועשו* (מל' יעקב ועשו ועשו)); Ruth R. (introduction); Epiphanius, *De Mens. et Pond.*, 16; ER 29, 125-126. But in the last-named Midrash it is not Esau, as in all the other sources, but his children, who, after Isaac's death, "despised" the Abrahamic covenant. This legend about Esau's rejection of circumcision is very likely of an anti-Christian nature (comp. note 19 and note 318 on vol. I, p. 306), though it possibly reflects the feeling of the Jew during the Hadrianic persecutions. Comp., however, Philo, 2 *Moses*, 43.

<sup>26</sup> ARN 2, 2; Tehillim 9, 84; Tan. B. I, 32; Tan. Noah 5. The other men distinguished in this way are: Adam, Seth, Enoch, Noah, Shem, Terah, Joseph, Moses, Balaam, Samuel, David, Isaiah, Jeremiah, and Zerubbabel. Comp. note 318 on vol. I, p. 306. PRE

24, on the other hand, speaks of the circumcision performed by Isaac on Jacob.

<sup>27</sup> Ziyroni, Gen. 25. 25.

<sup>28</sup> The interpretation of the name Esau occurs in Targum Yerushalmi Gen. 25. 25; Yashar Toledot, 50b, and, with some variants, *Hadar*, *ad loc.* For other interpretations of the names of Esau, Edom, and Seir see BR 63. 8; Lekah, *ad loc.*; MHG I, 396. Comp. also Rashi, *ad loc.* The interpretation of the name Jacob occurs in Tan. Shemot 4, where the name Isaac is explained in a similar way. BR, *loc. cit.*, emphasizes the fact that it was God Himself who gave Jacob his name. On the men distinguished in this manner see note 122 on vol. I, p. 239; comp. also BaR 18. 21; *Neweh Shalom*, 76; Lekah 1. 121.

<sup>29</sup> BR 63. 9; Targum Yerushalmi Gen. 25. 27; Yashar Toledot, 53b; PRE 32. Comp. also Berakot 16a, where it is said that Scripture sometimes uses the word "tent" as a metaphor for "house of study". The Bet ha-Midrash of Shem and Eber is also alluded to in BR 94. 8; Shir 6. 2; Koheleth 5. 11. Comp. further ER 5, 29 and 32, where, in addition to the industry with which Jacob devoted himself to his studies, his uprightness is spoken of. See also Tan. B. I, 125, 134, 167, 206, as well as note 34.

<sup>30</sup> MHG I, 397.

<sup>31</sup> BR 63. 10; Tan. Toledot 7; Yelammedenu in *Nur al-Zulm*, 96; Leket Midrashim 6a (a quotation from a supposed Midrash on Job); PK, 199a; MHG I, 397. In the last named passage it is said that Isaac knew the real character of his elder son, but hoped by love and kindness, to influence him to mend his ways. The same statement occurs also in Shu'aib, Toledot, 12d.

<sup>32</sup> Targum Yerushalmi Gen. 27. 31. Comp. note 100.

<sup>33</sup> BR 63. 10.

<sup>34</sup> Jub. 19. 16-30. See also *ibid.* 14, which reads: And Jacob learned to write. Comp. note 29. MHG I, 397, in citing BR 63. 9, reads: *ובית מדרשו של אברהם*. This reading must have been known to Yashar Toledot, 51a, where it is explicitly stated that Abraham instructed Jacob in the ways of the Lord. On the seven pious men who preceded Abraham, *i. e.*: Adam, Seth, Enoch, Mahalalel, Enoch, Noah, and Shem, referred to in Jub., *loc. cit.*, comp. note 28 on vol. I, p. 11.

<sup>35</sup> WR 36. 4; Tan. Toledot 4; Shemot 4; Aggadat Bereshit 64, 130. This Haggadah is based on Is. 31. 22; but in Sanhedrin 19b this verse is differently interpreted. Abraham should have been the

father of the twelve tribes, but Jacob took his place to save him the trouble of rearing children. WR, *loc. cit.*, states that mankind, including Abraham, was created for the merits of Jacob. Jacob's superiority over Abraham is expressed in many other statements of the Haggadah. It is for Jacob's merits that the Jordan became dry, that Israel might be able to enter the Holy Land; BR 76. 5. It was he who was the chosen one among the Fathers; *ibid.* 1. For Jacob's sake Israel was redeemed from Egyptian bondage, and will be redeemed by the Messiah; Haserot 2b; BR 75. 13. God loves Israel on account of Jacob; Lekah, Exod. 20. 19. It is for his sake that He makes His Shekinah dwell in Israel; Shir 7. 6. The Torah would have been revealed to Jacob, were it not for the fact that his descendants were not numerous enough in his life-time; an unknown Midrash quoted by Shu'aib, Shemini 'Azeret, 126b, and Yitro, 32b. When Israel suffers or commits a sin, it is Jacob who feels it more than the other patriarchs, and accordingly his joy will be the greatest when the future redemption comes; Tehillim 14, 115; PR 41, 174b. The conflicting view, which accords to Abraham the highest rank among the Fathers, is also given in most of the sources cited above. One may safely assert that the older Haggadah (universalistic) favors Abraham, the younger one (nationalistic) Jacob. This later view reached its highest state of development in the Kabbalah; comp., e. g., Zohar I, 86b; II, 23a. The man in the moon has Jacob's face; Kanah 10b; TShBZ, 220. Comp. note 102 on vol. I, p. 25, and note 6 on vol. IV, p. 4. Clemens Alexandrinus, *Stromata* 1. 15, speaks of the face of the Sibyl in the moon. Origen, *in Joan.* 2. 25, and *in Gen.* 3. 9, quotes, from the lost Jewish pseudepigraphic work, the Prayer of Joseph, the following remarkable words of Jacob concerning himself. He describes himself as an "angel of God, the first servant in God's presence", whereas the angel who wrestled with him is the third in rank. The statement that Jacob never died, which the Amoraim vainly attempted to explain (comp. Ta'anit 5b, according to which the embalming and burying of Jacob were docetic; see Rashi, *ad loc.*, and note 39 on vol. III, p. 22), originally belonged to a legend, which, like the pseudepigraphic work mentioned above, considered Jacob to have been an angel. In this legend the patriarch Jacob is confounded with the Semitic god Jacobel mentioned in an Egyptian inscription. Many an angel is nothing more than a degraded god. On Jacob's face in the heavenly throne, *Merkabah*, comp. note 134. The third patriarch (sometimes with the honorary designation "the pious"; comp. BaR 14. 12=

Tadshe 10) is usually called Jacob in rabbinic literature, and not by his later name Israel, whereas Abraham is never called Abram; comp. Berakot 13a and note 122 on vol. I, p. 239. When Israel is used as the name of the patriarch, and not of the nation, the word סבא, "the old", is added; comp. BR 70. 2, 68. 11, 73. 2, 77. 1, and in many more places. With regard to the orthography of the name יעקב, the remark is found that the Bible spells the name *plene* יעקוב only in five passages, and in an equal number of places אֱלִיָּהּ is spelled defectively instead of אֱלִיָּהוּ. Jacob took one letter from Elijah and attached it to his own name, as a pledge that the prophet will not fail to be the harbinger of the gladsome tidings of the future redemption; Haserot 22. Jub. 19. 25 (comp. also Charles, *ad loc.*) shows that the glorification of Jacob is of very high antiquity.

<sup>36</sup> Jub. 22. 1-23. 7. On the dream of Abraham, described in Jub., *loc. cit.*, comp. note 317 (end). On the point dwelt upon in Jub., *loc. cit.*, that with the death of Abraham the age of man was cut short and disease began to trouble the human race, comp. *Zadokite Fragments*, 10. 8-10 and note 272 on vol. I, p. 291, as well as note 357 on vol. II, p. 131. Yebamot 64b maintains that the cutting short of the age of man took place in the days of David.

<sup>37</sup> Baba Batra 16b; Tehillim 9, 83. A somewhat different view occurs in the Palestinian sources, BR 63. 12; PK 3, 22b; PR 12, 74 (this passage contains the addition that Esau was fifteen years old at the time of Abraham's death; this was adopted by Yashar Toledot, 50b); Tan. B. V, 35; Tan. Shemot 1 (from Baba Batra, *loc. cit.*) and Ki-Teze 4; Yerushalmi Targumim Gen. 25. 29 and 34; an unknown midrashic source in Shu'aib, Toledot, 13b; MHG I, 399 and 401.

<sup>38</sup> Yashar Toledot, 51b-52a. According to Targum Yerushalmi Gen. 25. 25 and PRE 32 (the complete text is found in Yalkut I, 110, and *Nur al-Zulm*, 95), Esau killed also Nimrod's son Enoch, or rather Hiwwar (= "the leper"); comp. Aggadat Bereshit 19, 37 (here it is stated that Abraham killed Nimrod); PRE 24; Tan. B. I, 125; BR 65. 16 and 63. 13. Esau owed to Jacob his victory over Nimrod. Esau and Nimrod had been engaged in a bitter feud for a long time, and finally resolved to leave the decision to a duel. Jacob, knowing that Nimrod was invulnerable as long as he was clad in Adam's garments (comp. notes 78-80 on vol. I, p. 177, and the following note), advised his brother not to enter into combat before his adversary had removed his magic garments. Whereupon Esau put those garments

on stealthily, and killed Nimrod in the duel; *Hadar and Da'at* on Gen. 25. 29-32.

<sup>39</sup> BR 63. 13. Comp. the preceding note.

<sup>40</sup> MHG I, 398.

<sup>41</sup> Baba Batra 16b; BR 63. 14; PRE 35. Jerome, *Epist.* 39. 3 also mentions the custom in use among the Jews of his time to serve lentils for the mourner's meal. Comp. also *Leket Midrashim* 2b; *Zohar* I, 139a-139b; *Hadar*, Gen. 25. 30; *Tan. B. I*, 125-126.

<sup>42</sup> PR 12, 47b-48a; a somewhat different text from that of the edition is found in *Yalkut Reubeni*, Gen. 25. 32.

<sup>43</sup> MHG I, 399-400. Comp. also EZ 19, 26-27, where the sale of the birthright by Esau to Jacob is explained as the renunciation by the former of his share in the world to come in favor of the latter, while retaining this world for himself. Comp. also *Tan. B. I*, 126, and *Sekel*, 100.

<sup>44</sup> BR 63. 13. On the priestly functions of the first-born in pre-Mosaic times, comp. vol. I, p. 332; vol. III, pp. 93, 211, and 226. Philo, *Quaestiones*, Gen. 4, 127, and *Hasidim* 446, maintain that Jacob's intention in buying the birthright from his brother was to take away from him the means to lead a dissipated and voluptuous life. In the last-named source it is stated that Jacob, after the consummation of the deal, was ready to return the birthright to Esau, provided he would become a pious and God-fearing man. Comp. *Lekah*, Gen. 25. 31, and the preceding note.

<sup>45</sup> *Lekah*, Gen. 25. 31, based on an unknown Midrash. Besides lentils, Jacob gave Esau some red wine; MHG I, 399, and BR 63. 12. In the last-named passage, as well as in many others, stress is laid on the gluttony of Esau, who asked Jacob to fill him with food; *Tan. B. I*, 126 (זיבורית) has been misunderstood by Buber and others; it means "a bowl"); PK 6, 59a (=Yalkut II, 950, on Prov. 13, where Yelammedenu is erroneously given as source); PR 16, 82a; *BaR* 21. 20; *Tan. Pinehas* 13.

<sup>46</sup> *Lekah*, Gen. 25. 34, based on an unknown midrashic source. The use of זרנוב and זרנום to describe a certain coin (= gulden) in this source betrays its late age. The pot of lentils was, accordingly, not the real price for the birthright, but is to be understood as the handsel given by Jacob to Esau; *Hadar* and *Midrah Aggada*, Gen. 26. 25.

<sup>47</sup> *Sekel* and *Imre No'am*, Gen. 25. 26. Comp. vol. I, p. 141, and note 63 appertaining thereto; see further vol. III, p. 411, and note 853 appertaining thereto, as well as *Index*, s. v. "David, Sword of".

<sup>48</sup> MHG I, 400-401; BR 63. 14. That Esau denied the existence of God, comp. note 37. *Da'at*, Gen. 25. 27, quotes Yerushalmi (not in our text) to the effect that Esau started on his impious mode of life two years prior to Abraham's death. Out of respect for his grandfather, however, he hid his wickedness from the eyes of man. But as soon as Abraham died, he threw his mask off. Comp. note 37 on vol. I, p. 318.

<sup>49</sup> Midrash Aggada Gen. 25. 33, and similarly Philo, *De Special. Leg.*, ii, 2; ii, 241, with reference to Gen. 31. 53. Comp. Ginzberg, *Unbekannte Sekte*, 130-131 (note).

<sup>50</sup> Yashar Toledot, 53a-53b, based on old sources; comp. vol. I, pp. 393 and 417.

<sup>51</sup> Midrash ha Ne'elam (end of paragraphs "וְרַעַי וְרַעַי"), 36d. Comp. further vol. I, p. 399 and vol. IV, p. 418, and note 126. One often meets with the statement that Esau's descendants (Romans, or rather Christians) received the dominion over the world as a reward for the filial affection Esau showed towards his father Isaac; see, e. g., DR 1. 1; DZ. 23; and in many other places. Hasidim 341 reads: Esau went hunting . . ., exposing himself thereby to great dangers, that he should be able to provide his father with game. His reward consists in his children's dominion over the world. Mishle 30. 107 says: Esau received the dominion (over the world) for the merits of Abraham. As to the question whether Jacob's dealing with Esau was entirely justified, see Hasidim 446, which is the source for *Da'at* and *Hadar* on Gen. 25. 33. Comp. vol. I, p. 320, and note 43.

<sup>52</sup> MHG I, 401 (רַעַי=relatives, compatriots); Tan. Toledot 9. The famine occurred immediately after the death of Abraham, and was much more grievous than the one which forced him to emigrate to Egypt; Sekel, Gen. 26. 1.

<sup>53</sup> BR 64. 3; Tan. B. I, 128 and 168; MHG I, 401; Sekel, Gen. 24. 6; *Ha-Hoker* I, 344. The land of the Philistines is a part of the Holy Land; comp. *Da'at*, *Hadar*, and Shu'aib on Exod. 14. 16; Hasidim 269. See also vol. I, p. 348.

<sup>54</sup> MHG I, 403.

<sup>55</sup> Aggadat Bereshit 26. 10; Yashar, Toledot, 52b. With regard to the difference in the attitude of the Philistines towards Abraham and Isaac, Bereshit Rabbeti (*Magazin* XV, 98) quotes, as an explanation, the proverb "He who was bitten by a snake fears a snakelike rope", and the fable of the lion and the fox. Comp. Epstein, *ad loc.*

On Abimelech the king of the Philistines, comp. vol. I, pp. 290-291, and Lekah, Gen. 25. 1.

<sup>56</sup> Yashar, Toledot, 52b; MHG I, 403; Philo, Gen. 4, 188; BR 64. 5; Midrash Aggada, Lekah, *Hadar*, and *Da'at* on Gen. 26. 8. According to Zohar I, 140b, and III, 113b, Abimelech found out by means of astrology the true relation between Isaac and Rebekah.

<sup>57</sup> Onkelos and Yerushalmi Targumim on Gen. 26. The rendering of אָחִי by "the most prominent one" is frequently found in the Talmud; comp. e. g. Megillah 28a (ascribed to R. Akiba's teacher); Hullin 28a. Comp. also Yashar, Toledot, 53a, and the dissenting view of 2 Targum Yerushalmi, which paraphrases אָחִי by חָדָר מִן טַלְיָא "a young man."

<sup>58</sup> MHG I, 404.

<sup>59</sup> Yashar, Toledot, 53a. Comp. also BR 64. 7.

<sup>60</sup> PK 11, 98a; PR 25, 127b; Tan. B. V, 24; Tan. Rēeh 14. PRE 33, EZ. 1. 170, and Targumim Yerushalmi, Gen. 26. 12, find in this verse an indication that Isaac was very wealthy, as the large quantity of grain which he is said to have possessed represented only the tenth part of his yearly income, the tithes which he gave away. Jub. 13. 25 and 32. 8 ascribes the introduction of the priestly tithe to Abraham and Jacob. Comp. also BR 64. 6 and Mishle 30, 105.

<sup>61</sup> BR 64. 6; Targum Yerushalmi Gen. 26. 2. Comp. also vol. IV, p. 360, l. 3 (from below), where "Israel" is a printer's error for "Isaac".

<sup>62</sup> MHG I, 407-408, and the parallel passages cited by Schechter. Haserot 14 is the source for the remarks in MHG about Isaac's filial piety and modesty. R. Bahya, Gen. 26. 18, cites the same remark from Sa'adya Gaon's commentary on the Pentateuch. Philo, *Quaestiones*, Gen. 4, 194, likewise dwells on Isaac's extraordinary filial piety. The masoretic note in MHG about the biblical places, where the expression הַלֵךְ וְגַרְלֵךְ is used, is found also in Aggadat Esther 9. 9. Comp. also note 122 vol. I, p. 239, and note 35.

<sup>63</sup> PRE 35, in accordance with the correct text in MHG I, 408. On the number of wells which Isaac dug, and their symbolic significance, comp. BR 64. 8. Septuagint, on Gen. 26. 32 reads λῆ, whereas the masoretic text has לו. But the reading of the Septuagint is found also in rabbinic sources; comp. Midrash Tannaim 73, and Ginzberg's remarks on it in Geiger's *Kebuzzat Maamarim*, 411. The fourth well is identified with the well of Miriam; comp. vol. III, p. 52, and vol. I, p. 324.

<sup>64</sup> MHG I, 408. Comp. the sources quoted in note 61.

<sup>65</sup> BR 64. 9. Lekah, Gen. 26. 26, identifies Abimelech, the king of Gerar at the time of Isaac, with the king of that name in Abraham's days. A different view is given in Yashar Toledot, 53a. See MHG I, 409 (מ'ג); note 53, and note 270 on vol. I, 290-291.

<sup>66</sup> Targum Yerushalmi Gen. 26. 20 and 28. The Philistines came to Isaac imploring him to intercede in their behalf; he willingly granted their request; Targum Yerushalmi, Gen. 26. 27; comp. also Sifre D., 38. Isaac moved out of Gerar because "change of place brings about change of luck"; MHG I, 408-409, and Midrash Aggada Gen. 26. 22. A similar remark occurs in Rosh ha-Shanah 16b, with reference to Abraham's emigration to Palestine. Here also the different view is cited to the effect that only emigration to Palestine may change one's luck. Comp. also note 122 on vol. I, p. 239 with regard to change of names.

<sup>67</sup> MHG I, 410-411. On the covenant between Isaac and the Philistines, comp. vol. IV, pp. 93-94. On the meaning of the name Beer-sheba see vol. I, p. 270, as well as the sources cited in note 63. Characteristic of the wickedness of the Philistines are the words of Abimelech, who spoke of adultery as of a peccadillo (Gen. 26. 10: כמעט "as a trifle"), whereas pious people, on the other hand, belittle their good deeds, but consider their failings as grave sins; MHG I, 404. See also ER 25, 128-129. After Abraham's death, Isaac said to himself: "Woe unto me! How will God deal with me now that my father is dead, and I have no good deeds like his to my credit?" God in His mercy thereupon appeared to Isaac.

<sup>68</sup> MHG I, 409. Here it is also stated that it was not on account of egotistical motives that Isaac exerted himself in digging the wells. Wherever the pious people take up their abode, they are anxious to provide the people of the neighborhood with water.

<sup>69</sup> Shabbat 89b; PRK, 33a and 37b. This legend is given in the form of an interpretation of Is. 63. 16, where Abraham and Jacob are mentioned, but not Isaac. The "first" and "third" patriarchs deserted their descendants, but not Isaac, who pleaded for them with God. A different view occurs in BR 67. 7 (see also the statement of Raba in Shabbat, *loc. cit.*), which maintains, on the contrary, that the prophet, Isaiah, *loc. cit.*, did not mention Isaac among "the Fathers", because he did not act as a father of Israel, when he bestowed the power of the sword on Esau (=Rome). Shir 8. 10 (this is the source Rashi, Sukkah 52b, had in mind, not Yalkut, as given in margin)



reads: Isaac went to the gates of Gehenna to his children. This hints at our legend; but it cannot be ascertained with which form thereof it was acquainted, whether with the one of the Talmud, or with that of PRK. Ginzberg, *Unbekannte Sekte*, 64, calls attention to the fact that in this legend twenty is taken to be the age of majority, in accordance with a view which prevailed in early times. The reduction of the four hundred years of the Egyptian servitude to two hundred and ten (comp. vol. II, p. 318, note 124) is likewise due to the merits of Isaac, who, in exchange of this, had to submit to a reduction in the numerical value of his name. He should have been called Yishak (יִשְׁחָק), but with the exception of one place (Jer. 33. 26), he is called Yizhak (יִצְחָק), and the difference between ש and צ amounts to two hundred and ten, corresponding to the years of the Egyptian servitude. See *Hadar*, *Imre No'am*, and *Pa'aneah* on Exod. 6. 1; Midrash Aggada, Exod. 4. 24, and Gen. 21. 1; Shu'aib, Wa-Yiggash 21a; Yalkut Reubeni, Exod. 1. 1 (here it is given as a quotation from מדרש דברי הימים; but the statement may be doubted). Comp. also Batte Midrashot, III, 28.

<sup>70</sup> Yerushalmi Sotah 5, 20d.

<sup>71</sup> Yashar, Toledot 43a-43b.

<sup>72</sup> Jub. 25. 1-23. Manifestly Rebekah is assumed to have been a prophetess. This is in agreement with Seder 'Olam 21, and parallel passages cited by Ratner, note 25, that the "fathers" and "mothers" were endowed with the prophetic spirit. Comp.; however, note 18.

<sup>73</sup> Tan. Toledot 8; MHG I, 411-412. On the idolatry of Esau's wives, comp. BR 65. 4 (here Rebekah is described as the daughter of an idolatrous priest); Targum Yerushalmi Gen. 26. 35; Aggadat Bereshit 41, 83 (Esau himself burned incense to the idols); Abkir in Yalkut I, 114; Yalkut II, 956 on Prov. 17. 25; MHG I, 411 (נ'). See also the following note.

<sup>74</sup> BR 65. 4-10, which also gives the different view to the effect that Isaac's blindness was caused by his looking at the Shekinah at the time of the 'Akedah. Comp. note 248 on vol. I, p. 282; PRE 32; Targum Yerushalmi, Gen. 27. 1; DR 11. 3; an unknown midrashic source quoted in Yalkut I, 101 (ויעקר). See also vol. IV. p. 361, note 58. The looking at the wicked causes blindness, and Isaac looked too often at Esau; Megillah 28a. This passage gives also another view, according to which Isaac's blindness was a consequence of the curse called down by Abimelech upon Sarah's children (a haggadic

interpretation of the "covering of the eyes"; Gen. 20. 16); for even the curse of an ordinary person sometimes takes effect. The evil ways of the children cause the parents to age prematurely, as may be seen from what happened to Isaac, Eli, and Samuel. The wickedness of one's child or disciple brings blindness to the father or master, respectively, as is proved by the blindness of Isaac and Ahijah the Shilonite. See Aggadat Bereshit 41, 83; Tan. Hayye Sarah 2 and Ki-Teze 4; PK 3, 23a; Tan. B. V, 35; Shemuel 8, 72; BR, *loc. cit.* Comp. vol. IV, p. 180, note 6. There is also another view which maintains that Isaac's blindness was his punishment for preferring the wicked Esau to the God-fearing Jacob. Besides this bodily punishment, he was also punished spiritually by losing the prophetic spirit; BR, *loc. cit.*; Tan. B. I, 30; Tan. Toledot 8; MHG I, 417; Batte Midrashot, IV, 14. Some, however, maintain that Isaac had prayed to God to send bodily ailments upon men, that they might atone for their sins, and his blindness was the first case of disease which came upon men. See BR, *loc. cit.*, and vol. I, p. 292, note 272.

<sup>75</sup> MHG I, 516; BR 65. 8; Tan. Toledot 8; Philo, Gen. 4, 196. The last passage adds that Isaac regained his sight after Jacob received the blessing from him. Philo (198) also remarks that Isaac knew very well the true character of his two sons; he nevertheless wished to bless the wicked Esau, in the hope that this distinction would induce him to mend his ways, whereas there was no need to offer Jacob any inducement to do good. The same view occurs in rabbinic sources; comp. note 31 and vol. I, 339, note 106.

<sup>76</sup> BR 65. 12; Lekah Gen. 17. 2. Differently in MHG I, 418.

<sup>77</sup> Tan. B. I, 130; MHG I, 418 (↔). It is difficult to harmonize this view with the high praise bestowed by the Haggadah upon Esau for his filial piety; comp. note 51. On the seven holy places, comp. also vol. I, p. 270. On the seven abominations (Prov. 6. 15), see BR 65. 11; WR 16. 1.

<sup>78</sup> BR 65. 4 and 13; Tan. Toledot 8. Another view finds in the different kinds of weapons mentioned by Isaac (Gen. 27. 3) an allusion to the "four kingdoms", which ruled the world by the might of the sword. See BR, *loc. cit.*, and Tan. B. I, 131.

<sup>79</sup> PRE 36; Targum Yerushalmi 27. 1; ShR 15. 11; Zohar I, 142a. Comp. also vol. I, p. 224, note 76.

<sup>80</sup> BR 65. 13; Koheleth 5. 10.

<sup>81</sup> BR 67. 9; Tan. Toledot 11; Tan. B. I, 131; Targum Yerushalmi Gen. 27. 5; Tan. Toledot 10. On Rebekah as a prophetess see note

72, and Index, *s. v.* "Prophetesses". A different view is found in Lekah, *ad loc.*, and MHG I, 421, which, on the contrary, remark: Women are eaves-droppers, as may be seen from Rebekah's action. Comp. vol. I, p. 66.

<sup>82</sup> Philo, *Quaestiones*, Gen. 200.

<sup>83</sup> PRE 36; Targum Yerushalmi Gen. 27. 6. On the first day of Passover the quantity of dew is fixed for the ensuing year, and on the last day of Tabernacles (Shemini 'Azeret) the quantity of rain; comp. Mishnah Rosh ha-Shanah 1. 2; Ta'anit 1. 1-2, and Luria, PRE, *ad loc.*

<sup>84</sup> Lekah and Midrash Aggada on Gen. 27. 8.

<sup>85</sup> PRE 36; Targum Yerushalmi Gen. 37. 11.

<sup>86</sup> BR 65. 15. Comp. also MHG I, 424 (מ"ב).

<sup>87</sup> PRE 36; Targum Yerushalmi Gen. 27. 9. By דחנין, in PRE, reference is made to Tosefta Pesahim 5. 3, according to which מטעמים (Gen., *loc. cit.*) is to be taken as a festival sacrifice. Comp. Targum Yerushalmi, *ad loc.*

<sup>88</sup> BR 65. 14; WR 21. 11 and 27. 9; Tan. Toledot 10 and Emor 12; PR 47, 191a. Goats' skins were used for the tabernacle in remembrance of Jacob who obtained the blessings by means of goats' skins; Shir 2. 4.

<sup>89</sup> Tan. B. I, 133 (read: שדיה בכורו... לאדם) and 181; BaR 4. 8; Aggadat Bereshit 43, 85-86. Comp. notes 39, 44, as well as vol. I, p. 177, notes 78-80. Jerome, Gen. 27. 16, also mentions the Jewish tradition according to which the choicest garments were the priestly garments worn by the first-born who performed the priestly service before Aaron's time. That Isaac, though the first-born of his mother (and inasmuch as Ishmael was the son of a bondwoman, the former was the first legitimate child of his father), did not act as priest himself, is due to the circumstance that his blindness disqualified him from the priesthood. Comp. Josephus, *Antiqui.*, I, 18.

<sup>90</sup> BR 65. 16-17; DR I. 15; PR 23, 124a; MHG I, 424-425.

<sup>91</sup> Tan. B. I, 131; BR 65. 18. The Haggadah would not admit that Jacob uttered an unqualified untruth, especially as his answer to Rebekah's suggestion was: To tell a lie is as great a sin as to worship idols (BR, *loc. cit.*, and Sanhedrin 92a). Accordingly, Gen. 27. 19 is explained in such a way, that Jacob's words, though somewhat ambiguous, do not express an untruth. The construction of the Hebrew sentence admits of such an explanation without difficulty. Jub. 26. 13 goes still further, and makes Jacob answer his father: "I am

thy son." Similarly with regard to verse 24, it is remarked that Jacob's answer was: "I" (=It is I), and not "I am Esau." Comp. Lekah and Rashi, *ad loc.*

<sup>92</sup> BR 65. 19-23; Tan. B. I, 131-132 and 134-135 (comp. *ibid.* 165, where the episode with the angel is given in connection with Jacob's terror at meeting Esau on his return from Mesopotamia); Tan. Toledot 11; Ephraim, I, 77D. On the assistance rendered by the two archangels, Michael and Gabriel, comp. also BR 63. 14, where it is said that they drew up the bill of sale, transferring the birthright from Esau to Jacob. On the fragrance from paradise, and how Isaac recognized it, see vol. I, p. 286, note 255, and vol. I, p. 297, note 300, as well as vol. IV, p. 205, note 54. According to Tan. B. I, 145, the bodies of the pious emit a celestial fragrance like that of paradise (comp. vol. III, p. 5), while according to another view the paradise fragrance which Isaac discerned came from Jacob's garments which originally belonged to Adam who had worn them in paradise; comp. vol. I, p. 332. The statement Tan. B. I, 141, that God caused the garments to emit a fragrance like the aromatic perfume of the incense used in the temple is a later modification of the Haggadah in BR 65. 23, and Targum Yerushalmi Gen. 27. 27.

<sup>93</sup> Tan. B. I, 135; Targum Yerushalmi Gen. 27. 35 (with the addition that the wine given by the archangel to Isaac was of the kind created at the very beginning of the world for the use of the pious in the world to come, and which is "preserved in its grapes", = *וְיִן הַטַּיִם*, till that time; comp. note 79 on vol. I, p. 20). A similar Haggadah is found in Shu'aib, Toledot, 12c, and Shir, 52b. A badly mutilated form of this legend occurs in a Pahlevi writing. Comp. *R.E.J.*, XVIII, 13-14.

<sup>94</sup> Zohar Shir 1. 2. On joy as the necessary condition for the manifestation of the holy spirit, comp. Shabbat 30b; vol. II, p. 116, note 294.

<sup>95</sup> MHG I, 430; PRE 32, and comp. Luria, *ad loc.* The mid-rashic literature contains many interpretations of the "blessing", all of which are based on the assumption that it is nothing but a prophecy of Israel's history. See BR 66. 1-4; Tan. B. I, 133-134; Aggadat Bereshit 42, 86-87.

<sup>96</sup> BR 66. 4; Tan. B. I, 136; MHG I, 430; Yerushalmi Targumim Gen. 27. 29; Aggadat Bereshit 42, 87.

<sup>97</sup> BR 75. 8; MHG I, 438. In Rebekah's blessing an allusion

is found to the legend (vol. I, p. 333) that Michael and Gabriel came to Jacob's assistance; comp. also note 92.

<sup>98</sup> PRE 32; comp. Index, s. v. "Dew, Celestial."

<sup>99</sup> Tan. B. I, 136; Tan. Toledot 11; BR 66. 5; *Hadar* and *Da'at* on Gen. 27. 30, cite the Haggadah that Michael and Gabriel came to Jacob's assistance at the moment of Esau's arrival. Comp. notes 92 and 97 as well as Targum Yerushalmi Gen. 27. 30.

<sup>100</sup> Targum Yerushalmi Gen. 27. 31. PRE 32, according to the reading in MHG I, 431, maintains, on the contrary, that Esau finally succeeded in catching a hart; comp. also Tan. Toledot 11, and Tan. B. I, 131. The sentence cited by Ginsburger (Targum, *ad loc.*) from PRE cannot be the source of Targum. The Karaite Hadassi, *Eshkol*, No. 362, 133a, quotes the following from the Midrash: Esau was in the habit of serving his father meat of animals not slaughtered according to the law, and on one occasion, when he failed to catch any game, he prepared a *ragoût* out of the flesh of young dogs and hares, and put it before Isaac. But no sooner did Isaac touch the plate than the dogs began to bark, and he became frightened as narrated in the Bible, Gen. 27. 33. The Karaite Mordecai b. Nissim, 65, likewise mentions this legend, but he cannot be cited as an independent authority for this, since he undoubtedly made use of *Eshkol*. It is not improbable that the Karaites, in their attempt to ridicule the Rabbanites, exaggerated the statement of Targum Yerushalmi, *loc. cit.*, though the barking of dead dogs is not impossible in legend; comp. vol. I, p. 236, note 113. See also vol. I, pp. 329-330, with regard to Esau's preparation of the food according to the law, in contrast to the view ascribed to the Rabbis by the Karaites.

<sup>101</sup> BR 65. 18 and 67. 1-4; Tan. B. I, 141-143; Tan. Toledot 11-13; Targum Yerushalmi Gen. 27. 33. Great terror took hold of Isaac at the time of the 'Akedah, when God opened the heavens and Isaac beheld the "chambers of the *Merkabah*"; Tan. B. I, 141. Comp. also the quotation from the Pesikta in *Da'at*, on Gen. 27. 1 (not found in our texts), as well as Zohar I, 143a, 144a. With regard to the suspicion against Rebekah, see note 81. Jacob who caused fright and terror to his father was punished "measure for measure", and terror seized hold of him at the report of Joseph's death. See Zohar I, 144b.

<sup>102</sup> *Lekah* Gen. 27. 36. רַקִּי is taken to be identical with talmudic רַקִּי "so".

<sup>103</sup> BR 67. 5; Tan. B. I, 143. Comp. also Megillah 6a and PRE 39 (end), as well as Mishle 26, 100, and Tehillim 10, 95.

<sup>104</sup> Tan. B. I, 143-144 and III, 79; Sanhedrin 101b (where בפלילה "argument", is to be read, with MHG I, 113, 433, and not בעלילה "accusation", as our texts have it. See Ginzberg, *Randglossen zum hebräischen Ben Sira*, 7. 7 and 14); PRK ed. G. 52, where חונה is to be explained in accordance with vol. III, p. 58, note 10. On the tears shed by Esau, comp. ER 13, 65 (two tears), and 19, 114; 2 ARN 48, 130; Tehillim 80, 362; Tan. Kedoshim 15; Sekel 100; vol. IV, p. 418. Philo, Gen. 4, 233, reads: Isaac mistook Esau's tears to be tears of repentance, and he blessed him, believing that he had forsaken his evil ways.

<sup>105</sup> BR 67. 6. Comp. also Onkelos and Yerushalmi Targumim Gen. 27. 40, as well as Jub. 26. 31. In the last-named source this biblical verse is rendered as follows: And it shall come to pass when thou becomest great (חרב instead of חרד?) and dost shake off his yoke from thy neck, thou wilt sin a grievous sin unto death, and thy seed will be uprooted from under the heaven. "Grievous sin" is a haggadic rendering of ופרקת עלו, which is explained in accordance with this mishnic use of פורק על "to cast off the heavenly yoke", while the other haggadic interpretation connects עלו with עול "young child"; hence the paraphrase "and thy seed", etc. On עול or על "child", comp. Ginzberg's note in Geiger, *Kebuzzat Maamarim*, 384.

<sup>106</sup> Tan. B. I, 134 and 135; Aggadat Bereshit 42, 86-87. See also note 75.

<sup>107</sup> Yashar, Toledot, 53a-53b. Comp. notes 71 and 73.

<sup>108</sup> BR 75. 9; WR 27. 11; Tan. B. III, 95; Tan. Emor 13; ER 3, 12; PK 9, 78b-79a; Tehillim 2, 24; Targum Yerushalmi Gen. 27. 41. See also note 118.

<sup>109</sup> BR 67. 8-10. On Rebekah as a prophetess comp. note 81. Commenting on the words of Scripture "And Esau said in his heart" (Gen. 27. 41), the Midrash remarks: The pious are masters of their hearts (= passions), the wicked are slaves to their hearts. See BR, *loc. cit.*; Tehillim 14, 112. Esau was a consummate master of deceitfulness: he not only played the rôle of a loving son, while he was anxiously awaiting his father's death (comp. Tehillim *loc. cit.*), but he also pretended to be a loving brother, in order that Jacob should not take any precautions against his murderous plans; Mishle 26, 99, and comp. vol. II, p. 7, note 11. According to Jub. 27. 1, Esau's evil designs were revealed to Rebekah in a dream. It is difficult to

harmonize this view with the description, given *ibid.* 26. 35, of the open hostility between the brothers.

<sup>110</sup> Jub. 27. 5.

<sup>111</sup> Sotah 13a. Comp. vol. II, p. 154. Targum Yerushalmi Gen. 27. 45 explains these words of Rebekah differently.

<sup>112</sup> Jub. 27. 7. Similarly in Tan. B. I, 145=Aggadat Bereshit 45, 91.

<sup>113</sup> BR 67. 11; גורפת מחוטמה, as a result of her incessant weeping which made her wipe her nose continually. The paraphrasing of אשה (Gen. 27. 46) by a "wicked wife" is found not only in Targum Yerushalmi, *ad loc.*, but also in Jub. 27. 8. Leket Midrashim 22a reads: Rebekah saw, in her prophetic vision, that Titus would destroy the temple which will be a hundred cubits high (a haggadic explanation of the masoretic note on Gen. *loc. cit.* that a small  $\eta$  is to be written in חִצְתָּ).

<sup>114</sup> Yashar, Toledot, 54b-55a. Targum Yerushalmi Gen. 28. 3 reads: May the Lord give thee many possessions, and make twelve tribes issue from thee, and mayest thou be found meritorious to produce Synedrions consisting of seventy members, corresponding to the number of the nations of the earth.

<sup>115</sup> BR 67. 12.

<sup>116</sup> MHG I, 437-438. Comp. vol. I, p. 299. On the number of the blessings, see Tan. B. I, 136, and sources quoted in note 95.

<sup>117</sup> BR 75. 8. Comp. vol. I, pp. 335-336. See further Index, s. v. "Dominions."

<sup>118</sup> MHG I, 440; Aggadat Bereshit 2, 6, and 46, 95-96; Tehilim 14, 112; *Nur al-Zulm*, 87. Comp. also BR 67. 8, and note 108. *Hadar* on Gen. 27. 42 quotes, from an unknown midrashic source, the statement that God had revealed to Shem Esau's evil designs; and the prophet informed the latter that his secrets were known to him.

<sup>119</sup> BR 67. 8. Comp. the preceding note.

<sup>120</sup> MHG I, 440, where נגף ישמעאל is to be read. A somewhat different version is found in *Nur al-Zulm*, 87, which reads: When Esau saw that Ishmael was unwilling to carry out his plans, he refused to marry Mahalath, who had been betrothed to him, and the marriage took place only after her father's death. See also Seder 'Olam 2 and Megillah 17a, where it is stated that Ishmael died after the betrothal, but before the marriage of his daughter.

<sup>121</sup> BR 67. 13. Here, as well as in the sources cited in the following note, Mahalath is identified with Basemath mentioned in Gen.

36. 3. This view is also shared by Targum Yerushalmi Gen. 28. 9. Philo, Gen. 4, 245, in agreement with BR, calls attention to the word על (Gen. 28. 9), which indicates that Esau did not separate himself from his Canaanitish wives, as his parents had hoped. In BR לגרשם is perhaps to be read instead of להתייר, and the Midrash wants to say that at first Esau had intended to divorce his Canaanitish wives, but changed his mind. The difference between Esau and Jacob became evident to everybody, when the former married the ungodly daughter of Ishmael, while the latter married the pious daughters of Laban; Yelammedenu in Supplement to Yalkut 18 = BHM VI, 181; Lekah, Gen. 28. 9. Comp. the following note.

<sup>122</sup> Yerushalmi Bikkurim 3, 65d; Shemuel 17, 95 and in abridged form BR 67. 13. In all these sources the identity of Mahalath with Basemath is presupposed. See the preceding note. Like this third wife of Esau, his two first ones also had double names: Oholibamah-Judith, and Adah-Basemath. Accordingly, there is no contradiction between Gen. 26. 34 and 36. 3. Comp. Lekah, Gen. 26. 46, and Rashi, Gen. 36. 2. These two authorities, though agreeing on this point, differ in their explanations of the meaning of the names, and show thereby that they made use of different sources. Comp. also ps.-Philo, 9, top.

<sup>123</sup> Jub. 27. 13-18. On the expression "my sister", used by Isaac in his address to Rebekah, see Charles, *ad loc.* He errs, however, in maintaining that the use of "brother" in the sense of "fellow-believer" (comp. 1 Corinth. 9. 5) is unknown in rabbinic literature. See Baba Kamma 88a: אַחִיךָ בַּמִּצְוָה. Comp. also MHG I, 341.

<sup>124</sup> Yashar Toledot, 55a-55b, where יהודה instead of כנען is to be read, since Shechem is not at the end of the Holy Land. A similar legend was known to Rashi; see his remarks on Gen. 19. 11. The statement of Berliner, *ad loc.*, that R. Judah Gedaliah, in his *Ot Emet*, 37a, quotes this legend from BR is based on a misunderstanding; comp. the following note, and note 156. The older Midrashim cite two views: according to one, Isaac, though a very rich man, sent his son away empty-handed, and God was wrath with him on this account. But the other view maintains that Jacob left his parental home laden with wealth. On his way to Laban, however, he was attacked by Esau, who robbed him of everything he had with him. See BR 68. 2 (גֵּרֵד "bare life", instead of גֵּרֵד; comp. the use of the adverb גֵּרֵד "only" in Talmud); Tan. B. I, 145-146; Aggadat Bereshit 45, 92-93, and 67, 136. Isaac, according to the first view, was



punished for his lack of paternal love. The Shekinah deserted him, and did not return to him until the day of his death; Tan., Aggadat Bereshit, *loc. cit.*; Makiri, Ps. 121, 234. On this desertion of the holy spirit (= Shekinah), comp. vol. I, p. 329.

<sup>125</sup> Tan. B. I, 145; Aggadat Bereshit 45, 93; quotation, from a Midrash in MS. by Azulai, *Midbar Kedemot* 'ס, 3; Bereshit Rabbeti, cited by Epstein in *Mikkadmoniyyot*, 107-108, and in *Magazin*, XV, 73; R. Judah Gedaliah, *Ot Emet*, 37 (not from BR, but from Bereshit Rabbeti); Makiri, Ps. 121, 233-234. Yelammedenu in Supplement to Yalkut 19 (= BHM VI, 81), speaks of the dividing of the Jordan for Jacob on his return home. On "Baarus" or "Baaras", see note 189.

<sup>126</sup> MHG I, 442-443; BR 68. 2 and 9; Tan. B. I, 145; Aggadat Bereshit 45, 93.

<sup>127</sup> MHG I, 443. This passage also remarks: After having taken leave from his parents, Jacob betook himself to Eber, in whose house he remained hidden for fourteen years, and then proceeded to Laban. These fourteen years he spent in the study of the Torah under the guidance of Eber. See BR 68. 5; Tan. B. I, 145; Index, s. v. "Shem and Eber".

<sup>128</sup> BR 68. 5 and 7; Tan. B. I, 151. In these sources Philistia is not considered as part of the Holy Land. On the different view see note 53.

<sup>129</sup> Tan. B. I, 147, and IV 161; Tan. Wa-Yehi 6 and Mass'e 1; Berakot 64a; Aggadat Bereshit 46, 95-96.

<sup>130</sup> PRE 35; BR 68. 10. Comp. also the sources cited in the following note, all of which presuppose that Jacob spent the night on mount Moriah. On the spring which followed him, comp. vol. II, 291, and vol. III, p. 52. The rendering of פגע by "and he prayed" in the Midrashim just cited is of tannaitic origin; comp. Mekilta Beshallah 2, 28a, and Mekilta RS, 45. This interpretation of פגע caused the word במקום, which follows it, to be taken to refer to God, in accordance with the frequent use of מקום "the Place" (= τόπος by Philo) as a name of God. See Mahzor Vitry 500, and Duran, *Magen Abot*, II, 19. These two authorities quote Sifre to the effect that God is called "the Place". A statement of this kind is not found in our texts of the Sifre; but comp. Midrash Tannaim 222, where the text is very likely to be completed according to Tehillim 90, 390-391. On the meaning of מקום, comp. Dalman, *Worté Jesu*, s. v., and Landau, *Die... Synonyma für Gott*, p. 30, seq.

<sup>131</sup> BR 68. 10; Sanhedrin 95b; Koheleth 3. 14; Yerushalmi Tar-

gumim, Gen. 28. 10. According to a frequently quoted statement (BaR 20. 12; Tan. B. IV, 137; Tan. Balak 11; Aggadat Bereshit 67, 71), God reveals Himself to Jews by day, and to Gentiles by night. Comp. note 221.

<sup>132</sup> Tan. B. I, 145; comp. also note 168.

<sup>133</sup> BR 68. 11; Tan. B. (introduction), 123-124, and I, 146; Shir 1. 16; PRE 35; Tehillim 91, 399; Yerushalmi Targumim Gen. 28. 10; Hullin 91b; see also BR 24. 5; ER 5, 29; Tan. B. I, 181; note 127. On the twelve tribes as a fixed order of nature, vol. II, pp. 30-31.

<sup>134</sup> BR 73. 12-14; Tan. B. I, 149-150; Sifre N., 119; Tehillim 78, 347; Lekah, Gen. 28. 12-13; MHG I, 449-451 (several interpretations of the vision of the ladder are given in this passage); Yerushalmi Targumim and Yalkut Reubeni on Gen. 28. 12. The angels took leave from Jacob at the time of his departure from the Holy Land, since each land has its own guardian angels, and the angels of Palestine could not accompany him to any other country; comp. note 230. According to one view given in BR, *loc. cit.*, the angels ascending to heaven on the ladder were the two angels who visited Lot, and who, till this memorable night, were excluded from heaven as a punishment for their boastful words: "For *we* will destroy this place" (Gen. 19. 13), as though the destruction of Sodom was their own work, and not the carrying out of the mission entrusted to them by God. As a further humiliation they had to make use of the ladder for their ascension; comp. Yalkut Reubeni, Gen. 19. 1. The idea that Jacob's countenance is in the *Merkabah* is often referred to in rabbinic literature. Comp. (in addition to the sources cited at the beginning of this note) BR 78. 3 and 82. 2; Hullin 91a; BaR 4. 1; Tan. B. IV, 19; Tan. Bemidbar 19; Alphabet of R. Akiba 40 (ד) and second version 62 (ק'ח); BHM V, 63. The acquaintance of the Mohammedans with this legend has been pointed out by Goldziher. Jacob is the ideal man, and hence it is his countenance which represents the human race (comp. Ezek. 1. 10) on the divine throne. Joel, *Blicke in die Religionsgeschichte*, I, 117, gives an interesting parallel to this conception from Lobeck, *Aglaophamos*, 909. The angels from the very beginning praised God with the words (comp. 1 Chron. 16. 36) "Blessed be the Lord, the God of Israel." When Adam was created, they asked God: "Is this the man whose God we proclaim Thee to be?" "No", replied God, "he is a thief: he partook of the forbidden fruit." When Noah was born, they repeated this question, and they received the answer: "No; he is a drunkard." At

the birth of Abraham the angels again addressed this question, and the answer was: "No; he is only a proselyte." At the birth of Isaac they came again with the same question, and the reply was: "No; he loves him whom I hate" (Esau; comp. Mal. 1. 3). But when Jacob was born, and the angels again addressed their question to God, He replied: "Yes; he is the one." See Tan. B. III, 72-73; Tan. Kedoshim 2; Aggadat Bereshit 61, 126. Comp. also Tan. Shofetim 15, and Makiri, Ps. 2, 16. Yelammedenu in Sikli's *Talmud Torah* reads: While Jacob was asleep the angels scrutinized him to ascertain whether he was the one on whose account they praised the Lord, as the God of Israel; comp. Poznanski in *Ha-Zofeh*, III, 19, and Ginzberg's note, *ibid.*, IV, 32. According to the version of this legend in Hullin 91a, BR 63. 12, and MHG I, 452, the angels intended to attack Jacob in his sleep, but God came to his rescue. The legend about the man in the moon, who is identified with Jacob, is perhaps connected with the old legend concerning Jacob's countenance in the divine throne. Comp. Sabba, Wa-Yeze, 31a, and Index, s. v. "Man in the Moon". Philo, *De Somniis*, 24, sees in Jacob's ladder the picture of man's fate: the one ascends and the other descends. A similar metaphor is used by the Rabbis who speak of the "revolving wheel"; comp. Tan. B. IV, 161; Tan. Mekilta 6; PK 2, 12a; WR 8. 1, and in many other passages. See also Bontwetsch, in the *Göttingen Nachrichten*, 1900, p. 76, *seq.*, and James, *Lost Apocrypha* 96, *seq.*

<sup>135</sup> PK 23, 150b-151a; WR 29. 2; PRE 35; Tan. Wa-Yeze 2; Tehillim 78. 347; ShR 32. 7.

<sup>136</sup> BR 68. 12. Comp. also the sources cited in note 134, as well as Midrash ha-Ne'elam on Gen. 28. 12.

<sup>137</sup> Midrash ha-Ne'elam Wa-Yeze (end), which has the additional remark that Jacob thereby noticed that he was in a holy place. God announced to him that the Shekinah would only dwell in the Holy Land, and reveal itself only to his descendants. Comp. note 215.

<sup>138</sup> BR 69. 4-5; Hullin 91a. Comp. PR 11, 45b, and vol. I, p. 229; note 82.

<sup>139</sup> Shabbat 118a. The passage implies that this was granted to Jacob as a reward for his observance of the Sabbath. Comp. BR 69. 6 and note 280.

<sup>140</sup> BR 69. 7; Sifre D., 352. In PR 33, 153a, it is said that Jacob's fear was due to the fact that he was not addressed by God in the same manner as his fathers, in speaking to whom God used the word

*Anoki* ("I am"). His fear, however, was soon allayed, when God used the same word in addressing him. Comp. Gen. 28. 13 and 15. Josephus, *Antiqui.*, I, 19. 1, remarks: Jacob spent the night in the open, as he did not care to lodge with the Canaanites whom he hated.

<sup>141</sup> PRE 35, which is the source of Rashi, Gen. 28. 18. The old sources (comp. vol. I, p. 12, notes 38 and 39) maintain that the *Eben Shetiyyah* is the "foundation stone" with which the formation of the earth began. Comp. Zohar I, 231, and Luria, PRE, *loc. cit.* The conception that the terrestrial sanctuary is placed opposite the celestial one is widespread, and occurs in very old sources. Comp. Mekilta Shirah 10, 43b; Yerushalmi Berakot 4, 8a; Ta'anit 16a; BR 55. 7; Shir 3. 10 and 4. 4; PR 40, 170a; Tan. B. I, 112; Tan. Pekude 1 and 2; MHG I, 454; Tehillim 30, 233. The distance from the terrestrial sanctuary to the celestial is only eighteen miles; BR 69. 7. It is to be observed that the Palestinian sources contrast the terrestrial with the celestial sanctuary, while in Babli (comp., e. g., Ta'anit, *loc. cit.*) the opposites are terrestrial and celestial Jerusalem. Accordingly Tan. Pekude 2 is a Babylonian source, while Tan. Pekude 1 is a Palestinian one. On the heavenly Jerusalem in pseudepigraphic literature, comp. the references cited by Box, 4 Ezra, 198-199.

<sup>142</sup> Targum Yerushalmi Exod. 28. 30; Targum Koheleth 3. 11; Toledot Yeshu. Comp. Krauss, *Leben Jesu*, 189, and Landauer, *Nöldeke-Festschrift (Orientalische Studien)*, 506. The legend which speaks of the name of the Messiah as engraved on a jewel (comp. vol. I, p. 3) presupposes the idea that God's name was engraved on the *Eben Shetiyyah*.

<sup>143</sup> PRE 35; BR 69. 6 and 70. 1-4.

<sup>144</sup> BR 70. 7; Tan. V, 24; comp. also note 60. The "ten days of penitence" were granted to Israel as a reward for the tithes which Jacob set aside; Sabba, Wa-Yishlah, 46b, based on an unknown midrashic source. The quotation from the "Midrash" in *Da'at* and *Hadar* on Gen. 28. 22 to the effect that Jacob was the first to give tithes from his income (in the halakic literature the phrase used is מעשר כספים; in this source it is מעשר ממון) is not found in the extant midrashic literature. Comp. note 63.

<sup>145</sup> BR 70. 4. Comp. vol. I, pp. 380-381.

<sup>146</sup> MHG I, 456.

<sup>147</sup> BR 70. 4. These are the three cardinal sins; comp. Ginzberg, *Unbekannte Sekte*, 23. In view of the fact that "slandering one's fellow-man is as grievous a sin as worshipping idols" (Yerush-

almi Peah 1, 16b, and parallel passages on the margin), the statement is found that Jacob prayed to God to guard him against slandering his fellow-men; BR, *loc. cit.*

<sup>148</sup> PRE 35; Targum Yerushalmi 28. 10 (in 1 Yerushalmi this is erroneously described as the fifth miracle; but the correct reading is found in 2 Yerushalmi). On the "jumping", or more correctly, "contracting of the earth", comp. vol. I, p. 294, note 287. A somewhat different version of the third miracle is found in Sanhedrin 95b; Hullin 91b; comp. the sources given in notes 130-131.

<sup>149</sup> MHG I, 457; comp. Schechter, *ad loc.* The "blessing of the water" is found, in abridged form, in BR 70. 19 and Targum Yerushalmi Gen. 28. 22 and 31. 22. The talkativeness of young women is also alluded to by Josephus, *Antiqui.*, I, 19. 4. This author adds that the shepherds told Jacob of Laban's prominent social position. Comp. BR 70. 11.

<sup>150</sup> BR 70. 11. Lekah, Gen. 29, 7, dwells on the duty of great men to correct the evil ways of their fellow-men, and not say: "It is none of our affairs".

<sup>151</sup> PRE 36; Targum Yerushalmi Gen. 29. 10, and 2 Targum Yerushalmi Gen. 28. 10. Laban was blessed with sons only after Jacob's arrival; BR 73. 12, and thence in Rashi, Gen. 30. 27. See vol. III, p. 373.

<sup>152</sup> PRE 32 (the text of the editions is to be supplemented by the reading of *Ketab Tamim*, 88). Comp. also note 98. On Jacob's gigantic strength, see vol. I, pp. 374 and 412, as well as vol. II, p. 137.

<sup>153</sup> Yerushalmi Targumim Gen. 28. 22 and 31. 22; PRE 36. Comp. note 149, as well as vol. I, p. 270, 295 and vol. II, p. 291. PRK, 26a, points out that for Jacob the water rose to the top, whereas for Moses it only rose high enough to be drawn. This is the source for MHG I, 459.

<sup>154</sup> PRE 36; Yerushalmi Targumim Gen. 27. 22. Comp. note 152.

<sup>155</sup> BR 70. 13. Rebekah, on a similar occasion, ran to her mother who was still alive; but Rachel's mother was dead; BR, *loc. cit.*, and 60. 7. Josephus, contrary to the words of Scripture (Gen. 24. 50; comp. Septuagint), maintains that Rebekah's father was dead, and this was the reason why she ran to her mother to report Eliezer's arrival.

<sup>156</sup> MHG I, 460-461; Yalkut Reubeni, Gen. 28. 20. According to Targum Yerushalmi Gen. 29. 3, Laban ran to meet Jacob, because

the report had reached him (through Rachel?) of his relative's gigantic strength and piety. On Jacob being robbed of his possessions by Eliphaz, see vol. I, 345-346 and 379.

<sup>157</sup> Yalkut Reubeni (citing Galya Raza) on Gen. 29. 15. The interpretation of נִקְרָה (Gen., *loc. cit.*) as נִקְרָה is also found in Zohar I, 160b.

<sup>158</sup> BR 70. 14. From the perfect ועבדתי (Gen. 29. 15) is inferred there that for a short time Laban had Jacob work for low wages. This short time, however, was sufficient for Jacob to find out Rachel's excellent character; *Imre No'am*, Gen. 29. 15.

<sup>159</sup> Megillah 13a (on the text comp. Rabbinovicz, *ad loc.*, and MHG I, 463-464). The sign consisted in Rachel's touching Jacob's right toe, right thumb, and right lobe; Azulai, *Hesed le-Abraham* II, 6.

<sup>160</sup> BR 70. 17-18. On Jacob's age at his marriage, see Seder 'Olam 2, and parallels cited by Ratner.

<sup>161</sup> BR 68. 4.

<sup>162</sup> BR 65. 1-3 (הַלֵּךְ is here a euphemism for sexual intercourse). The designation of Esau (=Rome) as "swine" is very common in rabbinic literature, and occurs in so old a source as Enoch 89. 12. Originally it was not intended as an expression of contempt, but was coined with reference to the standard of the Roman legion stationed in Palestine, which had as its emblem a boar, a wild swine, and hence the designation of Rome as חוּיַר מֵיעַר "the boar out of the wood". See *R.E.J.*, XLVII, 178; Epstein, *Mikkadmoniyyot*, 35; Blau, *Masoretische Untersuchungen*, 55-56. Comp. also WR 13. 5; Tehilim 80. 363; ARN 34, 100. In the time to come Esau will wrap himself in a praying-shawl (=Talit), and will attempt to take his seat among the pious; but God will drag him away from his seat, and expel him from the company of the pious. See Yerushalmi Nedarim 3, 38a. A favorite topic of the Haggadah is Rome's deceit and guile.

<sup>163</sup> Tan. B. I, 152-153 and 157; Tan. Wa-Yeze 4; BR 70. 16 and 71. 2; Baba Batra 125a; Targum Yerushalmi Gen. 29. 17; Zohar I, 223a, and II, 29b.

<sup>164</sup> BR 70. 19. See also Tan. B. I, 152; Targum Yerushalmi Gen. 29. 12; MHG I, 463 (where לֵאמֹר must be read instead of דָּם רָחֵל of the editions and MSS.). For the obscure דְּכִיּוֹן (BR, *loc. cit.*) MHG has מְבַרְדִּין "deceivers", which makes good sense. The inhabitants of Haran tried to allay Jacob's fear that a trick might be played on him, and they told him that they were not deceivers like

himself. Comp., however, Sifra 20. 23, 93b, where the immoral life of the Canaanites is contrasted with the chastity of the "dwellers in the east", by which the east-Arameans are very likely meant. According to BR, *loc. cit.*, this seems to allude to the modesty of the Haranites. In BR 70. 12 and PK 3, 43a, "the sons of the east", praised for their modesty, are the Persians and Medes, as may be seen from the parallel passage in Berakot 8b.—Yashar Wa-Yeze, 57a-57b, is an amplification of BR 70. 14.

<sup>165</sup> Jub. 28. 4.

<sup>166</sup> BR 70. 19; Yerushalmi Mo'ed Katan 1, 80d; Jub. 28. 8. The statement of Josephus, *Antiqui*, I, 19. 7, that Jacob married Rachel after having served seven years is due to a misunderstanding of the Hebrew שבע (Gen. 29. 27), which means "septinate" and "week". On the basis of Gen. 29. 26, Jub., *loc. cit.*, states that it is forbidden to give a younger daughter in marriage before the elder one. Laban and the Haranites, as authorities on Jewish law, are rather strange figures.

<sup>167</sup> BR 74. 13; PRE 36; Targum Yerushalmi Gen. 29. 24 and 29. Josephus, *Antiqui.*, I, 19. 8, likewise points out that Bilhah and Zilpah were not bondwomen. According to the 12 Testaments, Naphthali 1. 9, these two handmaids were the daughters of Rotheus, a brother of Deborah, Rebekah's nurse, a God-fearing man belonging to the family of Abraham. That Bilhah and Zilpah were sisters is also stated in Jub. 28. 9. The tendency of Jewish legend is to make all the tribes related to Abraham, on their paternal as well as their maternal side, and hence the statement that Rotheus was of the family of Abraham. *Pa'aneah*, Gen. 27. 2, maintains that after the death of Rachel (and Leah?) Jacob made Bilhah and Zilpah legitimate wives. Comp. vol. I, 415. The old rabbinic literature has no difficulty in explaining Jacob's marrying two sisters. The laws of the Torah became binding only after the revelation on Sinai; comp. vol. I, p. 292, note 275. The later authorities and especially the Kabbalists, on the other hand, developed many a theory to explain this marriage of Jacob. Comp. e. g. Recanati, Lev. 18. 6. Out of respect for Jacob the Torah, in dealing with prohibited marriages, does not mention the punishment for marrying two sisters; R. Bahya, Lev. 20. 21.

<sup>168</sup> Tan. B. I, 151-152; Aggadat Bereshit 48, 97-98. According to BR 71. 2, Leah was hated by Jacob because she deceived her sister. See also Yelammedenu in Yalkut, II, 394, on Is. 3, and MHG I, 466, as well as 468.

<sup>169</sup> BR 71. 2. See also vol. I, p. 359.

<sup>170</sup> PRE 36; BR 84. 21 and 82. 2. The last-named source contains the addition that Benjamin had two twin-sisters; comp. vol. II, pp. 37-39. On the difference of the ages of Jacob's sons, and on the meaning of their names, see vol. II, pp. 187-188, notes 1 and 4.

<sup>171</sup> MHG I, 468-469 and 192. The old Midrashim make no mention of Leah's sterility.

<sup>172</sup> Berakot 7b; MHG I, 469, which reads: My father-in-law's first-born is a robber and a thief; my first-born is very scrupulous in his actions, and is careful not to touch other people's property. Comp. note 190.

<sup>173</sup> BR 61. 4; MHG I, 469, and Sabba, Wa-Yeze, 35d, seem to have read ןַע םַשׁ in BR.

<sup>174</sup> DR, according to the reading of Rashi, Gen. 29. 34, but not found in our texts. A similar Haggadah occurs also in MHG I, 469, whose source is probably Bereshit Rabbeti; see Schechter, *ad loc.*, and comp. further vol. I, p. 298, note 312, as well as vol. I, p. 387 and Zohar II, 19a. In MHG, *loc.cit.*, the name Levi is associated with לָלֵךְ "borrowed", as well as לָלֵךְ "accompanied". Comp. the similar etymologies in Jub 31. 16; BR 71. 4; Targum Yerushalmi Gen. 29. 34.

<sup>175</sup> Berakot 7b; BR 71. 4; Tan. Wa-Yeze 9. Targum Yerushalmi Gen. 29. 30 reads: She called him Judah, "Thanks unto God", because he was destined to become the ancestor of the royal house of David, and further because from him will come forth David who will compose "songs of thanks" (= psalms of thanksgiving) unto the Lord. Comp. BR, *loc.cit.*; Tan. Wa-Yeze 6; Shemuel 28. 130; note 4 on vol. II, p. 188.

<sup>176</sup> BR 71. 6; Aggadat Bereshit 51, 103-104. Comp. also the preceding note. Women are of a jealous disposition, and Rachel shared this weakness with her sex; BR 18. 2, and parallel passages cited by Theodor. According to ER 18, 99, Rachel was married fourteen years before she bore a child; comp. vol. II, p. 187, note 1.

<sup>177</sup> Targum Yerushalmi Gen. 30. 1-2, which essentially follows Tan. B. I, 156, and BR 71. 6; but these Midrashim do not say that Rachel asked Jacob to pray unto God for her. Aggadat Bereshit 51, 104, reads: "If thou so desirest, I shall certainly bear children, just as thou hast made the sheep bring forth their young." Comp. also the midrashic quotation in Sabba, Wa-Yeze, 34a. On the "four



that may be regarded as though they were dead", comp. vol. II, p. 327, note 142, and vol. III, pp. 190, 259.

<sup>178</sup> BR 71. 7; Aggadat Bereshit 51, 104, which has the additional remark that Rachel was very anxious to become a mother because she had a presentiment of her premature death.

<sup>179</sup> Targum Yerushalmi Gen. 30. 5. Lekah, Gen. 30. 4, reads: From the word לַאִשָּׁה "to wife" we are to infer that Jacob took her as his legitimate wife. BR 45. 3 has the same haggadic interpretation of לַאִשָּׁה with regard to its use in connection with Hagar. Comp. note 167.

<sup>180</sup> Tan. B. I, 156; BR 71. 8. From the beginning of the third century C. E. till about the end of the ninth, Tiberias situated in Naphtali (comp. Megillah 6a and Yerushalmi 1, 70a) was the centre of Jewish learning in Palestine. Comp. BR 98. 17, with regard to the interpretation of the blessing given by Jacob to Naphtali. Other etymologies of the name Naphtali are found in BR 71. 8 and Tan., *loc. cit.*, as well as in MHG I, 472.

<sup>181</sup> Targum Yerushalmi Gen. 30. 8, with reference to Jud. 4. 6.

<sup>182</sup> MHG I, 473. On the relationship of Jacob's wives to one another, comp. note 167.

<sup>183</sup> BR 71. 8, according to the reading of Rashi, Gen. 30. 11. Hasidim 480 has several explanations of the name Gad, (= בּוֹדַד), one of which is to the effect that it signifies "deception", as well as "garment". Leah put her garment on Zilpah, and in this manner deceived Jacob who thought that he was in the company of the mistress and not of the handmaid. For other etymologies of this name see Lekah, Gen. 30. 11. The opinion that the prophet Elijah belonged to the tribe of Gad is widespread; see vol. II, p. 145; vol. III, p. 462, and Index, s. v. "Elijah".

<sup>184</sup> Targum Yerushalmi Gen. 30. 11.

<sup>185</sup> A midrashic quotation by Rashi, Gen. 30. 11. See Berliner, *ad loc.*, and vol. I, p. 306, note 318. BR 71. 18 and other sources (comp. note 183) also derive Gad from נָדַד "he cut"; but the cutting does not refer to circumcision.

<sup>186</sup> MHG I, 473-474. Comp. note 183.

<sup>187</sup> Yerushalmi Targumim Gen. 30. 13, following BR 71. 10.

<sup>188</sup> BR 72. 1 and 5. See note 194, and vol. II, pp. 201-202.

<sup>189</sup> An unknown midrashic source in Midrash Aggada Gen. 49. 14, and, in abridged form, 30. 14. In the last passage וְהוֹצִיא אֶת הַמַּנְדְּרֵקָה means "And it—the donkey—pulled it (the mandrake) out", and must not

be emended, as is done by Kaufmann, *Monatsschrift*, XXXIX, 139. The same story is cited also by Sabba, *Wa-Yeze*, 34a, and *Toledot Yizhak* (is it based on Sabba?), Gen. 30. 14. In *Nur al-Zulm*, 124, it is the dog, not the ass, which uprooted the mandrake, and this agrees with what Josephus, *Bell. Jud.*, vii, 6. 3, says about the plant Baaras, which is very likely identical with the mandrake. The expression קרא על ברוחא (Yerushalmi 'Erubin 10, 26c) clearly shows that the mandrake, like the Baaras of Josephus, was used in expelling demons. The anonymous commentator on Yerushalmi seems to understand the Talmud to refer to the charm used in uprooting the mandrake, which otherwise might cause death. But this could hardly be expressed by קרא על. It is very likely that the Aramaic name for the mandrake יברוחא "the chaser" describes it as a plant which chases demons away. The relation between the mandrake and the plant Adam "which kills anybody who comes near it" (comp. vol. I, pp. 31-32, note 148) is not quite clear. Frazer, *Folk-Lore in the Old Testament*, II, 372-397, deals at great length and in a very interesting manner with the mandrake in folk-lore. The spot, where, according to Josephus, this plant of miraculous properties grew, is undoubtedly identical with Baaras, the place where Jacob, by a hair-breadth, escaped death at the hands of Esau; comp. vol. I, pp. 347-348. The name Baaras, given to this plant by Josephus, is perhaps to be explained as an abridgment of "the mandrake of Baara" = ברוחא די מערה. Comp. note 193, and vol. II, p. 204, note 11. Baara is the Grecized form for מערה; comp. Yerushalmi Shabbat 3, 6a.

<sup>190</sup> BR 72. 2-4. Lekah, Gen. 30. 14, calls attention to the fact that, though Reuben was only ten years old at that time, he nevertheless knew what the law permits, and what it prohibits.

<sup>191</sup> BR 99. 10; Nidah 31a, and thence in MHG I, 741 (= BR 98. 12, where read חמור ליה גרם; but comp. note 193); Targum Yerushalmi Gen. 30. 16; MHG I, 473. Geiger's statement, *Kebuzzat Mamarim*, 142, that the old Rabbis read חמור instead of חמור (Gen. 49. 4), and hence the legend about the braying of the ass, is untenable, as shown by Ginzberg in Supplement to Geiger, *op. cit.*

<sup>192</sup> BR 72. 5.

<sup>193</sup> Nidah 31a. Comp. also 'Erubin 100b. Jacob's ass walked up to Leah's tent without having been led there by its master; Haserot in *Batte Midrashot*, III, 5; comp. also note 191; חמור לגרמיה "the ass by itself" is a play on חמור גרם (Gen. 49. 14). Yerushalmi

Sotah 3, 19a, and BR 72. 5, commenting on הוּיָא (Gen. 30. 16), remark that this word refers to God, who alone was witness to Leah's pure motive in making Jacob stop with her. DR 7. 11 on the other hand, maintains with reference to הוּצֵאָא (Gen., *loc. cit.*) that Leah was a "gad-about". In BR 18. 2, and parallels cited by Theodor, it is Dinah who is described by this expression. The substitution of the ass for the dog in the mandrake legend (comp. note 189) by some rabbinic authorities is due to a midrashic interpretation of חֲמֹר נָרָם (Gen. 49. 14).

<sup>194</sup> BR 72. 5; Shir 7. 4. On the compact between Zebulun and Issachar comp. vol. II, p. 144.

<sup>195</sup> Targum Yerushalmi Gen. 30. 20. Different etymologies of the name Zebulun are found in BR 72. 6 and MHG I, 476.

<sup>196</sup> Berakot 60a; Tan. B. I, 157; Tan. Wa-Yeze 8; Targum Yerushalmi 30. 12; Yerushalmi Berakot 9, 14a-14b; Tehillim 55, 292; MHG I, 479 (ל"ז); PRE 35.

<sup>197</sup> MHG I, 478-479 and 480 (ב"ב); Tehillim 55, 292; BR 73. 1 and 4. Comp. also Rosh ha-Shanah 11a.

<sup>198</sup> MHG I, 480-481, and comp. Schechter, *ad loc.* See also vol. I, p. 238, where it is said that Hagar declared that Sarah's sterility was a punishment for her impious life.

<sup>199</sup> BR 73. 3; Tan. B. I, 158 (which reads: Rachel feared that her father would take her away from Jacob and give her to Esau); Tehillim 55, 292; Aggadat Bereshit 51, 105; MHG I, 481.

<sup>200</sup> Targum Yerushalmi Gen. 30. 23. This Haggadah is based on the use of חרפה (Gen., *loc. cit.*, and Joshua 5. 9). See also MHG I, 481, which reads אִין חרפה אלא ערלה.

<sup>201</sup> Tan. B. I, 158; BR 61. 4; Yerushalmi Berakot 9, 146. According to Yelammedenu 20 (=BHM VI, 81), Rachel prophesied that Joseph would be the ancestor of the (Ephraimite) Messiah, who would arise at the end of days (בן אחריו של עולם) is to be understood in this manner). Comp. also BR 73. 5-6 for several other prophecies found in Rachel's words of Gen. 30. 24. The etymology given there of the name Joseph (יהוסף) as "the increase by the Lord" occurs also in Philo, *De Josepho*, 6.

<sup>202</sup> MHG I, 481. That Rachel bore children was a miracle, as she was sterile by nature, and this miracle was granted to her as a reward for her kindness to Leah, whom she saved from being put to shame by Jacob, who would have detected the fraud played on him by Laban, had not Rachel divulged to her sister the sign agreed

upon by her and Jacob by which he would recognize her on the nuptial night. See BR 73. 4; Baba Batra 123a; Tan. B. I, 154; Tan. Wa-Yeze 6. Comp. vol I, p. 357; vol. IV, pp. 310, 390.

<sup>203</sup> BR 73. 6; Tan. B. I, 154 and 164; Bata Batra 123a; Targum Yerushalmi Gen. 30. 25; and in many other places. Comp. vol. III, pp. 57-58 and 223. This Haggadah is described as an old tradition (מסורה).

<sup>204</sup> Yashar Wa-Yeze, 57b-58a, and Hayye Sarah, 49a, where Deborah is declared to have been the daughter of Uz, the son of Abraham's brother Nahor. Comp. the sources quoted in note 300.

<sup>205</sup> Tan. B. I, 161, and thence in Midrash Aggada and Targum Yerushalmi, Gen. 30. 27. Comp. also the extract from Galya Raza in Yalkut Reubeni, Gen. 29. 17, and note 157.

<sup>206</sup> PRE 26. Comp. note 151.

<sup>207</sup> BR 73. 12; BaR 20. 19; Tan. B. IV, 142; Tan. Balak 12; MHG I, 485 (with the additional remark that the same thing happened to Jethro who had only daughters until the arrival of Moses into his house, when he was blessed with sons). On the blessing which the pious bring to those whom they visit, comp. Sifre D., 38; Berakot 42a; BR 73. 8; MHG I, 485-486; Zohar I, 161a. Comp. also note 151.

<sup>208</sup> MHG I, 486. Laban's words (Gen. 30. 34) are taken to mean: O that thou mayest keep thy word!

<sup>209</sup> BR 73. 9-10 and 74. 3; Tan. B. I, 161; Tan. Wa-Yeze 11. The legend would not admit any trickery on the part of Jacob, and his cunning manipulations are turned into direct intervention of the angels. See Lekah, Gen. 30. 39 and *Or Zarua'* I, 227, No. 769.

<sup>210</sup> Tan. B. I, 161; Yashar Wa-Yeze, 58a-58b.

<sup>211</sup> Tehillim 8, 78. Similarly Tan. B. I, 161; Tan. Wa-Yeze 11; BR 73. 10; MHG I, 487 (ב'ט). Comp. note 209.

<sup>212</sup> MHG I, 490.

<sup>213</sup> MHG I, 488 (י'ט). Jacob made his cattle graze far away from cultivated land (comp. Gen. 30. 36), in order to avoid doing damage to the soil; MHG I, 487. Comp. also Baba Kamma 7. 7.

<sup>214</sup> BR 73. 11; Koheleth 9. 11; Tan. B. I, 161-162. The fecundity of Messianic times refers to that of human beings, as may be seen from Mekilta Bahodesh 2, 63a, where it is said that in the time to come the number of children of each and every Jew will be equal to the number of Jews at the time of the exodus from Egypt. See also vol. II, p. 230, note 10.

<sup>215</sup> MHG I, 489; BR 74. 1; Tan. B. I, 160; PRE 26. See also Mekilta Bo (פתיחה), 1b, which reads: When Israel entered into the Holy Land, all the other countries were excluded from being used as places of divine revelations. BR, *loc. cit.*, remarks that possessions acquired outside the Holy Land bring no blessings. Similarly Pesahim 50b; comp. note 274. See also note 137 and Index, *s. v.* "Holy Land".

<sup>216</sup> Targum Yerushalmi Gen. 31. 4. The fleet messenger Naph-tali (comp. Gen. 49. 21) is often spoken of in Jewish legend; comp. vol. I., pp. 408-401; vol. II, pp. 25, 108-109, 154, 209; vol. III, p. 206.

<sup>217</sup> Berakot 8b; BR 74. 2; PR 4. 34a (BR is to be emended according to this text); Tan. B. IV, 110; Tan. Hukkat 6; Koheleth 7. 23; PRK (Grünhut's edition, 50 and 41, כ"ו, where אין פושטין is to be read in accordance with Ketubot 48a. Among other peculiarities and customs of the Persians and the "children of the east" mention is also made of the fact that they do not kiss on the mouth. Comp., however, Herodotus I, 134, where the opposite is asserted. Comp. note 164.

<sup>218</sup> Yashar Wa-Yeze, 58b-59a (based on PRE 26, where, however, our texts read שם רוח טומאה "the name of an impure spirit", instead of השם "the Ineffable Name of God" of Yashar); Tan. Wa-Yeze 12; Targum Yerushalmi Gen. 31. 19; Lekah, Gen. 31. 34. Of the two descriptions of the Teraphim by Ziyroni, Wa-Yeze (end), one is taken from PRE and the other from Lekah. His etymological explanation of this word (as connected with talmudic תורה "shame", "decay"=בשח) is found in 'Aruk, *s. v.* See also Rashi, 1 Sam. 19. 13 and 2 Kings 23. 24. Rachel's motive in stealing Laban's idols was a laudable one; she said: Should I depart and leave the old man with his idolatry? See BR 74. 5; Tan. *loc. cit.*; Theodoretus, Gen. 31. 19. Comp. also Zohar I, 169b. On שם=the impure spirit, see note. 313 on vol. I, 298.

<sup>219</sup> Yerushalmi Targumim Gen. 31. 21-22. Comp. ARN 9, 27, as well as notes 153, 205, 207.

<sup>220</sup> PRE 36; Targum Yerushalmi Gen. 21. 24. It is a widespread view that Laban had intended to destroy Jacob and his family, root and branch. See Passover Haggadah beginning צא ולמד; Mid-rash Tannaim 172; Onkelos and Targum Yerushalmi Deut. 26. 5; Sifre D., 301; MHG I, 491. The angel restrained Laban from carrying out his plan of destruction, and admonished him, at the same time, not to have any dealings with Jacob whatsoever, not even to be kind

to him, for "the kindness shown by the wicked causes pain to the pious"; Yebamot 103b, with reference to Gen. 31. 24. Laban feared not only the angel but also Esau, who might, in case of injury to Jacob, appear as "the avenger of blood" against him. See Aggadat Bereshit 108, note 2, and 125, note 5. Although Rachel had taken the Teraphim with her, Laban succeeded in getting another set, which revealed to him Jacob's escape; Yashar, Wa-Yeze 59a. According to Targum Yerushalmi Gen. 31. 21-22, Laban noticed the absence of Jacob by the lack of water; comp. note 354.

<sup>221</sup> BR 74. 6-7. On the night as the time of divine revelations, see the sources cited in note 131, to which are to be added: WR 1. 13; Leket Midrashim, 6a and 20b; Zohar III, 113a and 200a.

<sup>222</sup> Targum Yerushalmi Gen. 31. 23.

<sup>223</sup> MHG I, 491-492. The power of which Laban boasted is the power of witchcraft, which he might have used against Jacob; Sabba, Wa-Yeze, 42c, and Ki-Tabo, 152c; Zohar I, 167b and 166a. Laban was a famous sorcerer (his grandson Balaam was by far his inferior), and Jacob was justified in pointing out to Esau (comp. Gen. 32. 5) that even this master of witchcraft could not prevail against him. See Zohar I, 167a.

<sup>224</sup> BR 74. 8-11; PRE 36; Tan. Wa-Yeze 13; Aggadat Bereshit 51, 105; PK 14, 116b; Koheleth 10. 5; Shemuel 22 (end). The view that even an unintentional curse or blessing takes effect is shared by the Talmud; see Mo'ed Katan 18a and Makkot 11a, which read: A compact is closed with the lips, *i. e.*, the spoken word is effective, be it a curse or a blessing. The account of Jacob's escape from Laban and of their meeting is given by Josephus, *Antiqui.*, I, 20. 9-11, with many embellishments. Jacob's excuse for his escape was that God implanted in every human heart the love of his native country, and Rachel's motive in stealing the Teraphim was to pacify her father by returning them to him, should he succeed in overtaking Jacob. The theft remained undiscovered for some time, because Laban did not think it possible that a woman in menstruation (comp. Gen. 31. 35) would dare to touch the Teraphim. On the effect of the spoken word, be it a curse or a blessing, comp. note 74.

<sup>225</sup> Tan. Wa-Yishlah 4; BR 74. 13; PRE 36. Comp. vol. IV, p. 93.

<sup>226</sup> BR 74. 13-14; PRE 26; Targum Yerushalmi Gen. 31. 46; Yoma 77a-77b; MHG I, 495.

<sup>227</sup> BR 94. 5 (Rashi, Gen. 31. 42, seems to have had a fuller text

before nim); Tan. Toledot 7; Tehillim 16, 120; comp. note 304. Tan. Wa-Yeze renders בַּפְּחַד אָבִיו (Gen. 31. 53) by "the life of his father", which agrees with Philo, *Special. Leg.*, 2. 3. See Ginzberg, *Unbekannte Sekte*, 130-131 (note) and *Hadar*, Gen., *loc. cit.* Lekah, *ad. loc.*, reads: He swore by the fear which seized Isaac at the 'Akedah, when he had given up his spirit and come to life again only by means of the dew of life. See note 101; vol. I, p. 282, and note 243 appertaining thereto. Lekah is very likely the source for Zohar I, 60a (חֹסֶפְחָא).

<sup>228</sup> BR 74. 16 (with the additional remark that, as a punishment for Laban's evil designs against Jacob, robbers broke into his house, during his absence, and took his possessions away with them). Similarly also Yelammedenu 21=HBM VI, 81.

<sup>229</sup> Yashar Wa-Yeze, 59a-59b, where וְאֶנְדְּלֶהוּ is to be explained in accordance with וְאֶנְדְּלֶהוּ בְּבֵיתוֹ, Wa-Yishlah, 60b. There is a number of different views concerning the relationship between Laban and Balaam: Laban is declared to be identical with Balaam, to have been Balaam's father, grandfather (Beor, Laban's son in Yashar is identical with Balaam's father), and uncle. See Sanhedrin 105a; BR 57. 4, and the parallel passages cited by Theodor, as well as *Hadar* and *Da'at* on Gen. 31. 52, and Exod. 1. 10; Mahzor Vitry 547; Zohar I, 166b.

<sup>230</sup> Tan. B. I, 163 and 178-179; Tan. Wa-Yishlah 3 and Mishpatim (end); Aggadat Bereshit 53, 109.

<sup>231</sup> BR 74. 17 and 76. 10; Shir 7.1.

<sup>232</sup> Yerushalmi Targumim Gen. 32. 3; Tan. Wa-Yishlah 3.

<sup>233</sup> Yashar Wa-Yeze (end) and Wa-Yishlah (beginning), 59b-60b. On the honor which Jacob owed Esau as the elder brother, comp. the midrashic quotation in Yalkut Reubeni, Gen. 32. 4, and Ketubot 103a.

<sup>234</sup> MHG I, 501-502. On the view that Abraham's descendants are to pay off the debt, comp. vol. I, p. 356; vol. III, pp. 55 and 315. The statement about Jacob's strict conformity with the Torah during the stay with Laban is found also in Lekah, Gen. 32. 5, but in a version somewhat different from the one in MHG and Rashi, *ad loc.*

<sup>235</sup> BR 75. 5 and 11; Tan. B. I 161.

<sup>236</sup> MHG I, 503. Jacob's message to Esau, as given by Josephus, *Antiqui.*, I, 20. 1, also differs from the biblical account.

<sup>237</sup> Yashar Wa-Yishlah, 60b.

<sup>238</sup> BR 75. 12 (and, with slight variations, 7); MHG I, 503

(where  $\text{השפ}$  is a faulty reading of the abbreviation 'ח=400, and hence the discrepancy in the number); Tan. B. I, 161.

<sup>239</sup> BR 75. 7; Tan. B. I, 161; Zohar I, 167b.

<sup>240</sup> BR 76. 1-2. On the fear of the pious to forfeit, through sin, the blessings promised to them, comp. the parallel passages cited on margin, and vol. I, pp. 352-353. Maimonides, *Shemonah Perakim*, 7, remarks: Even the patriarchs and prophets were not entirely free from human failings, as the fear of Jacob shows. Shu'aib, Wa-Yishlah, 16c, quotes a midrashic statement to the effect that Jacob contrasted his own conduct toward his father with that of Esau, and was compelled to admit his shortcomings. He caused his father to fear and tremble (comp. Gen. 27. 33, and note 101), whereas Esau never failed, in the slightest degree, in the honor and consideration due to Isaac. Jacob therefore thought that God might prefer Esau to himself. Comp. also Zohar I, 166a; MHG I, 503.

<sup>241</sup> MHG I, 504.

<sup>242</sup> Tan. B. I, 162; Koheleth 9. 18.

<sup>243</sup> BR 75. 9 and 13, as well as 76. 4-6; Yashar Wa-Yishlah, 60b-61a (gives a different version of Jacob's prayer, but at the same time makes use of BR). See also Tan. B. I, 162; Makiri, Ps. 20, 140, 141, and note 35.

<sup>244</sup> Yashar Wa-Yishlah, 61a-61b, which amplifies the legend concerning the angels who attacked Esau at night, found in BR 78. 11; Tan. B. I, 162; and in abridged form, BR 75. 10. See note 265. Damesek, the son of Eliezer, owes his existence to the phrase  $\text{דמשק אליעזר}$  (Gen. 15. 2). On Alinus comp. note 290 with reference to Eblaen of which Alinus seems to be a variant.

<sup>245</sup> BR 76. 3 and 8; Josephus, *Antiqui.*, I, 20. 1. The numerical relation of the male to the female animals varies with the different species, because the more active an animal is, the less its sexual desire, and the same applies to man. See Yerushalmi Ketubot 5, 30b; BR 76. 7; Justin Martyr, *Dialogue*, 112. Comp. note 274. Jacob first separated the tithes from the animals before sending them to Esau; see Rashi and Lekah, Gen. 33. 14. Comp. note 251.

<sup>246</sup> PRE 37; Tan. B. I, 161; Tan. Wa-Yishlah 3; BR 75. 5. A different view is given in BR 76. 2-3 and 11, where Jacob is severely censured for calling Esau "my lord", and it is added that as a punishment for that, Jacob's descendants established their kingdom eight generations later than Esau's descendants (comp. Gen. 36. 31). Moreover, the latter were granted dominion over the world, whereas the for-



mer have to wait for the dominion in the world to come. See BR 75. 11; PRE, *loc. cit.*; 1 Alphabet of Ben Sira 6b.

<sup>247</sup> BR 77. 2-3; Shir 3. 5. These sources add that it was Esau's guardian angel (comp. the following note and note 273) who, at the command of God, undertook to wrestle with Jacob. God said to the angel: "Jacob has five charms to protect him: his own merits and those of his parents and grandparents; now measure thy strength against his." The angel tried, and soon discovered that Jacob was no match for him. The words put into Jacob's mouth ("this night no enchantment prevails") wish to convey that, although ordinarily the darkness of the night is very propitious for such and similar operations (comp. Index, *s. v.* "Night", and Fraser, *Folk-Lore in the Old Testament*, II, 411), Jacob was not afraid of the angel's machinations.—Hullin 91a points out that the pious take great care not to lose or squander their possessions; hence Jacob, after having forded the river with all his belongings, returned to fetch a small pot which he had forgotten on the other side of the Jabbok.

<sup>248</sup> Abkir in Yalkut I, 132; according to this source, the angel appeared to make Jacob bold for his meeting with Esau. See also Zerubbabel (Jellinek's edition, 5. 5), which reads: "I am Metatron, the angel who wrestled with Jacob at the ford of Jabbok," while in Wertheimer's edition שַׁנְדְּבַקְתִּי בַעֲבֵר יוֹבֵק is corrupted to שַׁנְדְּבַקְתִּי בַעֲבֵר הַנְּדָר. Since in many sources Metatron is identical with Michael (comp. Index, *s. v.* "Metatron"), it follows that, according to this passage, the angel who wrestled with Jacob was sent to his assistance. In Wertheimer's edition (versions 1 and 2) this angel described himself as Metatron = Michael, *i. e.*, as the guardian angel of Israel. The antiquity of this view which identifies this angel with Michael, or rather Metatron, may be inferred from the statement of the Church Fathers, according to whom this angel was the Holy Ghost, or Jesus; comp. *e. g.*, Clemens Alexandrinus, *Instructor*, 1. 7. It has already been observed that Christian authors often transferred to Jesus, or rather the Holy Ghost, those functions which in Jewish legends are ascribed to Michael. It should be noted here that Abkir in its present form consists of three different parts, which are introduced by: 1) ר' שַׁרְפוֹן; 2) יֵשׁ אֹמְרִים; 3) אִמְרֵי ר' אֱלֵעִזֵּר = אִמְרֵי, in Gabai. Comp. further below.—Michael was appointed the guardian angel of Israel on the day of his visit to Abraham to announce to him the birth of Isaac; see Ziyoni, *Mishpatim* (end), quoting Galya Raza, and comp. note 91 on vol. I, p. 181, as well as the following note. The angel

was in a hurry, as he had to be present at the morning song of the celestial beings; comp. BR 78. 1-2; Hullin 91b-92a; Shir 3. 5; comp. vol. I, pp. 17-18. A fragment of a legend, according to which several angels fought against Jacob, is found in Yelammedenu quoted in Yalkut II, 758 on Ps. 39; comp. also vol. II, p. 8; note 199. On the view that the powers of the angels vanished in the presence of God, comp. Philo, *De Somniis*, 1. 13. For a correct text of Abkir comp. Yalkut Reubeni, Gen. 32. 25, and Gabai, *'Abodat ha-Kodesh*, 3. 7, who quotes a considerable portion of this Abkir passage from Sode Raze. It is to be observed that towards the end **שׁוֹמֵר הַשְּׁמִימִים** is to be read. The identity of this angel with Michael is also found in Tan. B. I, 165; comp. the following note.

<sup>249</sup> BR 78. 2. The name of the angel is not given here, and the question is left open whether it was Michael or Gabriel. But inasmuch as Gabriel is one of the two angels who were punished for divulging a heavenly secret (comp. vol. I, pp. 241 and 350-351), which punishment is given as an excuse by the angel for his reluctance to fulfil Jacob's wish, it follows that only Michael is meant here. According to BR, *loc. cit.*, as well as the sources cited in the preceding note, the angel finally fulfilled Jacob's wish, for otherwise he would not have been in heaven in time to chant the praise of God. Opposed to this view is the one in PRE 37, according to which the angel had to chant his hymn on earth, and when the angels heard him sing, they knew that Jacob prevented him from returning to heaven. Comp. also ps.-Philo, 18A, who likewise maintains that it was the heavenly band-master who wrestled with Jacob.—Jacob had adjured the angel not to move without his permission; but he doubted whether his adjuring was effective as he did not know the name of the angel; hence he was anxious to learn his name; comp. Ziyiyoni, Gen. 32. 27.

<sup>250</sup> Abkir in Yalkut I, 132. This legend assumes that the wrestling between Jacob and the angel took place in heaven; comp. also vol. I, pp. 388-389.

<sup>251</sup> PRE 27; Targum Yerushalmi Gen. 32. 25. There can be no doubt that according to this view it was Michael who wrestled with Jacob, in order to remind him of his promise concerning the tithes. This view is also shared by Ephraim, I, 181B, who also knows the other explanation given in note 248 for the appearance of the angel. According to one view, Jacob, in separating the tithes of his sons, started with the youngest of them (in the eyes of the Lord the small are more precious than the great; Yelammedenu 16=BHM VI, 80),

and therefore Levi was the tenth. See Jub. 32. 3; Sifre D., 355 (for the explanation of this passage see Brüll, *Jahrbücher*, IV, 130, and Epstein, *Mikkadmoniyot*, 97-98); Midrash Tanna'im 220; PRE, *loc. cit.* (the reason given here for starting from the youngest is not clear); *Da'at* and *Hadar* on Gen. 28. 22. Tan. is given as a source in *Hadar*, whereas *Da'at* refers to BR as its authority. But neither of these two Midrashim has this Haggadah. See Epstein, *Mosheh ha-Darshan*, 16; vol. II, p. 134, note 364. On Levi being taken into heaven, see vol. I, 363 and II, 194. On Jacob as the first to set aside the tithes, comp. notes 144 and 245.

<sup>252</sup> Zohar III, 45a (based on Tan. B. I, 127, or a source related to Tan.).

<sup>253</sup> PRE 47. The mystics of the geonic period speak of a heavenly being (יִיחָה), named Israel, on whose forehead this name is engraved. The function of this angel is to call the hosts of angels to chant God's praise. He addresses them with these words: "Bless ye the Lord who is to be blessed." Whereupon they praise God, saying: "Blessed is the Lord who is to be blessed for ever and ever." See Hekalot 4, 29; Zohar II, 4b; Baer's *Siddur*, 126. Razi'el, 6b, makes the assumption probable that this heavenly being was identified with the "Jacob's countenance" in the throne of glory; comp. notes 35 and 134.—The Haggadah knows of a number of explanations of the name Israel: It stands for אֱלֹהֵי רֵאָה אֱלֹהֵי "the man who saw God" (angel?); comp. ER 27, 138-139; Philo, *Conf. Ling.*, 16 and 20; *Migrat. Abr.*, 18, 36, 39 (end); *Quis Rer. Div. Haeres Sit*, 15; *De Cong. Quaer. Erud. Causa*, 10; *De Profugis*, 25 and 38; *Mut. nomenclum*, 12; *De Somniis*, 2. 4, 6, 26; *De Sacrificiis Abelis*, 36; *De Abrahamo*, 12; *De praemiis et poenis*, 8. From Philo, in whose writings this etymology occurs very frequently, besides in the passages just cited, it was taken over by the Church Fathers; comp. Siegfried, *Philo*, Index, s. v. "Israel". In Philo's opinion "the man who saw God" is identical with the Logos, hence Israel=Christ in the writings of the Church Fathers. See Justin Martyr, *Dialogue*, 75; Clemens Alexandrinus, *Stromata*, 2. 5; Cyril, *De Trinit.*, 19. Comp. note 428. The name Israel is also explained as "trying to sing instead of the angels" (= אֱלֹהֵי + יִשְׂרָאֵל), or "joyful like the angels at the time of their singing"; see Tan. B. I, 127, and Haserot in Batte Midrashot, III, 4. As to Jacob's singing instead of the angels, comp. BR 78. 2. Other etymologies are: "the remnant of God" (שְׂאֵר אֱלֹהֵי = יִשְׂרָאֵל), or "he who walks straight with the Lord" (יִשְׂרָאֵל = אֱלֹהֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל); Yalkut Reubeni, Gen. 232. 29, and comp.

note 273. Similar to the last etymology is the one given by Nahmanides, Deut. 2. 10 of Jeshurun, which signifies "one who walks straight", in contrast to Jacob, "he who walks crookedly". Comp. Nestle, *Zeitschrift f. Alt. Wiss.*, XXXII, 17-20.

<sup>254</sup> MHG I, 513.

<sup>255</sup> BR 68. 10; Tan. B. I, 168; Hullin 91b; Targum Yerushalmi Gen. 32. 32. Comp. vol. I, pp. 349-350.

<sup>256</sup> Zohar I, 203b, which, in the main, is based on Abkir in Yal-kut I, 132. Comp. also BR 78. 5.

<sup>257</sup> Hullin 90a. Comp. vol. I, p. 354.

<sup>258</sup> Tan. Wa-Yishlah 4; Tehillim 102, 468-469. The angels have no joints; they are formed of one piece. Hence when the angel noticed Jacob's gigantic strength he touched him on the hip to convince himself whether he is a human being or an angel, and this touch caused injury to Jacob. See PRE 36; Hullin 91a; BR 88. 6; comp. also vol I, p. 5, note 9.

<sup>259</sup> Zohar I 203b; MHG I, 513-514; *Hadar, Da'at*, and *Pa'aneah* on Gen. 32. 33, which are dependent on Hasidim, 91. In the old sources two views are mentioned with regard to the meaning of "the sons of Israel" (Gen., *loc. cit.*). According to one, it refers to the Jewish people; but the other view maintains that it alludes to Jacob's twelve sons. See Hullin 7. 6. "A scholar must not go out at night by himself", and had not Jacob disregarded this rule, nothing would have happened to him at the ford of Jabbok; see Hullin 91a and Zohar III, 55a. The evil spirits are envious of scholars, and try to attack them at night; comp. Berakot 54b.

<sup>260</sup> BR 78. 7-8; PK 19, 139a, which reads: He made his people put on white garments which concealed weapons beneath. He tried three means: 1) prayer; 2) appeasing Esau with gifts; 3) preparing for war. Comp. vol. I, p. 381.

<sup>261</sup> Targum Yerushalmi Gen. 33. 2.

<sup>262</sup> BR 78. 10; PK 12, 49b; MHG I, 517, which reads: At this time Rachel was pregnant with Benjamin, and Joseph, fearing lest Esau should look at her and she become frightened, placed himself in front of his mother to conceal her. "Haughtiness is more frequently found among low people than among nobles", as may be seen from the varied attitudes of Jacob's children towards Esau. Rachel and Leah bowed themselves before Esau, and their children followed their example. The two handmaids did the same; but their children said: "We are the sons of Jacob, and hence nobler than our mothers, and it is not seemly

for us to bow down before Esau"; Shu'aib, Wa-Yishlah, 16a. Comp., however, note 926 on vol. III, p. 458.

<sup>263</sup> BR 78. 9, and parallel passages cited by Theodor; Targum Yerushalmi Gen. 33. 4; Zohar I, 171b (the legend about Esau's long teeth is an adaptation of the Og legend, Berakot 54b). Abkir according to a MS. published by Epstein in *Ha-Eshkol*, VI, 206. Zohar I, 172a, quotes also the opposite view, according to which, Esau, on meeting Jacob, after many years of separation, was overcome by a true feeling of love for his brother; Yashar Wa-Yishlah, 62b, is very likely the source of Zohar. Comp. also MHG I, 517<sup>c</sup> and PRE 37.

<sup>264</sup> Tan. Wa-Yishlah 4; MHG I, 516-517; Zohar I, 17b. Comp. the preceding note.

<sup>265</sup> BR 75. 10 (the exact number of angels is given here) and 78. 11; Tan. B. I, 165; Tan. Wa-Yishlah 3. Comp. note 244.

<sup>266</sup> Yelammedenu 22=BHM VI, 81; BR 75. 4; Tan. B. I, 163; Tan. Wa-Yishlah 3. These messengers consisted of the angels who came with Jacob from Haran, and of those who arrived from the Holy Land to meet him. Comp. note 230.

<sup>267</sup> PRE 37. This was a punishment for delaying to set aside the tithes of his possessions for God. Comp. vol. I, p. 387.

<sup>268</sup> Tan. B. I, 169.

<sup>269</sup> *Hadar*, Gen. 32. 14.

<sup>270</sup> Lekah, Gen. 32. 16; MHG I, 507. A dissenting view is found in *Ba'al ha-Turim*, Gen., *loc cit.*, according to which Jacob sent to Esau only such animals as were, on account of their bodily injuries and imperfections, unfit for sacrificial purposes; comp. 'Abodah Zarah 1. 6, and Ginzberg, *Unbekannte Sekte*, 108-109. On animals refusing to serve impious masters, comp. vol. IV, p. 198.

<sup>271</sup> BR 78. 12. Esau stands for the Roman officials (comp. note 19) of whom Pesahim 118b says: They stretch forth their hands for gifts; yet do not keep their promises.

<sup>272</sup> Sotah 41b; MHG I, 518.

<sup>273</sup> BR 78. 3. As to the identity of this angel, comp. notes 247, 248, 259. On the basis of BR the mystics—but found already in Tan. Wa-Yishlah 8—call this angel Sammael, since he is the guardian angel of Rome, *i.e.*, Esau. See Zohar I, 146a, and the numerous references to Zohar in Yalkut Reubeni, Gen. 32. 25-33; *Imre No'am*, Gen. 32. 25 (here the reading is *סלמאל* instead of *סמאל*). The passage in Zohar II, 41b, where the angel is identified with Gabriel (comp.

note 284) is taken from Ra'ya Mehemena, and does not belong to Zohar. The angel, disguised as Esau, appeared to Jacob, and said to him: Thou art an impostor; thou didst say to our father: "I am Esau thy first-born." Jacob excused himself by pointing out that when he acquired the birthright he became Esau's rightful successor. Thereupon the angel said: "Thy name shall not be called any more Jacob, the impostor, but Israel, the remnant of God (comp. note 253), of whom it is said: The remnant of Israel shall not do iniquity, nor speak lies" (Zephaniah 3. 13). See Yalkut Reubeni Gen. 32. 29, who gives, as his source, PRE; but it is not found in our texts of this Midrash, nor is it likely that this passage ever formed a genuine part of PRE, since according to this source, the angel with whom Jacob wrestled was Michael (comp. note 251), while an angel disguised as Esau may be assumed to have been Sammael, Esau's guardian angel; comp. note 247. A description of Jacob's encounter with the angel, entirely different from that of the rabbinic sources, is quoted by Origen, *In Joannem*, 2. 31, from the Jewish pseudepigraphic work the Prayer of Joseph. It reads: I am Jacob and Israel, am angel of God, a ruling spirit... called Jacob by men and Israel by God; a man seeing God (comp. note 253), because I am the first-born of every creature whom He caused to live. When I was coming from Mesopotamia of Syria (= אַרְיִם נְהַרִים), Uriel, the angel of God, came forth and said: I have come down to the earth, and made my dwelling among men, and I am called Jacob by name. He was wroth with me, and wrestled with me saying that his name and the name of Him who is before every angel (the name אֵל is attached to every name of every angel; comp. PK 12, 108b, and parallel passages; hence we ought to read "after" instead of "before") should be before my name. I told him his name, and how great he was among the sons of God (= בְּנֵי אֱלֹהִים): Art thou not Uriel, the eighth from me, and I am Israel and archangel of the power of the Lord and a chief captain among the sons of God? Am I not Israel, the first minister in the sight of God? Do I not invoke my God by the inextinguishable name? For the expression "inextinguishable name", comp. the Hebrew phrase שְׁמוֹ נִמְחָקֵן שְׁאִינֵן נִמְחָקֵן which is frequently used in the Talmud (comp., e. g., Shebu'ot 35a) to describe the divine names like אֱלֹהִים אֵל אֱלֹהִים, in contrast to His attributes as אֵרֶךְ אִפְסִים, חַנוּן, etc. Comp. notes 35, 134, 253, and see further note 146 on vol. II, p. 328, on the encounter of Uriel (originally the angel of Hades; comp. however, note 13 in vol. I, p. 54, and Ginzberg, *Unbekannte Sekte*, 35-37 and 245) with

Moses.—Jacob in that memorable night at the ford of Jabbok intended to flee from Esau, and as a punishment for this lack of trust in God (comp. note 240) he was injured by the angel; *Hadar*, Gen. 32. 19.

<sup>274</sup> Tan. B. I, 168. On the possessions acquired outside the Holy Land, comp. note 215. On the acquisition of the Machpelah comp. vol. I, pp. 321 and 417. 1 Alphabet of Ben Sira ("ט) reads: God took it ill of Jacob, who, in his fear, gave gifts to Esau (comp. note 240), and was ready to follow his brother. He commanded him to separate himself from Esau, and as a punishment for his lack of faith in God, as evidenced by the gifts to Esau, all his cattle perished, with the exception of one little lamb, which was so precious to Jacob that he made a hut for it (comp. Gen. 33. 17), wherein to spend the night. Among the animals given by Jacob to Esau the male camel is not mentioned (comp. Gen. 32. 16, which reads: Thirty milch-camels and their colts), because it does not copulate with the female in the presence of others, and therefore Scripture omits to mention that a male camel was sent with the females. See Yerushalmi Ketubot 5,30b; BR 76. 7. The same remark is made by Justin Martyr, *Dialogue*, 112, but was misunderstood by his commentators. Comp. note 245.

<sup>275</sup> Abkir in Yalkut I, 133. For ומנין (so in first edition; in recent editions it is ומנהן or ולמיין or משם. Bet Gubrin is already identified with Seir in old sources; comp. BR 67. 6. According to a talmudic legend, God will slay the Yezer ha-Ra', "the evil inclination", on the day of judgment (Sukkah 52a and ER 4, 20). Since the Yezer ha-Ra' is identical with Sammael, the angel of Edom (Sotah 10a; Makkot 12a; comp. Rashi, *ad loc.*, and Lampronti, *Pahad Yizhak*, s. v. טעיוח 84c), the purport of this Abkir legend is that evil and sin will be abolished in the world to come. In Enoch 55. 4 it is the Messiah who judges Azazel and his companions, and this view is shared by 12 Testaments, Levi 18. 2, where it is said that the Messiah will bind Belior. Matthew 12. 29 and Luke 10. 19 agree with this view, while in Revelation 20. 2-3 this rôle is assigned to an agnel. In Abkir it is Elijah, an old competitor of the Messiah (comp. Ginzberg, *Unbekannte Sekte*, 342, seq.), who with the assistance of God, will destroy the prince of Edom, *i. e.*, Satan. The account of the struggle between leviathan and the angels, ending in the slaughtering of the monster by God Himself, so often alluded to in haggadic writings (comp. vol. I, p. 28, and the note 127 appertaining thereto), is another form of the legend about God's final victory over

evil, which is here represented by the leviathan in accordance with the old mythological terminology; comp. Jeremias, *Babylonisches im Neuen Testamente*, 44. The seizure by the hair is perhaps an allusion to Seir, "the hairy one" (comp. Josephus, *Antiqui.*, I, 20. 3, and MHG I, 395-396). See, however, vol. III, p. 29. In kabbalistic literature Sammael, the angel of Esau, has the form of a goat, and therefore he chose Seir (=Sair) as his people; comp. Nahmanides, Lev. 16. 8. Accordingly, the hair of Edom's angel is perhaps the same thing as the wool of the goat, and in this connection mention may be made of the Mohammedan legend (Buhari, III, 379; comp. Grünbaum, *Gesammelte Aufsätze*, 117), which has it that the angel of death (=Sammael; comp. Index, s. v.) assumes the form of a ram. The account of the flight to Bozrah as given in Abkir is based on Makkot 12a. Abkir quotes R. Aha as authority, because in the Talmud a remark bearing upon this subject is attributed to this Amora; the text reads: The angel of Edom in fleeing to Bozrah will commit three errors: he will think that Bozrah is a city of refuge, confusing it with Bezer (Deut, 4. 43); he will think that the cities of refuge grant protection to murderers (whereas only those who killed someone unwittingly may find refuge there); he will erroneously assume that an angel may seek refuge in these cities, but this law applies only to men; R. Aha adds: he will commit one other error: he will think that a city of refuge grants protection to a Gentile, whereas a Jew only may seek refuge there. Comp. Rabbinowicz *ad loc.* See also PRK 30a, which reads: Three things will be removed from the world before the advent of the Messiah: Seir, the Yezer ha-Ra', and the wicked kingdom (*i. e.* Rome). Comp. further the following note.

<sup>276</sup> BR 78. 14 (the truthful Jacob could not have possibly lied to Esau; comp. note 91); DR 1. 20; Tan. B. II, 92; Tan. Terumah 9; MHG I, 518. In all these sources the subject of the conversation between the two brothers is taken to have been the division of the two worlds: the older brother took this world and the younger the future. Comp. note 14. There is also another view to the effect that Jacob told his brother a diplomatic lie, which, under certain circumstances, is not only permitted but even commanded; comp. 'Abodah Zarah 25a; Yerushalmi 2, 40c; MHG I, 519. Yerushalmi is perhaps the source of MHG; comp. Yalkut II, 124, which quotes the statement of R. Nathan occurring in MHG from ירש' פ' שני שעירי. Comp. also Targum Yer. and Sekel on Gen. 33. 16.

<sup>277</sup> Targum Yerushalmi, Gen. 33. 17 (where perhaps "eighteen



months" should be read instead of a "twelve", in accordance with Seder 'Olam 2; BR 78. 16; Megillah 17a).

<sup>278</sup> Tan. B. I, 169. Comp. also BR 78. 16 and note 274. The four hundred men gradually slipped away from Esau, as they feared to remain in the proximity of Jacob, and as a reward for their respect to Jacob an equal number of their descendants were saved when David massacred the Amalekites (1 Sam. 30. 17; the Amalekites and the inhabitants of Seir are regarded as the same people); BR 78. 15.

<sup>279</sup> BR 79. 5; Shabbat 33b; Tan. B. I 168; Targum Yerushalmi and Jerome on Gen. 33. 16. The latter, however, combines this haggadic interpretation of שלם as "in perfect condition" with that found in the Septuagint and Jub. 30. 1, according to which שלם is the name of a place near Shechem. Comp. note 102 on vol. I, p. 233.

<sup>280</sup> BR 80. 6-7. A similar statement occurs in Shabbat 33b that Jacob established bath-houses, market-places, and a mint for the inhabitants of Shechem. In Shabbat 118b, BR 11. 7, and PR 23, 120b, attention is called to the fact that the Bible speaks of the observance of the Sabbath by Jacob, but not by Abraham; comp. note 139.

<sup>281</sup> MHG I, 522. It is very likely that this is the parcel of ground spoken of in John 4. 5 and 12. Comp. BR 80. 7.

<sup>282</sup> BR 80. 7-8; MHG I, 522-523. As to Jacob being called God, See Sifre D., 355; Midrash Tannaim 221; BR 77. 1. Comp. also Ginzberg's remarks in Geiger, *Kebuzzat Maamarim*, 393, as well as the quotation from the Prayer of Joseph in notes 35 and 273, against which the statement in BR and MHG is perhaps directed. Zohar I, 138a, maintains that God Himself appointed Jacob to be the lord of all earthly things.

<sup>283</sup> 2 ARN 3, 14; Koheleth 10. 8.

<sup>284</sup> PRE 28, and, with some embellishments, Yashar Wa-Yishlah, 63a-63b, where it is pointed out that Dinah went in company of the other female members of Jacob's household, and not by herself. Josephus, *Antiqui.*, I, 21. 1, says that Dinah went to the feast of the Shechemites.

<sup>285</sup> Tan. B. I, 171-172; Tan. Wa-Yishlah 5-7; BR 80.1 (numerous parallel passages are cited by Theodor) and 80. 1. In all these passages the biblical saying "as the mother so the daughter" (Ezek. 16. 44) is applied to Dinah and Leah, both of whom liked to go out to be "looked upon"; comp. note 193. The interpretation of

לראוח as לְרֹאוּחַ is old, though not in reference to Gen. 34. 1. Comp. Sanhedrin 4b.

<sup>286</sup> Lekah Gen. 34. 4, and comp. Buber, *ad loc.* According to the chronology of Seder 'Olam 2, Dinah was very young at the time when Jacob arrived in Shechem.

<sup>287</sup> BR 80. 5; Koheleth 10. 8; Yoma 77b. Comp. also MHG I, 524, where וַי, occurring four times in Gen. 34. 2, is explained as וַי "woe"; comp. the similar Haggadah in reference to Gen. 9. 20, *seq.*, in Sanhedrin 70a.

<sup>288</sup> BR 80. 4 and 73. 9. On Dinah, the wife of Job, comp. note 3 on vol. II, p. 225. According to some (comp. note 25), Esau was not better than Job, for the former, too, was not circumcised. See also vol. I, pp. 411-412, where another sin of Jacob is given as the cause for his misfortune with Dinah.

<sup>289</sup> Yashar Wa-Yishlah, 63b-69a. The old rabbinic sources give no particulars about the war against Shechem; they merely narrate that Jacob's sons, "relying on the strength of the old man", undertook to war against the heathens. Jacob, though opposed to offensive wars, could not but come to the assistance of his sons, and girded with his sword, he stood at the gates of Shechem to repel the attacks of the enemy. See BR 80. 10 and 97. 6; Targum Yerushalmi Gen. 48. 22. According to another view, the piety and prayers of Jacob warded off the threatening danger of an attack by the Amorites; comp. Baba Batra 123a; BR 97. 6; Aggadat Shir 3. 8, 33; 2 Targum Yerushalmi Gen., *loc. cit.* Yashar combined these two views: at first the threatening danger was warded off by Jacob's prayer; later, however, a fierce war broke out between the sons of Jacob and the Amorites. Comp. vol. I, pp. 408-411, and note 292.

<sup>290</sup> 12 Testaments, Levi 6. 9. Eblaen is perhaps to be explained as being due to a misreading of the Hebrew original, where the text read עבדו "his slave" (= Eliezer) or עבדיו "his slaves". On the slaves brought up in Abraham's house, comp. note 93 on vol. I, p. 231. For another justification of the killing of the Shechemites, see note 9 on vol. II, p. 198.

<sup>291</sup> Midrash published by Schechter from a MS. in *Semitic Studies* (in memory of Kohut), 489-492. The text is not free from errors, and a few emendations may be given here. 490, line 19: read הַחֲחֹק; *ibid.*, below: וַיִּלְחֶם יְהוּדָה תִּשְׁעַת שָׁעוֹת; 491, line 2; וְכֹאשֶׁר יֵשֵׁב; *ibid.*, below: שֹׂאֵר הַמַּלְכִּים or שֹׂאֵר הַמַּלְכוּת. On Judah's gnashing his teeth with a

frightful noise, see vol. II, p. 106, and on the fleet-footed Naphtali vol. I, pp. 371 and 410, as well as vol. II, p. 25. Comp. the following note.

<sup>292</sup> Midrash Wa-Yissa'u, in Yalkut I, 132 (from there it is reprinted by Jellinek in BHM II, 1-5, who, it is to be regretted, did not make use of the first edition of the Yalkut, and hence his text contains numerous errors). Yashar Wa-Yishlah, 70b-79b, embellished and amplified the narrative of Wa-Yissa'u, but had no other source for his verbose account of the war. Yerahmeel 36 agrees almost literally with Wa-Yissa'u, whereas Jub. 24. 4-9 and 12 Testament, Judah, contain only fragments of this legend. It is generally assumed that this legend has preserved many a reminiscence of the events of the Maccabean wars. This is quite likely; but one must not forget that the fabulist is only slightly interested in history. On the relation of Wa-Yissa'u to Jub. and Testaments the following may be stated. Instead of חצור in Yashar and Testaments, Wa-Yissa'u has חסר. This arouses the suspicion that the latter in its present form is a translation of a Greek or Latin text, which had no adequate transliteration of Hebrew צ. Sartan, "the great and strong fortress", is undoubtedly identical with the "tower of Straton", the old name of Caesarea, the conquest of which by the Maccabees is almost the only historical event of the Maccabean period known to the old rabbinic sources. Comp. Megillat Ta'anit 3 (beginning), and Megillah 6a. The orthography סרטן instead of סטרטן is not at all unusual; comp., e. g., אסרטא for אסטרטא "Strata", and see further Krauss, *Lehnwörter*, s. v. שרשן. A play on words (סרטן is the Aramaic word for "cancer") may have been intended. Instead of Gaash, Wa-Yissa'u has גועש, which is rather strange, as the use of ו to indicate a *Kamez gadol* is uncommon, and besides this the current vocalization of this word is גַעַש and not גֶעַש. It is very doubtful whether Maani Sakir in Jub.

is to be emended to Shakir Maani, since Wa-Yissa'u has מחנה שכיר (ed. Jellinek 2; in the first edition of Yalkut in כ and ב are hardly distinguishable), which can scarcely be rendered by Camp Shakir. Isidao of Jub. is very likely identical with זירורי in Wa-Yissa'u, which is to be emended to זירורי, i. e., זיד ארור "the curse villain". פסוס is, of course, the same as talmudic פסיסא or פוסיסא, and the name of the place פרעתק (fortified by Jonathan the Maccabee; 1 Maccabees 9. 50) is given by the legend to a person. On the text of Wa-Yissa'u the following details may be noted: 1. 11 (in Jellinek) read חניתות (he could throw two spears at once); *ibid.* the first edition has וא' ו

לירוח perhaps=לירוח; ויכול לירוח; 1. 21 read כירונו נול, and comp. 2 Sam. 23. 21; 1. 24 read והכהו על, and comp. Yashar, 72a, line 3; 2. 6 מָהָר is better than בָּהָר; 2. 14 'ושברו וכו' is an adaptation from Esther 9. 9, and this mosaic style is strong evidence of the lateness of this compilation; 2. 10; the first edition reads סרך ועלה, and comp. Baba Kamma 20a סריך סליק; 2. 17 וכחשה is hardly possible; *ibid.* Yashar misread חָלָה as חלה.—The medieval authors had, besides Wa-Yissa'u, other sources dealing with the wars of the sons of Jacob. Nahmanides, Gen. 34. 13, and R. Bahya, Gen. 36. 6, quote, from the "Book of the Wars of the Sons of Jacob" (R. Bahya's text is to be emended in accordance with Nahmanides, whom he very likely copies: *בספר מלחמות בני יעקב*), the legend that the Shechemites engaged in three great wars with the sons of Jacob, and if it were not for Jacob's valor, his sons would have perished. Zunz, *Gottesdienstliche Vorträge*, 145, identifies "the Book of the Wars, etc." with Wa-Yissa'u; but the quotation by Nahmanides and R. Bahya from the *Sefer Milhamot* is not found in Wa-Yissa'u, and therefore these two books are not identical. *Hadar*, Gen. 48. 22, quotes, from *Sefer Milhamot Bene Ya'akob* (the same as referred to by Nahmanides and R. Bahya?), the following account: The Shechemites (not Amorites as in Wa-Yissa'u) assembled to war against Jacob and his sons, but were vanquished. And on this occasion Naph-tali the swift runner (comp. note 216 and Index, s. v. "Naphtali") carried Judah on his shoulders to the battle array (that is how this obscure passage is to be understood), who, assisted by his father and brothers, annihilated the enemy. When later the sons of Jacob belittled the assistance rendered them by their father, maintaining that he was too old to be of any value as a warrior, he convinced them of their error by his great feats of valor. The *Sefer Milhamot* referred to by Sabba, Wa-Yishlah, 46b, is very likely identical with Wa-Yissa'u, as his quotation from the former book agrees with the beginning of the latter. On the other hand, it is safe to assume that Tan. B. Introduction 127, does not go back to Wa-Yissa'u. Comp. notes 297 and 317.

<sup>293</sup> WR 37. 1; Tan. Wa-Yishlah 8; Tan. B. I, 173, 174; BR 81. 2. Rachel's death which occurred about this time is also attributed (in the above mentioned sources) to this sin of Jacob. On the encounter with the angel as a consequence of Jacob's delay in fulfilling his vow, comp. vol. I, 387. See also vol. III, p. 90 (top).

<sup>294</sup> Tan. B. I, 174; WR 37. 1; Tan. Wa-Yishlah 8; BR 81. 2.

<sup>295</sup> Jub. 31. 2. The ear-rings, which were worn by the Shechemites,

and which, after the defeat of the latter, came into the possession of Jacob's sons, were adorned with pictures of idols; Targum Yerushalmi Gen. 35. 4, which is very likely based on BR 81. 3. Comp. also Zohar I, 173a.

<sup>296</sup> Yerushalmi 'Abodah Zarah 5, 44d; BR 81. 3. Comp. also Julius Africanus in Syncellus, *Chron.* 107, *al.* 86. Comp. note 298, and note 5 on vol. IV, p. 22.

<sup>297</sup> MHG I, 531. This passage also has the additional remark that this display of gigantic strength struck terror in the hearts of the Amorites, so that they gave up their intentions of undertaking a war against Jacob and his sons. On the war planned by the Amorites against Jacob, comp. note 289 and BR 82. 4. In the last-named passage it is said that the Amorites assembled for war at Hazor, and that is the reason why this city was later destroyed by Joshua (comp. Josh. 11. 13), who carried out the order given to him by Moses in accordance with the divine command. Midrash Aggada, Gen. 25. 2, reads: God caused the ground under the feet of the army assembled against Jacob to open as deep as the abyss, and a fire divided the heathen from Jacob and his sons, so that they were forced to abandon their plans. On Hazor comp. note 293.

<sup>298</sup> Hullin 6a, and comp. Midrash quoted by Tosafot, *ad loc.*, (beginning ברהש), which is not identical with any of the Midrashim cited in note 296. See also *Hadar*, Gen. 31. 4. On the pillar comp. Lekah, Gen. 35. 14;

<sup>299</sup> Jub. 31. 3-32, and 32. 4-29. It is said there that Jacob erected this altar on the first of the seventh month (*i. e.*, on Rosh ha-Shanah), and offered sacrifices during eight successive days, from the fifteenth to the twenty-second (*i. e.*, eight days of Tabernacles). Also in rabbinic sources it is said that Jacob celebrated this festival and, according to some authorities, he was the originator thereof. See Targum Yerushalmi Gen. 35. 14, and Abudrahim, *Musaf Rosh ha-Shanah* (end). The last-named authority refers to Gen. 33. 17, where it is said that Jacob erected "booths".

<sup>300</sup> Yashar Wa-Yeze, 57b-58a, and Wa-Yishlah, 69a. The similar Haggadah quoted in Rashi and Lekah on Gen. 35. 8 goes back to R. Moses ha-Darshan. Comp. Epstein, *R. Mosheh ha-Darshan*, 16. See also MHG I, 532, and note 204.

<sup>301</sup> *Da'at*, *Hadar*, and *Pa'aneah* on Gen. 35. 8 from a Midrash on Jud. 4. 5. Jub. 32. 30, reads: Jacob called Deborah's burial-place "the river of Deborah", and the oak, under which the grave was,

"the oak of the mourners of Deborah." The text is hardly correct; one cannot understand why a burial-place should be called a river. It is very likely that we have here a mistranslation of the Hebrew original, which read נחל דבורה "the valley of Deborah". But owing to the different meanings of the word נחל the translator rendered it by "river". Comp. note 12 on vol. I, p. 188.

<sup>302</sup> PK 3, 23b-24a; PR 12, 48b; Tan. B. I, 176, and V, 36; Tan. Ki-Teze 4; BR 81. 5 and 82. 1; Koheleth 7. 2; Targum Yerushalmi Gen. 35. 8; Yashar, Wa-Yishlah, 69a-69b. Contrary to this view of the old rabbinic sources, Yashar, in agreement with Jub. 35. 27, maintains that Rebekah died before Deborah. Comp. also Josephus, *Antiqui.*, I, 22. 1, which reads: Rebekah died before Jacob returned home. Rebekah's age at the time of her death was 158, according to Jub., but 133, according to Yashar. See also the unknown mid-rashic source in MHG I, 770. In the Tanhumas and Pesiktas, *loc. cit.*, Deborah is described as Jacob's nurse, which is not to be emended to the nurse of Rebekah (to make it agree with Gen. 35. 8). These Midrashim understand the expression מִיִּנְקָה רִבְקָה Gen. *l. c.* to mean "the nurse whom Rebekah employed for her children."

<sup>303</sup> MHG I, 533; comp. Schechter, *ad loc.*, and note 215. Contrary to the view of MHG, Tan. B. IV, 19, and Tan. Bemidbar 19 which state that God and His "family" (=court) appeared to Jacob at Beth-el, BR 82. 4 explicitly states that it was only an angel who appeared to Jacob at Beth-el on his return from Mesopotamia. On the parallels between the history of Abraham and that of Jacob, see MHG I, 534-536, and parallel passages cited by Schechter, as well as Makiri, Ps. 61. 311, whose source is not Yelammedenu, as Buber maintains, but Tan. B. I, 176.

<sup>304</sup> BR 82. 2-4; Tan. B. I, 176. On the joining of the name of God to those of the three patriarchs, comp. vol. II, pp. 225, 305, and 320; vol. IV, p. 424. See also the lengthy discussion on this point in Ginzberg, *Unbekannte Sekte*, 295, note 2. See also Philo, *Mut. Nomin.*, 2, which reads: The Lord God of three natures (of instruction, of holiness, and of the practice of justice) of which Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob are recorded as the symbols. The same thought is expressed more elaborately in *De Somniis*, 1. 27. Comp. note 227.

<sup>305</sup> Targum Yerushalmi Gen. 35. 14. Comp. 299.

<sup>306</sup> BR 78. 16.

<sup>307</sup> Seder 'Olam 2. This passage also states that Leah, the twin-sister of Rachel, died at the age of forty-four. Comp. Ratner,

*ad loc.*, and MHG I, 538-539. According to Yashar, Wa-Yishlah, 69b, Rachel died at the age of forty-five at the same time when her father Laban died, as a punishment for breaking the covenant he had made with Jacob.

<sup>308</sup> 12 Testaments, Benjamin 1; Lekah, Gen. 35. 18. Yashar Wa-Yishlah, 69b, and Rashi, Gen. *loc. cit.*, explain the name Benjamin as "son of the south". Jacob's youngest son was so called because he was the only one of his children who was born in the south, Palestine, whereas all the others were born in the north (Mesopotamia). Jub. 32. 33 states that Benjamin was born at night. This is very likely a midrashic explanation of Benjamin as "son of days" (= בְּיָמַי), which is taken to stand antiphrastically. Comp. Philo, *Mut. Nomin.*, 15, who likewise connects this name with יָמַי "days". The etymology of this name in BR 80. 11 is obscure. See also vol. III, p. 222 (top).

<sup>309</sup> BR 82. 8, which states that each of the other sons of Jacob was born with one twin-sister, Benjamin with two. Comp. note 170. Baba Batra 123a objects to the idea of "twin-sisters", and admits it only in the case of Dinah. See, however, Jub. 33. 22, which reads: **Dinah the only daughter of Jacob.**

<sup>310</sup> BR 82. 10. Comp. vol. II, p. 135, and vol. IV, p. 310. Jacob buried Rachel immediately after she died, and did not take her body to the family burial-place, because it is not proper to transport the corpses of women, especially those who died during childbirth. See Yerushalmi Mo'ed Katan 3, end and Babli 27b-28a; Responsum by R. Hai Gaon in *Sha'are Simhah* II, 73. Comp. also R. Bahya, Gen. 35. 19, and Lekah, 35. 8. Each of Jacob's sons took a stone and put it on the grave and these twelve stones make up Rachel's tomb; Lekah 35, 20.

<sup>311</sup> Targum Yerushalmi, Lekah, and Jerome on Gen. 35. 21. Comp. also Targum Yerushalmi, Rashi, Ibn Ezra, and Kimhi on Micah 4. 8.

<sup>312</sup> BR 98. 4; Tan. B. I, 218; Shabbat 55b (the "confusion caused to the Shekinah" spoken of in this passage is to be explained in accordance with the haggadah about the Shekinah dwelling with husband and wife, if their union is holy; comp. vol. I, pp. 68-69). See also Targum Yerushalmi Gen. 35. 22; Yashar Wa-Yishlah, 69b; *Shitah Hadashah*, 2 (after Leah's death Jacob placed Bilhah upon the couch of his deceased wife, *i. e.*, made her his principal wife); *Hadar*, Gen. 35. 22. Reuben sought, by some manipulation, (the same as

mentioned in Gittin 57a; comp. also note 130 and 340 on vol. II, 56 and 127 respectively), to throw suspicion on Bilhah's purity, in order to separate her from his father. Jacob, however, found out that he had no cause to suspect her. See also Zohar I, 175b and 176a. The pseudepigraphic writers make no attempt to exculpate Reuben; comp. vol. II, pp. 190-191, and note 382 on vol. II, p. 141.

<sup>313</sup> Sifre D., 355; Midrash Tannaim 220.

<sup>314</sup> BR 84. 19; PK 25, 159b; Targum Yerushalmi Gen. 37. 29. Comp. note 60 on vol. II, p. 24, and note 40 on vol. II, p. 13.

<sup>315</sup> Jub. 36. 1-8. Comp. the following note.

<sup>316</sup> PRE 38; MHG I, 541; Yashar Wa-Yishlah, 92a-93a (it seems to have made use of Jub. 36. 1-8, which legend was blended with that of the rabbinic sources); Makiri, Prov. 28, 78a-79a. Esau made his choice at the advice of Ishmael (PRE), or Nebajoth (Yashar). God rewarded Esau for departing from Jacob, and gave him one hundred cities in Seir; PRE, *loc. cit.*, and ER 13, 65. This is very likely midrashic Haggadah on עירם (Gen. 36. 43), which is explained as עיר "city", and מאה=מ "hundred". Comp. Menahot 43b, below and Sanhedrin 7a: מרון מאה דיני. One feels inclined to assume that PRE is dependent upon ER, as the latter is extremely fond of the number one hundred; comp. 10, 54; 18, 106 and 107; 19, 113; 22, 121; 23, 124; EZ 9, 189. According to this Midrash, Esau withdrew to Seir only for a time, until Jacob and his descendants have paid the "debt of Abraham" by serving the Egyptians; comp. MHG I, 542 and 551, as well as notes 156, 234, and notes 138 on vol. III, p. 55. Zohar I, 177a, and Lekah, Gen. 25. 29, maintain (on the basis of Baba Batra 16b) that at the burial of Isaac, Esau did not recognize Jacob's superiority, but claimed his birthright, and thus broke his oath with which he confirmed the sale of his rights to Jacob. There are three legends which attempt to explain Israel's exclusive right to the Holy Land and the cave of Machpelah. One dwells upon the fact that Esau, in selling his birthright to Jacob, renounced his claim to these two possessions (comp. vol. I, pp. 320-321); the second maintains that Jacob, on his return from Mesopotamia, acquired all claims from his brother; comp. vol. I, pp. 392-393, and the notes appertaining thereto, as well as Yelammedenu in Sikli (published by Poznanski, from a MS., in *Ha-Zofeh*, III, 20), where it is stated that on this occasion the brothers drew up an agreement to abide by the wish of Isaac as expressed in his blessings, to wit, that Jacob should inherit the world to come and Esau this world. The third legend justifies Israel's claim to Palestine



on the ground that Esau, in emigrating to Seir, gave up his right to the land of his fathers; comp. the sources cited at the beginning of this note, as well as BR 82. 13 and 84. 1; Koheleth 9, 18; Yelammedenu in Sikli, *loc. cit.*; Wa-Yissa'u (end). Comp. the following note.

<sup>317</sup> Wa-Yissa'u in Yalkut I, 132 = Jellinek in BHM III, 1, *seq.* Comp. note 292. Later additions to the original contents of Wa-Yissa'u, dealing exclusively with the war, are the introductory parts which were taken over verbatim from BR 82. 13, and the passages introduced by ויש אומרים (taken from Sotah 13a), as well as the sentence explaining Joseph's absence from the war. The text is far from faultless, and the following emendations may be recorded here. 4, 9 (in Jellinek's reprint) read בכסל; 5, 15 ושעמה as in 18 (where the first edition has correctly וכל) and as demanded by the context; 5, 20 read וראובן ולוי עומדים נגדם למלחמה ונפלו. Yerahmeel, 37, literally agrees with the text of Wa-Yissa'u in Yalkut, whereas Jub. 37 and 38 has a different version of the account of the war against Esau, only a fragment of which has been preserved in 12 Testaments, Judah 9. In contrast to Jub. 37. 9 and 38, where Adoram is described as an Aramean, he is correctly called the Edomite in Wa-Yissa'u, since this legendary figure owes his existence to the Edomite city Adorah (in Wa-Yissa'u corrupted to אדורין), where Esau was buried. The faulty text of Jub. is due to misreading ארמי as ארמי. In accordance with Testament of Judah, where the assault on the enemy's citadel by Judah is the most important event in this war (it is very likely modelled upon the war against the Amorites; comp. vol. I, pp. 409-411), the passage in Wa-Yissa'u 4, 16, is to be translated: Judah entered the rampart (= חיל; see note 292), and took the iron tower by storm.—The conversation between Jacob and Esau is given in the text in accordance with Jub., *loc. cit.*, which, it seems, is in need of emendation. Read: "Neither the children of men, nor the beasts of the field keep, etc.", instead of "swear an oath". The Hebrew original probably had לא יקימו האנשים, which the author employed in the sense of "keep an oath", as in classical Hebrew; but the translator took this phrase in the sense used in Aramaic and later Hebrew, and hence rendered it by "swear". The statement of Sabba, Wa-Yishlah, 45a, that the Midrash describing the wars between Jacob and Esau (the ב מלחמה) shows that מלחמה is not the title of the book; comp. note 292), speaks of a sudden attack by the latter on the former, very likely refers to Wa-Yissa'u. In view of the fact that Sabba himself admits that he quotes from memory, the difference between his text

and that of Wa-Yissa'u (as, e. g., מנדל in Sabba instead of בירה in Wa-Yissa'u) may be disregarded. Brüll, *Jahrbücher*, IX, 8, note 3, is to be corrected accordingly. For another legend about Esau's death, see Sotah 13a, and vol. II, 154. A later hand added this account to the original composition of Wa-Yissa'u. That this section did not form part of the original may be seen from the introductory words ויש אומרים.

<sup>318</sup> Tan. B. I, 108; DR 2. 20; MHG I, 524. Wa-Yissa'u (end) is accordingly to be emended to יצחק instead of יעקב. On Eliphaz comp. further vol. I, pp. 346 and 356, as well as vol. III, p. 63. Hasidim 19 reads: Jacob had a Bet ha-Midrash which was attended even by the sons of Esau. This is perhaps based on Wa-Yissa'u (end), where, according to our text, Eliphaz is considered a pupil of Jacob. Comp. the following note.

<sup>319</sup> Tan. B. I, 104 and 166; Aggadat Bereshit 55, 110-114; Tan. B. I, 108. See also Makiri, Obadiah (end), and *Ma'yan Gannim* 4. 1, both of whom very likely made use of Aggadat Bereshit, and not of an unknown Midrash on Job, as maintained by Wertheimer, *Leket Midrashim*, 5. The identity of Job's friend Eliphaz with Esau's son bearing the same name is maintained also by Jerome, Gen. 36. 10. Comp. notes 31-32 on vol. II, p. 236. BR 82. 12 (see also MHG I, 54), on the contrary, asserts that Eliphaz was very wicked and had unchaste relations with his father's wife, who bore him children.

<sup>320</sup> Sanhedrin 99b; MHG I, 542; Yashar, Wa-Yishlah, 70a. BR 80. 14, on the contrary, says: As a reward for the honor which Esau paid to his father, he was so highly esteemed by his contemporaries that princesses considered it a great honor to become related to his house by marriage. From this one may infer the great respect enjoyed by Jacob who was by far his brother's superior. Comp. BaR 14. 10; note 138 on vol. III, p. 55.

<sup>321</sup> Yashar Wa-Yishlah, 70a. Similarly Zohar I, 188a-188b, reads: Adam met demons in the desert, the place where evil spirits dwell.

<sup>322</sup> Yerushalmi Berakot 8, 12b; BR 80. 15; Pesahim 54a. Zohar I, 188b, combines this view on דימים (Gen. 36. 24) with the one given in the preceding note. Jerome, Gen. *l. c.*, offers three explanations of דימים communicated to him by his Jewish masters. According to one, it refers to the mules which Eliphaz produced by crossing the horse with the ass, or rather by observing these animals mating with one

another. The other explanation considers הַיַּמִּים to be identical with הַמַּיִם "wells of water". The third view refers it to the hot springs (חַמִּיִּים) which he found. Onkelos and Lekah on Gen. *l. c.*, take הַיַּמִּים in the sense of הַחַמִּיִּים "the awful beings" (comp. Hullin 6a), and Ephraim, I, 105 E, shares this view, whereas Targum Yerushalmi, *ad loc.*, agrees with Pesahim, *loc. cit.* This talmudic reference records also another opinion, according to which Adam crossed the horse with the ass.—The Haggadah finds in the names of Esau and his descendants and in those of their dwelling-places hints at their wicked and impious mode of life. See BR 82 .4; PRE 38 (this is the source of Rashi, Gen. 36. 43), and in amplified form, Sekel 1, 207-212 (based on an unknown midrashic source). Comp. also Tan. Wa-Yesheb 1; Shabbat 85a, and MHG I, 542, where it is stated that the inhabitants of Seir were great experts in agriculture.

<sup>323</sup> BR 83. 1-2; MHG I, 546 and 547-548. On foreigners as kings of Edom (Rome), see also Hullin 56b; ShR 37. 1; BaR 14. 10 (Bela, Jobab, and Husham were the only Edomites, while the other kings were foreigners); vol. II, p. 156. Just as the Romans (Edomites) had no kings of their own, even so they had to borrow their language and script from other nations; comp. 'Abodah Zarah 10a; Yerushalmi Megillah 1. 71c; Esther 1. 22; Targum 1 Chron. 1. 43; Targum Yerushalmi Gen. 36. 32; Krauss, *Lehnwörter*, s. v. בּוֹרְגִין.

<sup>324</sup> Targum 1 Chron. 1. 43; Targum Yerushalmi Gen. 36. 32. Comp. also *Monatsschrift*, XLIV, 35, as well as Ginzberg, *Haggadah bei den Kirchenv.*, 123. According to BaR 14. 10 Bela is a surname of Esau; comp. the preceding note.

<sup>325</sup> BR 83. 3. On the view that Job = Jobab, comp. note 3 on vol. II, p. 225.

<sup>326</sup> MHG I, 548.

## I. JOSEPH

### Vol. II

(pp. 1—184)

<sup>1</sup> BR 84. 2-4; MHG I, 552-553. On the conception that the life of the pious is a pilgrimage, see Tan. B. I, 179; Aggadat Bereshit 57, 117; notes 327, 260 on vol. I, p. 280. Concerning Abraham's proselytizing activity, see vol. I, p. 219. On Isaac's activity in this direction, see R. Bahya on Gen. 26. 15.

<sup>2</sup> Seder 'Olam 2. During this short period, however, his life was very happy (Josephus, *Antiqui.*, II, 2. 1), especially from the moment Esau emigrated from the Holy Land (Tan. B. I, 178; MHG I, 541-542), so that Jacob could live at his father's place in Hebron (MHG I, 553-554), and discharge his filial duties, which he had been compelled to neglect for twenty-two years; see Seder 'Olam, *loc. cit.*

<sup>3</sup> BR 84. 5 and 87. 8; Mekilta Beshallah 3, 29b; Mekilta RS 48 (an entire sentence, which fell out through a homoioteleuton, is to be restored in accordance with the text of our Mekilta, *loc. cit.*); Tan. Wa-Yesheb 9; Pekude 11; Naso 30; Tan. B. I, 179 and 188, as well as 206, and IV, 45; Tehillim 114, 475, and 20, 175 (which reads: The final redemption will take place on account of the merits of Joseph; see also MHG I, 544); Yelammedenu in 'Aruk, s. v. יוסף; Zohar I, 180a, 182b, and 222a; II, 49a and 230b; III, 214a; 12 Testaments, Joseph 18 (according to Jub. 21, 9, it was Levi and Judah, not Joseph, who resembled their father most closely in appearance); Targum Yerushalmi Gen. 36. 2-3. Comp. also the following three notes. In 12 Testaments, Benjamin 12, Joseph is designated as "the good and pious one" (the reading "the beautiful one" lacks support), and this is in agreement with the rabbinic and pseudepigraphic sources which frequently give Joseph the title יוֹסֵף הַצַּדִּיק "the pious one". Comp. Yoma 35b; ARN 16, 63 and 160; PRE 38 (=12 Testaments, Zebulun 3); BR 93. 7, 11, as well as 95. 4; ER 16, 83; 4 Maccabees 2. 2 (which has "the virtuous Joseph", undoubtedly representing יוֹסֵף הַצַּדִּיק, though it is not its literal translation); Ascension of Isaiah 4 (end); Shir 6. 12; Koheleth 19. 15; an unknown Midrash quoted in MHG I, 580 (r), 582 (מ'), 590 (top)

and 602. There can be no doubt that this title was conferred on Joseph on account of his virtuous victory over the wiles of his master's wife, as expressly stated in 4 Maccabees, *loc. cit.* Hence the statement of the Kabbalists that he who keeps himself sexually clean deserves the title צדיק like Joseph; comp. *Abkat Rokel* 2. 2 and Zohar I, 59b. In the kabbalistic literature Joseph is hardly ever mentioned without this title; comp., *e. g.*, Zohar I, 59b, 71b, 85a, 153b, 158a, 189b, 194b, 204a, 206b, 207a, 208a, 246b; II, 23a, 258a; III, 14a, 26a, 189a, 242b. In later books, owing to the influence of this literature, this title of Joseph is of frequent occurrence, and it is interesting to note that sometimes later recensions of liturgic compositions read יוסף הצדיק, whereas the old sources of the very same pieces only have יוסף without any epithet; comp. *e. g.*, the prayer רבונו של עולם in Berakot 55b and Makiri, Prov. 24. 17, where all manuscripts and editions read יוסף only, whereas the prayer-books (רוכנ) have יוסף הצדיק. Attention is also to be called to the fact that the liturgic composition ואניל ואשמח which is of geonic times speaks of יוסף and not of הצדיק. Grünbaum, *Gesammelte Aufsätze*, 545, and Schapiro, *Haggadische Elemente*, 36, are to be corrected accordingly. Some of the Midrashim explain צדיק as "one who practises charity", צדקה, and remark that only Joseph and Noah bore that name of distinction because both of them provided man and beast with food in the time of famine and distress; comp. Tan. B. I, 31; Tan. Noah 3; Yelammedenu in Recanati, Wa-Yesheb; Zohar I, 208a. The title חסיד is very rarely conferred upon Joseph; comp. Abba Gorion 2, and parallel passages cited by Buber. This passage reads: Joseph the first of the חסידים. See also Shemuel 5, 63 (the correct text is to be found in MHG I, 589); Yelammedenu in Yalkut I, 744 (נ"ב); MHG I, 579. The Muslim writers, following Jewish custom, give Joseph the title *al-Ziddik*; but ignorant of Hebrew, they explain it in accordance with the Arabic meaning of צדק as "truthful one". Comp. Excurs. II; Joseph. The use of the epithet הצדיק after Joseph's name is by far more frequent among Arabic-speaking Jews than among other Jews; comp., *e. g.*, Maimonides, *Guide of the Perplexed*, II, 34 and 48, as well as III, 46. On the reason of this epithet see also Lekah, Gen. 45. 15.

<sup>4</sup> BR 84. 6; BaR 14. 5; Tan. B. I, 179; Tan. Wa-Yesheb 1 (end) and Mikkez 3; MHG I, 554-555. Comp. vol. IV, p. 201 (top).

<sup>5</sup> Targum Yerushalmi Gen. 37. 2. Comp. notes 3 and 6.

<sup>6</sup> MHG I, 553; Yelammedenu 24-25 (= BHM VI, 82), with the additional remark that he studied under the guidance of Jacob and

Isaac; Philo, *De Josepho*, 1; Josephus, *Antiqui.*, II, 2. 1; Zohar III, 207. On the view that the life of a shepherd is the proper preparation for a ruler, comp. vol. II, pp. 300-301.

<sup>7</sup> MHG I, 555; Yelammedenu 25 (=BHM VI, 82), which reads: The sons of the handmaids were treated by the other sons of Jacob with contempt, but Joseph offered his services to them, as though he were their slave. Comp. the sources quoted in the following two notes.

<sup>8</sup> BR 84. 7; Yerushalmi Peah I, 15d-16a; Tan. B. I, 180; Tan. Wa-Yesheb 7. See the following note.

<sup>9</sup> 12 Testaments, Gad 2. The rabbinic sources cited in the two preceding notes, on the contrary, are of the opinion that the relation between Joseph and the sons of the handmaids were very friendly, whereas the relations between the "sons of the ladies", on the one hand, and the sons of the handmaids and Joseph, on the other, were strained. PRE 28 and Targum Yerushalmi Gen. 37. 2 share the view of 12 Testaments.

<sup>10</sup> Zohar I, 216b.

<sup>11</sup> BR 84. 8-10; Tan. Wa-Yesheb 4; Aggadat Bereshit 60, 123-124; comp. also R. Bahya, Gen. 37. 3, who very likely made use of Aggadat Bereshit. According to the view of later authors, Joseph's coat was the holy tunic of the priest; comp. *Keli Yakar*, Gen., *loc. cit.* The frankness of Joseph's brethren may be taken as a contrast to Esau's cunning in concealing his feelings towards Jacob; comp. note 109 on vol. I, p. 342. Philo, *De Josepho*, 2, likewise remarks: The virtuous man loves and hates openly; hidden hatred is evidence of fear. But he maintains that Joseph's brethren acted like cowards, and tried to conceal their enmity. See also Palkera, *Ha-Mebakkesh*, 17a. On the dividing of the Red Sea, comp. vol. II, p. 3 (below), and vol. III, p. 201.

<sup>12</sup> Lekah Gen. 36. 6; MHG I, 559.

<sup>13</sup> MHG I, 560; BR 84. 10. Comp. also Josephus, *Antiqui.*, II, 2. 2.

<sup>14</sup> Josephus, *Antiqui.*, II, 2. 3.

<sup>15</sup> BR 67. 10 and 84. 11; MHG I, 560. Comp. the following note.

<sup>16</sup> MHG I, 560; comp. Dan. 12. 3, and Yerushalmi Nedarim 3, 38a. Josephus, *Antiqui.*, II, 2. 3, gives a somewhat different interpretation of the dream.

<sup>17</sup> BR 84. 11-12. Similarly Philo, *De Josepho*, 2, and Josephus,

*Antiqui.*, II, 2. 3, assert that Jacob was convinced of the truth of the dream, but for the sake of peace, in order not to arouse the envy of his other sons, he rebuked Joseph for telling his dreams. Berakot 55a-55b reads: A dream may be partly fulfilled, but never in its entirety, as may be seen from Joseph who dreamed that his mother would appear before him, and yet she had already been dead. Comp. notes 18 and 20.

<sup>18</sup> Lekah Gen. 37. 10, according to which ואל אחיו is to be translated "in the presence of his brethren". The same view is expressed by Josephus, *Antiqui.*, II, 2. 3. Comp. preceding note as well as note 20.

<sup>19</sup> BR 84. 11.

<sup>20</sup> Lekah, Gen. 37. 11. Comp. notes 17 and 18.

<sup>21</sup> BR 84. 13; Sifre N., 69; Mishle 26. 99; ARN 34, 10; second version 37, 99. In all these sources, with the exception of the last-named, the dots on נח in Gen. 37. 12 indicate that it is to be read as נחנח (they went to enjoy themselves), whereas according to ARN, *loc. cit.*, these dots draw attention to the fact that the sons of Jacob drove the flock to the pasture for their own pleasure, to enjoy the meat of the fattened animals. Comp. vol. II, p. 6. Accordingly there is no need to emend the text of ARN. See Theodor, BR, *ad loc.* and Blau, *Masoretische Untersuchungen*, 23-25.

<sup>22</sup> Yashar Wa-Yesheb 80b; Targum Yerushalmi Gen. 37. 13; similarly Josephus, *Antiqui.*, II, 2. 4.

<sup>23</sup> BR 84. 13; Tan. B. I, 183; comp. Hasidim 233 and note 442 appertaining to it. Philo, *De Josepho*, 2, reads: Jacob sent his sons away for a time, retaining only Joseph with him, as the suffering of the soul is cured only by time; and when he thought that the ill-feeling of his sons against Joseph had subsided, he sent the latter to inquire after their welfare.

<sup>24</sup> Hullin 91b. Comp. vol. II, pp. 99, 115, as well as vol. IV, p. 137; See also notes 254 and 292.

<sup>25</sup> MHG I, 562. On unconscious prophecies see note 239 on vol. I, p. 277.

<sup>26</sup> BR 84. 13 and 86. 1-2; Tan. B. I, 183 and 185, as well as 188; Tan. Wa-Yesheb 4; Sotah 11b; Shabbat 89b; Aggadat Bereshit 69, 122-123; Tehillim 115, 450. Comp. note 32.

<sup>27</sup> Sanhedrin 102a; Tan. Wa-Yesheb 2.

<sup>28</sup> Yashar Wa-Yesheb, 80b.

<sup>29</sup> PRE 38; Targum Yerushalmi Gen. 37. 15; Tan. B. I, 183,

163; Tan. Wa-Yesheb 2; *Hadar, ad loc.* (which reads: Raphael); BR 84. 14 (three angels). Comp. also MHG I, 562. Philo, *Quod Deterius Potiori Insidiari Soleat*, 7, seems to have known the Haggadah about the angel meeting Joseph, and in his rationalistic manner changed the angel for the soul; comp. Zohar I, 184a. The name Dothan (דוּתָנָה) in Gen. 37. 17 refers to the angel, who is thus designated because he observes the law (דָּת) of God. Comp. Tan., *loc. cit.*

<sup>30</sup> PRE 38.

<sup>31</sup> Targum Yerushalmi Gen. 37. 17. Comp. notes 22 and 26, as well as Targum Yerushalmi 14.

<sup>32</sup> PRE 38.

<sup>33</sup> BR 84. 14; Tan. B. I, 183. These Midrashim take מרחוק (Gen. 37. 18) as qualifying לְהַמִּיתוֹ, *i. e.*, to kill him while he was still far off by setting dogs on him. According to some authorities, they drew lots to decide upon the mode of killing him. Comp. Aggadat Bereshit 60, 23; R. Bahya on Gen. 37. 3; Mishle 1, 45.

<sup>34</sup> 12 Testaments, Zebulun 2. According to a widespread view in rabbinic literature (comp. note 41), it was Simeon and Levi who advised to put Joseph to death, and if not for Reuben and Judah they would have killed him. In the 12 Testaments Levi is idealized as a prophet and priest, and therefore the rôle of a bloodthirsty plotter had to be taken away from him and assigned to another brother (comp. note 41). Gad and Dan (12 Testaments, Gad 2 and Dan 1) are the competitors for this unenviable rôle of the villain. As to the dry pit, comp. note 63 on vol. I, p. 324.

<sup>35</sup> BR 84. 15.

<sup>36</sup> Josephus, *Antiqui.*, II, 3. 1-3. Reuben hoped to enable Joseph to escape during the night; Josephus, *loc. cit.*, and PRE 38. On the conception that to cause one's death is not as grievous a sin as to commit murder, see vol. II, p. 251, as well as the Halakah in Baba Kamma 24b.

<sup>37</sup> Lekah Gen. 37. 30; comp. Zohar I, 185a-185b, which is very likely the source of Sabba, Wa-Yesheb, 48a.

<sup>38</sup> MHG I, 562-563 and the parallel passages cited by Schechter, as well as ARN 45, 125.

<sup>39</sup> BR 84. 15; Shemuel 9, 75; Makkot 10a.

<sup>40</sup> PK 25, 159b; MHG I, 563. For another version of this Haggadah see note 314 on vol. I, p. 416.

<sup>41</sup> BR 84. 16; Tan. B. I, 184; Tan. Wa-Yesheb 2; Yashar Wa-Yesheb, 81a; Shabbat 22a; Targum Yerushalmi Gen. 38. 27. Josephus,



*Antiqui.*, II, 3. 2, asserts that Reuben himself threw Joseph into the pit, but with the intention of saving him; comp. note 36. It is to be observed that although both Simeon and Levi are described as the plotters against Joseph's life (BR 99. 10; Tan. B. I, 183; Tan. Wa-Yesheb 9; Targum Yerushalmi Gen. 37. 19), yet it is only Simeon who is declared to have thrown him into the pit in all the sources mentioned above, with the exception of Mishle I, 44, where Levi is said to have been Simeon's accomplice in this undertaking also. In view of the remark of note 34, it is possible that Mishle has preserved the original form of this legend, while the other sources attempted to exonerate Levi, with the result that in the Testaments (comp. note 34) and Targum Yerushalmi Gen. 42. 24 there is not the faintest allusion to Levi's enmity towards Joseph. Philo, *De Josepho*, 30, likewise puts the entire blame on Simeon.

<sup>42</sup> Tan. B. I, 184, whence it was incorporated in Yalkut I, 142.

<sup>43</sup> BR 84. 16, which is followed by Targum Yerushalmi Gen. 37. 3. פְּרוּד מְצִייר is a paraphrase of פְּסִים, which accordingly is not to be translated "a coat of many colors", but "an upper garment in which figures are woven," in accordance with mishnaic פְּסִסִין; comp. Nega'im 11. 6.

<sup>44</sup> Yashar Wa-Yesheb, 81a. Comp. notes 33 and 34.

<sup>45</sup> 12 Testaments, Zebulun 4.

<sup>46</sup> PR 10, 40b; Tan. Ki-Tissa 2. Against this view which praises Judah's interference is directed the statement of R. Meir in Sanhedrin 6b, blaming Judah for his half-hearted stand, for he could have saved Joseph from slavery just as he saved him from death. See also Tosefta Berakot 4. 18 and 1 Alphabet of Ben Sira 13a, as well as note 388 on vol. III, p. 195.

<sup>47</sup> Yashar Wa-Yesheb, 81b. Comp. the following note.

<sup>48</sup> PRE 38; BR 84. 17; Tan. Wa-Yesheb 2. Against this view comp. vol. II, p. 217, according to which Judah sold Joseph without the knowledge of his brethren.

<sup>49</sup> Yashar Wa-Yesheb, 81b-82a. As to Simeon's terrible voice see vol. II, pp. 86 and 106, as well as vol. IV, p. 35. That Simeon is here the spokesman of his brethren is to be explained in accordance with notes 34 and 41.

<sup>50</sup> Tehillim 10, 93. The great sin of the sons of Jacob was never forgiven, so that each generation of Israelites has to bear its share of suffering as an atonement. The death of the "ten martyrs" (comp. Index, s. v.) especially was a partial payment of this debt. These

great men suffered for the crime of the ten sons of Jacob. Comp. Mishle 1, 45; Elleh Ezkerah 64; Midrash Shir 3a-3b; *Kaftor wa-Ferah*, 412. See further B<sup>R</sup> 84. 17; note 62 and note 14 on vol. II, p. 216.

<sup>51</sup> Tan. Wa-Yesheb 2; PRE 38 (the text of the editions is very likely incomplete; comp. *Da'at* and *Hadar*, Gen. 37. 2); MHG I, 564; 'Asarah Haruge Malkut 20. On the text of the last-named source see *Da'at* and *Hadar*, *loc. cit.* According to the reading of the last-mentioned sources, the angel changed Joseph's sallow and sickly complexion into a rosy and ruddy one, and that is the reason why the brethren asked a higher price for him. The Midianites added a pair of shoes for each one of them. The shoes as part of the price (comp. Amos 2. 6) are also mentioned in 12 Testaments, Zebulun 4, and in Targum Yerushalmi Gen., *loc. cit.* Comp. the sources cited in the following note.

<sup>52</sup> 'Asarah Haruge Malkut 20, whence it was borrowed by *Da'at*, *Hadar*, and *Imre No'am* on Gen. 38. 22-23. In *Hadar* and *Imre No'am* Raphael (comp. vol. II, p. 10 and note 28) is substituted for Gabriel. This is due to the fact that the former is the angel of healing (comp. Index, *s. v.*), and is thus more likely to have been the one to bring about an improvement in Joseph's health. Comp. the previous note. Schapiro, *Haggadische Elemente*, 27, is to be corrected accordingly. The view that the shoes were an addition to the price proper removes the contradiction between Gen. 37. 28 and Amos 2. 6. Comp. previous note.

<sup>53</sup> Yerushalmi Shekalim 2, 46d; PK 1, 19b-20a; BR 84. 18; Tan. Ki-tissa 10; comp. MHG I, 564, and vol. III, p. 148.

<sup>54</sup> 12 Testaments, Zebulun 3; comp. notes 51, 52. He who refuses to enter into a levirate marriage shows that he is lacking in brotherly love, and hence the ceremony of taking off the shoes brands him as one who is like Joseph's brethren.

<sup>55</sup> Yashar Wa-Yesheb, 82b. Concerning the various masters who possessed Joseph, see note 99.

<sup>56</sup> Tosefta Berakot 4. 16; BR 84. 17.

<sup>57</sup> Midrash Shir 3a. Comp. vol. IV, p. 242, and the following note.

<sup>58</sup> Aggadat Shir 1, 12, where the general assertion is made that by the odor of the dead bones one may distinguish between the pious and the wicked, between Jew and Gentile, between man and woman. Comp. note 92 on vol. I, p. 334, and note 2 on vol. III, p. 5.

<sup>59</sup> Yashar Wa-Yesheb, 82b-84a and 85b-86a. The author was

perhaps acquainted with the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs. Comp. vol. II, pp. 34-42 and 220-221.

<sup>60</sup> BR 84. 19; PK 25, 159a-159b; Mishle 1, 45; Targum Yerushalmi Gen. 37. 29. Reuben is very often referred to in the Haggadah of the earliest Tannaim and the latest Amoraim as the type of the "penitent"; comp. the sources cited in the notes on vol. I, p. 416; vol. II, pp. 36, 131, 141, 190; vol. III, pp. 199, 220, 223, 232, 462; vol. IV, p. 360. Comp. also Schechter, *Zadokite Fragments*, 27, note 66. Charles, *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs, Introduction*, 15, note 1, is accordingly in error when he maintains that the old rabbinic literature does not know of the "penitent Reuben", and the conclusion he draws from this assumption is quite untenable. Comp. Ginzberg in *Journal of Bibl. Lit.*, XLI, 119.

<sup>61</sup> Yashar Wa-Yesheb, 84a-84b, partly following older sources; comp. BR 86. 14, and vol. II, pp. 30, 205. Issachar, as the ancestor of the "tribe of the wise" (comp. note 391), gives a wise counsel.

<sup>62</sup> MHG I, 565; BR 84. 19; Lekah and Targum Yerushalmi on Gen. 37. 31. Zohar I, 185b adds: Just as Jacob deceived his father by means of a young goat, even so was he deceived by means of a young goat. Comp. notes 65, 87-88 and note 88 on vol. I, p. 332. As to the gravity of the sin, comp. note 50.

<sup>63</sup> 12 Testaments, Zebulun 4.

<sup>64</sup> Yashar Wa-Yesheb, 84a-85a, which in many points resembles the description given by Philo, *De Josepho*, 3. The lamentation on Joseph closes with the acknowledgment of God's justice צְדִיק הָרִין. Comp. vol. I, p. 286 and note 256 appertaining to it. Joseph's coat, soiled with blood and dust (comp. Philo, *loc. cit.*; Yashar 84b; *Da'at* and *Hadar* on Gen. 37. 31), was brought to Jacob. According to Yashar the coat was brought by the swift messenger Naphtali (comp. note 216, on vol. I, p. 371); but the older sources maintain that it was Judah (BR 84. 8 and 95. 2; Tan. B. I, 209; BaR 13. 14; Aggadat Bereshit 60, 124), and that lots were drawn to decide who should bring the message to their father. Targum Yerushalmi Gen. 37. 25 agrees with the older sources, but in 37. 32 it states that the sons of the bond-women brought the sad news to their father.

<sup>65</sup> Jub. 34. 14-19; comp. note 62. According to the views of the Rabbis, Bilhah survived Jacob; see vol. II, p. 167. Dinah is mentioned in Gen. 46. 15 among the members of Jacob's family who emigrated to Egypt many years after Joseph had been sold into slavery, Comp. note 96.

<sup>66</sup> Yashar Wa-Yesheb, 85a-85b. This legend seems to be of Arabic origin, since in genuinely Jewish legends animals do not talk.

<sup>67</sup> Soferim 21; Targum Yerushalmi Gen. 37. 33. The latter source made use of BR 84. 19, but changed the unconscious prophecy of the Midrash into a conscious one. On the number 12 in Jewish legends, comp. Zunz, *Literaturgeschichte*, 601-602, and see further ER II, 29-30; Tan. B. I, 181 and 222; MHG II, 4.

<sup>68</sup> PRE 38; Tan. Wa-Yesheb 2; MHG I, 564. Comp. notes 66, 198, and 370.

<sup>69</sup> BR 84. 21; comp. Yashar Wa-Yesheb, 85a, where Isaac's mourning for Joseph is spoken of. Different views have been expressed with regard to Jacob's daughters mentioned in Gen. 37. 35. According to one opinion, the daughters-in-law are meant by the word "daughters", but another view maintains that this word refers to the twin-sisters of the twelve sons; comp. the sources cited in note 170 on vol. I, p. 362. Yashar, *loc. cit.*, has בנות עבדיו, the daughters of his slaves, instead of בנותיו. On Isaac "the prophet" comp. note 78 on vol. I, p. 330.

<sup>70</sup> Tan. B. I, 180 and 221. BR 24. 5, Shir 15. 6, and Aggadat Bereshit 72, 141-142, dwell upon the fact that the existence of the twelve tribes is a part of the plan of creation. Were it not for his sin, Adam would have been the father of the twelve tribes. See also notes 67 and 428.

<sup>71</sup> Rashi on Gen. 37. 35, which is based upon an unknown mid-rashic source somewhat similar to Tan. B. I, 204 and Tan. Wa-Yiggash 9; but neither of these two is Rashi's source. Comp. note 320.

<sup>72</sup> BR 84. 20; Megillah 17a. Comp. note 2 and note 240 on vol. I, p. 381.

<sup>73</sup> BR 84. 20; Esther 4. 1.

<sup>74</sup> Tan. B. I, 181, 183, 209; BR 85. 3; DR 7. 4; Tan. 'Ekeb 6; ShR 42. 3; Aggadat Bereshit 60, 123-124; Sotah 13b; Tan. Ki-Tissa 22; Zohar I, 186a. In all these sources Judah is blamed for two things: First for his failure to complete the good deed he began, since he might have restored Joseph to his father after he saved him from death and not sold him into slavery (comp. vol. II, p. 37). Secondly, for having delivered Joseph's coat to his father with the words "Discern now whether it is thy son's coat or not" (Gen. 37. 23). Judah's punishment for these deceitful words correspond to his sin: Tamar said to him: "Discern, I pray thee, whose are these, etc." (*ibid.* 38.

25). Comp. notes 46, 64. That Judah was the leader of his brethren is also found in Philo, *De Josepho*, 32. On the basis of the Haggadah in the Midrashim just quoted, Targum Yerushalmi Gen. 38. 1 paraphrases וירד by "And he became poor"; comp. Yerushalmi Peah I, 19a, and WR 34. 13, for the explanation of מרודים in Is. 58. 7. Comp. note 95.

<sup>75</sup> 12 Testaments, Judah 9, 8, and 11 (verses 1-2 in the last passage ought to be transferred to 8. 2). On Judah's marriage see also vol. II, pp. 37 and 199.

<sup>76</sup> MHG I, 569-570. Targum Yerushalmi Gen. 38. 3 dwells upon the fact that Judah did not marry his wife before converting her to Judaism. Comp. note 96.

<sup>77</sup> BR 85. 1; Tan. B. I, 182; Aggadat Bereshit 63, 128.

<sup>78</sup> BR 85. 4; Targum Yerushalmi Gen. 38. 3; MHG I, 570.

<sup>79</sup> 12 Testaments, Judah 10. The Bible does not specify the nature of Er's sin; but the Rabbis maintain that he committed the same sin as Onan; see Yerushalmi Ketubot 7, 31 (מְעָרָה = עָרָה); BR 85. 4; Yebamot 34b; Targum Yerushalmi Gen. 38. 7; Tan. Wa-Yesheb 90b. It is possible that in the Hebrew original of the Testaments the same view was expressed. Comp. Excursus II; Judah. On the expression דש מבפנים חורה מבחוץ and חורש בנות used in BR to describe onanism (severely condemned in rabbinic sources; comp., e. g., Niddah 13a), see MHG I, 570; PRE 21 (beginning); Shir 4. 13. While 12 Testaments, *loc. cit.*, and Jub. 41. 1 describe Tamar as the daughter of Aram, the rabbinic sources declare Shem to have been her father. It is true that Shem was the father of Aram (Gen. 10. 21), and there would be no difficulty in taking "father" in the sense of "grandfather". Moreover in view of the fact that Shem is by far more famous than his son Aram, the reason for describing Tamar as the daughter of Shem is quite obvious. Nevertheless the context in which the Rabbis speak of Tamar as Shem's daughter (comp. vol. II, p. 35) shows clearly that they were of the opinion that she was his daughter and not his grand-daughter; comp. BR 85. 10; Tan. B. I, 187; Aggadat Bereshit 63, 129; Ruth R (end); Targum Yerushalmi, *loc. cit.* Only Yashar, *loc. cit.*, considers Tamar to have been a grand-daughter of Shem by his first-born son Elam. Comp. Excursus II; Judah. For the etymological explanations of the name Tamar, see Lekah and Sekel on Gen. 38. 6.

<sup>80</sup> BR 85. 4; Targum Yerushalmi Gen. 38. 4; MHG I, 570.

<sup>81</sup> 12 Testaments, Judah 10-11. In Sotah 13b and in the sources cited in note 74 the death of Judah's wife and children is declared to have been his punishment for having sold Joseph into slavery. For he was mainly responsible for this sin; comp. vol. II, pp. 31-32. Many etymological explanations are given of the name Shelah, see BR 85. 4; Targum Yerushalmi Gen. 38. 5; MHG I, 570. With regard to בְּכוֹיֵב (Gen. 38. 5) an opinion is quoted according to which it is not a name of a place but a noun derived from the root כִּיב; this verse is thus to be translated: "And she stopped bearing children after the birth of this one"; see BR, *loc. cit.*, where two explanations of בְּכוֹיֵב are combined into one; Targum Yerushalmi and MHG, *loc. cit.*

<sup>82</sup> BR 85. 6-9; Sotah; 10a-10b; Yer. Ketubot 13 (beginning); MHG I, 569 (כ'); Zohar I, 188a-188b. According to Seder 'Olam 2, the difference in age between Er and Onan was only one year; they married at the age of seven, and died a year after their marriage. Philo, *De Virtutibus, De Nobilitate*, 6, gives an idealized picture of Tamar, "who was reared in the house of idolaters, but became converted to the belief in one God, and by the purity of her life she acquired nobility for her descendants." He further adds that although Tamar was of the race of the Palestinian Syrians (not Canaanitish!), she was nevertheless a free woman; her parents, too, were free people, yea, probably distinguished persons. On the view that Tamar was a convert to Judaism from idolatry, see note 76 and Sotah 10a, where she is described as a proselyte. For a different opinion comp. note 79.

<sup>83</sup> MHG I, 572.

<sup>84</sup> Sotah 10a, as a haggadic interpretation of בַּפְתָּח עֵינַיִם (Gen. 38. 14), which is explained to mean: The gate to which the eyes of all are turned. For other haggadic interpretations of these words comp. Yerushalmi Sotah 1. 16d-17a; BR 85. 7; Tan. B. I, 186-187; Shemuel 6, 67; MHG I, 573 (כ'); Targum Yerushalmi, *ad loc.* See also note 86.

<sup>85</sup> Megillah 10b; Targum Yerushalmi Gen. 38. 15 BR 85. 8 and Tan. I, 187 warn against following Judah's example and refraining, out of excessive prudery, from looking at one's female relatives. If Judah had not been too modest, the shocking incident with Tamar would never have happened.

<sup>86</sup> BR 85. 7, and the sources referred to in note 84. Tan. B. I, 187, has Michael instead of the "angel of love", of the other sources. On the text of Tan. see *Hadar*, Gen. 38. 15. When Moses ascended into heaven, "the great prince" Michael met him, with the intention

of consuming him with the breath of his mouth, and said unto him: "What hast thou, that art born of woman, to do here in the place of the holy ones (=angels)?" Moses rejoined: "And who art thou, and what is thy rank?" "I am as important as Judah the son of Jacob", replied Michael. From this it may be inferred that Judah was a very pious and holy man. He betook himself to Tamar only after he had been compelled to do so by an angel; Tan. B. (Introduction) 128-129; read שְׁהָרִי instead of שְׁעָלִי יְרִי.

<sup>87</sup> BR 85. 9; 12 Testaments, Judah 15. 3, and in abridged form 12. 4. Shu'aib, Wa-Yesheb, 18d, quotes, from an unknown Midrash, a different explanation of the three pledges.—Just as Jacob deceived his father by means of a young goat (comp. note 62), even so did Tamar deceive Judah by means of a young goat; BR, *loc. cit.* Comp. note 74.

<sup>88</sup> Tan. B. I, 187; BR 85. 10; Targum Yerushalmi Gen. 38. 24. Comp. note 79, and the following note.

<sup>89</sup> Yerushalmi Targumim Gen. 38. 25-26; Sotah 10b, which reads: Sammael hid the pledges, so that Tamar's innocence should not be proved thereby; but Gabriel (=Michael in Palestinian sources; comp. Index, *s. v.*) brought them back. See also Tan. B., Introduction, 127 (here also Gabriel is mentioned; but this passage is not based on the Talmud); Makkot 23b, where it is stated that Shem was the presiding judge, and accordingly in Tan. B. I, 187 שָׁם should be read and not שָׁמ; BR 85. 1 (here the Holy One, blessed be He, הַקֹּבֵה, takes the place of the angel); Koheleth 10. 16; Tehillim 72, 325; Shemuel 14, 91. In the last-named five sources the additional remark is found to the effect that on this occasion, as well as at the time when Samuel asserted his incorruptibility and disinterestedness (1 Sam. 12. 3, *seq.*), and when Solomon pronounced his judgment on the dispute of the two mothers (1 Kings 3. 24, *seq.*), a heavenly voice was heard to corroborate the statement made by the mortals.—Tan. B. I, 187-188, and Aggadat Bereshit 17, 35, remark that the "three youths" were saved from death in the furnace as a reward for the pious deed of their ancestor Judah, who had saved three lives from death by fire: Tamar and her two sons. Comp. also MHG I, 577-578.

<sup>90</sup> Sifre D., 348; Midrash Tannaim 214; Tan. B. I, 188. Comp. note 60, and vol. III, p. 455. As a reward for his frank confession of his sin, Judah was granted royal dignity; Tosefta Berakot 4. 17;

Mekilta Beshallah 5, 31b, and parallel passages cited by Friedmann; ShR 30. 19.

<sup>91</sup> BR 85. 9; Tan. B. I, 188, which remarks: They were kings like their father; MHG I, 574.

<sup>92</sup> Targum Yerushalmi Gen. 38. 29, and somewhat different in BR 85. 19, where the name Perez (=פֶּרֶץ) is taken to be an allusion to the Messiah, who is called "the breaker" (comp. Micah 2. 13), and who is a descendant of Perez, the son of Judah. See also Lekah Gen., *loc. cit.*, and MHG I, 579, which reads: Perez, he who broke through his mother's womb.

<sup>93</sup> MHG I, 579; Lekah Gen. 38. 29. Comp. also Targum Yerushalmi Gen., *loc. cit.*, which remarks: Zerah, the shining (=the scarlet) thread.

<sup>94</sup> MHG I, 336-337. The source of MHG is Mishle, but not of our editions.

<sup>95</sup> BR 85. 2-3 and the sources cited in note 74. To exonerate Judah of the sin of having married a Canaanitish woman, it was necessary to explain כְּנַעֲנִי (Gen. 38. 2) as "merchant"; comp. BR, *loc. cit.*, and Pesahim 50a, as well as Onkelos and Targum Yerushalmi, *ad loc.* For a different view see vol. II, p. 32, and notes 75-77. The name 'Alet is only found in Yashar, Wa-Yesheb, 89b; comp. also Sekel, *ad loc.*, 226. On Hiram=Hirah see note 105 on vol. IV, p. 336. Concerning the wives of Jacob's sons; comp. note 69, and vol. I, p. 362.

<sup>96</sup> BR 80. 11; MHG I, 682; Yashar Wa-Yishlah, 60b and 89b. The older sources would not admit that any one of Jacob's sons married a Canaanitish woman (comp. the preceding note), and this gave rise to the view that כְּנַעֲנִיָּה (Gen. 46. 10) refers to Dinah, whereas Yashar in an uncritical manner makes Simeon marry Dinah, and, as his second wife, the Canaanitish woman Bunah. As to the name בִּנְיָה, comp. 1 Chron. 2. 25; but there it is the name of a man, and it is quite possible that in Yashar it is the Latin *bona*; comp. vol. I, p. 400 (top). On the basis of the statement in BR, *loc. cit.*, that Dinah's body was brought from Egypt to Palestine, the medieval authors maintain that her grave is at Arbel; see Shu'aib, Wa-Yishlah, 16a, and Wa-Yehi, 24a, as well as *Seder ha-Dorot*, 2198. Comp. note 65.

<sup>97</sup> PRE 38, which is the source of Targum Yerushalmi Gen. 41. 45 and 46. 20; Abkir in Yalkut I, 146; Judah b. Barzillai 63 (the source is not given); Soferim (end). A somewhat different version of this legend is found in *Hadar* and *Da'at* on Gen. 41. 45 (only these



sources give the episode about Asenath handing over her amulet to Joseph), as well as R. Bahya, *ad loc.* *Hadar*, Gen. 34. 1, however, literally agrees with PRE, and in *Da'at loc. cit.* (Tosafot), reference is made to this passage of *Hadar* with the word כַּדְפְּרִישִׁית. For a third version of the Asenath legend comp. vol. II, pp. 139, 170, as well as note 188. The very elaborate Asenath legend found in Syriac, though undoubtedly of Jewish origin, differs in many essential points from the rabbinic version of this legend. An eagle (not an angel; in PRE it is Michael) brings the babe from Palestine, and places her on the altar of an Egyptian temple, where she is found by the priest Potiphar who, being childless, adopts her. See Oppenheim, *Fabula Josephi et Asenathae*, Berlin 1886, 4-5. Abu'l-Rabi', in *Perushim le-Rashi*, on Gen. 46. 10, gives an abridged form of this Syriac legend, as he "found it in the words of our masters"; comp. Perles, *R.E.J.* 21, 254, and 12, 87-92, as well as in *Magyar Zsido Ssemle* 8, 294. The old Midrashim take Asenath to have been the real daughter of Potiphar; see note 109.

<sup>98</sup> Yashar Wa-Yesheb, 80a-90b. It is to be noted that of all the sons of Jacob, only Reuben, Simeon, and Judah took Canaanitish wives. The Bible (Gen. 35. 2 and 46. 10) is the authority for this statement of Yashar with regard to Simeon and Judah; but it is difficult to give the reason for assuming that Reuben married an undesirable woman except that it is likely that the two younger brothers followed the example of the oldest one. Comp. note 96 which has some remarks concerning Simeon's second wife. According to Jub. 44. 13 Simeon's Canaanitish wife came from Zephath; comp. Judges 1. 17. On Benjamin marrying at the age of eighteen, see Abot 6. 2 (does not belong to the Mishnah) and Kiddushin 39a (top).

<sup>99</sup> 12 Testaments, Joseph 11-16. On the text and the rabbinic parallels to this description of the life of Joseph, see Excursus II., Joseph.

<sup>100</sup> BR 86. 3, where several explanations are given why the same man is called Potiphar as Joseph's master (Gen. 39. 1), and Potiphera as his father-in-law (*ibid.* 41. 50). The identity of Potiphar with Potiphera is also assumed in Jub. 40. 10; 12 Testaments, Joseph 18. 3; Origen and Jerome on Gen. 37. 36. See the following note.

<sup>101</sup> Sotah 13b; BR 86. 3; Tan. B. I, 185; Targum Yerushalmi Gen. 39. 1; MHG I, 579 (this passage is abridged in Shemuel 5, 63); Jerome on Gen. 37. 36. The question how the eunuch Potiphar could be the father-in-law of Joseph has already attracted the attention of Philo; see *De Allegor.*, 84. The rabbinic Haggadah offers two answers

to this question: 1) Asenath was Potiphar's adopted daughter (comp. note 97); 2) she was born before he was made a eunuch by an angel as a punishment for his evil intentions towards Joseph. Comp. the sources quoted at the beginning of this note, as well as R. Bahya, Gen. 41. 45. Tehillim 105, 451, states: As soon as Joseph became powerful, he put Potiphar in prison for life. Was this a punishment for his evil intentions towards Joseph?

<sup>102</sup> Tan. Wa-Yesheb 8; Tan. B. I, 186; BR 86. 4-5. Comp. also Tan. B. IV, 44; Tan. Naso 30; BaR 14. 3. In the last-named three sources it is stated that Joseph's master said to him: "I should like to see your God." Whereupon Joseph replied: "Thou canst not look straight at the sun; how canst thou expect to see God?" The proof for the invisibility of God from the impossibility to stare at the sun is very likely taken from Hullin 60a (=Abkir in Yalkut I, 396), where it is quoted as the answer of R. Joshua to a Roman emperor (=Hadrian); it is already found in Xenophon's *Memor.* IV, 3. 14. Jewish and Christian apologists often mention this proof; comp. Gudemann, *Religionsgeschichtliche Studien*, 117. To the references given by him the following are to be added: Philo, *De Abrahamo*, 16; Mangey I, 12. Theophilus, 1. 2; Origen, *Con. Cels.* 6. 66. Comp. Marmorstein in *Debir*, I, 123 and Ginzberg in *Ha-Goren*, IX, 62. Schapiro, *Haggadische Elemente*, 76, misunderstood the Midrashim, and speaks of Joseph's attempt to convert the king of Egypt. Comp. note 195.

<sup>103</sup> BR 86. 6; ShR 1. 32; Targum Yerushalmi Gen. 39. 6. On the euphemistic expression "to eat bread" for "to have sexual intercourse", see Shabbat 62b and Ketubot 13a.

<sup>104</sup> MHG I, 581; BR 86. 5. Comp. also Berakot 42a; BR 86. 6; Zohar I, 189.

<sup>105</sup> Josephus, *Antiqui.*, II, 4. 1. Philo, *De Josepho*, 8, likewise remarks that in Potiphar's house Joseph was given the opportunity to acquire the knowledge necessary for a statesman; for the management of a house is the management of a state in miniature.

<sup>106</sup> BR 87. 3-4; Tan. Wa-Yesheb 8; MHG I, 583. Lekah, Lam. 1. 67, reads in Ekah 1. 71: 'כר יוסף...במצרים וכו'; but this reading is certainly untenable.

<sup>107</sup> BR 87. 4. 12 Testaments, Joseph 3, speaks of the ten temptations which Joseph withstood; comp. vol. I, p. 217. The wish of the pious to prove their piety under temptations is also mentioned with regard to David; see vol. IV. p. 104.

<sup>108</sup> BR 85. 2 (87. 4 is very likely to be explained accordingly); MHG I, 596. In these sources Asenath is considered as Potiphar's real daughter, and not as his adopted child; comp. note 97.

<sup>109</sup> BR 85. 1.

<sup>110</sup> 12 Testaments, Joseph 3-7. On the text of this passage and on the rabbinic parallels to this description of Joseph's steadfastness, see Excursus II; Joseph.

<sup>111</sup> Yashar Wa-Yesheb, 86b. In the older Haggadah the wife of Joseph's master is nameless. But Philo, *Leg. Alleg.*, 84. 7, speaks of Pentophoe, the wife of Pharaoh's chief cook. The description of Potiphar as Pharaoh's chief cook is in accordance with the translation of שר הטבחיים (Gen. 39. 1) in the Septuagint and Jub. 34. 11. Of course, the author of the Hebrew original of Jub. quoted Gen., *loc. cit.*, literally, and there is no means to ascertain in what sense he took it. Zohar III, 213b, maintains that at first Joseph pretended not to understand the Egyptian language, in order that he might be spared the passionate words of the infatuated woman. After a while he could no longer feign ignorance of the language. When she saw that her words were of no avail, she attempted to use force.

<sup>112</sup> Yoma 35b; comp. also BR 87. 9; ARN 16, 63; MHG I, 591; Tan. Wa-Yesheb 9. Concerning the daily change of garments and the threats, see also Yashar Wa-Yesheb, 86b-89a. This source clearly shows that Yoma, *loc. cit.*, speaks of changing Joseph's garments, not those of the woman; comp. Rabinowicz, *ad loc.*

<sup>113</sup> BR 87. 5. The name Zulaika (of Persian origin) is only found in Yashar; comp. note 111. As to the intention of Potiphar's wife to kill him, see vol. II, pp. 46, 183. On the view that the night is the time for divine revelations see note 221 on vol. I, p. 373.

<sup>114</sup> MHG I, 586 (not from BR), and similarly Philo, *De Josepho*, 9.

<sup>115</sup> BR 87. 4; Ruth R. 3. 9. The indecent language used by Potiphar's wife is contrasted with the modest words of Ruth. Comp. Ruth 3. 9.

<sup>116</sup> Tan. Wa-Yesheb 8, and, in a more elaborate form, Philo, *De Josepho*, 9.

<sup>117</sup> MHG I, 584. Comp. the passages referred to by Schechter, *ad loc.*, and ER 26, 131.

<sup>118</sup> Yashar וישב 87a-87b. The episode with the oranges (more accurate citrons אחרונים) is also found in Tan. Wa-Yesheb 5, where it is introduced with the formula "our masters say" (אמרו רבותינו), which indicates that an old source was made use of. MHG I, 590, has

“bread and meat” instead of oranges, and is not directly based on Tan. Yerahmeel 91 and Sikli in the manuscript of his Talmud Torah quote Tan. See Ginzberg’s remarks (badly corrupted by the printer) in *Ha-Zofeh*, IV, 34-35. Whether Yashar made use of the Koran 12. 30-33 is doubtful; the Jewish origin of the legend as given in Tan. is beyond dispute. The feigned illness of Potiphar’s wife is already mentioned in 12 Testaments, Joseph 7. See also Mahzor Vitry, 342, whose source is neither Yashar nor Tan.

<sup>119</sup> Tan. Wa-Yesheb 8, and reference is made to this passage in ‘*Aruk*, s. v. שרש. In BR 87. 9 it is said that the shackles were used on Joseph during his imprisonment by his master.

<sup>120</sup> Yashar Wa-Yesheb 88a, which essentially follows older sources; comp. BR 87. 7; Sotah 36b; PR 6, 23a; Shir 1. 1.

<sup>121</sup> Sotah 36b; Yerushalmi Horayot 2, 46d; BR 87. 7 and 98. 20; Shemuel 5, 63; Tan. Wa-Yesheb 9; Abkir in Yalkut I, 145, and 146; Targum Yerushalmi Gen. 49. 24.

<sup>122</sup> MHG I, 589, and Abkir in Yalkut I, 146. See also 2 Alphabet of Ben Sira 22b, and note 237 on vol I, p. 279.

<sup>123</sup> MHG I, 588-589.

<sup>124</sup> According to Luria on PRE 39, note 21, *Eben Shetiyyah* is here used as a metaphor for the likeness of Rachel. But this interpretation seems to be very far-fetched.

<sup>125</sup> Abkir in Yalkut I, 145, and comp. citation from an unknown Midrash in Tosafot שו"ט Sotah 36b.

<sup>126</sup> Yashar Wa-Yesheb, 88a-88b. This passage does not record the inner struggle in Joseph’s soul between passion and virtue, to which the old sources refer; comp. the references in note 121. But even in these sources another view is quoted, according to which Joseph was not swayed by passion for a moment.

<sup>127</sup> BR 87. 8.

<sup>128</sup> Yashar Wa-Yesheb 88b. According to BaR 14. 6 (119a-119b) and Josephus, *Antiqui.*, II, 4. 4, she threatened Joseph that if he did not gratify her desire, she would charge him with a terrible crime before his master, who would certainly kill him for it.

<sup>129</sup> Abkir in Yalkut I, 146, and in a somewhat different form in MHG I, 590. Comp. also Mahzor Vitry, 342.

<sup>130</sup> Yashar Wa-Yesheb 88b. Targum Yerushalmi Gen. 39. 14 and 20 gives a detailed description of the wicked woman’s intrigues, by means of which she expected to prove Joseph’s guilt. He was, however, defended by the Egyptian priest, who exposed the trick she

attempted to play on him. See Sekel 240; note 340, as well as note 312 on vol. I, p. 415.

<sup>131</sup> Abkir in Yalkut I, 146.

<sup>132</sup> Josephus, *Antiqui.*, II, 4. 5. It is stated by Josephus, *ibid.*, II, 4. 3, that Potiphar's wife feigned illness, and remained home on a festive day when all the people rejoiced in public festivities. This is in accordance with the view of the Rabbis; see vol. II, p. 53 (top), and note 120.

<sup>133</sup> BR 87. 9. Potiphar intended to kill Joseph whom he believed to be guilty, but his wife prevented him from doing so, and advised him to imprison him, giving as a reason the monetary loss they would sustain by the death of the slave. In truth, however, she hoped that Joseph in prison would be more tractable than Joseph at large; Tan. Wa-Yesheb 9; comp. also note 135.

<sup>134</sup> Yashar Wa-Yesheb, 88a-89a. Instead of עבד..מעבדי the context demands ילדי..מילדי. See also note 189. The speaking of babies is a favorite subject in Jewish and Christian legends; comp. Günter, *Die Christliche Legende*, 89; see also 4 Ezra 7. 21, which reads: And one-year old children shall speak with their voices. As to the establishing of Joseph's innocence, see notes 130 and 340.

<sup>135</sup> BaR 87. 9; MHG I, 591; Lekah, Gen. 39. 20.

<sup>136</sup> Tan. B. I, 180; Tan. Wa-Yesheb 7. Comp. note 8. Joseph was the cause that his father and brethren should rend their garments (Gen. 37. 34), and his punishment was that the rending of his garment was the cause of his imprisonment; see the unknown Midrash in Shu'aib, Wa-Yesheb, 22a. The view which holds Joseph responsible (partly at least) for the crime committed by his brethren against him is old; comp. vol. II, pp. 5-6, where it is stated that Joseph's tale-bearing caused the hatred against him.

<sup>137</sup> WR 23. 10; Sotah 36b; Tehillim 81. 368; Targum Ps. 81. 6. On the changes of names by adding or taking away letters, see Index s. v. "Abigail", "Abraham", "Ephron", "Jonadab", and "Joshua".

<sup>138</sup> Tan. Wa-Yesheb 9; comp. notes 129, 133, and 134. As to the machinations of Potiphar's wife against the prisoner Joseph, see also 12 Testaments, Joseph 9.

<sup>139</sup> BR 87. 10; Tan. Wa-Yesheb 9; Yashar Wa-Yesheb, 89a-89b. Comp. notes 112 and 119.

<sup>140</sup> Yashar Wa-Yesheb, 10b; comp. 12 Testaments, Joseph 9.

<sup>141</sup> BR 87. 10; MHG I, 595. Comp. *Mattenot Kehunnah* and Einhorn, BR, *ad loc.*

<sup>142</sup> Onkelos and Targum Yerushalmi Gen. 39. 21-23; Josephus, *Antiqui.*, II, 5. 1. Philo, *De Josepho*, 16, dwells upon Joseph's kindness and wisdom, by means of which he succeeded in making the criminals lead a better life, without using punishments and fines. See also BR 87. 10.

<sup>143</sup> BR 87. 1-2; Targum Yerushalmi Gen. 40.1 (which reads: Poison was found in the beverages and food served to the king). Comp. vol. IV, p. 391. R. Bahya, *Da'at* and *Hadar* on Gen. 40. 1 and 21 maintain (they undoubtedly follow midrashic sources) that the guilt of the chief baker was greater than that of the chief butler, as the fly might have fallen into the king's cup, while it was served, whereas the pebble in the bread was obviously due to the gross negligence of the baker. Comp. note 152.

<sup>144</sup> BR 88. 3; Megillah 13b; Esther R 2. 21; Lekah Gen. 40. 4.

<sup>145</sup> MHG I, 594-595. Perhaps נשחרה is to be read instead of נשחרו, and the Midrash thus speaks of the years which Joseph spent in prison; comp. note 155. Yashar Wa-Yesheb, 91a; Lekah and Rashi on Gen. 40. 4 maintain that the two officers were imprisoned for one year; comp. Ketubot 57b, which reads: ימים שנה and hence ימים (Gen., *loc. cit.*) is as much as a year.

<sup>146</sup> BR 88. 4; Berakot 55b.

<sup>147</sup> Lekah Gen. 40. 4-6. We ought to read הלומו בראשו "with confusion in his head", instead of חלומו בראשו of the editions.

<sup>148</sup> BR 88. 4; comp. note 173.

<sup>149</sup> MHG I, 595.

<sup>150</sup> BR 88. 5-6; Hullin 92a; Targum Yerushalmi Gen. 40. 20. According to Josephus, *Antiqui.*, II, 5. 2, Joseph saw a great omen in the dream of the vine, because wine banishes care and conciliates men.

<sup>151</sup> Yashar Wa-Yesheb, 91b. According to old sources (BR 88. 6; Targumim on Gen. 40. 20; Yerushalmi 'Abodah Zarah 1, 39c) יום פרעה הולדת אה in Gen., *loc. cit.*, means Pharaoh's birthday. Yashar takes this expression to mean "when a child was born unto Pharaoh".

<sup>152</sup> Lekah Gen. 40. 21. As to the reason for this decision, see note 143.

<sup>153</sup> Yerushalmi Targumim Gen. 40. 22; Sekel 298.

<sup>154</sup> BR 89. 2-3; Tan. B. I, 189-190; Tan. Wa-Yesheb 9; Tehillim 105, 451; MHG I, 594-595 and 598-599, as well as 610; Targum Yerushalmi Gen. 40. 14, 23; Yashar Wa-Yesheb, 91b.

<sup>155</sup> BR 88. 7. Philo, *De Josepho*, 19, likewise remarks that God did

not wish to bring about Joseph's freedom by the hand of man. Josephus, *Antiqui.*, II, 5. 1, emphasizes the fact that Joseph, trusting in God and in Him only, did not care to defend himself against the accusation of Potiphar's wife. As to the "making of knots" (BR, *loc. cit.*), see Goldziher, *Berliner-Festschrift*, 152. Comp. also Tan. B. I, 190.

<sup>156</sup> MHG I, 601-602; BR 87. 7 and 89. 1; comp. note 154.

<sup>157</sup> Tan. B. I, 190; BR 89. 4; MHG I, 617-618.

<sup>158</sup> BR 89. 5; Berakot 55b.

<sup>159</sup> MHG I, 611 and 618 (ר"ב).

<sup>160</sup> Tan. B. I, 190; MHG I, 618; comp. BR 18. 4 and Zohar I, 194a.

<sup>161</sup> MHG I, 618.

<sup>162</sup> BR 89. 6.

<sup>163</sup> Yashar Mikkez, 94a-94b. It is obvious that Dan. 2. 1, *seq.*, is the model for this legend. Comp. Excursus II, Joseph. A vague reminiscence of the close political relations between Egypt and Palestine in pre-Israelitish times is discernible in this legend. As to other references to these relations in the legendary literature, see Ginzberg's remarks in *Eine Unbekannte Sekte*, 339.

<sup>164</sup> BR 98. 7.

<sup>165</sup> Targum Yerushalmi Gen. 41. 10, which is based on older sources. Comp. note 144.

<sup>166</sup> Yashar Mikkez, 94b-95a.

<sup>167</sup> BR 89. 7; BaR 14. 16 (19b).

<sup>168</sup> Yashar Mikkez, 95a.

<sup>169</sup> BR 89. 9; Zohar I, 194b. As to Joseph's raiment given to him by the angel, comp. note 52. According to old sources, Joseph left the prison on New Year. Comp. Rosh ha-Shanah 11a; Tehillim 81, 368; Targum Ps. 81. 6. Joseph's joy at regaining his freedom was, however, incomplete, as at that time the death of his grandfather Isaac took place; Seder 'Olam 2; MHG I, 609; Demetrius 9. 12 (424c). The last-named authority maintains that Joseph spent thirteen years in prison, but according to the Rabbis, only twelve years; comp. note 243.

<sup>170</sup> Yashar Mikkez, 95a.

<sup>171</sup> Josephus, *Antiqui.*, II, 5. 5; Philo, *De Josepho*, 20, remarks that as soon as Pharaoh looked at Joseph he immediately perceived him to be not only a free and noble man, but also a wise one, who would be able to interpret the dream.

<sup>172</sup> MHG I, 625; Josephus, *Antiqui.*, II, 5. 4, which reads: The vague recollection which Pharaoh had retained of the interpretation was sufficient to convince him that his "wise men" were deceiving him. This is evidently the meaning of Josephus, and MHG is to be explained accordingly.

<sup>173</sup> MHG I, 625; Tan. Mikkez 3; BR 89. 9. Comp. note 148.

<sup>174</sup> Tan. Mikkez 3; Yelammedenu 26=BHM, VI, 82; Zohar I, 196a.

<sup>175</sup> MHG I, 611.

<sup>176</sup> An unknown midrashic source in Sabba, Mikkez, 51b, where a lengthy exposition is given on the impropriety of connecting God with evil; comp. MHG I, 612, and note 9 on vol. I, p. 5.

<sup>177</sup> BR 89. 9; Baraita of 32 Middot, 10; MHG I, 625-626; comp. note 411.

<sup>178</sup> Yashar Mikkez, 95b-96b.

<sup>179</sup> BR 90. 1.

<sup>180</sup> Yashar Mikkez, 96b. As to the wisdom of Joseph's counsel to Pharaoh, see citation from an unknown Midrash in Sabba, Mikkez, 51c.

<sup>181</sup> MHG I, 626; Sotah 36b. Pharaoh's councillors said unto him: "Is it possible that a slave should become king?" When Joseph, notwithstanding their opposition, became ruler of Egypt, he imprisoned them until the arrival of his brethren who established the nobility of his descent; Tehillim 105, 451. Comp. the following note as well as notes 171 and 285.

<sup>182</sup> Yashar Mikkez, 96b-97a, which is, in the main, based on old sources; see Sotah 36b, where the angel, nameless in Yashar, appears as Gabriel. Comp. vol. IV, p. 360, and Sotah 33a; PK 4, 34b; PR 14, 60a; Tan. B. IV, 111; Tan. Hukkat 6; BaR 14. 5 and 19. 3; Kohel-eth 7. 23; Yelammedenu in Yalkut II, 831 on Ps. 41 (Yelammedenu is given as the source in the first edition only); MHG I, 626-627; Zohar III, 213b. Comp. notes 137 and 415.

<sup>183</sup> BR 90. 3; WR 23. 9; BaR 14. 6 (119b); Tan. Bereshit 12 and Mikkez 3; Zohar I, 19b; an unknown midrashic source in Mahzor Vitry, 333. That Joseph reached his high position as a reward for his virtuous life is also stated in Maccabees 2. 53; Wisdom 10. 14; 12 Testaments, Joseph 10.

<sup>184</sup> Yashar Mikkez, 97a. מצרים refers here, as is often the case in this work, to the capital city of Egypt, and not to the country.

<sup>185</sup> MHG I, 628-629; BR 98. 18; BaR 1. 6 (119b); PRE 39.



On the view that Joseph and his descendants are proof against the evil eye, see Berakot 30a and the parallel passages cited on the margin. Comp. vol. II, p. 38 and note 97.

<sup>186</sup> Yashar Mikkez, 97a-97b. For a similar description of a festive procession see vol. IV, p. 439.

<sup>187</sup> BR 90. 4. For other explanations of this name, see *Da'at, Hadar*, and *Toledot Yizhak* on Gen. 41. 45. *Pa'aneah, ad loc.*, employs the system of *Notarikon* thirty times, by which he finds the history of Pharaoh's dream and Joseph's interpretation in the name Zaphenath Paaneah. The author displays great ingenuity in some of these *Notarika*. The explanation of this name given by Origen and Jerome, *ad loc.*, is on the whole identical with that found in BR, *loc. cit.*, in Targumim, and Josephus, *Antiqui.*, II, 6. 1. Philo, *Mut. Nomin.*, 15, takes this name to mean "a mouth judging in an answer".

<sup>188</sup> Midrash Aggada, Gen. 41. 45. Concerning the Asenath legend see note 97.

<sup>189</sup> Abkir in Yalkut I, 146 and, in an abridged form, Origen on Gen. 41. 45. Comp. note 134.

<sup>190</sup> Ta'anit 11a. Comp. ER 20, 112 and 25, 120; EZ I, 167, and 15, 198. *Ben ha-Melek*, 12 (following a Mohammedan legend?), writes: It is said that Joseph used to eat so little during the years of famine, that he was always hungry. The people said to him: "O thou, on whom God has conferred wisdom, why art thou hungry, while storehouses filled with grain are at our disposal?" He answered: "I fear that, if I am satisfied, I might forget the hungry." Comp. Ta'anit, *loc. cit.*, and note 250, as well as 54 on vol. I, p. 166.

<sup>191</sup> Yashar Mikkez, 98a-98b.

<sup>192</sup> Targum Yerushalmi Gen. 41.47. Comp. also BR 90. 5, where two explanations of לקמציים (*Gen., loc. cit.*) are given, both of which, however, are obscure.

<sup>193</sup> BR 90. 5; Targum Yerushalmi Gen. 41. 48; Yashar Mikkez, 98b. Comp. the following note.

<sup>194</sup> Yashar Mikkez, 98b-99a. It is very likely based on PRE 39, where it is said that only the grain preserved by Joseph did not rot—it remained in a perfect condition as long as he lived—whereas all the other grain rotted as soon as the seven years of famine began.

<sup>195</sup> MHG I, 631. The blessings taught to the Egyptians consisted of Ps. 136. 25, which forms part of the grace after meal; comp. vol. I, p. 271, and note 224 appertaining to it. The suddenness of the famine is also referred to in BR 90. 6 and Josephus, *Antiqui.*, II,

6. 1. Pharaoh, the king of Egypt in Joseph's time, is the one who later oppressed the Jews (comp. note 429), and it is this Pharaoh of whom MHG says that he later became arrogant. The Mohammedan legend speaks of two Pharaohs in Joseph's time: the first became converted to the true religion of Joseph, while the second remained an infidel; comp. Schapiro, *Haggadische Elemente*, 75-76. On p. 76 Schapiro erroneously maintains that this legend is found in rabbinic literature. Comp. note 102.

<sup>196</sup> BR 91. 5 and 90. 6; Tan. Mikkez 7; MHG I, 631. Comp. also Yelammedenu (in Yalkut II, 285 on Jer. 11, no source is indicated, but 'Aruk s. v., ארזק quotes it from Yelammedenu). It says: The Egyptians introduced circumcision amongst them in Joseph's time, but later abandoned it.

<sup>197</sup> BR 90. 6; Yashar Mikkez, 99a. Philo, *De Josepho*, 27, maintains that, on the contrary, the famine spread like a plague from country to country, until the entire world had become affected by it. BR 89. 4 remarks that the famine caused scabies among the men. Comp. Josephus, *Antiqui.*, II, 6. 1.

<sup>198</sup> BR 91. 1 and 6; Tan. B. I, 192-194; Tan. Mikkez 5; Aggadat Bereshit, 69, 136-138; MHG I, 632, 635. Philo, *De Josepho*, 32, also remarks that Jacob had a vague presentiment of Joseph's stay in Egypt. On the idea that a joyful mood is necessary for a prophet, see note 294. In contrast to the view of the Midrashim just quoted, Tan. B. I, 192 (comp. also *ibid.* 188) maintains that Jacob and his sons, who were great prophets, were abandoned by the prophetic spirit, in order that they should not think that they were able to foresee everything and thus become proud.—In BR 91. 6; MHG I, 635, and in many other places the statement is made that Jacob sent his sons to Egypt that they, the descendants of Abraham, should begin the Egyptian servitude, which, as announced to their ancestor, was to last four hundred years. Comp. Lekah Gen. 42. 1. When suffering is inflicted on the pious, they attribute it to their sins; and hence when the famine broke out Jacob saw in it a punishment for having held on to Esau's heel at the time of their birth. Indeed it was this very sin with which the angel charged him before God, saying: "In his womb he took his brother by the heel" (Hosea 12. 4); see Yelammedenu in Yalkut II, 758, on Ps. 49. To his sons who were greatly agitated by the fear of the famine, Jacob said thus: "God always assists the pious in the time of famine; so He did in the time of my fathers Abraham and Isaac, and so will He do unto me."

<sup>199</sup> Ta'anit 10b.

<sup>200</sup> MHG I, 635; Yelammedenu (?) in Yalkut I, 148. In the first edition ילמדנו רמז י"ז does not refer to what follows, but to the supplement of Yalkut, where paragraph 17 contains a quotation from Yelammedenu bearing upon the same biblical verse as the one on which Yalkut comments.

<sup>201</sup> BR 91. 6; Tan. B. I, 193-194 and 195; Tan. Mikkez 8; Yashar Mikkez 99b; Targum Yerushalmi Gen. 42. 5; MHG I, 635; Yelammedenu in Yalkut I, 148. Comp. preceding note.

<sup>202</sup> Yashar Mikkez, 99a-100a (in the main, it follows older sources; comp. BR 91. 4 and 6); Koheleth 9. 15; Tan. Mikkez 8; Tan. B. I, 194, 202; Targum Yerushalmi Gen. 42. 6. See also Josephus, *Antiqui.*, II, 6. 2.

<sup>203</sup> BR 91. 4.

<sup>204</sup> Yashar Mikkez, 100a-100b (following BR 91. 6 and the other sources cited in note 202). As to מצרים in the sense of the capital of Egypt, see note 184.

<sup>205</sup> Yebamot 88a and parallel passages cited on the margin; BR 91. 7; Targum Yerushalmi Gen. 42. 8. Comp. also Yashar Mikkez, 100b; Josephus, *Antiqui.*, II, 6. 1; vol. II, p. 112.

<sup>206</sup> Yelammedenu 28=BHM VI, 84 and in a very elaborate form, Aggadat Bereshit 72, 142-143. The source of *Ba'al ha-Turim*, Gen. 42. 6, is very likely Yelammedenu, though he states that it was the angel Gabriel who incited Joseph against his brethren. Comp. note 29.

<sup>207</sup> BR 91. 6; Tan. Mikkez 8; Yashar Mikkez, 100b.

<sup>208</sup> BR 91. 6-7 and see sources referred to in the preceding note.

<sup>209</sup> Yashar Mikkez, 100b-101a, mainly following older sources. See BR 91. 6; Tan. Mikkez 8; Tan. B. I, 194 and 203. Comp. also citation from Yelammedenu in 'Aruk, s. v. קלן 4. The idea that disreputable houses are hiding-places for spies is in accordance with Josh. 2. 1.

<sup>210</sup> BR 91. 7; Tan. B. I, 203. A different view is found in ER 26, 131, and BaR 14. 6 (119a), according to which Joseph kept his oath, though he did not take it by God, but by the life of Pharaoh. Comp. Mekilta Beshallah (פתיחה) 24d, which is very likely the source of BaR.

<sup>211</sup> Yashar Mikkez 101a, following BR 91. 6; Tan. Mikkez 8. Sabba, Mikkez, 53a, quotes the following from an unknown Midrash: They did not accept Joseph's proposal to send one of them to Canaan

for Benjamin, for they feared lest their families should die of hunger, since it was impossible for one person to take with him the grain needed for so many families.

<sup>212</sup> BR 91. 7; comp. also Targum Yerushalmi 41. 1; Esther R. 5. 3; Tehillim 22, 182-183.

<sup>213</sup> MHG I, 637-638.

<sup>214</sup> BR 91. 8; Targum Yerushalmi Gen. 42. 23.

<sup>215</sup> MHG I, 639; BR 91. 1 and 99. 7. Comp. notes 34 and 41.

<sup>216</sup> Abkir in Yalkut I, 148. On the view that Levi possessed wisdom, prophecy, and priesthood, see vol. I, p. 175, and vol. III, p. 364. Levi is glorified not only in Jub. and the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs, but also in rabbinic literature; comp. Sifre Z., 109; PK I, 1b, and the numerous parallel passages cited by Buber, as well as the sources referred to in notes 174 and 251 on vol. I, pp. 363, 387.

<sup>217</sup> BR 91. 7; Tan Wa-Yiggash 4; Targum Yerushalmi Gen. 42. 24. Comp. notes 34 and 42.

<sup>218</sup> BR 91. 7; Tan. Wa-Yiggash 4; Yashar Mikkez, 101b; Abkir in Yalkut I, 148. Comp. note 275.

<sup>219</sup> Tan. Wa-Yiggash 4; Abkir in Yalkut I, 148; Yashar Mikkez, 101b; BR 91. 7. Comp. vol. II, pp. 104-105, 110.

<sup>220</sup> BR 91. 8; Tan. B. I, 184; Lekah, Gen. 42. 8; Zohar I, 198b and 200b. Comp. also BR 91. 7 and 92. 4; MHG I, 639. Josephus, *Antiqui.*, II, 6. 6, seems to have been acquainted with a similar Hag-gadah.

<sup>221</sup> Yashar Mikkez, 101b-102a; MHG I, 640, and comp. Schechter, *ad loc.*; Targum Yerushalmi Gen. 42. 27 and 2 Targum Yerushalmi 42. 36; Zohar I, 200b. How it came about that it was just Levi and no other of the brethren who made the discovery is explained in three different ways. In his excitement over the separation from his favorite brother Simeon he forgot to take provender for the road so that it was necessary for him to open the sack intended to be used at home, and thus he found the money; see the unknown Midrash in Sabba, Mikkez, 53a. That he should not be suspected of theft, he immediately communicated his find to his brethren; MHG I, 640. Other authorities say that Levi, who was very pious (comp. note 216), was the first to give food to his donkey, for according to the law, before partaking of food, one must first feed the animals entrusted to one's care (comp. Berakot 40a). In opening the sack he found the money. See the unknown midrashic source in Shu'aib, Mikkez, 19d. The third explanation is that Levi took with him the sack of

his favorite brother Simeon who was detained by Joseph in Egypt, and in order to alleviate the burden of his donkey, his brethren took his own provender for the road. He accordingly had to open the sack intended to be used at home. See *Hadar*, 20b. They had intended to search all the sacks, for they suspected trickery, but fearing that the Egyptians were persecuting them, they made haste and reached their country in a very short time; Philo, *De Josepho*, 21.

<sup>222</sup> MHG I, 640; BR 91. 9; Philo, *De Josepho*, 30.

<sup>223</sup> Aggadat Bereshit 72. 142; MHG I, 640. Comp. vol. II, pp. 30-31.

<sup>224</sup> 2 ARN 40, 112. "Satan appears as the accuser of men when they are in danger", and in consequence of his accusations they frequently die. Accordingly Jacob feared to expose Benjamin to the danger of travel; Yerushalmi Shabbat 2, 5b, and parallel passages cited on the margin. Jacob had all the more reason to fear the dangers of travel, as it was on the road that Rachel died, and it was away from home that Joseph disappeared and Simeon was taken captive; Yerushalmi Shabbat 6, 8c, and parallel passages cited on the margin. Man can protect himself against all illness except against cold and heat, which mostly attack one while travelling, and Jacob feared to expose Benjamin to dangers of this kind; Ketubot 30a.

<sup>225</sup> MHG I, 641; BR 91. 9; Tan. Mikkez 8.

<sup>226</sup> Yashar Mikkez, 102a-102b; Tan. Mikkez 8.

<sup>227</sup> Yashar Mikkez, 102b.

<sup>228</sup> BR 91. 10; PK 17, 131a; Ekah 3. 35; Aggadat Bereshit 45, 130. The last-named source contrasts Jacob's impatience in time of distress with Abraham's complete resignation to God's will.

<sup>229</sup> BR 91. 10; Tan. B. I, 203; Tan. Mikkez 8; Philo, *De Josepho*, 32. Comp. Brody's remark in Berliner's *Rashi*, 23.

<sup>230</sup> Yashar Mikkez, 102b-103a.

<sup>231</sup> BR 91. 10-11. "To be unable to satisfy a child's demand for food is worse than to be at the gate of death"; Jacob could brave many calamities, but not the children's cry for bread, and he was forced to permit Benjamin to go to Egypt; MHG I, 646. Comp. vol. II, p. 89 (top).

<sup>232</sup> Tan. B. I, 202-203; Tan. Mikkez 10; BR 92. 1-2; MHG I, 644 and 646. Many more explanations are given in these passages why on this occasion Jacob addressed God as *Shaddai* (= "He who exclaimed: Enough"). Comp. note 43 on vol. I, p. 13.

<sup>233</sup> BR 92. 3; Tan. B. I, 203; Aggadat Bereshit 73, 142; MHG I,

648 (נ"ל) and 649. Comp. also Yerushalmi Targumim Gen. 43. 14; 2 ARN 43, 118; *Neweh Shalom*, 42; Midrash Aggada, Gen. 22. 5. On unconscious prophecies see note 239, on vol. I, p. 279.

<sup>234</sup> Yashar Mikkez, 103a-104a. The text is to be read נ"ס כ"י instead of ש"מנעו ע"ם כ"י ש"מנעו, and אחר דעם stands here, in accordance with note 56 on vol. I, p. 322, for מלך "king". The assertion made by Grünbaum, *Gesammelte Aufsätze*, 532, that this letter is modelled after an Arabic original is without the slightest foundation. The designation of Joseph as king is not borrowed from Arabic legends, as Grünbaum maintains, but is of frequent occurrence in the rabbinic literature of the pre-Arabic period; see, e. g., BR 91. 10 and 107. 19; ShR 1. 7; DR 2. 33 and 4. 7; BaR 14. 5 and 6; WR 16. 2; 2 ARN 10, 26 (comp. Schechter, note 11). Sifre D., 334, and Josephus, *Antiqui.*, II, 7. 3, show the high antiquity of the view which considers Joseph as king of Egypt. In some passages Joseph is described to have been the ruler of the whole world, "cosmocrater"; see *Batte Midrashot* III, 11 (a fragment of Yelammedenu?); PR 3, 10b; comp. also WR, *loc. cit.*, and Aggadat Bereshit 66, 132. The allusions, in this letter, to the wars of the sons of Jacob against the Amorites undoubtedly presuppose the legend given in vol. I, p. 408, which is unknown to the Arabs. The departure of Jacob's sons with great weeping is also described by Josephus, *Antiqui.*, II, 6. 5.

<sup>235</sup> Tan. Mikkez 10. For a different view see notes 3, 244.

<sup>236</sup> Targum Yerushalmi Gen. 48. 16; Tan. B. I, 197 and 202.

Comp. notes 214.

<sup>237</sup> Hullin 91a; Targum Yerushalmi Gen. 43. 16; ER 26, 131.

<sup>238</sup> BR 92. 4; BaR 14. 2; Tan. B. IV, 43; Tan. Naso 28; ER 36, 131; Mekilta Beshallah (פתיחה), 24b. Aphaates, 28, on the contrary, writes: Joseph proved his piety in resisting the sinful temptations (of Potiphar's wife), but not in the observance of the Sabbath, which had not yet been commanded at the time. It is rather strange that Schapiro, *Haggadische Elemente*, 78, misunderstood the explicit words of this Church Father. Comp. vol. II, p. 201, and vol. III, p. 183, as well as note 280, on vol. I, pp. 394-395. As to the discourteous way in which Joseph's servants dealt with his brethren, comp. 12 Testaments, Zebulun, 3. 7=vol. II, p. 18.

<sup>239</sup> MHG I, 649, 817. Comp. Hullin 91a. They feared not the Egyptians, but the consequences of their crime against Joseph; see citation from an unknown Midrash in Sabba, Mikkez, 53c.

<sup>240</sup> BR 92. 4. As to Simeon, comp. vol. II, p. 87, and note 220

appertaining to it. On the merits of the fathers which came to the aid of Joseph's sons, see BR 34. 12; Tehillim 27, 228; citation from an unknown Midrash in Sabba, Mikkez, 53c.

<sup>241</sup> Yashar Mikkez, 104a.

<sup>242</sup> BR 92. 5. Even to-day it is customary among Jews to hint at death, but not to announce it directly; see *Shulhan 'Aruk, Yoreh De'ah*, 402. 12.

<sup>243</sup> MHG I, 609; comp. note 169.

<sup>244</sup> Yashar Mikkez, 104a. Benjamin bore a close resemblance to Rachel his mother (comp. vol. I, p. 94, and note 235), and looking at him, Joseph could not refrain from thinking of their dead mother; he wept, for "only tears extinguish the burning coals of the heart"; Tan. B. I, 197; Lekah and Sekel, Gen. 43. 30; Zohar I, 202b.

<sup>245</sup> BR 74. 10 and 92. 5.

<sup>246</sup> Tan. B. I, 180; Tan. Wa-Yesheb 2; comp. sources referred to in notes 8 and 237.

<sup>247</sup> Onkelos and Targum Yerushalmi, Gen. 43. 32.

<sup>248</sup> BR 92. 5; Tan. Wa-Yesheb 4; Mishle I, 45; Targum Yerushalmi Gen. 42. 33.

<sup>249</sup> Yashar Mikkez, 104a-104b, which follows the sources referred to in the preceding note. Jub. 42. 23 reads: Benjamin received seven times as much as his brethren. Comp. also Demetrius, 9. 12, 425.

<sup>250</sup> BR 92. 5 and 98. 20; Shabbat 139a; Mishle I, 46; Yashar יקב, 104b; 12 Testaments, Joseph 3. 5. Philo dwells upon the frugality of the meal, as Joseph would not indulge in dainties while others were suffering hunger. Comp. Ta'anit 11a and note 190.

<sup>251</sup> Tan. Wa-Yiggash 4; BR 94. 8; Sotah 37b; Tan. B. I, 206-207; Targum Yerushalmi Gen. 47. 21; Yalkut I, 150; MHG I, 683-684; Yashar Mikkez, 104b; Zohar I, 153b-154a. Comp. note 279, as well as note 6 on vol. II, p. 189. Joseph was destined to be the father of twelve sons, but as a punishment for having permitted for a moment illicit passion to enter his heart (comp. vol. II, pp. 53-54, and note 121), he begot only two sons, while his brother Benjamin was blessed with ten. See Sotah, *loc. cit.*

<sup>252</sup> Yashar Mikkez, 104b-105a. That Joseph tried to ascertain the feelings of his half-brethren towards Rachel's children is also stated in Jub. 42. 25 and by Philo, *De Josepho*, 39, as well as by Josephus, *Antiqui.*, II, 6. 7. Comp. also the citation from an unknown midrashic source in Sabba, Mikkez, 53, which reads: Benjamin did not betray

his brethren's secret, and did not tell Jacob that they sold Joseph into slavery; Tehillim 15, 118, and comp. note 370.

<sup>253</sup> 12 Testaments, Benjamin 2; an unknown midrashic source quoted by Sabba, Wa-Yiggash, 54d. Comp. Excursus II; Benjamin and vol. II, pp. 220-221.

<sup>254</sup> MHG I, 651; comp. Schechter, *ad loc.*, and note 24. Sabba, Mikkez, 53b, quotes, from an unknown Midrash, several explanations of בקר (Gen. 44. 3).

<sup>255</sup> Tan. B. I, 197-198; Tan. Mikkez 10; MHG I, 625. As to the distance from the city, comp. Yalkut I, 150 (in the first edition no source is given; but later editions have מדרש), according to which they were still a mile from the city. This is based on an old interpretation of הרחיקו (Gen. 44. 4). Comp. note 236 on vol. I, p. 279.

<sup>256</sup> BR 102. 8; Tan. B. I, 198; Tan. Mikkez 10; MHG I, 653; Yahsar Mikkez, 105a. For a somewhat different description comp. Tan. B. Introduction, 130-131. Philo, *De Josepho*, 38, and Josephus, *Antiqui.*, II, 6. 7, likewise dwell upon the cleverness with which the search was carried out without exciting the suspicion that the searchers knew where the cup was. Philo, however, adds that when it was found in Benjamin's sack, his brethren did not for a moment doubt his innocence, being convinced that the finding of the cup was the result of a conspiracy.—According to Egyptian law, no one beside the king and the viceroy was permitted to use a silver cup, and therefore the stealing of the silver cup was a much greater crime than ordinary theft. See Sabba, Mikkez, 53d. Comp. notes 263 and 268.

<sup>257</sup> Tehillim 10, 93-94; Aggadat Esther 40; BR 92. 8; Tan. Mikkez 10; Tan. B. I, 198, and introduction 131. The last-named passage reads: Happy are the righteous who are punished for their sins during their lifetime; woe to the wicked who receive their punishment after their death.

<sup>258</sup> BR 92. 8; MHG I, 654, where הַכֶּסֶם is to be read instead of הַכֹּחַ. Comp. Targum Yerushalmi Gen. 44. 3.

<sup>259</sup> Tan. B. I, 198; Tan. Mikkez 10; Aggadat Bereshit 74, 146. Comp. MHG I, 653, and note 256.

<sup>260</sup> BR 92. 8.

<sup>261</sup> Tan. B. I, 198; Tan. Mikkez 10. This is the only occasion on which Joseph's dream was fulfilled in its entirety, since on the two other similar occasions there were only ten brethren; on the first occasion Benjamin was absent, and on the second Simeon (and he had dreamed of eleven stars!).



<sup>262</sup> Yashar Mikkez, 105a; Tan. B. I, 198; Tan. Mikkez 10.

<sup>263</sup> BR 92. 9 (here Judah confesses his sin with Tamar, Reuben his sin with Bilhah, and all the brothers their unjustified war against Schechem); Tan. B. I, 198; Tan. Mikkez 10; Targum Yerushalmi Gen. 44. 15; Aggadat Bereshit 74, 147; MHG I, 654-655. As to the question whether Benjamin was suspected of theft by his brethren, see notes 256 and 270.

<sup>264</sup> Tan. B. I, 198; Tan. Mikkez 10. On the proverb about the rope and the bucket, see note 274.

<sup>265</sup> BR 92. 9; Yalkut I, 150 end of Mikkez (did Yalkut have a different reading in BR?); MHG I, 656; citation from an unknown Midrash in Sabba, Mikkez, 54a, which reads: The brethren wanted to abandon Benjamin to his fate, though he protested his innocence by the life of his father and the captivity of Joseph (שבִּיה), but Judah admonished them to hold together. As to the expression נָעַר פְּוֹרְפֹרִיָה in BR, *loc. cit.*, comp. Nehem. 5. 13. See Tan. Wa-Yiggash 1 (end).

<sup>266</sup> Yashar Mikkez (end) and Wa-Yiggash (beginning).

<sup>267</sup> BR 93. 6. Here, as in the two Tanhumas (beginning of Wa-Yiggash) and MHG I, 659, Judah is highly praised for his sense of duty which prompted him to do his utmost in behalf of Benjamin, because he had "guaranteed" to his father to bring his youngest son back safely. See also Tan. B. Introduction, 131 and 146, a well as I, 209; MHG I, 661-662.

<sup>268</sup> Tan. B. I, 205; MHG I, 663; BR 93. 6. Josephus, *Antiqui.*, II, 6. 8, puts a grand oration in Judah's mouth, which, however, has nothing in common with Judah's address as found in the Haggadah. Strangely enough Josephus speaks of the crime alleged to have been committed by Benjamin as one punishable by death, whereas according to the Jewish law theft is not a capital offence. Comp., however, note 256. On מַחֲוִירוֹ in Tan., *loc. cit.*, comp. Kiddushin 11a (top).

<sup>269</sup> BR 93. 6; Targum Yerushalmi Gen. 44. 18.

<sup>270</sup> MHG I, 663 (here Judah accuses Joseph of having first put money in their sacks, and then the cup in Benjamin's sack); Tan. B. I, 205; Tan. Wa-Yiggash 5; BR 93. 6. Comp. note 263.

<sup>271</sup> BR 93. 6 and 8. Comp. the following note. On Manasseh see vol. II, pp. 87 and 106.

<sup>272</sup> Tan. B. I, 295; Tan. Wa-Yiggash 5; BR 93. 6.

<sup>273</sup> BR 93. 2; Zohar I, 206a; MHG I, 661 (י'ב).

<sup>274</sup> Tan. Wa-Yiggash 4 and 5; MHG I, 660; comp. Schechter, note 9. The application of the proverb concerning the rope and the

bucket is that Judah might say to his father that one and the same fate overtook Benjamin and Joseph. Comp. note 264.

<sup>275</sup> BR 93. 7; Yalkut II, 897, on Job 4. 10 (in the first edition the reference to the source, *ומדרש איוב מוסיף*, before *כשבא חושים*, is not in parentheses as in the later editions); Tan. B. Introduction, 131. On Judah's terrible voice see vol. I, p. 406; vol. II, pp. 16, 86 (in the last passage it is Simeon who has a terrible voice), 107, 112. As to the stamping upon the ground (Tan., *loc. cit.*, read *בעטו*), see vol. III, p. 268.

<sup>276</sup> Tan. B. I, 131; *Hadar*, Gen. 44, 18, which has some variants.

<sup>277</sup> BR 93. 6; Tan. B. Introduction, 131; MHG, 664-665; Tan. Wa-Yiggash 3; *Hadar*, Gen. 44. 18, which has the additional remark that the hair above Judah's breast had the peculiarity to kill anybody touching it. As to the strength of people being in their hair, comp. Frazer, *Folk-Lore in the Old Testament*, II, 484, *seq.*

<sup>278</sup> Yashar Wa-Yiggash, 107a-108a, which in the main follows Abkir in Yalkut I, 150, and BR 93. 8, whereas *Hadar*, Gen. 44. 18 (read *כבנו* instead of *יכנו*) is directly based on Yashar. As to the part played by Manasseh, see Tan. B., Introduction, 131, which reads: During the dispute between Judah and Joseph, Manasseh attempted to pacify the former; but as soon as he noticed that the hair on Judah's breast became hot (comp. vol II, p. 107, and preceding note), he cried to his father: "We are all dead men!" Comp. MHG I, 665, and vol II, pp. 87, 104. As to the dependence of Yashar on Abkir, it should be noticed that the first part of the dialogue between Judah and Joseph in Yashar is mainly based upon Abkir, although BR 93. 8 is also made use of. 2 Targum Yerushalmi Gen. 44. 18, according to the editions, is entirely based upon BR, *loc. cit.*; but a manuscript in the library of the Jewish Theological Seminary of America gives the dialogue between Judah and Joseph in accordance with Abkir and Yashar. As to Naphtali's swiftness, see note 216 on vol. I, p. 371.

<sup>279</sup> Tan. B. I, 206-207. A different view is quoted in vol. II, p. 97, and note 251, according to which Joseph made himself known to Benjamin at their first meeting.

<sup>280</sup> Tan. B. Introduction, 131-132; *Hadar*, Gen. 44. 20; comp. MHG I, 665 (*כ"ו*). BaR 13. 18 likewise dwells upon the exceptional piety of Jacob's sons who committed only one sin, the selling of Joseph into slavery.

<sup>281</sup> Tan. Wa-Yiggash 5; BR 93. 8; Tan. B. Introduction, 132. This legend (concerning Judah's terrible voice) and the one given in vol.

II, p. 106, are doublets. Joseph ordered the Egyptians to withdraw before he made himself known to his brethren, to spare the latter the shame of being exposed as abductors. Out of consideration for their feelings, he did not utter the words "I am Joseph your brother, whom ye sold into Egypt" (Gen. 45. 4) in the presence of Benjamin, who thus never learned what his brethren had done Joseph. Comp. Philo, *De Josepho*, 40; citation from an unknown Midrash by Sabba, Wa-Yiggash, 54d; the same(?) Midrash in *Hadar* and *Da'at*, Gen. 45. 4; comp. also Yashar Wa-Yiggash, 108b (below), and note 370. In view of the fact that the brethren did not recognize Joseph (comp. vol. II, p. 82), he could only establish his identity by addressing them in Hebrew (Jub. 43. 15; BR 93. 10; Tan. Wa-Yiggash, *loc. cit.*; Targum Yerushalmi Gen. 45. 12) and by showing them that he had the Abrahamic covenant on his body; BR 93. 8; Tan. Wa-Yiggash 5; Targum Yerushalmi Gen. 45. 4. Josephus, *Antiqui.*, II, 6, 10, puts a lengthy oration in Joseph's mouth, by means of which he accomplished his reconciliation with his brethren. The Midrash likewise records Joseph's conciliatory words. Comp. vol. II, p. 112-113.

<sup>282</sup> MHG I, 670; comp. Schechter, note 6; see also vol. II, p. 168.

<sup>283</sup> Targum Yerushalmi Gen. 45. 15.

<sup>284</sup> BR 93. 12; Megillah 16b; Targum Yerushalmi Gen. 45. 14; Zohar I, 209b.

<sup>285</sup> Yashar Wa-Yiggash, 109a. Pharaoh was in such a fear of Jacob's sons, that when he heard of the dispute between Judah and Joseph, he told the latter to comply with the wish of the Hebrews or leave Egypt; Yashar Wa-Yiggash, 108a. Pharaoh's delight with the final outcome was very great, for the appearance of Joseph's brethren confirmed the latter's claim to noble descent. Joseph had maintained his claim all the time, but the nobles of the realm mocked him, saying: "Look at the slave, ruling over Egypt." See citation, from an unknown Midrash, by Bekor Shor and Sabba on Gen. 45. 16. Comp. note 181.

<sup>286</sup> MHG I, 671.

<sup>287</sup> Tan. B. Introduction 132.

<sup>288</sup> Megillah 16b; MHG I, 671. The three hundred Shekels which Benjamin received from Joseph had, like the other presents, a symbolic meaning; see R. Bahya, *Da'at* and *Hadar* on Gen. 45. 22, as well as Tan. B. Introduction 132-133.

<sup>289</sup> Yashar Wa-Yiggash, 109a, where it is said that although

all the brethren received "royal garments", only Benjamin's garments were beautifully embroidered. As a further mark of distinction, Benjamin received three hundred Shekels, while the brethren were only given one hundred each.

<sup>290</sup> BR 94. 3. According to Egyptian law, it was not permitted to export wagons or animals, but on this occasion Pharaoh suspended the law; Lekah, Shu'aib, and Sabba on Gen. 45. 19.

<sup>291</sup> Yashar Wa-Yiggash, 109a-109b. Concerning Dinah comp. note 65. Lekah Gen. 45. 23 maintains that Benjamin remained with Joseph; hence Gen. 45. 23 speaks of only ten donkeys which Joseph sent to Canaan, one for each brother.

<sup>292</sup> Ta'anit 10b; BR 94. 2 (he admonished them to continue to study the Torah while travelling); PRK 57 (Grünhut's edition), where the second precept reads: "Love one another". Comp. vol. I, p. 169; Targum Yerushalmi and Lekah on Gen. 45. 24, which reads: Do not quarrel as to who is responsible for my having been sold into slavery, in order that your fellow-travellers should not be angry with you. Comp. note 24.

<sup>293</sup> Yashar Wa-Yiggash, 109b-110a; MHG I, 672; *Hadar*, Gen. 45. 26, which is based upon a source independent of the first two. *Hadar*, *loc. cit.*, states that Esau greatly rejoiced when the report of Joseph's death had reached him (he knew that the house of Joseph was destined to destroy the house of Esau; comp. vol. I, p. 369), and therefore when this report turned out to be false, Jacob hastened to inform his brother that his joy was groundless, for Joseph was still alive.—The brethren excommunicated Asher when they heard that his daughter informed Jacob that Joseph was still alive. They said: A child speaks in the street about the things its parents speak of at home (Sukkah 56b); hence Asher must have betrayed their secret about the selling of Joseph. According to the agreement they entered upon at the time of the sale, excommunication was the punishment for betraying this secret; *Hadar*, Deut. 33. 24. Comp. vol. II, p. 30.

<sup>294</sup> PRE 37; Onkelos and Targum Yerushalmi Gen. 45. 27 (see, however, Targum Yerushalmi 43. 14); Tehillim 24, 204; MHG I, 672-673; Tan. Wa-Yesheb 2; 1 Alphabet of Ben Sira 13a; Zohar I, 180b and 216b. Comp. further Shabbat 30b; Pesahim 117a; ARN 30, 90; vol. II, pp. 80 and 136, as well as note 548 on vol. III, p. 282.

<sup>295</sup> Yashar Wa-Yiggash, 110a. That Serah "did not taste death" is very likely presupposed in such old sources as BR 94. 9; PK 10, 86a-87a; 2ARN 38, 103; but explicitly it is stated in later sources

only. Besides Yashar, *loc. cit.*, see also 2 Alphabet of Ben Sira 28b, which is perhaps the source of Yashar; Derek Erez Zuta 1 (end); Targum Yerushalmi Gen. 46. 17. See also Ratner, Seder 'Olam 1, note 50, and 9, note 19; Index, *s. v.* "Paradise, Entering Alive Into".

<sup>296</sup> BR 94. 3 and 95. 3; ARN 30. 90. The "heifer whose neck is broken" is brought to atone for the sin of those who neglected to accompany the wayfarer (Sotah 46b), and hence the last conversation of Jacob with Joseph, while the latter started on his journey to his brethren was about the kindness one is to show to the wayfarer; comp. *Da'at, Hadar, Pa'aneah*, and *Shu'aib* on Gen. 45. 27, as well as Tan. B. Introduction, 132 and 145. That the last conversation between Jacob and Joseph consisted of a halakic discussion is already stated in Yerushalmi Berakot 5, 8d, according to the reading of *Eshkol* I, 23.

<sup>297</sup> Targum Yerushalmi Gen. 45. 28. As to Jacob's wars against these kings, comp. vol. I, pp. 408, *seq.*

<sup>298</sup> Yashar Wa-Yiggash, 110a.

<sup>299</sup> MHG I, 675; comp. the following note.

<sup>300</sup> PRE 39; Josephus, *Antiqui.*, II, 7. 2; Lekah, Gen. 46. 3; MGH I, 676 (1) and 713-714.

<sup>301</sup> Jub. 44. 2-4. Here it is also stated that Jacob celebrated the Feast of Weeks on the fifteenth of the third month; whereupon, on the following day, God appeared to him.

<sup>302</sup> BR 94. 45.

<sup>303</sup> MHG I, 675; BR 57. 7, and comp. Theodor, *ad loc.*

<sup>304</sup> Targum Yerushalmi Gen. 46. 3.

<sup>305</sup> PRE 29 (which reads: Also at the time of the Exodus the Shekinah brought up the number of Israel to six hundred thousand souls); Targum Yerushalmi Gen. 46. 4. Concerning the conception that the Shekinah goes with Israel into exile, see note 4 on vol. II, p. 188; on the number seventy which is used in connection with Jacob's family, comp. note 321. Sabba, Wa-Yiggash, 56b, gives a text of PRE different from the one found in the editions; comp. also R. Bahya on Exod. 12. 37, and Zohar II, 16.

<sup>306</sup> MHG I, 676 and 713-714. Comp. BR 94. 6 and vol. II, p. 117, and note 300 appertaining to it.

<sup>307</sup> Yashar Wa-Yiggash, 110a-110b; Philo, *De Josepho*, 42. Yalkut Reubeni Gen. 45. 28, which is very likely based on Abkir (comp. Midrash Talpiyyot, *s. v.* יִשְׁרָאֵל) writes: Jacob apprehended that Joseph living in the midst of the sensual Egyptians, had lost his purity, and

therefore wished to see his face, as Jacob possessed the faculty of telling a man's character by looking at him.

<sup>308</sup> BR 94. 4. Here, as well as in Yerushalmi Pesahim 4, 30d, it is stated that as late as in the fourth century C. E. the grove of cedars at Magdala was considered holy, the people believing that these cedars were planted (by the patriarchs) for the purpose of being used for the tabernacle. Comp. vol. II, p. 164.

<sup>309</sup> MHG I, 676 and 700; Koheleth R. and Z. 9. 11; *Hadar* and *Da'at* on Gen. 46. 5. For an other view comp. the sources referred to in note 290 on vol. II, p. 114 (about the burning of the wagons by Judah) and Sekel 286. EZ 2, 175 reads: God bestowed His blessings on Jacob's sons as a reward for the filial piety shown toward their father.

<sup>310</sup> BR 95. 1-5; Tan. B. I, 209-211; Tan. Wa-Yiggash 9 and 11; Yelammedenu in 'Aruk, s. v. צמח. On the idea that Jacob was the head of an academy for the study of the Torah, see note 318 on vol. I, p. 421. Targum Yerushalmi has three translations of להורח (Gen. 46. 28): 1) *to show the way*; 2) *to conquer the inhabitants* (from Syriac להורח *to war against some one*?); 3) *to establish a dwelling-place*. The last translation is in agreement with BR, *loc. cit.*, and Onkelos, whereas Jub. 44. 9 read perhaps לראח. Septuagint, Samaritan, and Peshitta read להראח.

<sup>311</sup> MHG I, 688. Were it not for the tribe of Judah, Israel, persecuted by the Egyptians, would have returned to Egypt (comp. III, pp. 21-22), and accordingly it is said here that on account of the descendants of Judah, Israel was led forth from Egypt.

<sup>312</sup> MHG I, 688-689; Mekilta Beshallah 1, 27a; Mekilta RS, 48; BR 55. 8. The sources referred to in notes 285 and 428 say that the appearance of Joseph's brethren proved the falsehood of the rumor about his being a slave.

<sup>313</sup> Tan. Wa-Yiggash 7; PRE 39.

<sup>314</sup> Yashar Wa-Yiggash, 110b.

<sup>315</sup> Targum Yerushalmi Gen. 46. 29. Comp. note 429.

<sup>316</sup> MHG I, 689, where בן יטו is to be taken in the sense of "suddenly."

<sup>317</sup> Yashar Wa-Yiggash, 110b-111a.

<sup>318</sup> Targum Yerushalmi Gen. 46. 29. Comp. note 315.

<sup>319</sup> R. Yehudai Gaon in *Geonic Responsa* (Lyck edition, No. 45, p. 19); Rashi and Midrash Aggada Gen. 46. 29. A different version is found in Kallah 8b, which reads: Jacob did not kiss Joseph be-

cause he feared lest the latter's beauty had caused the Egyptian women to lead him astray. Comp. notes 121 and 307, as well as note 14 on vol. III, p. 349.

<sup>320</sup> Tan. B. I, 209; Tan. Wa-Yiggash 9; Targum Yerushalmi Gen. 46. 30. Comp. note 71.

<sup>321</sup> BR 94. 9; PK 10, 86b-87a; Baba Batra 123a; Targum Yerushalmi Gen. 46. 27; PRE 39; Shemuel 32, 146; MHG I, 676; Jub. 44. 12-33; Josephus, *Antiqui.*, II, 7. 4. In these sources the seventy souls of which Jacob's household consisted are differently counted: 1) Jacob and sixty-nine of his descendants make seventy; 2) Jochebed was born just when they were about to enter Egypt; 3) the Shekinah which accompanied Jacob into Egypt is to be included in the number seventy (comp. note 305); 4) Serah the daughter of Asher was the seventieth, but she is not counted among Jacob's family, either because she was only an adopted child (comp. vol. II, p. 39) or because she was one of those who never "tasted death" (comp. vol. II, p. 116); 5) the seventieth soul was a son of Dan whose name is not given in the Bible. Comp. note 6 on vol. II, p. 189. Comp. also Tehillim 105, 449, which reads: God counts Himself among the pious.

<sup>322</sup> MHG I, 682; Tan. B. II, 3; Tan. Shemot 3; MHG II, 5; Lekah Exod. 1. 1.

<sup>323</sup> Seder 'Olam 2; MHG I, 682. Comp. note 82, and note 39 on vol. I, p. 202.

<sup>324</sup> Baba Kamma 92a; BR 95. 4; Targum Yerushalmi Gen. 47. 2. According to the Talmud and Targum, the weak among the twelve sons were Zebulun, Dan, Naphtali, Gad, and Asher; whereas according to BR, they were Reuben, Simeon, Levi, Issachar, and Benjamin. Comp. Sifre D., 354.

<sup>325</sup> MHG I, 641; comp. Yalkut Reubeni Wa-Yiggash (end), and note 74 on vol. I, p. 223. The following is quoted by Reubeni from Tan.: When Pharaoh learned of Joseph's descent, he feared lest the latter now reconciled to his brethren should return with them to his country. In order to keep him in Egypt he promised him the same kind of treatment as his ancestor Abraham had received at the hands of the Egyptians. This passage is not found in our texts of Tan., but Sabba, Wa-Yiggash, 55c, had it in his copy of that Midrash.—The aversion of the Egyptians towards shepherds is given by Demetrius 9. 11 (422d) as a reason why Joseph, before the arrival of his brethren, had not sent for them and his father to come and

settle in Egypt. For another explanation why Joseph did not inform his family of his whereabouts, see notes 360 and 370.

<sup>326</sup> MHG I, 692; Sifre D., 128; Passover Haggadah, caption צא ולמד.

<sup>327</sup> MHG I, 692-693; DR 1. 25. Like Og, Pharaoh, king of Egypt at the time of Joseph, also knew Abraham by sight, and like him he mistook the grandchild for the grandfather; Lekah Gen. 45. 1 and 47. 8. According to others, Pharaoh as a young prince spent some time at the court of Abimelech, where he made the acquaintance of Isaac. The resemblance between the latter and Jacob was so great that subsequently Pharaoh mistook the son for the father; *Imre No'am*, Gen. 47. 8. On the idea that life on earth is merely a temporary sojourn, see note 1, and note 260 on vol. I, p. 280; comp. also Philo, *De Confusione Linguarum*, 17; Lekah Gen. 10. 2 and 7. 9, as well as Tan. B. I, 179; MHG I, 402 (ק) and 453 (א"). On Og see vol. I, p. 263, and vol. III, p. 305.

<sup>328</sup> Tan. B. Introduction 132; *Da'at* and *Hadar* on Gen. 47. 8-9, as well as Shu'aib and Midrash Aggada, *ibid.* 47. 28. Comp. also Aggadat Bereshit 61, 125, and note 228.

<sup>329</sup> MHG I, 692; Tan. B. IV, 39; Tan. Naso 26; BaR 12. 2; Aggadat Bereshit 42. 85, which contains the variant that no sooner had Jacob blessed Pharaoh (וַיְבָרֶכְתִּי וַיִּשְׂכַּח בְּפִלְטִי) is not to be taken literally) than a messenger appeared and informed the king of the inundation of the Nile; comp. Jub. 45. 9-10 and note 177 on vol. II, p. 70.—Shu'aib, Gen. 47. 28, cites an unknown Midrash to the effect that all the years that Jacob dwelt in Egypt no sickness afflicted that country; no person even suffered from toothache; no miscarriage occurred (comp. BR 96, end; Baba Mezi'a 85a, with regard to the time of Rabbi Judah ha-Nasi). Conscious of the blessings he brought to Egypt, Jacob feared at his death-bed that the Egyptians would not permit his body to be removed from their country; comp. vol. II, p. 129 (top).

<sup>330</sup> Yashar Wa-Yiggash, 111b. Philo, *De Josepho*, 42, remarks: Pharaoh was so greatly impressed by Jacob, that he treated him as though the latter had been his father and not his subject. At the same time he appointed Jacob's sons as chief shepherds. The Egyptians who were animal worshippers paid great respect to those in whose care the animals were entrusted, and Joseph therefore arranged it so that his brethren should be appointed "rulers over the cattle" of Pharaoh; Zohar II, 250b-251a. Comp. *Imre No'am*, Gen. 46. 34, and note 325.



<sup>331</sup> 12 Testaments, Benjamin 3. Comp. vol. II, p. 221.

<sup>332</sup> MHG I, 693-694; Lekah Gen. 47. 12. Just as Joseph received the title "the God-fearing one" on account of his charity and loving-kindness, even so Abraham, Job, and Obadiah received this title for the same reason; Tan. B. III, 9, and IV, 157; Tan. Wa-Yikra 7 and Matot 1. 2 ARN 10. 26 (comp. Schechter, note 11) has Jonah instead of Obadiah, whereas BaR 22. 1 mentions only three, Abraham, Joseph, and Job, on whom this title was conferred.

<sup>333</sup> Tan. Mikkez 7. In Tan. B. I, 188, it is stated: Joseph was a scholar and a prophet, as well as the supporter of his brethren. Comp. Aggadat Shir 1, 26, and Josephus, *Antiqui.*, II, 6. 1. Joseph took such great care of his brethren and their families, that each and every one of them was entered on the list of the king's pensioners. When, after Joseph's death, the descendants of Jacob began to increase rapidly, the Egyptians felt that the pensioning of such a vast multitude was too heavy a burden. Unmindful of their obligations, they withdrew their support of Jacob's descendants altogether. Lekah Gen. 47. 12 and Deut. 26. 5.

<sup>334</sup> MHG I, 694. As to the explanation of מְלֵךְ (Gen. 47. 13) given there, see Sa'adya Gaon in Kimhi, *Shorashim*, s. v. לְמֶלֶךְ.

<sup>335</sup> Yashar Wa-Yiggash, 111b. For further details concerning the treasure, see vol. III, pp. 11 and 286, as well as the notes appertaining to these passages. God had promised Abraham that his descendants would go forth from Egypt with great substance (comp. Gen. 15. 14). In order that this promise should be fulfilled God caused all the wealth of the earth to flow into Egypt. Zohar I, 196, which is very likely the source of Yalkut Reubeni, 15. 14, where זָהָר is to be read instead of מְדַרְשׁ. Comp. Reubeni, Gen. 41. 46.

<sup>336</sup> Pesahim 119a; Sahnedrin 110a; Lekah Gen. 46. 49, whose source is not the Talmud.

<sup>337</sup> Yashar Wa-Yiggash, 111b.

<sup>338</sup> Pesahim 119a (on נְצוּלָה comp. Harkavy, *Responsen der Geonim*, No. 398, p. 213, according to which it means an empty threshing-floor) and 87a; Mekilta Amalek, 53b; Mekilta RS, 169. Comp. vol. IV, pp. 182, 184, and 276.

<sup>339</sup> MHG I, 695. Joseph is described by Artapanus, 9. 23 (429d), as a reformer of the taxation of the soil. The same author also narrates that Joseph was the inventor of measures, on account of which he was beloved by the Egyptians. Comp. also Josephus, *Antiqui.*, II, 7. 7.

<sup>340</sup> Targum Yerushalmi, *Hadar, Da'at*, Midrash Aggada, *Pa'aneah*, and *Shu'aib* on Gen. 47. 22, as well as *Da'at* on Deut. 32. 12 and *Yashar Wa-Yesheb* 89b. According to Philo, *De Josepho*, 10, the proof of Joseph's innocence consisted in the fact that his garment and not that of the woman was torn; for if he had used force against her, he would have torn her garment; but she, having attacked him, tore his garment. In the Koran 12. 26-28 it is stated that a slave belonging to Potiphar's household proved Joseph's innocence by the fact that the garment was torn in the back instead of the front. As to the other trick which Potiphar's wife tried to play against Joseph and as to the discovery thereof, see the sources referred to in note 130, as well as *Imre No'am*, Gen. 47. 22, which follows Targum Yerushalmi Gen. 39, 14. Comp. note 312 on vol. I, p. 415.

<sup>341</sup> MHG I, 696 (where כְּטִיבוֹ "as his reputation" is to be read instead of כְּטוֹבוֹ); Baraita 32 Middot according to the reading of MHG I, introduction, XIX. An explanation of Joseph's ordinance that a fifth of the produce of the land should belong to Pharaoh is given in *Lekah Gen.* 47. 24.

<sup>342</sup> *Hullin* 60b; *Tan. B. I.*, 186; Targum Yerushalmi Gen. 47. 21.

<sup>343</sup> MHG I, 695. Comp. *Yadayim* 4. 4, and *Berakot* 28a.

<sup>344</sup> MHG I, 701-702; *Lekah, Shu'aib* (gives מִדְרָשׁ as source), and *Da'at*, Gen. 48. 1; *Zohar I.*, 180a and 216b. As to the happiness of the pious during the last years of their life, comp. *Tan. B. V.*, 18; *Tan. Ekeb* 3; *Aggadat Bereshit* 40, 121-122; comp. note 2.

<sup>345</sup> *BR* 96. 5; *Tan. B. I.*, 213-214; *Tan. Wa-Yehi* 3; MHG I, 709-711. On the signs of approaching death, see *Zohar I.*, 217b, and 227a. On Israel as the "lamb for atonement", see *Tan. B. IV.*, 20; *BaR* 4. 5; *Ekah* 1, 73 (below). Jacob's fear that he would "be made an idol" is also mentioned in the sources referred to in note 329; comp. further vol. IV, pp. 71, 328 (top). *Ziyyoni*, *Beshallah* (beginning), maintains that Jacob and Joseph wished to have their bodies removed from Egypt in order that they should not be desecrated by the Egyptians, whereas according to *Tehillim* 24. 19, the reason for Jacob's last wish was that the pious are loath to have their last rest among the wicked; comp. note 21 on vol. IV, p. 246. As to the superiority of the Holy Land to all other countries at the time of resurrection, see *Apocalypse of Baruch* 29. 2, 40. 2, and 71. 1; 4 *Ezra* 13. 48-49; *Midrash Tannaim* 58 (this is very likely the source of *Kaftor wa-Ferah* 138); *Mishle* 17, 84; *Ruth Z.*, 1. 47; *Alphabet of R. Akiba* 31 (ט); *Ketubot* 111a; *Yerushalmi Kil'ayim* 9, 32c; *Abkat Rokel* 2, 4; *Zohar*

I, 113b-114a, 128b-129a, 136b-137a. The statement in the kabbalistic sources mentioned above that the resurrection of the dead of the Holy Land will take place forty years earlier than that of the dead of other countries is based directly or indirectly upon Midrash Tannaim, *loc. cit.* See Ginzberg's remarks in *J.Q.R.*, XVI, 447, note 1. In connection with the widespread view that the reign of the Messiah will last forty years (comp. Sanhedrin 99a and Tehillim 90, 393), this statement very likely implies the doctrine that the messianic kingdom will be confined to the Holy Land, whose dead will therefore be resurrected forty years before the general resurrection takes place when the Lord Himself will be King and Ruler. Zohar I, 137a, and II, 28b, in speaking of the resurrection of the dead, refers to a very small bone in the human body which is indestructible and will form the nucleus of the new body at the time of resurrection. There can be no doubt that this bone mentioned in the Zohar is identical with the "almond-shaped" bone Luz, concerning which see BR 30. 7; WR 18. 1; Koheleth 12. 5. Comp. Index, s. v. "Luz". Hyrtl, *Das Arabische und Hebräische in der Anatomie*, 165, draws attention to the fact that old German anatomists called this bone "Jew-bone"; comp. also Löw, *Pflanzennamen*, 375. The Luz legend came from the Jews to the Arabs; comp. *Jewish Encyclopedia*, 8, s. v. "Luz".

<sup>346</sup> Nazir 65a; MHG I, 711.

<sup>347</sup> MHG I, 708-709. As to the idea that Jacob was "the goal of creation" and the deliverer "of Abraham from the fiery furnace", see note 35 on vol. I, p. 317.

<sup>348</sup> Megillah 16b. According to this view, וישתחו (Gen. 47. 31) is to be translated "and he bowed down to Joseph", whereas others are of the opinion that it means: "And he prostrated himself before God". Comp. the sources referred to in notes 354-355. Yelammedenu 30 (=BHM VI, 83, and MHG I, 709) says: Jacob told Joseph that it was his duty to fulfil the word of God: "And Joseph shall put his hand upon thine eyes."

<sup>349</sup> PRE 39.

<sup>350</sup> MHG I, 711.

<sup>351</sup> Yelammedenu 29 (=BHM VI, 83, and MHG I, 358 and 711, 'ב). This midrashic passage may also mean that Joseph as "a free man" did not at first want to affirm his promise by an oath; but subsequently consented to act in the same manner as Eliezer had done to Abraham. Comp. note 349.

<sup>352</sup> Targum Yerushalmi Gen. 47. 30. Comp. Pesahim 51b and Semahot 12.

<sup>353</sup> *Hadar* and *Da'at*, Gen. 47. 30.

<sup>354</sup> Sifre D., 31; Midrash Tannaim 24; MHG I, 711. Comp. Shabbat 12b and Nedarim 40a, in accordance with which Tan. Wa-Yehi 3 (end), MHG I, 712 (ל"ו), and Targum Yerushalmi Gen. 47. 30 are to be explained.

<sup>355</sup> MHG I, 711; comp. note 383. *Lekah*, Gen. 47. 31, gives two explanations of וישחור (Gen. 47. 12): (1) Jacob thanked God for having given him a son like Joseph; comp. Heb. 11. 21; (2) Jacob bowed to Joseph because he wished to fulfil the latter's dream in which it was revealed to him (Gen. 37. 9-10) that his father would bow down to him; comp. note 348.

<sup>356</sup> Sifre D., 31; Midrash Tannaim 24. In accordance with these sources, MHG I, 711, is to be read שהיחה מטחי שלמה; comp. the use of this phrase in the prayer before retiring to bed at night (ברכת המפיל), Berakot 60a and Siddur (Baer's edition, 573). See also note 383. As to Reuben's penitence see note 60.

<sup>357</sup> BR 45. 9. This sickness was the fourth great miracle since the creation of man; for until Jacob's time people died suddenly, without having been warned by illness of their impending death: they sneezed and fell dead. Hence the custom to bestow the blessing "Unto life" upon a person who sneezes; see PRE 52; note 272 on vol. I, p. 291, and note 20 on vol. IV, p. 246. In old sources (comp., e. g., Tosefta Shabbat 7. 5 and Babli Berakot 53a) the blessing used is מרפא, or in Aramic אסוהא "Unto health".

<sup>358</sup> MHG I, 712; Yelammedenu 31 (=BHM VI, 83) and in 'Aruḥ, s. v. פוש and רח.

<sup>359</sup> Yelammedenu 32 (BHM VI, 83); MHG I, 714. Comp. the following note.

<sup>360</sup> PR 3, 10b; Yelammedenu 32, where, ראובן must be read instead of בנימין. As to Joseph's silence about the fact that his brethren sold him into slavery, see note 370. The source of *Hadar* and *Da'at*, Gen. 48. 1, is PR, which has also another opinion that Joseph heard of his father's illness from Bilhah who nursed him, or from Benjamin who was constantly with his father. Comp. Sifre D., 352. See also Tan. Wa-Yehi 6; MHG I, 714 and 715-716 (here it is Manasseh who studied under Jacob); Sekel 306.

<sup>361</sup> MHG I, 713-714. Comp. Schechter, *ad loc.*, and note 306.

<sup>362</sup> MHG I, 716; Yelammedenu 33 (=BHM VI, 83). This is

very likely the source of *Hadar*, *Da'at*, and *Sekel* on Gen. 48. 2. Comp. note 348.

<sup>363</sup> PR 3, 11a, and the other view 12a, line 7.

<sup>364</sup> MHG I, 716. As to the tithe of Jacob's sons, see note 250 on vol. I, p. 387

<sup>365</sup> MHG I, 717.

<sup>366</sup> PR 3, 11b-12a; MHG I, 717 (below) and 718-720; Yelammedenu 33-34 (=BHM VI, 83; read ללהך על) where it is also stated that the holy spirit had abandoned Jacob during the time that he grieved for Joseph (comp. note 294); Tan. Wa-Yehi 6; Zohar I, 207b; Targum Yerushalmi Gen. 48. 9; Aggadat Bereshit 5, 12. As to Rachel's burial place, see note 310 on vol I, p. 415, and Lekah Gen. 48. 7.

<sup>367</sup> PR 3, 12a-12b; MHG I, 720-721, in accordance with which PR is to be emended to read נשחכלו = נשחכלו "asked in a foolish way"; Aggadat Bereshit 5, 11-13, the text of which suggests that ברנול in MHG, 721 means "according to the way of a spy", i. e., "I betray a secret to you" Very likely however תר גלי is to be read. Philo, *De Josepho*, 6, likewise mentions that it was the prophetic spirit which revealed to Jacob that in the future Ephraim would be superior to Manasseh.

<sup>368</sup> PR 3, 12 (as to the text, see *Ketab Tamim*, 88); Aggadat Bereshit 5, 12; BR 97. 4; Tan. Wa-Yehi 6.

<sup>369</sup> BR 97. 4.

<sup>370</sup> PR 3, 12b. The Haggadah often refers to Joseph's nobility of character as shown by the fact that he did not tell anyone that his brethren sold him into slavery. His desire to keep this matter secret went so far that he did not attempt, after he had risen to a high position in Egypt, to communicate with his father, fearing lest he should have to explain his presence in Egypt and thus betray his brethren; see Philo, *De Josepho*, 41; Hasidim 479-480; *Imre No'am*, Gen. 41. 16, and the sources referred to in notes 99, 281, 360, 442, as well as vol. II, p. 221. Comp. also note 68.

<sup>371</sup> BR 97. 4-5; MHG I, 717 (top) and 722-723; Tan. Wa-Yehi 6; PR 3, 12b; Targum Yerushalmi and Lekah on Gen. 48. 20.

<sup>372</sup> Aggadat Bereshit 80, 155; Shitah Hadashah 1.

<sup>373</sup> BR 97. 3. Comp. Aggadat Bereshit 5, 13, and note 371. Jacob's guardian angel is Michael; comp. Zerubbabel 10; *Sekel* 309 and 318, as well as Index, s. v. "Michael".

<sup>374</sup> MHG I, 723, where many other explanations are given of

the blessing וידנו לרב (Gen. 48. 16) bestowed by Jacob upon his two grandchildren. Comp. also the following note.

<sup>375</sup> BR 97. 3; Tan. Wa-Yehi 6 (the Ephraimites pronounced "Sibboleth" instead of "Shibboleth"; comp. Jud. 12. 6); Lekah and Targum Yerushalmi on Gen. 48. 16. Comp. note 50 on vol. II, p. 269.

<sup>376</sup> WR 2. 3; Shemuel 1, 45. Ephraim received this distinction, as well as many others, as a reward for his humility; God exalts those who humble themselves; BR 6. 4; PR 3, 12b; MHG I, 720-721. The last-named source gives further instances of the reward for humility: Joktan, who became the father of thirteen sons (comp. note 70 on vol. I, p. 172), and David, who was exalted above all other rulers. The more luxuriant the vine the lower are its branches; the greater the man the deeper his humility, MHG, *loc. cit.*, and comp. Schechter note 31.

<sup>377</sup> BR 97. 9; Targum Yerushalmi Gen. 48. 22; Baba-Batra 123a. On Jacob's war against the Shechemites, see vol. I, pp. 403-411 and notes 289-292 appertaining to them. Concerning Adam's garments see notes 78-80 on vol. I, p. 177.

<sup>378</sup> Sabba, Wa-Yehi, 59c. On Dinah and Asenath see vol. II, p. 38.

<sup>379</sup> *Da'at* and *Hadar*, Gen. 30. 29-30. Comp. vol. I, pp. 318-319, and preceding note.

<sup>380</sup> BR 97. 6. Comp. vol. II, p. 330.

<sup>381</sup> BR 97. 1; MHG I, 721; Shitah Hadashah I, Tan. Wa-Yehi 8; Aggadat Bereshit 82, 158.

<sup>382</sup> BR 98. 1-3; Yerushalmi Targumim Gen. 49. 1-2; Tan. Wa-Yehi 8; Aggadat Bereshit 81, 157, and 83, 163. In all these sources it is presupposed that Jacob did not act rightly in attempting to reveal divine mysteries to his sons without having first obtained permission from God; comp. the following note. Shu'aib, Wa-Yehi, 22d, quotes an unknown Midrash to the effect that the word ויקרא (Gen. 47. 29 and 49. 1), if explained according to the hermeneutical rule of Notarikon, contains the statement that Jacob revealed to Joseph the teachings of wisdom and the great mystery of the messianic age.

<sup>383</sup> Sifre D., 32; Midrash Tannaim 24; BR 98. 3; Pesahim 56a; Tan. Wa-Yehi 8; Shitah Hadashah 1; DR 2. 6, where it is also stated that Moses learned the response "Praised be the name, *etc.*" by listening to the angels. Comp. also Mahkim 111 (which gives a somewhat different version of the origin of this prayer of the angels); Aggadat

Bereshit 81, 157; Targum Yerushalmi Gen. 48. 2; WR 36. 5; Tehillim 31, 239-240. Comp. notes 239-240. Several medieval authors quote the following from an unknown Midrash: God called Jacob's attention to the fact that the names of the twelve tribes contain neither the letters ח'ט (=ט"ט "sin") nor ק'צ' (=קצ"ע "end"); the tribes are free from sin, but the knowledge of the "end" shall not be revealed to them. See *Da'at, Hadar, Pa'aneah*, Shu'aib on Gen. 48. 1; R. Bahya, Gen. 47. 28; Abudrahim, *Shema'*; Zohar III, 188b. Sanhedrin 97b very strongly condemns those who occupy themselves with ascertaining the end of time, and the Rabbis speak of the "end" as a mystery which has not been revealed to man or angel; Sanhedrin 99a; Tehillim 9. 81; Pesahim 54b. Comp. Mark 13. 32.

<sup>384</sup> BR 98.4 and 99. 6; Tan. B. I, 218; Tan. Wa-Yehi 9; Aggadat Bereshit 82, 158-159; Shitah Hadashah 2; Targumim Gen. 49. 3-4; MHG I, 731-734. Concerning Moses and Reuben see vol. III, pp. 196 and 455.

<sup>385</sup> Sabba, Wa-Yehi, 60a, quoting an unknown Midrash. Comp. BR 98. 4 אלו זקפי המלחמה and the following note.

<sup>386</sup> Abkir in Yalkut I, 157, and MHG I, 732; comp. BR 82. 11; MHG I, 539-540; Sabba, as in preceding note, who very likely had before him a fuller text of Abkir.

<sup>387</sup> BR 98. 5 and 99. 7; Shitah Hadashah 2; Tan. B. I, 218-219; Tan. Wa-Yehi 9-10; Aggadat Bereshit 82, 159-160; Targumim Gen. 49. 5-7. The Church Fathers Tertullian, *Adversus Marcion.*, 3, 18, and *Adversus Judaios*, 10 and Hippolytus on Gen. 49. 5 likewise mention the tradition that the Pharisees and Scribes belonged to the tribes of Simeon and Levi; comp note 5 on vol. II, p. 194. PR 7, 28a-28b, dwells upon the fact that the three oldest sons of Jacob received his blessings like the other brethren, though he severely censured them for their sins. As to the meaning of מְכַרְוֹתֵיהֶם (Gen. 49. 5) see also, besides the sources mentioned at the beginning of this note, PRE 38 and Yelammedenu in 'Aruk s. v. מְכַר 3.

<sup>388</sup> Tan. Wa-Yehi 10; Targumim 49. 8-12; MHG I, 735-739 (based on different sources); Yelammedenu 35 (=BHM VI, 84, and 'Aruk, s. v. כֵּס 5). The Haggadah finds in the blessing of Judah not only praise for his valiant and gallant spirit displayed at Tamar's trial and at the time when Joseph's life was threatened by his brethren (comp. notes 46 and 90), but also a prophecy about his prominent descendants, the Judean kings, and particularly the Messiah. The Church accepted the messianic interpretations of the blessing; comp.

*e. g.*, Hippolytus, *De Anti-Christo*, 9, *seq.*; *De Consummatione Mundi*, 18, and the reference to the patristic literature given by A. Poznanski, *Schiloh*, *passim*. Next to the Messiah it is David whose life history is found in the blessing of Judah; see the interesting passage quoted by Sabba, *Wa-Yehi*, 62a (top), from an unknown Midrash.

<sup>389</sup> BR 99. 9 and 72. 5; Tan. *Wa-Yehi* 11; Aggadat Bereshit 82, 161; *Shitah Hadashah* 11; WR 25. 2; *Batte Midrashot* III, 26-27. Comp. note 391 and note 194 on vol. I, p. 367.

<sup>390</sup> Targum Yerushalmi Gen. 49. 13; BR 98. 11.

<sup>391</sup> Tan. *Wa-Yehi* 11; BR 98. 12 and 99. 10; *Shitah Hadashah* 11; Aggadat Bereshit 82, 161. Issachar as "the tribe of scholars" is very frequently referred to in the Haggadah; comp., *e. g.*, vol. I, p. 367; vol. II, pp. 25 and 188; vol. III, pp. 170, 193, 197, 221, 223, 237, 460, 462. Comp. also note 61. This legend is very likely based upon 1 Chron. 12. 33, where among those who came to David mention is made of the children of Issachar, "men that had understanding of the times, to know what Israel ought to do"; comp. Targum, *ad loc.*, and Megillah 12b, where with reference to Esther 1. 13 it is stated that "those that have understanding of the times" describes the scholars (רַבֵּינָן) who are well-versed in astronomy and understand how to fix the calendar. However, as there seems to be no trace of this legend in tannaitic sources, the following hypothesis may be suggested: During the amoraic period Tiberias was the main seat of Jewish learning in Palestine, and inasmuch as this city was located in the territory of the tribe of Issachar (comp. Sanhedrin 12a; *Shitah, loc. cit.*, and Megillah 6a on its identity with biblical רִקָּח), it was quite natural that this tribe should share in the glory of its metropolis. In support of this assumption one may quote Shir 8. 2, which reads: The tribe of Issachar studies in the house of learning situated in its territory (*i. e.*, Tiberias); Naphtali does more than this: it wanders to foreign houses of learning, and hence its reward is greater. Comp. the sources referred to in note 389, and note 194 on vol. I, p. 367.

<sup>392</sup> BR 98. 14 and 99. 11; Tan. *Wa-Yehi* 12; *Shitah Hadashah* 11, where it is stated that the Messiah was a Danite on his maternal side; this view is very likely related to the one found in early Christian authors about the Danite descent of the anti-Christ; comp. Irenaeus, V, 30, Hippolytus, *De Consum. Mundi* 19, and Bousset, *Antichrist*, Index, *s. v.* "Dan"; Yelammedenu 36 (=BHM VI, 84; read יְהוֹה דָּן שְׁמִשׁוֹן כִּי שְׁמִשׁוֹן נִגְרַע instead of נִגְרַע); Targumim Gen. 49. 16-18.



<sup>393</sup> BR 99. 11; Tan. Wa-Yehi 12; Yelammedenu 37. Comp. note 183 on vol. I, p. 365. Others find in the blessing of Gad a prophecy concerning the activity of the Gadites as the vanguard of Israel, armed to conquer the Holy Land; comp. BR 98. 15; MHG I, 744; Shitah Hadashah 2; Targumim Gen. 49. 19.

<sup>394</sup> BR 99. 12; Tan. Wa-Yehi 13; ER 9, 52. For other interpretations of the blessing of Asher see BR 98. 16; Shitah Hadashah 11; Targumim Gen. 49. 20.

<sup>395</sup> BR 98. 17 and 99. 12; Tan. Wa-Yehi 13. Numerous other interpretations of the blessing of Naphtali are found in MHG I, 745-746, as well as in *Hadar, Da'at*, and Targumim on Gen. 49. 2. Comp. the following three notes.

<sup>396</sup> MHG I, 745; BR 98. 17. In the second passage as well as in many others (Aggadat Bereshit 82, 162; Shitah Hadashah 11; comp. especially the unknown Midrash quoted by Sabba, Wa-Yehi, 63a), the scholarship of Naphtali (*i. e.*, of the tribe of this name) is praised. Comp. note 391.

<sup>397</sup> MHG I, 746-747; BaR 14. 11; Sabba, Wa-Yehi, 63a; ER 9, 51, and 11, 59. As to Naphtali's extraordinary swiftness, comp. note 216 on vol. I, p. 371, as well as vol. II, p. 154; vol. III, pp. 171, 237-238; vol. IV, p. 161 (transferred to the descendants of Naphtali); Targum Yerushalmi Gen. 49. 21.

<sup>398</sup> Sabba and Targum Yerushalmi on Gen. 49. 21, whereas in Targum Yerushalmi Num. 27. 46 it is Serah the daughter of Asher who brings the glad tidings to Jacob. In the quotation by the glossator of *Pa'ameah* on Num., *loc. cit.*, from Targum Yerushalmi Gen. 49. 20, to the effect that Asher was the happy messenger, Asher is very likely to be emended to "Serah the daughter of Asher". Comp. vol. II, pp. 115-116, and notes 293-295.

<sup>399</sup> BR 98. 18-20; Shitah Hadashah 2; Yerushalmi Targumim Gen. 49. 22-26; comp. Sabba, Wa-Yehi, 63c, and note 184.

<sup>400</sup> Midrash Aggada, Gen. 49. 23, and comp. Targumim on this verse. That Sarah's likeness hung in Pharaoh's bedroom is stated in Zohar II, 30a. As to the objection raised against Joseph that he was a slave, comp. vol. II, p. 72. Kimhi on Gen., *loc. cit.*, likewise refers to this verse concerning Potiphar's enmity toward Joseph. *Ben ha-Melek* 6 reads: A man once said to Joseph: "I love thee very much"; to which Joseph replied: "Love caused me great suffering; my father's love brought upon me my brethren's hatred which resulted

in my being sold as a slave; the love of Potiphar's wife for me lodged me in prison."

<sup>401</sup> BR 99. 3; Tan. B. I, 219-220; Tan. Wa-Yehi 14; Shitah Hadashah 2; Aggadat Bereshit 82, 162; Targum Yerushalmi Gen. 49. 27; MHG I, 751. The interpretation of Gen. 49. 27, found in 12 Testaments, Benjamin 11, and Hippolytus, *ad loc.*, according to which the "wolf" refers to the Benjamite Saul (=Paul), is a Christianized form of the Jewish Haggadah which takes the "wolf" as a symbol of Saul, the first king of Israel. Testaments, *loc. cit.*, finds in the blessing of Benjamin a hint that the temple would be erected in his territory; comp. vol. III, p. 458.

<sup>402</sup> BR 99. 2; Tan. B. I, 219-220; Tan. Wa-Yehi 14; Shitah Hadashah 2. On Joseph as the adversary of Esau, see vol. I, p. 364; vol. III, pp. 57-58.

<sup>403</sup> Tan. B. I, 221; Tan. Wa-Yehi 16; BR 99. 4; DR 13. 8; PR 7, 28b. Comp. note 387.

<sup>404</sup> BR 100. 2.

<sup>405</sup> Tan. B. IV, 11; Tan. Bemidbar 12; BaR 2. 8; Yashar Wa-Yehi, 112a-112b; a somewhat different version is found in BaR 5. 2. See also Hasidim 383 and Nahmanides, Gen. 48. 2. The passage in the Tanhumas escaped Nahmanides, for they explicitly state that, in accordance with Jacob's last will, none of his grandchildren was allowed to touch his bier, because their mothers (or the mothers of some of them) were Canaanitish women. In Tan. B. IV, 11, בָּכָם is to be read instead of בָּהֶם. Comp. note 98.

<sup>406</sup> Yashar Wa-Yehi, 112b. ER 18, 104, reads: Jacob admonished Joseph to be proud of his virtue, since God gives man knowledge and wisdom to be used only for the sanctification of His holy name, *i. e.*, to resist temptations.

<sup>407</sup> BR 100. 1.

<sup>408</sup> Baba Batra 16a-17a. Comp. note 276; on vol. I, 292, and note 35 on p. 317.

<sup>409</sup> Yerushalmi Targumim Gen. 50. 1.

<sup>410</sup> Yashar Wa-Yehi, 112b-113a.

<sup>411</sup> Yerushalmi Targumim Gen. 50. 3; Zohar I, 294. Comp. note 177.

<sup>412</sup> BR 100. 3. Comp. vol. II, pp. 148-149. On Joseph's premature death see note 430.

<sup>413</sup> Unknown Midrash quoted by Sabba, Wa-Yehi, 104a; BR 100. 6; Aggadat Esther 70. On the view that Pharaoh subsequently be-

came king of Nineveh, see vol. III, p. 29, and note 34 on vol. IV, p. 250. The Egyptians drowned in the Red Sea were brought to burial as a reward for their participation in the last honor paid to Jacob; PRE 39 (this is the source of R. Bahya, Exod. 15. 12); comp., however, the opposite view about the end of the Egyptians, vol. III, p. 31. R. Bahya, in his work *Kad ha-Kemah*, אב"ל 2, 16a, gives (following old sources?) a description of the nine divisions of which the cortège of Jacob's funeral consisted.

<sup>414</sup> BR 100. 4; MHG I, 761, where נרלח שפחים could hardly mean "friseur"; comp. 'Aruk, s. v. נרל, and vol. IV, p. 287.

<sup>415</sup> Sotah 36b. Comp. vol. II, pp. 72-73. Midrash Aggada, Gen. 50. 2, is based on a combination of Sotah, *loc. cit.*, with Yashar Mikkez, 95a-95b.

<sup>416</sup> Yashar Wa-Yehi, 113a. Comp. note 413.

<sup>417</sup> Tan. B. IV, 11, and the sources referred to in note 405, as well as *Da'at* and *Hadar*, Gen. 50. 12. The number of Jacob's descendants at the time of his death amounted to sixty myriads; BR 79. 1.

<sup>418</sup> Yashar Wa-Yehi, 113a-113b. Comp. also vol. II, p. 147.

<sup>419</sup> Yerushalmi Sotah 1, 17c; BR 100. 5.

<sup>420</sup> Sotah 13a; Tan. B. I, 222; Tan. Wa-Yehi 17.

<sup>421</sup> Yerushalmi Sotah 1, 17b; BR 100. 6; PK 10, 85a; Tan. B. I, 222; Tan. Wa-Yehi, 17.

<sup>422</sup> Sotah 13a; PRE 39; Yerushalmi Targumim Gen. 42. 21 and 50. 12; Yashar Wa-Yehi, 113b-114b (here this legend is given in a very elaborate form). As to the acquisition of the Machpelah by Jacob, see vol. I, p. 321, and note 50 appertaining to it. For another legend about the death of Esau comp. vol. I, pp. 418-419, given in accordance with Jub. 38. Closely related to the legend found in Jub. is the one given in Tehillim 18, 159-160, which reads: Jacob all alone occupied himself with the burial of his father; his sons withdrew themselves for a while, so that, unrestrained by the gaze of others, he might give himself up entirely to his grief for Isaac. At this very moment Esau sneaked into the Cave of Machpelah with the intention of killing Jacob whose life he had spared all the years their father Isaac was alive. Judah, however, noticed the attempt made by Esau upon Jacob, and killed his wicked uncle from behind. The reason that he killed him in this way was because Judah could not bring himself to kill Esau while facing him. The resemblance between the twin brothers Esau and Jacob was so great, that looking at one was

as much as looking at the other, and Judah would never have been able to kill Esau while looking at his face which was the very image of Jacob's. That Jacob's sons refrained from killing their uncle on account of his close resemblance to their father is also stated in *Jub., loc. cit.* Sifre D., 348, and Midrash Tannaim 214, as well as Yerushalmi Ketubot 1, 25c, seem to presuppose the legend found in Tehillim; *Hadar*, Gen. 49. 8, is directly based on this Midrash. In quoting the other legend about Esau's death, found in *Sotah, loc. cit.*, *Hadar* wrongly gives בַּחֶלֶק as source instead of בְּרִמְקֵינָה. Another inaccuracy in *Hadar*, Gen. 49. 33, is רַחֵם instead of קִלְפֵּת of the Talmud.

<sup>423</sup> PRE 39; Comp. 103 on vol. I, p. 339. As to the order in which the graves of the patriarchs and their wives were arranged, comp. Yerushalmi Ta'anit 4, 68a, and Zohar III, 164a. As long as Jacob dwelt in Canaan a celestial light shone in the Cave of Machpelah, and as often as Jacob entered it the fragrance of paradise pervaded it. All these ceased the moment Jacob left Canaan for Egypt, and did not return until Jacob's dead body was brought back to his native land; Zohar I, 250b. Comp. vol. I, p. 289.

<sup>424</sup> Yashar Wa-Yehi 114b-117b, and Shemot, 118b-119b. That only Esau's rump was buried is already stated in PRE 39. On the foreign kings whom Esau's children appointed over themselves, see note 323 on vol. I, p. 424. The description of the flight of Zepho from Egyptian bondage to Africa and his great deeds in that country is very likely taken from Josippon 2, and it is possible that Yashar had before him a fuller text of this pseudepigraphic work which contained also the details given in it about the wars between the sons of Esau and Joseph and his brethren. Yerahmeel 50. 4, *seq.*, is taken verbatim from Josippon. The reading Agnias is not certain, and perhaps Angias is to be read. Comp. the following note.

<sup>425</sup> Yashar Shemot, 120a-125b, partly based on Josippon 2-3. Kittim is, of course, identical with Italy, as is explicitly stated in Josippon 1, and the point of this legend is the explanation of the old tradition about the identity of Rome with Edom (comp. note 19 on vol. I, p. 314) by making Zepho, the grandson of Esau-Edom, the first king of Italy. Sikli in the manuscript of his Talmud Torah (comp. Poznanski in *Ha-Zofeh*, III, 21) quotes, from Yelammedenu, the following legend: Zepho established the kingdom of Rome (or perhaps, founded the city of Rome), but was killed by Tiranus the king of Elisha in the war which was waged between these two countries. When Esau heard of the tragic end of his grandson, he left Palestine,

and betook himself to his son Eliphaz, who had settled down with his son Zepho at Rome, that he might comfort him in his bereavement. Tiranus (it is the Greek *τύραννος* "ruler") is, of course, identical with the king of Benevento, bearing the same name, mentioned in Josippon and Yashar. As to the centaur killed by Zepho, see vol. I, p. 423, where a similar incident is narrated of another descendant of Esau. On Zepho as king of Rome see Abarbanel, *Mashmia' Yesh-u'ah*, 7. 18.

<sup>426</sup> Yashar Shemot, 121a-121b, 127a, 128a, 131a-131b, 136b, 137a, 141a, and Joshua, 157a-157b. On the war between the Moabites and the Midianites see vol. III, p. 354. It is noteworthy that in the description of the wars between Carthage and Rome the defeat of Hannibal and his tragic end is ignored. The chief enemy of Rome is accorded in Jewish legend a better fate than was granted him in history.

<sup>427</sup> BR 100. 8; Tan. Wa-Yehi 17, and Zaw 9; Tan. B. II, 2, and III, 18; Yerushalmi Targumim, Lekah, and Rashi on Gen. 50. 15-20.

<sup>428</sup> BR 100. 9; PK 16, 126b; Megillah 17b. Comp. vol. II, pp. 30-31 and 113.

<sup>429</sup> Yashar Wa-Yehi, 116b-117a; Targum Yerushalmi Gen. 50. 23, where *גוריון* is not to be emended to *רבינון*, but explained in accordance with Tehillim 35, 248; hence Targum takes *ברכי* (Gen., *loc. cit.*) to refer to the holding of the child on the knees during the performance of circumcision. On the view that Pharaoh is the title borne by all the Egyptian kings, see vol. I, p. 227, as well as Lekah, RSBM, Ibn Ezra, *Pa'aneah*, Shu'aib (giving Midrash as his source) on Gen. 41. 10; Zohar II, 19b; *Imre No'am*, Balak (end). Several of these authorities refer to the use of Abimelech among the Philistines, Hiram among the Phenicians, Melchizedek among the Canaanites, and Agag among the Amalekites, as parallel to this employment of Pharaoh. As to the question whether Joseph bore the title king or not, see note 234, as well as vol. II, p. 178. According to PRE 11 (this is the source of Yalkut Reubeni, Exod. 1. 8), Joseph governed Egypt forty years as viceroy and the same number of years as king. Comp. also note 195. As to Joseph's premature death and the reason thereof, see Berakot 55a; PK 28, 184a, and parallel passages cited by Buber; 2 ARN 22, 46. In the last-named passage Solomon and Joshua are quoted as further examples of the truth that dominion buries him that exercises it. In Pesahim 87b attention is drawn to the fact

that the activity of some of the prophets extended over the lifetime of four kings; "the rulers" died at a comparatively youthful age, while the prophets lived on to a very old age. It is to be noticed that in Berakot, *loc. cit.*, Joseph's premature death is attributed to the haughtiness displayed by him as a ruler, and the same view is maintained in BaR 13. 3, where mention is made of an additional punishment of Joseph: the standard of his descendants did not bear his name but that of his son Ephraim. In opposition to this view, 2 ARN, *loc. cit.*, does not blame Joseph, but sees in his premature death the natural consequence of the cares and worries which he had in common with many other kings and rulers.

<sup>430</sup> PRE 39 (comp. Luria, *ad loc.*, and *Hadar*, Gen. 44. 31); BR 100. 3. Comp. notes 315 and 412. Hasidim 328 reads: El-isha declined the gifts offered to him by Naaman, and was rewarded by remaining the leader of Israel for many years; Joseph accepted Pharaoh's presents, and for this he died before his time. As a punishment for not having protested against the designation of Jacob as "thy servant" (comp. Gen. 43. 28), Scripture speaks of the corpse of Joseph (Gen. 50. 25) while he was yet alive; comp. Sotah 13a.

<sup>431</sup> Sotah 2a. A Jewish sage was asked: "What is God occupied with since the creation of the world?" He answered: "He makes matches." PR 1, 11b-12a, and parallel passages. Comp. note 297 on vol. I, p. 296.

<sup>432</sup> The Prayer of Asenath. Almost all scholars agree upon the Jewish origin of this pseudepigraphic work (comp. Schürer, *Geschichte*, fourth edition, III, 399-400) and in view of the etymology it gives of the name Asenath, "a city of refuge" (comp. Syriac text, 32, l. 11), one is inclined to assume a Semitic (Hebrew or Aramaic) original of this Prayer, as this etymology clearly alludes to the similarity of אסנת and חסנת. In Hebrew חסן means "was strong", and in Aramaic חוסנת means "strength", as well as "a fortified place", "citadel." There are, however, not many parallels to this story in rabbinic literature. The legend about the bees bringing honey from paradise to Asenath is closely related to the widespread view that the manna was heavenly food prepared by the angels in the third heaven, where, according to an old conception, paradise is situated; comp. Index, s. v. "Manna" and "Paradise". The honey in the Asenath legend stands for manna, which, according to Exod. 16. 31, tasted "like wafers made with honey." The enmity of the sons of the handmaids, particularly of Dan, toward Joseph is also alluded to in the rabbinic

Haggadah and in the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs; comp. vol. II, pp. 6, 207, *seq.*, and 216, *seq.* The glorification of Levi in the Asenath legend likewise agrees with the view of the Rabbis, Jub., and the 12 Testaments concerning Jacob's third son; comp. Index, s. v. Jacob's gigantic strength is often referred to in rabbinic literature; comp., e. g., PR 3, 12b; Tan. Wa-Yehi 6; BR 84. 3. Comp. also notes 151-152 on vol. I, p. 354. It is noteworthy that in the Asenath legend the strength of Jacob's arms (a midrashic Haggadah of Gen. 49. 24, where זרועי is taken to refer to the following עקב) is dwelled upon in agreement with Tan., *loc. cit.*, which states that Jacob's arms were like the pillars supporting the bath-house of Tiberias. As to Joseph being "king of Egypt", see notes 234 and 429. On the rabbinic legends concerning Dinah, comp. note 97.

<sup>433</sup> Mekilta Beshallah (פתיחתא), 24b; Mekilta RS, 39-40; Tan. Beshallah 2; PK 10, 94b-95a; ShR 20 (end); MHG I, 770 (following Mekilta RS?), where, by including the first human pair, "four fathers and four mothers" are spoken of. Comp. note 7 on vol. II, p. 191.

<sup>434</sup> MHG I, 769-770; PRE 48; Targum Yerushalmi Gen. 50. 25, which remarks: Two redeemers will appear, Moses and Aaron, corresponding to the words פקד יפקד with which the redemption was promised; comp. vol. II, pp. 139 (below), and 330.

<sup>435</sup> MHG I, 770; comp. the sources cited in the preceding note. PR 12, 49b, and Tan. Ki-Teze 10 remark: Joseph showed by his last words that he believed in the resurrection of the dead. An unknown Midrash quoted by Shu'aib, Gen. (end), explains פקד יפקד (Gen. 50. 25) to mean: He will remember you in the present world, and He will remember you in the future world.

<sup>436</sup> 12 Testaments, Joseph 1, 10-11, 17-18, and 20. According to the view of the Rabbis, Bilhah survived Jacob (comp. vol. II, p. 167), whereas Jub. 34. 16 states that she, as well as Dinah, died in Palestine many years before Jacob, and was buried over "against the tomb of Rachel"; the Testaments followed Jub.; comp. also note 65.

<sup>437</sup> Mekilta Beshallah (פתיחתא), 24b; Tosefta Sotah 4. 7; Tan. Beshallah 2. The statement of Exod. 13. 19, according to this Haggadah, is not to be understood to mean that nobody in Israel, except Moses, thought of taking care of Joseph's remains, but, on the contrary, all the Israelites, mindful of their duty toward Joseph, thought to honor him best by allowing their great leader Moses to take charge of the body of their dead leader. Similarly, when Israel subsequently

entered the Holy Land, the descendants of Joseph did not think that the burial of their ancestor concerned only them, but saw to it that the entire nation participated in it; Tosefta, *loc. cit.*; Mekilta RS, 40; Sotah 13b. Comp. vol. III, pp. 5-6.

<sup>438</sup> Mekilta Beshallah (פתיחה), 24a-24b; Mekilta RS, 24, where it is stated that the Egyptians had sunk the coffin in the Nile, so that its waters should be abundant; Tan. Beshallah 2; ShR 20. 19; PK 10, 85b-86a; DR 11. 7; Sotah, Tosefta 4. 7, and Babli 13a; Targum Yerushalmi Exod. 13. 19; Petirat Mosheh 115; Zohar II, 46a, where it is stated that Joseph's brethren sank their brother's coffin in the Nile in order to prevent the Egyptians from worshipping his body; comp. note 345; Perek R. Yoshiyyahu 113; Sabba, Wa-Yehi (end), where פרה is either a misprint or *lapsus calami* instead of ניל; MHG I, 771-772. As to the sinking of the coffins of the kings by the Babylonians, see Strabo, 16. 11. Arrian, *Alexander's Campaigns*, 7. 2; Friedrich Delitzsch, *Das Land ohne Heimkehr*, 12. Most of the above Midrashim contain the dissenting view that Joseph "was buried in the royal palace". In Mekilta, *loc. cit.*, read, with Oxford MS., קבריניטין instead of קפטיילין, which is undoubtedly a corruption; see Krauss, *Lehnwörter*, s. v. Comp. vol. II, p. 194, as well as vol. III, pp. 5 and 122.

<sup>439</sup> MHG I, 772. Comp. the discussion of this legend in note 266 on vol. III, p. 122; see further vol. III, p. 5.

<sup>440</sup> Mekilta Beshallah (פתיחה), 24a; Mekilta RS 39; Sotah 13a; DR 11. 7; ShR 20. 7; Petirat Mosheh 112. Comp. the sources cited in note 438.

<sup>441</sup> ShR 20. 19.

<sup>442</sup> Mekilta Beshallah (פתיחה), 24b; Mekilta RS, 39, containing essential variants (as to the expression קים זה, see Baba Kamma 17a); Tan. B. IV, 45; Tan. Naso 30; PR 22, 112a-112b; Yerushalmi Berakot 1, 4c; ER 26, 131. Moses took Joseph's bones and wrapt them up in a sheep's skin, upon which "the Name of God" was written; the dead bones and the skin then came to life again, and assuming the form of a sheep, it followed the camp of Israel during their wanderings through the wilderness; *Hadar*, Exod. 13. 19. As to Joseph's virtues enumerated in the text, comp. notes 23, 113, 210, 238, 270, as well as vol. III, pp. 82 and 202. Philo, *De Josepho*, 43, reads: Joseph stored up all the silver and gold he had received for the grain sold by him in the king's treasury, without appropriating a drachma for himself; comp. vol. II, p. 125.



<sup>443</sup> Sotah 13b; BR 85. 3, which contains the dissenting view that Joseph himself expressed the wish to be buried in Hebron; DR 8. 4; ShR 20. 19; Mekilta Beshallah (פתיחה), 24b; Tan. Ekeb 6. All the Israelites took part in the last honors paid to Joseph, to atone for the sins of their ancestors, who had sold him into slavery; Hasidim 222. Comp. note 437.

<sup>444</sup> MHG I, 772. The difference in the pious when they are alive and dead is that in the latter state they lack the faculty of speech, but they nevertheless do not cease to praise their Creator; PR 2, 5b, and 12, 47a; Tehillim 30, 234; DR 11. 7. These passages as well as many others (comp., *e. g.*, Ketubot 104a) speak of the three divisions of merciful angels who meet the righteous on their entering into the other world, and of the three divisions of the angels of destruction who seize the wicked as soon as they die. A similar view is also found in 12 Testaments, Asher 6, whereas according to PR 44, 184a, man's guardian angels meet him at the time of his death; comp. note 20 on vol. I, p. 59, and Index, *s. v.* "Guardian Angel". *Visio Pauli* 14 is in agreement with this view. Zohar Hadash, Lek Leka, heading שמע"י maintains that Michael and Gabriel, at the head of the angels who guard the gates of Paradise, meet the pious and lead them into paradise. As soon as a righteous person dies, God says to the three patriarchs: "Go and offer the righteous a heavenly welcome." They, however, refuse, saying: "It is not for parents to pay respect to their children; but it is the duty of children to pay respect to parents." God thereupon addresses Jacob, saying: "Thou who didst suffer so much in bringing up thy children, go thou and meet thy righteous child, and I shall accompany thee". Zohar I, 97a; comp. also 123b and 125b; note 49 on vol. I, p. 70.

## II. THE SONS OF JACOB

Vol. II, (pp. 185-222)

<sup>1</sup> ShR 1. 1-3; Tan. Shemot 1; MHG II, 3-4. In contrast to Jacob who was a stern father to his children, Abraham and Isaac were indulgent, with the result that they subsequently suffered for their attitude. Ishmael, the son of Abraham, and Esau, the son of Isaac, would have been different men if their fathers had been less indulgent.

<sup>2</sup> MHG I, 681-682, and II, 5, where the filial devotion and chastity of Jacob's sons are particularly praised. On the designation of Jacob's twelve sons as "fathers", see Tosefta Ma'aser She-ni (end), where it is also stated that all that God did for Israel was on account of these twelve sons (comp. Index, *s. v.* "Fathers, Merits of"). A similar statement is also found in PR 4, 13a and 14a, with the additional remark that the creation of the world was brought about through the merits of "the twelve tribes." See further vol. IV, p. 158, "The Seven Patriarchs"; Sifre N., 11, where אבות can only refer to Israel's great men in post-biblical times. Comp. the full discussion of the question, whether אבות "fathers" refers exclusively to the three patriarchs, in Ginzberg's *Unbekannte Sekte*, 295-297.

<sup>3</sup> Sifra 26. 45 and 42. In the second passage mention is made of the covenant with the "mothers" (the rabbis usually speak of the four mothers, Sarah, Rebekah, Rachel, and Leah; comp. Index, *s. v.* Mothers). The old liturgy contains no reference to the covenant with the tribes or to the covenant with the mothers, and even in the later liturgy these covenants are rarely alluded to. R. Gershon B. Judah (about 1000) is, it seems, the oldest paitan who, in his Selihah זכר בריה for Ne'ilah in the Ashkenazic ritual, speaks of the covenants made with the fathers, mothers, and tribes.

<sup>4</sup> ShR 1. 5; Tan. Shemot 3; Tan. B. II, 3; MHG I, 681. For other explanations of these names see BaR 14. 10 and BR 81. 3; Sekel 290; vol. I, p. 362. Philo, *De Somniis*, 2. 3, is very likely the oldest authority to explain these names independently of the Bible; comp. also Philo, *De Mutatione Nominum*, 16. In this connection men-

tion should be made of the haggadic etymology of the name *Yehudi* ("Jew"), which is explained as "one who proclaims God's unity" (יהודי = יהודי from יחד); *Panim Aherim* 82; comp. also *Apostolic Constitutions* II, 60. The Haggadah is interested not only in the names of the twelve tribes but also in the dates of their birth and death; comp. Seder 'Olam 2; PRE 26; Tadshe 8; Lekah, Gen. 19. 31; Algazi, *Tol-dot Adam*; Heilprin, *Seder ha-Dorot*, I, 2192; Jub. 28. 11-12; 12 Testaments, *passim*.

<sup>5</sup> MHG I, 683; BaR 13. 16. On Issachar as the tribe of scholars, see note 391 on vol. II, p. 144. The description of the tribe of Issachar as mathematicians in Yerushalmi Targumim Gen. 46. 13-14, goes back to 1 Chron. 12. 33; comp. the full discussion of this point in the note referred to.

<sup>6</sup> Sabba, Wa-Yiggash, 56c, quoting an unknown Midrash. As to Aaron's activity in Egypt and his crusade against the idolatrous Hebrews, see vol. II, pp. 259 and 283, and vol. III, p. 457. With the exception of the three tribes of Reuben, Simeon, and Levi, all the others were addicted to idolatry, and for this reason the genealogical tables of these three tribes only are given in Scripture (Exod. 6. 14, *seq.*); Shir 4. 7.—The legend about the Benjamin tribe is an attempt to harmonize Gen. 46. 21 with Num. 26. 28, *seq.* A similar solution is already found in Jub. 44. 33-34 (Charles misunderstood this passage entirely), where it is stated that five of Jacob's descendants disappeared in Egypt without leaving any trace; they are nevertheless counted among "the seventy souls" who entered Egypt with Jacob. The sentence concerning the sons of Judah in Jub., *loc. cit.*, is either a later addition or is to be taken parenthetically. For another solution of the apparent contradiction between, Gen. *loc. cit.*, and Num., *loc. cit.*, see vol. III, p. 333.—On the pious Naphtalites, see note 391 on vol. II, p. 144, and note 396 on vol. II, p. 146.—The difficult בני (Gen. 46. 23) is explained in the following way: Dan had only one son; but this son had so many children that he was called "heath-rush" חשים, because his children were as numerous as the heath-rushes; Baba Batra 143b; BR 94. 9 (here the variant בן is given); Targum Yerushalmi Gen., *loc. cit.* (as to אמפורין see Targum Yerushalmi Gen. 25. 3); ShR 32. 140. Charles, Jub. 44. 28, quotes the Rabbis to the effect that Dan had numerous children; but the Rabbis maintain the opposite view.

<sup>7</sup> 12 Testaments, Reuben 1-6; comp. Excursus II, Reuben.

<sup>8</sup> 12 Testaments, Simeon 1-5 and 8; comp. Excursus II, Simeon.

- <sup>9</sup> 12 Testaments, Levi 1-2, 5-8, 11-12; comp. Excursus II, Levi.
- <sup>10</sup> 12 Testaments, Judah 1-2, 12-14, 16. As to the gigantic strength of Jacob, see vol. I, pp. 404, *seq.*, and 419, *seq.*, as well as vol. II, pp. 106, *seq.*, and 108, *seq.* Comp. Excursus II, Judah.
- <sup>11</sup> 12 Testaments, Issachar 1-7.
- <sup>12</sup> 12 Testaments, Zebulun 1, 5-8. On Zebulun as the mariner see vol. III, p. 237. Comp. Excursus II, Zebulun.
- <sup>13</sup> 12 Testaments, Dan 1-6. As to Dan's hatred of Joseph, see vol. II, p. 176. Comp. Excursus II.
- <sup>14</sup> 12 Testaments, Naphtali 1-2 and Zawwaat Naphtali. Comp. Excursus II, Naphtali.
- <sup>15</sup> 12 Testaments, Gad 1-2, 5-8. Comp. Excursus II, Gad.
- <sup>16</sup> 12 Testaments, Asher 1-8. It is the only Testament which exclusively consists of parenetic material without the slightest admixture of legend.
- <sup>17</sup> It is very likely that either Adam or Methuselah is to be added. Comp. Excursus II.
- <sup>18</sup> 12 Testaments, Benjamin 1-7, 10, and 12.

### III. JOB

Vol. II, (pp. 223–242)

<sup>1</sup> DR 2. 4; comp. note 4.

<sup>2</sup> ARN 43. 121. Eighteen characters designated by God as "His servants" are enumerated: Abraham, Jacob, Israel, the Messiah, Moses, Joshua, Caleb, David, Isaiah, Eliakim (Is. 22.2), Job, Daniel, Haniah, Mishael, Azariah, Nebuchadnezzar, Zerubbabel, and the angels. The expression "servant of God", employed in addressing a person, which is found in medieval rabbinic literature, is due to Arabic influence. Accordingly the occurrence of this phrase in *Zawwaat Naph-tali* is additional proof that this book is of recent date.

<sup>3</sup> Baba Batra 15a–15b, where the following views concerning Job's time are given: 1) He was a contemporary of Moses, and lived in Palestine when the spies visited that country; 2) he was born when the Israelites entered Egypt, and died when the Exodus took place; 3) he lived during the period of the Judges; 4) he was a contemporary of Solomon; 5) of Nebuchadnezzar; 6) of Ahasuerus; 7) he was among those who returned from Babylon to Palestine and founded a college at Tiberias. Baba Batra, *loc. cit.*, further states that according to the view of most scholars, Job was a Jew, since he was endowed with the gift of prophecy, which during the period that followed the death of Moses was exclusively in the possession of Israel (comp. vol. III, p. 355). The rationalistic view that Job is not a historical but a fictitious character is likewise recorded in the Talmud, *loc. cit.*; comp. however, the responsum of R. Hai Gaon, cited by Shu'aib, Debarim, 100b, which reads: **אֵיבּ לֹא הָיָה וְלֹא נִבְרָא אֱלֹהִים לְמַשֵּׁל** "the purpose of Job's life was to serve as an example". Comp. further Masnut, 3. For other references to Job in older rabbinic sources, see Seder 'Olam 3; Mekilta RS, 27; Yerushalmi Sotah 5, 20c; BR 57. 4, and the parallel passages cited by Theodor. In connection with the view given in BR, *loc. cit.*, according to which Job was a contemporary of Abraham, Vital, *Likkute Torah* (at the beginning of Job) and Shalshet ha-Kabbalah 13a, state that Uz, Abraham's nephew, died without issue, whereupon Buz married Uz's wife, and Job was

the offspring of this union. Comp. Yelammedenu in Yalkut I, 766. On the view that Job was identical with Jobab, comp. notes 13-14, and note 325 on vol. I, p. 424. On Dinah see note 35. Comp. further on Job. vol. II, pp. 250, 254, 296, 308, 319, 344, 356, as well as vol. III, pp. 17, 267, and notes 51, 52. The monument of the Arabic general Ayyub in Constantinople was later considered as that of Job; see Straschun, *Ha-Maggid*, IX, 13 and '*Inyane Shabbetai Zebi* 17 (ed. Freimann). With regard to the divergent and contradictory views concerning Job's time and nationality, it may be safely stated that the old legend considered him a contemporary of the patriarchs and placed him in friendly relations towards them (comp. vol. I, p. 326). The late Haggadah, on the other hand, could not allow that a man of the kindness and piety of Job should be a non-Jew, and therefore made him a Jew; comp. Baba Batra 15a-15b, and the following note. Origen, *Contra Celsum* 6. 43, basing his assumption on the addition of the Septuagint to Job, maintains that Job lived long before Moses (comp. vol. I, p. 326), whereas Methodius (quoted by Photius, *Bibliotheca* VII) and Ephraim (beginning of Job) assert that Moses was the author of the book of Job, which view is found in Babli and Yerushalmi, *loc. cit.*; Comp. note 14, end. It should be noted that also Targum on Job (comp. 3. 18; 4. 7; 5. 17; 14. 18; 15. 10, 20, 29), like the old Haggadah, found in this book a great many things which point to the lives of the patriarchs. Comp. Schwartz, *Tikvat Enosh*; Wiernikowski, *Das Buch Hiob nach der... rabbinischen Aggada* (Frankfurt, 1893).

<sup>4</sup> PR 47, 190b-191a. The text is not quite correct; read in 191a, l. 20: אדם; 21 אברהם מן אבותה; l. 24 קרא תגר ולא מראוח ולא קרא תגר. On God as the God of the fathers, see vol. I, p. 414; vol. II, pp. 305 and 320. On the words carelessly uttered by Abraham, comp. note 110 on vol. I, p. 325. On Adam as the creation of God's own hand, see vol. I, p. 50. On the angels remaining outside the holy of holies, see vol. III, pp. 210 and 216. The contrast between the patriarchs and Job is also shown by the fact that the latter only served God out of fear (Sotah 5. 5 cites this view as that of Rabban Johanan b. Zaccai, whereas a later authority considers Job to have loved God; see further Sotah 31a; Yerushalmi 5. 20c; ARN 45, 124; Zohar II, 33b), while Abraham served Him out of love. On the inferiority of Job to the patriarchs, see also DR 2. 4; Tehillim 26. 16; Aggadat Bereshit 9, 26. See also Semahot 8, where emphasis is laid on Job's lack of patience and on his audacity to argue with God. Comp. the following note.

<sup>5</sup> BR 49. 9; Tan. B. I, 99; Tan. Wa-Yera 5. Job was better than the generation of the Tower of Babel, but not as good as Abraham. The latter stood firm in ten temptations, the former not even in one. See Rashi's midrashic quotation (probably a later addition) and Masnut on Job. 1. 3.

<sup>6</sup> Baba Batra 16a-16b. A view is also recorded here which defends Job against disbelief.—On the hair-sac comp. Tan. B. III, 35; WR 15. 3; Haserot, No. 30; 2 Alphabet of Ben Sira 24 (here likewise is found the observation on rain-drops; comp. 2 Enoch 40. 8). BR 4. 4 reads: Sometimes God reveals Himself to man in his hair, as in the case of Job. Comp. ShR 3. 6; PR 47, 190a; Niddah 52a; Matt. 10. 30, which reads: The very hairs of your head are all numbered. On the gazelle comp. Shemuel 9, 73.

<sup>7</sup> *Ben ha-Melek we-ha-Nazir*, 12.

<sup>8</sup> ShR 31. 12; this shows, however, how weak Job was; for although he himself asked that bodily suffering be inflicted on him, he murmured against God when he was tested.

<sup>9</sup> Baba Batra 15b-16a. PK 7, 65b-66a; PR 17, 88b; WR 17. 4; Ruth R 1. 5; Koheleth 9. 11. See also the midrashic citations in Makiri, Amos 9. 13, and by R. Isaac ha-Kohen on Job 1. 14; comp. Leket Midrashim 4b. At harvest time the clouds used to hang over Job's fields, so that the grain suffered neither from moisture nor from extreme heat; Tan. B. I, 133. Whenever anyone received even a small coin from Job, it became a blessing unto him; Baba Batra, *loc. cit.*; Pesahim 112a; BR 39. 11.

<sup>10</sup> Testament of Job 3. The following parallels from rabbinic literature are to be recorded: Tan. B. I, 161-162 (concerning Jacob's herds and dogs); the description of Job's hospitality and benevolence is only a duplicate of the Abraham legend; comp. vol. I, pp. 270-271. ARN 7, 33-34 (second version 14, 33), points out Abraham's superiority to Job: the latter befriended only those needy who came to him for help, whereas the former took great pains to seek out those who were in need of help; moreover, Abraham gave delicacies and luxuries to the poor who had never been used to such things. Comp. further ARN 163-164. Tan. B. V, 25, emphasizes the fact that Job had strictly observed the agricultural laws, and was therefore astonished when he was reduced to poverty.

<sup>11</sup> Midrash quoted by Masnut, Job 29. 13, whence it was incorporated in Leket Midrashim, 6b-7a.

<sup>12</sup> PR 33, 149b-150a; comp. further the midrashic quotation

in Leket Midrashim, 7b-8a. Job's prayer was pure because his estate was free from ill-gotten gain; ShR 22 (at the end).

<sup>13</sup> Testament of Job 1. Abraham, Job, Hezekiah (all of whom lived in a wicked environment), recognized God of their own accord; and in the days to come the Messiah will do the same; BaR 14. 2. On the identity of Job with Jobab, comp. the following note.

<sup>14</sup> Aristeas (in Eusebius, *Praep. Evang.*, 9. 25, 430d-431) is very likely the oldest source which identifies Job with Jobab (son of Zerah, son of Reuel, son of Esau), although it is quite probable that the Septuagint knew of this identification. The corresponding observation found in some manuscripts of the Septuagint as a postscript of the book of Job goes back to Aristeas; comp. the thorough investigation of this subject by Freudenthal, *Hellenistische Studien*, 136-141. This scholar, however, has overlooked the fact that in the older rabbinic literature Eliphaz, Job's friend, is identified with the son of Esau, bearing the same name; comp. vol. I, pp. 421-422. The Targum fragment published by Luzzatto (אגרות שר"ל, 741), where this identification occurs, is, in its present form, most likely of a late date. Hence Ginzberg's remarks in *Haggada bei den Kirchenv.*, 123, are to be corrected accordingly. In Targum חמר = לולבא and hence ברא תניינא דלול' = Zerah, the second son of Tamar. Testament of Job 1 is corrupt. For in this verse Job says: "I am of the sons (descendants?) of Esau; my brother is Nahor", and this is impossible. Either "my father" is to be read instead of "my brother" (on the view that Job is the same as Uz, the son of Nahor, see note 3). and the words "of the sons of Esau" are a gloss from the postscript of Septuagint, or "Zerah" should be read in the place of Nahor. On the view that Job is the same as Uz (Gen. 22, 21) comp. Tan. B. IV, 73 (which is the source of Rashi on Job 1. 1; on Rashi's remark that עצה = עוץ, see BR 57. 4), and the quotation from a Midrash in Leket Midrashim, 4a, where Uz = Edom in alluding to Lam. 4. 21. On the assertions of the Church Fathers Origen, *Hom. in Ezech.* IV (Job, qui temporibus patriarcharum et Moses vixisse...), Jerome, Gen. l. c. (Hus, de cuius stirpe Job descendit), and Aphraates, 215 (Job lived two hundred and ten years); comp. Ginzberg, *Haggada bei den Kirchenv.*, 123-124, and note 3.

<sup>15</sup> Testament of Job 1-2. The fame promised to Job is perhaps related to the legend cited in vol. II, p. 225, that God wishes to connect His name with that of Job. Satan as a beggar occurs frequently in Jewish legends, comp. note 226 on vol. I, p. 272. The Kabbalists observe that Satan would have had no power over Job, had the latter



brought, instead of burnt-offerings, sacrifices in which "the other side" (Satan = the material world) also had a share; comp. Yalkut Reubeni, Lev. 1. 3. WR 7. 3 reads: Burnt-offerings atone for sinful thoughts, and Job was not sure whether his sons, who as princes frequently made feasts (according to others the feasts mentioned in Scripture refer to their weddings), did not sin in their hearts.—On Job's love of God, comp. note 4. On the expressions *נוטל רשות* and *נתן רשות* with respect to the power which Satan asked and received from God, comp. Baba Batra 16a; ARN, 164 (in the Job story); midrashic quotation in Leket Midrashim, 46. Comp. also Targum on Job 1. 12.

<sup>16</sup> Baba Batra 16a; comp. note 260 on vol. I, p. 288, and note 39.

<sup>17</sup> ARN, 164 (*מה לך = מלך*); but it is decidedly a recent addition.

<sup>18</sup> Targum on Job 1. 6, which is very likely the source of this assertion met with in medieval authors, Rashi, Ibn Ezra, R. Joseph Karo, Masnut, *ad loc.*, R. Nissim Gaon in Hasidim, 31; Sekel 26; Zohar II, 32b; III, 231; Leket Midrashim, 4b. Comp. Ginzberg's note on this point in *Ha-Zofeh*, III, p. 187.

<sup>19</sup> Testament of Job 4. The Merciful One seizes not first upon the souls; first He destroyed Job's wealth, before He put his children to death; WR 17. 4, and the other sources cited in note 9.

<sup>20</sup> Targum on Job 1. 15 (on the text comp. Masnut, *ad loc.*). The kingdom of Lilith is called *זמרגד* ("Zmargad") in our text; comp. Krauss, *Lehnwörter*, s. v., where the literature appertaining to it is recorded. The queen of Sheba is also known as a female demon among the Arabs, and in a very old source she is considered as a great witch; comp. note 55 on vol. IV, p. 152.

<sup>21</sup> The midrashic source made use of by R. Isaac ha-Kohen reads: "Behold, how long God withheld the punishment decreed over Job. For three years Job lived undisturbed in the village Karnaim but when his sons sinned the queen of Sheba raided them and took their possessions away". The distance from Sheba to Palestine is a very great one, according to some it would take no less than seven years to traverse it (comp. vol. IV, pp. 144-145) and hence the statement that at least three years must have passed between the issuing of the heavenly decree and its execution. The queen of Sheba started on her march against Job immediately on the passing of the decree and arrived three years later to execute it. The Church Fathers as well as Mohammedan writers speak likewise of Karnaim as the abode of Job; comp. Schlatter,

*Verkanntes Griechisch* 55; Klein, *Barajta 24 Priesterabteilungen* 81 seq. and Apt, *Die Hiobersählung in der arab. Literatur* 2b. (Arabic text). Another local legend seems to have claimed "Magdala of the Dyers" as the abode of Job and accordingly we have the harmonizing statement in the Midrashim cited at the beginning of this note that the sons of Job marched from Karnaim through the entire valley of the Jordan (*אבלון* = *אבלון* comp. Schlatter, *loc. cit.*) to "Magdala of the Dyers" where death overtook them.

<sup>22</sup> Testament of Job 4; Persia stands for Chaldea; comp. Job 1. 17.

<sup>23</sup> Baba Batra 16a.

<sup>24</sup> Testament of Job 4. On three occasions God sent forth a hurricane: When the house of Job collapsed over his children; when Jonah was found in the ship; when God revealed Himself to Elijah on mount Horeb; Yerushalmi Berakot 9, 13c; BR 24. 4; WR 15. 1; Koheleth 6. 1.

<sup>25</sup> Midrashic quotation by R. Isaac ha-Kohen 2.8; Leket Midrashim, 5a; Testament of Job 5. Comp. further R. Isaac, 19. 21a, which reads: There are not such sufferings as those of Job; God afflicted him with not less than fifty plagues (ShR 23. 9, and Baba Batra 116b), among which were seven different kinds of boils; Tan. B. III, 80; Tan. Kedoshim 15.

<sup>26</sup> Testament of Job 5; ARN, 164. *Visio Pauli* 49 states that Job's wounds were at first of the size of a grain of wheat, but on the third day they grew to the size of an ass's hoof. This statement is followed by the obscure sentence: "worms moreover which fell four digits in length." This amounts to the same as the statement in Testament of Job and ARN.

<sup>27</sup> Midrash quoted by R. Isaac ha-Kohen on Job 2. 9; Leket Midrashim 5a (the text is not quite correct; read: *כי כן נאמר... ולמה* *כי כן נאמר... ולמה*). Job, who, despite his sufferings wished to continue his former benevolent deeds, proposed to his friends to care for the poor; but they did not believe that he would remain steadfast in his piety; Leket, *loc. cit.* Other interpretations of the words of Job's wife (Job 2. 9) are: She advised him to blaspheme God, so that the heavenly punishment of death should immediately come down upon him, and he would be rid of his sufferings. Confess thy sins to God, and do not entertain any hope that He will relieve thee of thy suffering. Comp. Masnut, *ad loc.* and the following two notes.

<sup>28</sup> Midrash quoted by Masnut on Job 2. 10; comp. Mekilta

Bahodesh 10, 72b; Sifre D., 32; Midrash Tannaim 26; BR 19. 12, where it is assumed that Job's wife also led a pious life, so that her husband asked her to continue to live in the same manner.

<sup>29</sup> Testament of Job 5-6. The greatest sacrifice a wife could make to support her husband was to sell her hair; comp. Yerushalmi Shabbat 6, 7a.

<sup>30</sup> Baba Batra 16a, where another view is cited to the effect (comp. Rashi) that pictures had been engraved on trees. See, however, Targum on Job 2. 11, which reads: When Job's friends saw that the trees in the garden had withered, that the meat which they ate was transformed into raw meat, and that the wine which they drank was turned into blood, they realized that a misfortune had befallen Job. In accordance with this remark we may well assume (against Rashi) that the Talmud, *loc. cit.*, refers to the withering of the wreaths and trees and not to the pictures on the trees.

<sup>31</sup> Tan. B. I, 166 (comp. vol. I, pp. 421-422); Targum Yerushalmi Gen. 36. 12. This identification, however, was most likely known to the Septuagint, according to which Job's friends were kings, *i. e.*, princes of Edom; comp. notes 3 and 14.

<sup>32</sup> Yelammedenu in Yalkut I, 766; Yashar Wa-Yera, 42b; Sekel 70; Targum on Job 32. 32; comp. notes 3 and 14, and vol. III, p. 356. In old sources Elihu is identified with Isaac (vol. I, p. 326) or Balaam (comp. note 33), and in Zohar II, 166a, he is described as a descendant (son? comp. Ezek. 1. 1) of Ezekiel, although the different view of Targum was known to this source.

<sup>33</sup> Testament of Job 7-9. Although his friends came from different places, they all met at the same time, at the gate of the town in which Job resided; Baba Batra 16b. Those who visit a house of mourning should not speak until the mourners have spoken first. Job's friends acted according to this rule, and kept silence until he had spoken; Mo'ed Katan 28b. Comp. further Yerushalmi 3, 82d, and ARN 37, 111-112. As long as the friendship between Job and his companions was unimpaired, Satan had no power over the former; but when jealousy and strife set in among them, he accomplished his task. As soon as the old friendship was re-established, God restored Job to his pristine greatness; PR 38, 167a; Aggadat Bereshit 28, 57; midrashic quotation by Masnut on Job 30. 1, which throws some light on the story told in the Testament of Job.—The idea that man, since he does not know himself, cannot fathom God's acts occurs frequently in Jewish literature; comp. Wisdom 9. 15-16; Philo, *De Mi-*

*gratione Abrahami*, 24; *De Somniis*, 1. 10 and 36; Judith 8. 14; 4 Ezra 4. 10 (this, as is shown by the parallels, has nothing to do with the view of man as a microcosm as maintained by Gunkel; the original Hebrew text of 4 Ezra very likely read עִמָּךְ הַגְּדוּלִים = quae tua sunt tecum coadulescentia); Sanhedrin 39a; Ibn Ezra, *Yesod Mora* 1, 16b.—In contrast to the description of Job's poverty as given in Testament of Job, some rabbinic sources assert that he had to endure indescribable bodily pain, but no poverty (comp. notes 24-26); see *Baba Batra* 117a and *ShR* 31. 21. Quite different, however, is the view of *Tan. B. III*, 8, and *Tan. Kedoshim* 15.—The idea that Elihu is the instrument of Satan is to be compared with the view of R. Akiba, according to which Balaam is identical with Elihu; comp. *Yerushalmi Sotah* 5, 20d. See further note 38, where mention is made of the reward of only three friends of Job.

<sup>34</sup> Testament of Job 7; *Visio Pauli*, 49. These sources have thirty years, but according to the rabbinic view only one year; *Eduyot* 2. 10. Comp. note 27 on vol. III, p. 17.

<sup>35</sup> Testament of Job 1, 10-11. An additional gift bestowed by God is more than the original possession; Job was seventy years old, and God granted him an additional term of life with double that number of years, so that he lived two hundred and ten years. *BR* 41. 4; *DR* 1. 31; comp. note 3 and the sources cited there (see also Ephraim on Job 42. 16) concerning Job's age and fortune; see further Testament of Job 12. At the appointed time, when his afflictions came to an end, Job arose from his seat and shook off the dust, as a cock rises from the dunghill; *Tehillim* 103, 344; *Midrash in Makiri*, *Ps.* 146, 281. On the expression וְנַחֲדָשׁ ("and he became a new man") employed in *Tehillim*, comp. *Tan. Noah* 5 on the three men (Noah, Daniel, and Job) who lived to see a new world; comp. also *BR* 30. 8 (see also the parallel passages cited by Theodor) and *Tan. B. I*, 180. On *Dinah* comp. vol. I, p. 396, and the sources from *Babli*, *Yerushalmi*, and *BR* cited in note 3; see further *Targum* on Job 2. 10.

<sup>36</sup> 2 *ARN* 2, 9; comp. Ginzberg, *Unbekannte Sekte*, 184. Although Job's contemporaries led a licentious life, he was so chaste that he never looked at an unmarried woman; *Baba Batra* 15a and 16a (but Abraham was still more chaste than he, for he never even took notice of the charms of his own wife; comp. vol. I, p. 222); *Tan. B. I*, 170; *ARN*, *loc. cit.*, and the first version 2, 13.

<sup>37</sup> Testament of Job 11-12. It is further remarked that these magic girdles insured Job's immediate recovery (comp. note 35). The

names of the three daughters are explained in Baba Batra 16b and Targum on Job 42. 14. Jemimah means "beautiful as the day"; Keziah means "exquisite as the aromatic cassia"; Keren ha-Puch means "splendid as Saffron", or (so Targum) "as the diamond" (נוֹפֵךְ = פֶּרֶךְ). The Septuagint renders Keren ha-Puch by "Horn of Amalthea" (the goat, of Greek mythology, which nursed young Zeus); this is based on the identification of "Puch" in the Talmud with a (fabulous?) species of the antelope. It is quite uncertain whether this Amalthea is in any way connected with Amthelai, Abraham's mother (comp. note 6 on vol. I, p. 186).

<sup>38</sup> Koheleth 7. 2; comp. note 33 (end). Heaven has compassion on him who is merciful to his neighbor; when Job prayed to God in behalf of his friends, God had mercy on him; PR 38, 165a; Tan. B. I, 104; comp. note 33. According to a remark by R. Akiba, when Job repented, he was rewarded by God because of the pious deeds he had done in former years, prior to his affliction; Koheleth 7. 8; Ruth R 3. 13; Yerushalmi Hagigah 2, 77a (here it is מַצְוָה instead of תְּשׁוּבָה). The views of the Rabbis concerning Job's piety prior to his affliction differ greatly from one another (comp. note 3). R. Johanan, who takes Job to have been a Jewish sage, entertains the most favorable opinion of him, observing that Scripture spoke more highly of Job than of Abraham; Baba Batra 15b; comp., BR 30. 8. But all agree that Job was found wanting when tested by suffering. It is even said by R. Johanan that some of Job's words are so blasphemous that, if they were not written in the Bible, one would not be permitted to utter them; Baba Batra 16a; comp. further Leket Midrashim, 5a; Baba Batra, *loc. cit.*, where Job is severely criticised by Raba who remarks: "Job's mouth ought to have been filled with dust on account of the offensive words he uttered against God".—The revelations which God granted to Job showed that he was unreasonable in finding fault with God's administration of justice; they proved how little he understood the mysteries of nature or the meaning of the ruling of God's wisdom in the history of mankind; Midrash in Makiri on Ps. 146, 281, and the midrashic source quoted by R. Isaac ha-Kohen on Job 11. 7; comp. Leket Midrashim 6b. In the Testament of Job, on the other hand, Job is presented in a different light; he is glorified for his steadfastness and piety during the time of his suffering. This conception is quite unknown in the older rabbinic literature; Comp. the following note.

<sup>39</sup> ARN, 164. The Job legend given in this passage is directly

or indirectly influenced by the Testament of Job (use was made of Arabic sources which tell many things about Job and which are familiar with the contents of the Testament of Job; comp. Grünbaum, *Neue Beiträge*, 262-271; Apt, *Die Hiobberzählung in der arab. Lit. passim.*); hence it forms a contrast to the Rabbis (comp. the preceding note) in maintaining that Job was steadfast. The vermin which infested Job's body are mentioned only here and in the Testament. In contrast to ARN, the Talmud speaks of Satan in complimentary terms, and maintains that his desire to test Job was prompted by good motives, for he feared lest God should prefer Job to Abraham, and he therefore endeavored to test Job's moral strength; Baba Batra 16a.—The cantillation of the books of Job, Proverbs, and Psalms is the same because their authors experienced a similar fate. Job was humiliated, but was afterwards restored to glory; even so were David (see note 96 on vol. IV, p. 104) and Solomon who was dethroned for a time (vol. IV, pp. 169, *seq.*), but later became king again; Shir (Grünhut's edition, 9a) which was made use of by Masnut on Job 3. 1. Job resembles David also in other respects, for both of them, as well as Jeremiah at a later period, cursed the day of their birth, although their motives were different: Job on account of his sufferings (Job 3. 3); Jeremiah on account of the misfortunes brought upon Israel in his days (Ter. 20. 14); David on account of the sinfulness of man (Ps. 51. 7); Makiri, Ps. 51. 281.—ARN likewise mentions that the angels set forth a prayer to God (this is the signification of קשר חפלה; comp. קשר הטפר in Yerushalmi Yoma 1, 38b; the translation "tied a magic knot of the Tephillin before God", Kohler, Testament of Job, 290, cannot be taken seriously) in behalf of Job; whereupon God took mercy on him. The magic girdle mentioned in the Testament of Job is the special application of the motive "heavenly gifts" frequently employed in legends (comp. Günter, *Legende des Abendlandes*, s. v. "Himmelgabe"), which appears here as a girdle in allusion to Job 40. 7.

#### IV. MOSES

Vol. II, (pp. 243-375)

<sup>1</sup> BR 96. 1; comp. commentaries, *ad loc.*

<sup>2</sup> Seder 'Olam 3. According to Shir 4. 7 and BaR 13. 8, Reuben died first, then Simeon, then Levi, and then Judah. Comp. the sources referred to in note 4 on vol. II, p. 188; see also vol. II, p. 330.

<sup>3</sup> Yashar Shemot, 118a, and 122a-122b; ShR 1. 4; Tan. B. II, 3; Tan. Shemot 3; MHG II, 6, which reads: When Joseph died, his brethren considered themselves as though they were all dead, because at his death they lost their honored position among the Egyptians; Zohar II, 16b. Comp. also Tosefta Sotah 10. 10, which states: As long as Joseph lived his brethren enjoyed a pleasant life. According to a widespread tradition among the Kabbalists, Joseph, Moses, and David died on a Sabbath towards evening; comp., *e. g.*, Zohar II, 156a.

<sup>4</sup> BR 79. 1; this is very likely the source of Midrash Aggada, Gen. 24. 34. The fecundity of the Hebrew women was quite miraculous: they bore as many as six and twelve (according to some, even as many as sixty or seventy) children at one time; Mekilta Bo 12. 13a, and Beshallah (פתיחה) 24a; PK 10, 85b; ShR 1. 5 (on כחושים see note 6 on vol. II, p. 189); Tan. B. II, 4; Tan. Shemot 5 and Pekude 9 (the number six hundred thousand is to be explained according to Shir 1. 15; comp. note 56); Aggadat Bereshit 5. 11; MHG II, 6, where it is also stated that they were of heroic valor; comp. also Shir 1. 16; Mekilta Bahodesh 2, 63a; Shabbat 30b (below).

<sup>5</sup> Yashar Shemot, 112b and 125a-125b. Comp. vol. II, pp. 163-164, 169, 178. For other reasons why the Egyptians changed from friends of the Hebrews into enemies, see vol. II, p. 259, and vol. III, p. 9.

<sup>6</sup> Yashar Shemot, 125b-127a, partly based on older sources; comp. vol. II, pp. 360-361 and 336. On the idea that Balaam was the one who advised the enslavement of Israel, see vol. III, p. 363, and vol. II, pp. 254-255. The tribe of Levi, mindful of the fact that they were destined to be the servants of God in the temple, refused

to serve Pharaoh, who did not press them, for he knew that Jacob exempted them from carrying his bier (comp. vol. II, p. 147), and even the wicked king feared to force to work those whom Jacob had exempted; *Hadar, Da'at*, and *Imre No'am* on Exod. 1. 13. On *Malul* = *Maror*, see note 36.

<sup>7</sup> Sotah 11a; ShR 1. 10-11; Mekilta RS, 31. As to the king himself participating in the building, see the inscription of Nabopolassar in R. F. Harper's *Assyrian and Babylonian Literature*, 131-133, where this king, in describing the restoration of Esagila and Ezida, writes: I arrayed myself in my gown, the robe of my royalty. Bricks and mortar I carried on my back, a dupshikku of gold and silver I wore; and Nebuchadrezzar the first-born... I caused to carry mortar... with my workmen. As to men performing the work of women, and *vice versa*, see Herodotus, II, 35. Philo, *Moses*, 1. 7, maintains that many of the Hebrews died because they were unable to stand the hardships imposed upon them; their corpses were thrown out beyond the boundary (of Egypt), and nobody was allowed to cover them with earth. This is very likely to be understood to mean that the Egyptians granted to the Hebrews no respite from their work to enable them to bury their dead. On the cities built by the Hebrews, see Septuagint and Targumim on Exod. 1. 11.

<sup>8</sup> ShR 1. 12; PR, addition, 197b; Koheleth 2. 23; BR 27. 2 (comp. Theodor, *ad loc.*); Tan. Wa-Yeze 9; Philo, *Moses*, 1. 7; Abkir in Yalkut I, 153 = MHG II, 8.

<sup>9</sup> ER 7, 44; ShR 5. 21; Wa-Yosha' 45, which reads: Every Hebrew was compelled to make six hundred bricks daily. Tehillim 119, 497; PRE 48; Sanhedrin 111a; Mekilta RS, 170. Comp. vol. II, pp. 299, 337, and 372, as well as vol. IV, p. 49.

<sup>10</sup> PRE 48; comp. vol. II, p. 367; vol. III, p. 13.

<sup>11</sup> ShR 1. 8; MHG II, 8. Comp. note 4.

<sup>12</sup> Yashar Shemot, 124a-124b, which is based on older sources; comp. note 21, and note 32 on vol. II, p. 236. Yalkut Reubeni, Exod. 1. 10, quotes an unknown Midrash to the effect that the agitation against the Jews was due to the fact that the Egyptians at that time apprehended an attack upon them by the kings of Canaan, and feared lest the Hebrews should support the enemies of Egypt. As to the historical events reflected in this legend, see Ginzberg, *Unbekannte Sekte*, pp. 338-339 and Index s. v. "Historical Reminiscence."

<sup>13</sup> ShR 1. 14. Comp. note 36 on vol. II, p. 12.



<sup>14</sup> ShR 1. 18; ps.-Philo, 10 (top). As to the sensuality of the Egyptians, see ER 7, 40, and vol. I, p. 222.

<sup>15</sup> ShR 1. 13-14; ER 7, 43; Sotah 11b. As to the different positions of the male child from the female at the time of birth, see BR 17. 7, and parallel passages cited by Theodor. Comp. note 17.

<sup>16</sup> Sotah 11b; ShR 1. 15; Yashar Shemot, 127b.

<sup>17</sup> ShR 1. 15. The identification of Shiphrah and Puah with Jochebed and Miriam, respectively, is already found in old sources; comp. Sifre N., 78; Sotah 11b, which gives also the dissenting view that Puah is identical with Elisheba, the wife of Aaron and the daughter-in-law of Jochebed; Shemuel 18, 113; Koheleth 7. 1. As to the meaning of the names of the midwives, see the sources cited above, and Philo, *Quis Rer. Divin. Haeres Sit*, 26. The last-mentioned authority maintains that in Hebrew Shiphrah signifies "a bird" and Puah "red". Philo confused שפֶּרָה with צפֶּרָה and פּוּעָה with פּוּאָה (in mishnic Hebrew פּוּאָה "woad" is employed to describe the reddish or rather bluish dye obtained from the leaves of the "woad"), for which blunders the inaccurate pronunciation of Hebrew by the Alexandrians is partly responsible. Philo speaks of these two women as "midwives of the Egyptians", agreeing on this point with some of the Rabbis who are of the opinion that Jochebed and Shiphrah were not Jewish women; see Tadshe 21 (end), where they are declared to have been proselytes; *Imre No'am*, Exod. 1. 15. See also Josephus, *Antiqui.*, II, 9. 2.

<sup>18</sup> Sotah 11b; ShR 1. 16, which draws attention to Jacob's blessings, where several of his sons are compared to animals.

<sup>19</sup> Sotah 11b-12a; ShR 1. 17; Tan. B. I, 152; comp. further 1 Chron. 2. 18; vol. II, pp. 70-71, vol. IV, p. 78. The view that Miriam was the ancestress of David (and hence of the Messiah) is already found in Sifre N., 78; comp. also Yerushalmi Targumim on Exod. 1. 21. The Christian legend that Jesus is a descendant of the priestly family is very likely connected with this view of the Rabbis; see Julius Africanus, *Epistle to Aristides*, 1.

<sup>20</sup> Sotah 11b. Comp. vol. III, p. 154.

<sup>21</sup> Yashar Shemot, 128a-130b; Dibre ha-Yamim 1; MHG II, 12, where שׁה stands inaccurately for טלה, Aramaic טליא "kid" and "young child". The older sources (Josephus, *Antiqui.*, II, 9. 2; Sotah 12a-12b; Tan. B. II, 122; Tan. Wa-Yakhel 4; ShR 1. 18) maintain that the astrologers announced to Pharaoh the exact day upon which the redeemer of Israel would be born; but they could not tell whether

he would be a Hebrew or an Egyptian. Pharaoh therefore commanded that all the male children, Hebrew as well as Egyptian, born on that day should be thrown into the river. The Egyptians, however, did not submit to the king's command, protesting that the redeemer of Israel would certainly not be an Egyptian; and thus only the Hebrew male children were thrown into the river; comp. note 56. On the three counsellors, see Sotah 11a, where, however, it is Pharaoh himself who advised the throwing of the children into the river; comp. the following note. According to ShR 27. 3 and 6, Pharaoh's counsellors at that time were Balaam, Jethro, and Amalek. On Job see vol. II, pp. 250-251, 296; on Jethro comp. vol. II, p. 296. According to Zohar II, 33a, it was Job who advised the enslavement of the Hebrews, to save them from complete annihilation planned against them by Pharaoh. The sufferings subsequently inflicted upon Job had the purpose to make him realize the acuteness of pain and the troubles he had caused to Israel. It is very likely that Yashar is the source of Zohar, *loc. cit.*

<sup>22</sup> Sotah 11a; ShR 1. 18 and 2. 1; Shir 2. 15; Aggadat Bereshit 1, 2. God swore unto Noah never again to destroy the world by water or fire, but this oath applied only to the destruction of the entire world and not to parts thereof; comp. vol. I, p. 250-251, and note 55 on vol. I, p. 166.

<sup>23</sup> Shir 2. 15; ER 7. 43; Mishle 19, 86; ShR 22. 1; Lekah Exod. 1. 2. Philo, *Vita Mosis*, 1. 3, also speaks of the search for the Hebrew children in all hiding-places. Pharaoh who was informed of the approaching birth of the redeemer of Israel (see note 21), ordered to take a census of all the pregnant women of the Hebrews, and as soon as the time of their confinement arrived, the male children were seized and killed; Midrash Shir 25b-26a; MHG II, 12; Haggadat Teman 36.

<sup>24</sup> Josephus, *Antiqui.*, II, 9. 2.

<sup>25</sup> Yashar Shemot, 130a (based on older sources; see Sotah 11b; ER 7, 42; PRE 42).

<sup>26</sup> Josephus *Antiqui.*, II, 9. 2.

<sup>27</sup> Mekilta RS, 3; Sotah 12a; ShR 1. 13, where ראש סינהרין is the same as נדול הדור in Talmud; see Pesahim 70b, and Büchler, *The Political.... Leaders of the Jewish Community of Sepphoris*, 9; PR 43, 180a-180b; BaR 13. 20; Koheleth 9. 17; MHG II, 12-13; Dibre ha-Yamim 2. Another version of this legend is given by ps.-Philo, 10c, according to which the leaders of the people ordered all Israel to stop propagating the race; but Amram, trusting in God, the Savior

and Redeemer of Israel, objected to the command of the leaders, and finally succeeded in making them repeal the prohibition against the propagation of the race. Comp. note 37.

<sup>28</sup> Sifre N., 67; ShR 1. 8; Josephus, *Antiqui.*, II, 9. 3, which reads: Amram, one of the nobler sort of the Hebrews. Comp. note 409 on vol. III, p. 211.

<sup>29</sup> Sotah 11a; ShR 1. 8; Tan. B. II, 4; Tan. Shemot 5. As to the dissenting view which maintains that Pharaoh the persecutor of the Hebrews is not identical with the king of Egypt at the time of Joseph, see note 5. Josephus, *Antiqui.*, II, 9. 1, agrees with the latter view, and dates the anti-Israelitish policy of the Egyptians from the coming into power of a new dynasty. This author remarks that the Egyptians who were indolent and effeminate envied the industrious and successful Hebrews. Tan., *loc. cit.*, says that the theatres and circuses were filled with the Hebrews, and this caused envy and enmity. "Ingratitude is as grave a sin as idolatry"; Pharaoh began with the one and ended with the other. He pretended that he did not know of any service rendered by Joseph to Egypt (comp. Exod. 1. 8), and subsequently said: "I know not the Lord" (*ibid.* 5. 2); MHG II, 7; ShR and Tanhumas, *loc. cit.*

<sup>30</sup> Baba Batra 17a; Targum on Ruth (end); Ma'ase Torah 94, where Benjamin is counted among the distinguished persons. On Amram's piety comp. also Tan. B. IV, 16, where it is said that Israel was redeemed from Egypt on account of the merits of Amram and his wife Jochebed. The latter, however, was not the equal of her husband, as shown by her exposing the infant Moses to danger; WR 2. 1 and Koheleth 7. 28. Comp. note 46, end. Philo, *Vita Mosis*, 1. 2, describes this couple as the noblest of their time. See also Zohar II, 19; Sifre Z., 109; vol. II, p. 323; vol. IV, p. 158.

<sup>31</sup> PK 1, 1b; PR 5, 18b; BaR 12. 6 and 13. 2; BR 19. 7; Shir 5. 1; Tan. Pekude 6 and Naso 16; Tan. B. IV, 24, and III, 110; Tehillim 75, 338; Hallel 101; comp. vol. III, p. 185. The Hellenistic writers, as well as the Rabbis, call attention to the fact that Moses was the seventh generation from Abraham; comp. Demetrius 10, 29, 438d; Philo, *Vita Mosis*, 1. 2; Josephus, *Antiqui.*, II, 9. 6; PK 23, 154b-155a, and the parallel passages cited by Buber. Comp. note 17 on vol. II, p. 222, and Index, *s. v.* "Seven".

<sup>32</sup> MHG II, 8. A similar legend is found in *Hadar, Da'at*, and *Imre No'am* on Exod. 1. 13, according to which the entire tribe of

Levi was too wise to be deceived by Pharaoh. See also ShR 1. 11 and 5. 18; Tan. Ki-Teze 9; comp. note 9.

<sup>33</sup> 12 Testaments, Levi 12. Levi had two wives, from one he begot Kehath and from the other Jochebed. In view of the fact that before the revelation on mount Sinai only maternal relationships were taken into consideration, the marriage of Amram and Jochebed was in accordance with the law; see Sahnhedrin 58b; Onkelos and Lekah Exod. 6. 20; vol. III, p. 253. The name of Jochebed's mother was Otah; *Hadar* and *Da'at* on Num. 26. 59.

<sup>34</sup> MHG II, 11 (based on a midrashic work on Prov., but not found in Midrash Mishle) and 13; comp. note 30 towards the end.

<sup>35</sup> MHG II, 11 (read ועשה instead of וכסה), where it is also stated that the same miracle happened to the two spies who lodged at the house of Rahab; comp. vol. IV, p. 5.

<sup>36</sup> Yashar Shemot, 128a; Dibre ha-Yamim 2 (read ומהם השליך ל'יאור). The etymology of the name Miriam is found in old sources; comp. Seder 'Olam 3; PR 5, 50a; see also the etymological explanations given of the names Merari and Malol in vol. II, pp. 197 and 248. The etymology of Aaron אהרן as standing for אהרן "woe to this pregnancy" is also found in 12 Testaments, Levi 17. Jochebed's age at the time of her marriage was, according to old sources, one hundred and thirty years; see Sotah 12a; ShR 1. 19; Baba Batra 12a; comp. note 38 and vol. III, p. 200.

<sup>37</sup> Sotah 12a; Mekilta RS, 3; PR 43, 180b, and the sources referred to in note 27. Amram married "for the sake of heaven", and God swore that the issue of this union will carry the scroll of the Torah in their arms; ER 29, 157; EZ 3, 177; Nispahim 9. Maimonides, *Yad ha-Hazakah, Melakim* 9. 1, following an unknown source, writes: God revealed several laws to Amram.

<sup>38</sup> Sotah 12a; Baba Batra 120a; ShR 1. 19. Comp. vol. III, pp. 200, 393, and 436.

<sup>39</sup> Josephus, *Antiqui.*, II, 9. 3-4.

<sup>40</sup> Ps.-Philo, 10-11, from which it was incorporated in Yerahmeel 42. 8. The description of the man clothed in fine linen is, of course, taken from Ezekiel 10. 2, and according to the view of the Rabbis, he is identical with Gabriel; comp. Tan. B. III, 84. Zohar II, 19a, maintains that it was Gabriel who brought Amram and Jochebed together after they had been separated; comp. vol. II, p. 262 (below) with reference to the angels participating in the celebration

of Amram's second wedding with Jochebed. On Miriam's prophecy see vol. II, p. 265.

<sup>41</sup> Sotah 12a; ShR 1. 20; Josephus, *Antiqui.*, II, 9. 4.

<sup>42</sup> Mekilta RS, 71; Sotah 12a; ShR 1. 20; Yashar Shemot, 130b; Zohar II, 11b. The primordial light, which God had hidden shortly after its creation (vol. I, pp. 8-9), shone upon Moses during the first three months of his life; it was withdrawn from him as soon as Pharaoh's daughter took him to her house; it came back to him when he ascended on mount Sinai, and remained with him till the end of his life. It was by means of this light that he was able to survey the whole of Palestine in the twinkling of an eye (vol. III, p. 442); Zohar II, 11b; comp. also *Kad ha-Kemah, Hanukkah*, 11a. On the appearing of celestial lights at the birth of heroes, see note I, on vol. I, p. 145.

<sup>43</sup> DR 11. 9, 120b; comp. vol. III, p. 468. Philo, *Vita Mosis*, 1. 3, remarks: The boy, immediately after his birth, showed a noble appearance different from that of an ordinary child. On the speaking of babes, comp. Index, *s. v.* "Babes, Speaking of".

<sup>44</sup> Mekilta RS, 3; Sotah 12b; Targum Yerushalmi on Exod. 2. 2; Yashar Shemot, 130b; Dibre ha-Yamim 2; MHG II, 13 (all prophets are seven-month children); ShR 1. 20. The last-named source, as well as Mekilta RS and Talmud, maintain that Jochebed had been pregnant for three months at the time of her separation from Amram (comp. vol. II, pp. 258, 262); but the Egyptians could not notice her condition. The same view is also found in ps.-Philo, 10d, where the text needs to be emended. The statement in MHG that Moses was born on the seventh of Adar is based on an old tradition; comp. Seder 'Olam 10, and the numerous parallel passages cited by Ratner. In all these sources it is remarked that Moses' death also took place on the seventh of Adar, in accordance with the rule that the righteous die on the day of the anniversary of their birth; comp. note 60 on vol. I, p. 137. Hippolytus, on Deut. 33. 11, gives the seventh of Iyyar as the day of Moses's death; but in view of the statement of the Rabbis, Iyyar is perhaps to be emended to Adar. MHG is the only source for the legend that Jochebed was pregnant with Moses for only six months and two days. *Kaftor wa-Ferah*, XLVII, 640, reads: Moses, the light of the world, was born in the year two thousand and sixty-eight (A. M.), on Tuesday the sixth of Adar; the new moon of this Adar was Thursday, one hour and twenty-two parts of an hour. Comp. notes 3 and 23.

<sup>45</sup> Josephus, *Antiqui.*, II, 9. 4.

<sup>46</sup> Sotah 12a-13a; ShR 1. 21-22; Mishle 14, 74-75, and 31, 111; BaR 13. 20; Mekilta Shirah 10, 44a; Mekilta RS, 71. Clemens Alexandrinus, *Stromata*, 1, 22, gives a similar description of the ark. In Talmud, *loc. cit.* (ShR is a literal quotation from it), two views are cited concerning the meaning of סֹן (Exod. 2. 3). According to one, it is the same as סֹן יָם "Red Sea", while according to the other, it signifies "swamp". Jochebed did not endanger the life of the infant Moses, as she abandoned him only for a short time, so that the Egyptian astrologers (comp. vol. II, p. 268) may be misled in believing that the promised redeemer of Israel found his grave in the water. The astrologers sometimes have visions of future happenings, but they never "see clearly"; ShR, *loc. cit.* This tendency to exonerate Jochebed of the crime of exposing her child to danger is also noticeable in the tragedian Ezekiel, 475, and Josephus, *Antiqui.*, II, 9. 4, who state that Moses' mother placed Miriam near the water to see "whether the ark would be carried away". For the other view, blaming Jochebed for this act, see note 30.

<sup>47</sup> Sotah 12b; ShR 1. 24. The answer given by God to the angels is also mentioned, in a somewhat different form, by Josephus, *Antiqui.* II, 9. 4. Sotah, *loc. cit.*, quotes an opinion that Moses was put into the river on the sixth day of Siwan, the day of the revelation of the Torah on mount Sinai; comp. MHG II, 13.

<sup>48</sup> Targum Yerushalmi Exod. 2. 5 (in the source cited by Ginsburger there is nothing bearing upon this legend); PRE 48. Yashar Shemot, 130b-131a, Dibre ha-Yamim 3, and Ephraim on Exod, *loc. cit.*, speak of an unusual heat which God sent upon Egypt, and thus the princess was compelled to go to bathe in the Nile. The name Thermutis is only found in Josephus, *Antiqui.*, II, 9. 5, and Jub. 47, as well as in later, mostly Christian, sources dependent on these two authorities; see Rönsch, *Das Buch der Jubiläen*, 265. In rabbinic literature the name of Moses' foster-mother is Bithiah; see note 60. Sibyll. 3, 253, speaks of the queen who saved Moses from death by drowning; this is not to be taken literally, as proved by Josephus who makes Miriam address the woman who delivered Moses from death as queen, though he himself explicitly states that she was the daughter, not the wife, of the king. Artapanus 9, 27, 432, calls Pharaoh's daughter Merois and her husband Chenephes, king of Memphis. She adopted Moses because she was childless; this view is also found in Philo, *Vita Mosis*, 1. 4, and Josephus, *op. cit.*, 7. Philo adds that she was the only child of Pharaoh and very much loved by

him; on account of her childlessness she was always depressed and sad. In an attack of melancholy, Pharaoh's daughter, accustomed to indoor life, left her house to seek solace for her aching heart in God's free nature. She betook herself to the river where she found the infant Moses. Comp. note 226.

<sup>49</sup> Sotah 12b; ShR 1. 23; comp. Lekah, Exod. 2. 10.

<sup>50</sup> Josephus, *Antiqui.*, II, 9. 5; Philo, *Vita Mosis*, 1. 3. On the beauty of Moses see vol. II, pp. 271, 285, 322.

<sup>51</sup> Sotah 12b; ShR 1. 24. The view that the Hebrews only were circumcised, but not the Egyptians, so that the infant was easily recognized as a Hebrew child, is shared also by Ephraim, I, 178c, and Theodoretus on Exod. 2. 6, whereas Aphraates, 210, rejects it on the ground that Joseph introduced the ceremony of circumcision among the Egyptians. The last statement is also found in rabbinic literature but with the modification that the Egyptians abandoned this rite after Joseph's death; comp. note 196 on vol. II, p. 79. According to a widespread legend, Moses was born with the sign of the covenant on his body (comp. Sotah 12a; ShR 1. 20; DR 11. 9; comp. note 318 on vol. I, p. 306). PRE 48, on the contrary, dwells upon the fact that the parents of Moses circumcised him on the eighth day after his birth. As to the infant's refusal to take milk from the breast of an Egyptian woman, comp. vol. II, p. 264, according to which he did not take any milk, not even from the breast of his own mother. This Haggadah takes *ותניקרו* (Exod. 2. 9) in the applied sense: the woman was called to nurse him "and not to give him the breast". In the fuller form of the suffix *ותניקרו*, instead of *ותניקי*, the Haggadah finds support for this view. Comp. the following note.

<sup>52</sup> Josephus, *Antiqui.*, II, 9. 5, who remarks also that Miriam acted as though she had come that way by chance. The same observation is made by the Rabbis, Sotah 12b and ShR 1. 24.

<sup>53</sup> Sotah 12b; ShR 1. 25; MHG II, 14, with the addition that Jochebed pretended to fear to take charge of the child, and she consented to do it only after she had been assured by the princess that there was no reason to apprehend any unpleasant consequences.

<sup>54</sup> Yashar Shemot, 131; Dibre ha-Yamim 3.

<sup>55</sup> ShR 1. 25.

<sup>56</sup> Sotah 12b; ShR 1. 18 and 24; Sanhedrin 101b; Shir 2. 15; BR 97. 3; Koheleth 1. 4; MHG II, 12. Opinions differ as to the time during which this edict was in force. Sotah limits it to one day, ShR 1. 18 to ten or twelve months, Jub. 47. 2 to seven months,

and PRE 48 to three and a half years. If the last view, which is difficult to explain, is disregarded (comp. Luria, *ad loc.*), the difference of opinion among the other sources is easily understood. The edict against the Hebrew male children was due to the information Pharaoh had received from the astrologers concerning the approaching birth of the redeemer of the Hebrews (comp. note 21). According to the Talmud, they were mistaken in believing that the night on which they saw their vision was the night of the conception, and hence they counted seven months from that time. In this they erred, for Jochebed had already at that time been pregnant for three months (comp. note 44), so that on the day when the edict was put into execution Moses was already three months old. ShR is of the opinion that the edict was put into force immediately after the astrologers informed Pharaoh of the impending danger, on the very night when Jochebed conceived, and was continued to be applied until they informed him that the danger had passed, that is, when Moses was thrown into the river and they believed him drowned; hence the edict lasted for ten months (this supposes that Moses was born after seven months of pregnancy; comp. note 44), or twelve months (if he was born after the regular time of pregnancy). The text of Jub. is certainly corrupt, since it flatly contradicts the statement of Scripture that Jochebed put Moses in the river when he was three months old, and accordingly the edict must have lasted some time after his birth. It is quite likely that the Hebrew original of this work read *בו נולדה* *עד היום אשר השלכת בו*, but the Greek translator misread *השלכת* as *נולדה*, and the seven months are to be counted from the third month of Jochebed's pregnancy until Moses was three months old; comp. ps.-Philo, 10D, and BR 85, 10, where it is stated that the pregnancy of a woman becomes noticeable at the end of the third month. On the number of children thrown into the water; see note 4.

<sup>57</sup> Yashar Shemot, 131a; WR 1. 3; Dibre ha-Yamim 3 (the text is corrupt); PRE 48; Megillah 13a; Targum on 1 Chron. 4. 18; comp. also Lekah Exod. 2. 10 and the piyyut (geonic?) *מלאכים* *התקבצו* for the Day of Rejoicing of the Law according to the Ashkenazic ritual. In the last source Moses has two additional names: Nathaniel (= Nethanel) and Tobiah; this is due to a peculiar interpretation of WR, where, according to the context, the three names comprising the word *Abi* are to be counted double, and hence Moses had ten names including the name by which he is generally known; but the paitan considered *Abi* as the inseparable part of the name, and in order to secure ten



names for the prophet, he was obliged to add two names. Ps.-Philo, 11A, states that Jochebed named her son Melkiel (מלכיאל), and Clemens Alexandrinus, *Stromata*, 1. 21, agrees with this.

<sup>58</sup> DR 11. 9. Comp. vol. III, pp. 468-469, and vol. II p. 264.

<sup>59</sup> MHG II 14; Lekah, Exod. 2. 10. The Haggadah attempts to answer the question why the baby was called משה "the drawer", instead of מִשּׁוּי "the drawn". Philo, *Vita Mosis*, 1. 4, and similarly Josephus, *Antiqui.*, 11, 9. 5, as well as *Contra Apionem*, 1. 31, derive the name Moses from the Egyptian *Moy* "water". The similarity between the names Moses and Musaeus is responsible for the identification of the lawgiver of the Hebrews with Musaeus the Greek sage found in syncretistic writings; comp. e. g., Artapanus, 434. See note 69.

<sup>60</sup> WR 1. 3; Megillah 13a, and in many other passages of rabbinic literature (comp. Index, s. v. "Bithiah"). The daughter of Pharaoh with the name Bithiah, mentioned in 1 Chron. 4. 8, is taken to be the foster-mother of Moses, and this view seems to have been known to Eusebius. On Caleb see vol. II, pp. 253 and 287.

<sup>62</sup> Mishle 31, 111; 2 Alphabet of Ben Sira 28b; Derek Erez Zuta 1 (end); comp. Index, s. v. "Paradise, Entering Alive Into". According to Artapanus, 433c, Moses' foster-mother died before he had fled from Egypt.

<sup>62</sup> Artapanus, 432; Philo, *Vita Mosis*, 1. 3; this opinion is very likely shared by Ezekiel, the tragedian, 458b. Comp. Hebrews 12. 23, and vol. II, p. 282 (top).

<sup>63</sup> Tan. Shemot 8; ShR 1. 26. Comp. the following note as well as note 50.

<sup>64</sup> Josephus, *Antiqui.*, II, 9. 6-7. Philo, *Vita Mosis*, 1. 5, and ShR 1. 26 also dwell upon the precocity of the infant Moses. The statement of ShR that he remained for twenty-four months with his mother is to be explained in accordance with Tosefta Nedarim 2. 1 and Ketubot 60a, where the time of nursing is fixed at twenty-four months. Josephus accordingly says that Moses began to display his extraordinary faculties in his third year, i. e., after he was taken from his nurse Jochebed and brought to the royal house. Comp., however, note 50. On the beauty and charm of Moses see notes 50 and 63, as well as Ecclesiasticus 44. 22-45. 1. It is a prominent feature of legend to paint the infancy and youth of their heroes in glowing colors; comp. e. g., Luke 3. 52, and the numerous Christian legends about the infant Jesus. See Acts 8. 20 and notes 42-43.

<sup>65</sup> Yashar Shemot 131b-132b, and, in abridged form, Dibre ha-Yamim 3-4. In ShR 1. 26 it is Jethro who advised the test with the burning coal. As to the age of Moses at this occurrence, see vol. III, p. 469 (top). The name Alfar'anit seems to be Arabic, the feminine of Pharaoh; but comp. Syncellus, I, 227: *θερμῶδης καὶ ἡ φαρλίη*. Tertullian, *Ad Nat.*, 3. 8, and *Apologia*, 16, maintains that Faria is the same as Isis.—Josephus, *Antiqui.*, II, 9. 7, does not know of the test with the burning coals, but is acquainted with the legend that Moses, while still a small child, threw the crown down from Pharaoh's head and stamped on it with his feet. The sacred scribe (astrologers, in rabbinic sources), who had forseen the birth of Moses and warned Pharaoh of the danger that threatened him insisted that the child be put to death. In a similar strain is the version of the legend in Tan. Shemot 8 and ShR, *loc. cit.*, whereas in Yashar, Balaam takes the place of the sacred scribe. On the Arabic version of this legend see Grünbaum, *Neue Beiträge*, 155-160. On an old Slavonic translation of this section of Yashar, see Bonwetsch, *Die Mosessage*. Comp. also Hamilton in *Zeitschrift f. Romanische Philologie*, XXXVI, 129-159.

<sup>66</sup> Josephus, *Antiqui.*, II, 9. 7.

<sup>67</sup> Philo, *Vita Mosis*, 1. 5-7, who gives a very elaborate description of the course of studies of the youthful Moses. Among other things he remarks that Moses received instruction in the wisdom of the Greeks, Egyptians, and the neighboring nations. A similar description is found in Clemens Alexandrinus, *Stromata*, 1. 23, which is very likely taken from Philo. What Moses borrowed as a youth he repaid with considerable interest as an adult mature in years. The benefits derived by the nations, directly or indirectly, from Moses' wisdom by far outweighed those he had received from them. Moses, "the first sage", taught the Hebrews the art of writing, and the Phœnicians, who subsequently learned it from them, taught it in turn to the Greeks; Eupolemus, 431c. Numa, the king of the Romans, following the precepts of Moses, prohibited his people to represent the deity in human or animal form; yea, even the great Plato, to quote the Pythagorean Numenius, what was he, "but Moses speaking in Attic Greek"; Clemens Alexandrinus, *Stromata*, 1. 15; Eusebius, *Praep. Evang.*, 410-411. The strangest expression of these syncretistic tendencies is found in the life of Moses by Artapanus, 432, *seq.* According to this author, Moses, or as he calls him, Moyses (comp. note 59), is identical with Musaeus of the Greek legend, which erroneously styles him the disciple of Orpheus, whereas he was his

master. Philosophy, medicine, the invention of numerous instruments, utensils, and weapons, the hieroglyphic characters, the administrative division of Egypt into thirty-six districts, and the allotment of one district to the priests are all the work of Moses. There is therefore nothing surprising in the divine honors paid to Moses by the Egyptians who called him Hermes. On these syncretistic legends see Freudenthal, *Hellenistische Studien*, 143–198; Krauss, *Ha-Goren*, VII, 29–34; note 955 on vol. III, p. 474. The description of Moses' education given by the Hellenist Ezekiel, 438b, is closely related to the one found in Philo and Josephus, and one is justified in assuming a common source (not Artapanus) upon which these three authors drew.

<sup>68</sup> Lüpschütz, *Tif'eret Israel*, Kiddushin (end). The author does not give his source, but a similar legend is found in *Shita Mekubbezet*, Nedarim (end of the third chapter; here the hero is a sage whose name is not given), and *No'am ha-Middot*, letter 'מ (from here it was incorporated in Midrash Eliyyahu 8), where this legend is told of Aristotle. Philo, *Vita Mosis*, 1. 6, and *De Praemiis et Poenis*, 9, likewise dwells upon Moses' discipline over himself. Comp. also Berakot 33b, which reads: Moses spoke of the fear of God as though its attainment were a light task (comp. Deut. 10. 12), because he had reached the stage where the fear of God became second nature to him.—The rabbinic sources generally speak of "Moses our master" (משה רבינו), whereas the designation "our master Moses" is extremely rare; see Midrash Tannaim 14; WR 10. 3; PK 10, 45b; ShR 50. 2. In the three last-named passages Moses is addressed directly. It is very difficult to explain why in the case of Moses the title רבינו is put after the name, whereas in connection with other names the similar titles, like רבן, רבי, and רב, are placed before the name. Attention should be called, however, to the fact that אבינו "our father", המלך "the king", and הנביא "the prophet" in post-biblical literature, follow mostly the names to which they refer. Thus, e. g., the Rabbis speak of דוד המלך, in contrast to the use of the Bible, where, with one doubtful exception (2 Sam. 13. 39) דוד המלך is always employed. The talmudic and midrashic literature, in contrast to the post-talmudic literature, hardly ever uses the title רבינו before any other name than that of Moses, if we except רבינו הקדוש as the title of the compiler of the Mishnah, and רבינו רב for Abba Arika, the founder of the academy at Sura. Comp. Ginzberg, *Geonica*, I, 42. The explanation of the unusual expression משה רבינו given in *Or ha-Hayyim* 12 and *Sefer ha-Hayyim* (introduction) is of a homiletical nature. An-

other title given to Moses is "the pious", in Tadshe and the sources depending on it; comp. Epstein in the introduction to his edition of this Midrash 23. Comp., however, WR 1. 4, where חסיד is used as an attribute of David (see Berakot 4a) and Moses, whereas in Tadshe Jacob shares this honor with Moses. "The father of wisdom" or "of the wise" and "the father of prophecy" are often used to describe Moses; comp., e. g., Sifre N., 134, and Sifre D., 306, 132b; 2 ARN 1, 3; Mishle 25. 97; DR 9. 3; WR 1. 3; Tehillim 106, 454; ER 5, 21; 6, 33; 13, 68 (here he is called "the wisest of the wise, the greatest of the great, the father of the prophets"); 18, 83; EZ 12, 194. Moses is called "the master of all prophets" (Midrash Tannaim 213; DR 1. 10 and 2. 1; PR 41, 144a; Tehillim 5, 56); "the master of all Israel" (Ruth R 2. 4); "the elect of the prophets" (BR 76, 1); "the best and most chosen of the prophets" (Shir 4. 9; Tehillim 1, 3); "the most chosen, the most prominent, and the most indefatigable man among all the tribes" (Shir 4. 9); "the first of the prophets" (Esther R, introduction), where "first" is to be taken in the temporal sense: "the father of all seers" (Kalir, Shahrit for פרשת החדש; Confession of Sin at the end of the Selihah for the eve of New Year); "king and master of Israel" (Tehillim 24, 207). On Moses as king, see Index, s. v. "Moses".

<sup>69</sup> Yashar Shemot, 132b-133a. Opinions differ as to Moses' age at the time of his fleeing from Egypt. Some authorities think he was twelve years old (ShR 5. 2), while according to others he was twenty, twenty-two, or forty years at that time; see BaR 14. 18; ShR 1. 27 and 30; Tan. Shemot 5. The Haggadah is extremely fond of symmetry, and accordingly divides the life of Moses into three equal periods. He is said to have lived forty years in Egypt, forty in Midian, and forty in the wilderness; Sifre D., 357; MHG I, 771; Acts 7. 23. Comp. note 76.—Moses, though brought up as a royal prince, soon learned from his "nurse" Jochebed the truth about himself, and it was she who also taught him the history of his people, their former grandeur, their present enslavement, and their hopes for the future; the Hellenist Ezekiel, 438. As to the sons of Balaam, see vol. II, p. 283.

<sup>70</sup> ShR 1. 27; Tan. Shemot 9; WR 37. 2. Moses endangered his life for the sake of Israel, the Torah, and the execution of justice. His reward for this is that God speaks of "the Torah of Moses", of Israel "the people of Moses", and of "the judgment revealed to Moses"; comp. Mekilta Shirah 1, 34b; Midrash Tannaim 96; Tan.

B. V, 29; ShR 30. 4, and parallel passages marked on the margin; Batte Midrashot, IV, 2-3. The devotion of Moses to his nation and his attempt to alleviate its sufferings are very elaborately described by Philo, *Vita Mosis*, 1. 7-8, and it is very likely that the author of Hebrews 12. 24-25 was acquainted with the Philonic Haggadah.

<sup>71</sup> Philo, *Vita Mosis*, 1. 8.

<sup>72</sup> ShR 1. 28; Yashar Shemot, 133a; *Shibbole ha-Leket* 55-56. According to the version of this legend given by Abudrahim (on שמח משה) and by Treves (who follows the former), *Kimha Dabishuna* ('Amidah for Sabbath morning), Moses chose Saturday as the day of rest, because it being an unlucky day, "the day of Saturn", Pharaoh, it was hoped, would not object to the Hebrews refraining from work on it, since the work done on that day would anyway bring ill-luck. Saturday, and especially the night preceding it (according to the Jewish conception, the day follows the night), is the time when the demons and the evil spirits (מייקים) hold full sway; Pesahim 112b; Seder R. Amram 25a and 26a; Mahzor Vitry 81 and 83-84; *Shibbole ha-Leket* 100.—The Hebrews in Egypt spent the Sabbath in reading the scrolls dealing with the promised redemption of Israel from Egyptian bondage; ShR 5. 18; Tan. Wa-Era 6; Tehillim 119, 498. R. Azariah de Rossi, *Meor 'Enayim*, 4. 4, quotes the following from Origen: On Sabbath Moses used to show the Hebrews the book of Job, that they might learn from it that the suffering of the righteous is only for a time and finally makes room for joy and pleasure. As far as can be ascertained, nothing of this kind is found in the writings of Origen. It is hard to tell whether this supposed quotation from Origen, which de Rossi claims to have read in a work of Pico di Mirandola, is contained in the latter's writings or not. In *Shalshet ha-Kabbalah*, 13a, this supposed quotation from Origen is changed into a quotation from an old treatise קינטרס ישן. Comp. Straschun in *Ha-Maggid*, IX, No. 12.

<sup>73</sup> ShR 1. 28; WR 32. 4-5; PRE 48; Tan. Shemot 9 and Emor 24; Tan. B. III, 102-103; Sifre 24. 10; Dibre ha-Yamim 4; Targum Yerushalmi Lev. 24. 10; comp. vol. III, p. 239; on the brothers Dathan and Abiram, see note 75. That the Egyptian attempted to slay the Hebrew is also maintained by Philo, *Vita Mosis*, 1. 8.

<sup>74</sup> Yashar Shemot, 133b; Dibre ha-Yamim 4. The name Dathan is supplied in accordance with ShR 1. 28.

<sup>75</sup> ShR 1. 29-31; Tan. Shemot 9-10; Abkir in Yalkut I, 167; Tehillim 29, 206; DR 2. 29; ARN 20, 72 (this is the source of Lekah,

Exod. 2. 12); Philo, *Vita Mosis*, 1. 8-9; Clemens Alexandrinus, *Stromata*, 1. 22. The brothers Dathan and Abiram were the most bitter enemies of Moses from his first appearance before the public until his death. They were the men who at the Red Sea attempted to make the people return to Egypt (comp. vol. III, p. 13), and they also tried the same thing at the time the spies returned from Canaan (comp. vol. III, p. 276). They transgressed the commandment concerning the manna (comp. vol. III, p. 48); they were also the ringleaders at the rebellion of Korah. See the sources cited at the beginning of this note, and further ER 18, 106-107; Megillah 11a. As to the justification of the killing of the Egyptian, see the sources cited in the preceding note; Targum Yerushalmi Exod. 2. 12; Sanhedrin 58b; vol. III, p. 428 (the only passage where Moses is blamed for this action). Comp. also vol. IV, p. 240 (concerning the young men cursed by Elisha).

<sup>76</sup> ShR 1. 31; DR 2. 29; Yerushalmi Berakot 9, 13a; Tehillim 4, 40-41; Shir 7. 4; Mekilta 58b; Mekilta RS, 86; Yashar Shemot, 133b; Dibre ha-Yamim 5. The view that an angel assumed the form of Moses (Docetism?) is also found in WR 6. 5, where, however, the text ought to be corrected in accordance with Midrash Tanna'im 57. Comp. also Yerushalmi Peah 1, 22a. The miracle of the sword refusing to cut the neck of a saint is of very frequent occurrence in Christian legends; comp., e. g. *Acts of Andrew and Matthias*. As to the age of Moses at the time of the flight from Egypt, see note 69 and further Philo, *Vita Mosis*, 1. 9, according to whom the punishment of Egypt followed shortly after Moses' flight, whereas Artapanus, 431, maintains that Moses spent thirty years in Midian. The statement (Jub. 47. 10 and 48. 11) that Moses fled from Egypt in his twenty-first year is based on Exod. 2. 11, where it is said that Moses' first appearance in public took place when he "grew up", which is taken by the Haggadah to refer to the age of majority, and this, according to the old Halakah, is the age of twenty; see Ginzberg's remarks, *Unbekannte Sekte*, 64-65. The other statement, found in rabbinic sources, that Moses fled from Egypt at the age of eighteen, is to be explained in the same manner, since according to some authorities, eighteen is the age of majority; comp. Niddah 5. 9.

<sup>77</sup> Yashar Shemot, 133b and Yerahmeel 45. 2. In Dibre ha-Yamim 5 '1 is to be emended to 'ד.

<sup>78</sup> ShR 1. 30; Abkir in Yalkut 167. Many passages state that Israel was redeemed from Egypt on account of the great virtue in

refraining from slander and tale-bearing; comp. Mekilta Bo 5, 5a, and the numerous parallel passages cited by Friedmann, *ad loc.*

<sup>79</sup> Seder 'Olam 21; Targum on 1 Chron. 14. 12; Yashar Shemot, 133b; BaR 14. 12; Dibre ha-Yamim 5. The five sons of Zerah are, according to 1 Chron., *loc. cit.*, Zimri, Ethan, Heman, Kalkol, and Darda. As to Aaron's activity as the leader of his people, see ShR 3. 16; MHG II, 35; Midrash Tannaim 215; vol. II, p. 188.

<sup>80</sup> Yashar Shemot, 133b-136b and 138a (read נבון or נרין, with Yalkut in 138a, l. 14); Dibre ha-Yamim 5-7; Yerahmeel 45 and 46. 6-9; Yalkut I, 168.—With regard to the names of the persons occurring in this legend, the following is to be noticed: מנכרוס in Yashar and מונחס in Yalkut are scribal errors for מנרכוס = *μονάρχος*. The Grecized forms of the names Jannes and Jambres representing the Semitic names יחני and גמרא, occurring in Mehaot 85a, cannot be taken as proof of the Greek origin of this legend, as these forms are found in Aramaic and Hebrew sources of legends directly borrowed from the Talmud; see, *e. g.*, Targum Yerushalmi Exod. 7. 11, and Tan. Ki-Tissa 19 (read: יינוס ויימברוס) and comp. it with Menahot, *loc. cit.* It is, however, true that the legend in rabbinic sources concerning Moses' stay in Egypt has some points of contact with the following story given by Artapanus, 432, *seq.* This author writes: Chenephres, the husband of Moses' foster-mother, became envious of Moses, and sought to slay him on some plausible pretext. And so when the Ethiopians invaded Egypt, Chenephres sent Moses in command of a force against them, and enrolled a body of husbandmen for him, hoping that through the weakness of his troops Moses would be easily destroyed by the enemy. Moses, however, was victorious in his campaign which lasted for ten years (in Yashar the siege of the capital of the Ethiopians lasted ten years), and on account of his excellence even the Ethiopians became so fond of him that they learned from him the custom of circumcision. Moses built a city as quarters for his vast army, and therein he consecrated the ibis (in Yashar, the stork), because this bird destroys the animals that are noxious to man. When Moses returned to Egypt, he was welcomed by Chenephres, who in reality continued to plot against him. He took the troops away from him, and sent them to the frontier of Ethiopia. He also ordered to demolish the temple of Divispolis which had been built of baked bricks, and erected another of straw. He appointed Nacheros (identical with מנכרוס in Yashar?) superintendent of the building. Having alienated the Egyptians from Moses, Chenephres

induced Chanethothes to undertake to slay Moses. The plot conspired against him was reported to Moses, and on the advice of Aaron he sailed across the Nile from Memphis, intending to take refuge in Arabia. Chanethothes, informed of Moses' proposed flight, placed himself in ambush with the intention to kill him. When he saw Moses approach, he drew his sword against him. But Moses seized his hand and slew him with his own sword. Self-evident is the affinity between this story of Artapanus and the following Moses legend given by Josephus, *Antiqui.*, II, 10-11. The Jewish historian narrates: The Egyptians, sadly oppressed by the Ethiopians, betook themselves to their oracles and prophecies, and when God had given them the counsel to make use of Moses the Hebrew to assist them, the king commanded his daughter to produce him, that he might be the general of their army. After she had made him (the king) swear he would do him (Moses) no harm, she delivered him to the king. At the same time she reproached the priests, who, though they had before urged the Egyptians to kill him, were not ashamed now to own their need of his help. So Moses, at the persuasion, both of Thermuthis and the king himself, cheerfully undertook the campaign against the Ethiopians. And the sacred scribes of both nations were glad; those of the Egyptians, because they would at once overcome their enemies by his valor, and by the same strategy Moses would be slain; but those of the Hebrews, because they would escape from the Egyptians, since Moses was to be their general. Now Moses led his army against the Ethiopians before they were apprised of his attacking them; for he did not march by the river, but by the land, where he gave a wonderful demonstration of his sagacity. For when the ground was difficult to pass over, because of the multitude of serpents which it produces in vast numbers, some of which come out of the ground unseen, and also fly in the air (comp. Is. 30. 6). Moses invented a wonderful stratagem to preserve the army. He made, of sedge, baskets like unto arks and filled them with ibes, and carried them along with them; now this animal is the greatest enemy of serpents, for they fly from them when they come near them, and as they fly they are caught and devoured by them. As soon, therefore, as Moses was come to the land which was the breeder of these serpents, he let loose the ibes, and by their means repelled the serpents, and used them for his assistants before the army came upon the ground. When he had, therefore, proceeded thus on his journey, he came upon the Ethiopians before they expected



him, and joining battle with them he defeated them and went on capturing their cities. At length the Ethiopians retired to Saba, which was a royal city, afterwards named Meroë (comp. note 226) by Cambyses after the name of his own sister. The place was besieged with great difficulty, since it was both encompassed by the Nile and by two other rivers, besides having a strong wall and great ramparts between the wall and the rivers. However, while Moses was uneasy at the army's lying idle—for the enemy dared not come to battle—this accident happened. Tharbis was the daughter of the king of the Ethiopians; she happened to see Moses as he led the army near the walls and fought with great courage, and admiring the subtlety of his undertakings, and believing him to be responsible for the success of the Egyptians, she fell in love with him, and sent to him the most faithful of all her servants to discuss with him about their marriage. Moses thereupon accepted the offer on condition that she should deliver the city and gave her the assurance of an oath to take her for his wife, and that when he had taken possession of the city, he would not break his oath to her. The agreement took effect immediately. And when Moses had cut off the Ethiopians, he gave thanks to God, and consummated his marriage, and led the Egyptians back to their own land. Now the Egyptians after they had been saved by Moses, entertained hatred toward him, fearing he would take advantage of his success to raise a sedition, and introduce innovations into Egypt. They therefore told the king that he ought to be slain. The king had similar intentions himself out of envy of Moses' glorious expedition at the head of his army, as well as out of fear of being brought low by him; and being instigated by the sacred scribes, he was ready to undertake to kill Moses. But when Moses had learned of the plots being hatched against him (the slaying of the Egyptian, the cause of Moses' flight according to Exod. 2. 12-15 is ignored by Josephus in true apologetic fashion), he went away privately, and because the public roads were watched, he took his flight through the desert, where his enemies could not suspect he would travel; and though he was destitute of food, he went on courageously. It is very likely that the story in Josephus, or to be more accurate, in Alexander Polyhistor, his authority, is based entirely on Artapanus, although the present text of the latter does not contain the incident about Moses' Ethiopian wife. The old rabbinic sources know neither of Moses' wars against the Ethiopians nor of his marriage with an Ethiopian princess. They

maintain that the Ethiopian wife of Moses, mentioned in Num. 12. 1, is identical with Zipporah; comp. note 488 on vol. III, p. 250. This view is also held by Demetrius, 439d, and the Hellenist Ezekiel, 348. ShR 1. 27 and Tan. Shemot 5, though late Midrashim, do not know yet of Moses' stay in Ethiopia, and the oldest rabbinic source where reference is made to it seems to be Targum Yerushalmi Num. 12. 1. Comp. Freudenthal, *Hellenistische Studien*, 143-198, and Isidore Lévy, *R.E.J.*, LIII, 201-211.

<sup>81</sup> Josephus, *Antiqui.*, II, 11. 1, which is very likely based on Demetrius, 439b, *seq.*, who gives a lengthy exposition of the relationship between Moses, "the seventh from Abraham", and Zipporah, "the sixth from Abraham." As to Medan, the son of Abraham, see vol. II, p. 23.

<sup>82</sup> ShR 1. 32; Tan. Shemot 11; Mekilta Yitro 1, 57b and 59a; Mekilta RS, 86 and 88; PR 35, 161a; Koheleth 3. 11. The Hellenist Ezekiel, 439, describes Jethro as a monarch and sole chief in war... ruler, judge, and priest. Josephus, *Antiqui.*, II, 11. 2, likewise dwells upon the high position which Jethro held in his country. According to an opinion recorded in the first four sources cited at the beginning of this note, כהן (Exod. 2. 16) signifies "prince" and not "priest"; comp. also vol. III, pp. 384 and 388.

<sup>83</sup> Mekilta Yitro 1, 57a; Mekilta RS, 86; Sifre N., 78; Sifre Z., 73-74 (this passage also gives the dissenting view that Reuel was the father of Jethro); ShR 1. 32 and 27. 8; Tan. Yitro 4; Tan. B. II, 6; PRK, 37b; Lekah Exod. 4. 18. See also Philo, *De Mut. Num.*, 17. The contradiction between Exod. 2. 18 and Num. 10. 11 did not escape the Rabbis, and in the passages referred to (see also the rabbinic sources cited in the preceding note) two solutions of the difficulty are offered. According to one, Reuel is an attribute of Jethro; according to the other, Reuel was Jethro's father. It is true that in Exod. Reuel is described as the father of Jethro's daughter; but this is merely due to the fact that children are in the habit of addressing their grandfather as father. Ephraim, I, 254 E, agrees with the second view, Theodoretus, Num. *loc. cit.*, with the first. Comp. also Josephus, *Antiqui.*, II, 12. 1, and Vulgate, Num., *loc. cit.*

<sup>84</sup> ShR 1. 34; Tan. Shemot 11; ARN 15, 72; MHG II, 18. Comp. also BR 70. 11. According to Philo, *Vita Mosis*, 1. 10, Moses arraigned the shepherds in a lengthy address, with the result (he spoke like a prophet) that they repented of their unkind treatment of Jethro's

daughters, and made amends for it by taking Jethro's flock to the troughs. See also Abkir in Yalkut I, 169; Targum Yerushalmi Exod. 2. 18-19; Zohar II, 13b and vol. I, pp. 354-355.

<sup>85</sup> ARN 20, 72; this is the source of Midrash Aggada, Exod. 2. 19. Comp. vol. I, pp. 354-355.

<sup>86</sup> Zohar II, 12b. Comp. note 127 on vol. III, p. 52.

<sup>87</sup> ShR 1. 32; Tan. Shemot 2.

<sup>88</sup> Wa-Yosha 42. The description of the rod in the text is in accordance with PRE 40. A somewhat different version of this legend is found in Hashkem 2b; comp. Targum Yerushalmi Exod. 2. 21, 4. 20, and 14. 21, as well as Deut. 34. 12. According to Targum, the rod was hewn from the sapphire of the divine throne, and weighed forty seah; comp. Mekilta Beshallah 6, 58b; Mekilta RS, 81; Tan. B. II, 25, and III, 37, as well as the parallel passages cited by Buber. For further details concerning the rod of Moses (it is often confused with Aaron's staff), see note 95; vol. III, pp. 19, 431, 477, and note 894 of vol. III. According to ps.-Philo, 20c at the death of Moses the rod was placed by God as a "witness" between Him and His people, so that when the Israelites sin and God is wroth against them, He remembers the rod, and has mercy on them, according to His loving-kindness. See also Abrahams, *Rod of Moses*.—Zipporah (on the etymology of this name see note 147) is praised in the legends not only on account of her piety and virtue (Mo'ed Katan 16b; Tan. B. II, 7; ShR 1. 32, end; Yashar Shemot, 143a; Dibre ha-Yamim 7), but also for her beauty; comp. Sifre N., 99; Sifre Z., 82 and 204; Tehillim 7, 71. Philo, *Vita Mosis*, 1. 11, describes her as the most beautiful of the seven daughters of Jethro. As to the position held by Jethro at the court of Pharaoh, see vol. II, pp. 254 and 296.

<sup>89</sup> ShR 1. 32.

<sup>90</sup> Abkir in Yalkut I, 169; Lekah Exod. 2. 20. A somewhat different account is given in ShR 1. 32 and Tan. Shemot 11, where it is said: Jethro said: He is very likely the descendant of Jacob for whom the water of the Nile rose from the bottom; comp. vol. I, pp. 354-355.

<sup>91</sup> ShR 1. 32; Tan. Shemot 11, and similarly Philo, *Vita Mosis*, 1. 11. Comp. also Sanhedrin 103b-104a; Berakot 63b-64a, and Shir 2. 3 (end). The last passage presupposes Jethro's descent from Abraham (comp. note 81), and hence his words *בְּיִחוּת אֲבוֹתֵינוּ* "for the merits of our fathers." According to the sources referred to above, Jethro, from the moment he heard of Moses' arrival, wished to have him as

as his son-in-law; but there is also a dissenting view to the effect that he greatly objected to Moses' marriage with Zipporah; see vol. II, pp. 293, *seq.*

<sup>92</sup> DR 2. 8; Tan. B. II, 134, and, in abridged form, Wa-Yosha' 42. Comp. vol. III, p. 422.

<sup>93</sup> Tan. B. II, 6; Lekah Exod. 2. 20. Comp. note 147.

<sup>94</sup> Wa-Yosha' 43-44. Comp. also Philo, *Vita Mosis*, 1. 11.

<sup>95</sup> Wa-Yosha' 42, and comp. note 88. According to Yashar Shemot, 141a, Jacob wrested the rod from Esau, and from the time it came to his possession he always kept it with him, so that it was the only thing he took with him when he left his father's house for Haran (comp. Gen. 32. 11). At his death he bequeathed it to his favorite son Joseph.

<sup>96</sup> Wa-Yosha' 43 (read חכמי מצרים instead of ה' ישראל). Different versions of this legend are found in Yashar Shemot, 138b, 140-141a, and Dibre ha-Yamim 7. According to the first-named source Jethro imprisoned Moses for ten years, because he thought he had run away from the Ethiopians, and he wished to return him to his masters. Dibre ha-Yamim maintains that when Jethro heard Moses' life story from his own mouth, he imprisoned him for a time with the intention of giving him up to Pharaoh. Finally Zipporah prevailed upon her father to release Moses, who appeared, with the miraculous rod in his hand, before Jethro. Moses then received the hand of Zipporah as his reward. Artapanus, 434b, writes: Jethro intended to wage war against Egypt, and put his son-in-law on the throne; but Moses' patriotism would not permit him to engage in war against his native land. Instead of that he proposed to invade Arabia. Jethro, however, disapproved of this undertaking.

<sup>97</sup> Wa-Yosha' 43; Yashar Shemot, 141b-142a. Comp. the opposite view in ShR 5. 8 and note 148.

<sup>98</sup> ShR 1. 33; 12 Testaments, Levi 11 (here the etymology refers to Gershon the son of Levi); Mekilta Yitro 1, 57b; Mekilta RS, 86; MHG II, 19. Lekah Exod. 2. 22 remarks that Zipporah's pregnancy was hardly noticeable because she was very young; comp. vol. II, p. 365, where a similar statement is found with reference to Bilhah.

<sup>99</sup> Wa-Yosha' 43-44. Comp. vol. II, p. 328.

<sup>100</sup> Wa-Yosha' 44. Comp. note 75 for further details concerning these two brothers, the chief enemies of Moses.

<sup>101</sup> Yashar Shemot, 138b; Targum Yerushalmi Exod. 2. 23; MHG

II, 20; ShR 1. 34. As to the three advisers of Pharaoh (only in MHG and in Haggadat Teman, which is very likely based on MHG), comp. vol. II, pp. 254-256, and note 21. That Pharaoh's illness was leprosy is also mentioned by Artapanus, 344b, who writes: About the same time (*i. e.*, shortly before Moses' return to Egypt) Chenephres died, having been the very first person attacked by elephantiasis; and he is said to have incurred this misfortune because he ordered the Jews to wear linen garments and forbade them to wear woolen clothing, so that they might be conspicuous and be punished by him. The statement about Pharaoh's leprosy is the reply of the Jewish legend to the account that the Hebrews were driven out of Egypt because of their leprosy; see Josephus, *Contra Apionem*, 1. 26. Bathing in blood as a remedy for leprosy among the Egyptians is mentioned by Pliny, *Nat. Hist.*, 26. 1, 5. Shortly before the outbreak of the French Revolution, King Louis was accused of bathing in children's blood; comp. Carlyle, *French Revolution*, I, 2. 12. R. Solomon ben Ha-Yatom on Mo'ed K. 18a reads: גִּרְסֵי שֵׁמוֹ "his name was Girsi". Very likely we should read סִיגְרִי "the leper," less likely is סִיגְרִי = Sakiri, king of Egypt about 1391-1387.

<sup>102</sup> Sotah 11a. Comp. Index, *s. v.* "Job".

<sup>103</sup> BR 57. 4. Comp. Index, *s. v.* "Job".

<sup>104</sup> Yashar Shemot, 138b-140a. This source, in describing Pharaoh's death, has very likely made use of 2 Maccabees 9. 5, *seq.* As to Pharaoh's ungainly appearance, see Mo'ed Katan 18a. Yashar seems to have misunderstood the obscure word פֶּרֶטְשָׁחֻקִי occurring in the last-named passage. On Alfar'anit (incorrectly אֶפְרַעֲנִיָּה), see note 65; on Bithiah comp. note 60. On the legend that babies were used instead of bricks, see vol. II, p. 20. In contrast to Yashar, the old sources maintain that Pharaoh of the Exodus was the father of Bithiah, not her brother; see Tan. B. III, 36, and note 226. The statement in ShR 1. 34 that Pharaoh recovered from his leprosy seems to be directed against the view of Yashar, according to which the Pharaoh of the Exodus was a son of the king who had been afflicted with leprosy on account of his cruelty to the Hebrews. See also Philo, *Vita Mosis*, 1. 14.

<sup>105</sup> ShR 1. 36; DR 3. 9 and 2. 23, where it is said: Israel's sufferings, the merits of the fathers, God's mercy, the advent of the (promised) "end", all combined, brought about the redemption of Israel: Yerushalmi Ta'anit 1. 63d-64; Tehillim 106, 457; PR 44, 184b; MHG II, 20-21. Comp. the following two notes.

<sup>106</sup> Mekilta Bo 5, 5a; ER 17, 85 and 23, 123-24, 125, where

it is stated: They observed the Abrahamic covenant although, by abandoning it, they would have gained their complete liberty; comp. vol. II, p. 259, where a different view is expressed; ShR 1. 28, 29. 36 and 15. 4. The redemption was due to the merits of the fathers; WR 32. 5; BaR 3. 6 and 13. 20; Shir 2. 8 and 4. 12; Tehillim 114, 472, and 122, 508; Tan. B. IV, 146; PRE 48; PK 10, 83b; comp. also Mekilta Bo 16, 19b-20a; Mekilta RS, 171; ER 27, 138; Tehillim 44, 268; 107, 461; 114, 172-173. The manifold reasons given for the redemption of Israel may be reduced to four: 1) merits of the fathers (including the mothers); 2) Israel's own merits; 3) merits of the pious in Israel destined to be born in the future generations; 4) the mercy of God who helps the sufferers, even though they do not deserve it. —As to the use of the Egyptian language by the Hebrews, see vol. III, p. 94.

<sup>107</sup> Unknown Midrash in *Sifte Kohen* on Exod. 2. 25.

<sup>108</sup> ShR 1. 33; Tan. Shemot 12. As to the different explanations of *למל* (Exod. 2. 21), see Mekilta Yitro 1, 33; Mekilta RS, 169; Sifre D., 4 and 27; Midrash Tannaim 4 and 16; Tan. B. II, 7; Nedarim 65a. Vulgate has *juravit* in accordance with the view shared by most of the Rabbis. Comp. note 148.

<sup>109</sup> ShR 2. 2-3; Tan. B. II, 6; Tehillim 78, 357. Philo, *De Josepho*, 1, and *Vita Mosis*, 1. 11; Clemens Alexandrinus, *Stromata*, 1. 22 (based on Philo); Aphraates, 196. Comp. vol. IV, pp. 82-83. Moses is often called the "faithful shepherd". This designation is a favorite with Zohar, a part of which work is called *רעיא מהימנא* ("The Faithful Shepherd"), after Moses, who is introduced as revealing certain mystic doctrines; comp. also IV, 308-309 and 416, where it is said: "God elevates no man to an office, unless He has tried him and found him worthy of his calling"; see vol. III, p. 211, and, in abridged form, ShR and Tan., *loc. cit.* Commenting on Moses' working as a shepherd, *Gadol u-Gedolah*, 125-126, remarks: Great is the dignity of work, since the prophets occupied themselves with work, as, for instance, Jacob, Moses, David, and Amos were shepherds. The designation of David as prophet sounds rather strange, but see Yerushalmi Sotah 9. 24b, where Samuel and David are described as "the early prophets"

<sup>110</sup> Tan. B. II, 6; ShR 2. 3.

<sup>111</sup> PRE 40; MHG II, 23, which reads: Moses used his miraculous rod as his shepherd's staff. Comp. vol. I, p. 374.

<sup>112</sup> ShR 2. 4; Tan. B. II, 7; Tan. Shemot 14; comp. also Philo,

*Vita Mosis*, 1. 12. On Moses as the head of his generation at the time of resurrection, see vol. II, pp. 315-316 and 373, as well as vol. III, pp. 35 and 481.

<sup>113</sup> Tan. B. IV, 7-8; BaR 1. 8; ShR 2. 14 and 51. 8 (this passage gives only three names: the first, the fifth, and the sixth of the text); PRK 20a (this source does not know of names 2, 3, and 4, but has an additional name not mentioned elsewhere, namely: "Mount of the Kings"); Lekah Exod. 3. 1; *Rimze Haftarot, Pinehas*; Yelammedenu in Yalkut II, 503, on Is. 60. See further Sa'adya, *Emunot we-Deot*, 3, 92; Lekah Num. 13. 17; *Kaftor wa-Ferah* 118; Poznanski, *Einleitung*, 64, on Paran and Seir as additional names of Sinai. Efodi and Shem Tob, in their respective commentaries on Maimonides' *Guide of the Perplexed* I, 66, remark that they saw stones of this mount upon which the signs of thorns were discernible, and it is on account of these thorns that the mountain is called "Sinai". As to God's hatred of the heathen, see Mekilta RS, 93; Midrash Tannaim 111; vol. III, p. 8, *seq.*, where other names of Sinai are given. Mount Horeb was known as a holy mount even before the revelation took place on it, and for that reason the shepherds did not allow their flocks to graze there; Josephus, *Antiqui.*, II, 12. 1; comp. vol. II, p. 203. After the revelation the mount did not lose its significance entirely. Every day a heavenly voice goes forth from it, proclaiming these words: "Woe to mankind for the contempt of the Torah." Abot 6 (Kinyan Torah); Nispahim 17. Comp. also Berakot 16b and Baba Batra 74a. As to the defective spelling of Horeb (חורב, not חורב), see Haserot, No. 90.

<sup>114</sup> Zohar II, 21a (as a magnet draws iron, even so did the holy mount draw Moses) which is very likely the source for Shu'aib, Shemot, 25b, whereas the somewhat different version in Recanati, Exod. 3. 1, is independent of Zohar. There are mountains, and Horeb is one of them, upon which neither man nor beast can set foot without immediately causing thunder-storms to come down at the first sound made by them, and only complete silence will stop these thunder-storms; Hasidim 426.

<sup>115</sup> ShR 2. 5; Tan. Shemot 14-15. As to the peculiarities of the heavenly fire, see Yoma 21b; Darmesteter, *R.E.J.*, I, 187, *seq.*; note 60 on vol. I, p. 16. The angel who appeared to Moses was the archangel Gabriel, according to ShR, *loc. cit.*, whereas Aggadat Bereshit 32, 64, maintains that it was Michael, who from this moment until the worship of the golden calf watched over Moses and Israel.

The appearance of Gabriel or Michael served the purpose to indicate the presence of the Shekinah, for it was God Himself, and not the angels, who spoke to Moses; see ShR, *loc. cit.*, and 32. 9; BR 97.3; Trypho, in Justin's *Dialogue*, 20 and 128. See Index, s. v. "Angels". As to the symbolic significance of the bush, see Tan. B. II, 8; Lekah Exod. 3. 1; PRE 40; Sabba, Shemot 66d and 67a; Al-Barceloni, 134; Tehillim 37, 223; PK 1, 2b; *Emunah u-Bittahon* 18; the vast collection of material dealing with this point in MHG II, 25, and the parallel passages cited by Hoffmann, *ad loc.* Philo, *Vita Mosis*, 1. 12, in agreement with many of the Rabbis, sees in the bush a symbol of Israel, and in the fire that could not consume it a symbol of Israel's enemies. The symbolic explanations of the bush given by Ephraim I, 102 and Theodoretus Exod. 3. 1, are also found in the Midrash. On the "lowly" bush, see Shabbat 67a; Sotah 5a; vol. III, p. 83; on the "purity" of the bush, see vol. III, p. 84. On the conception that God suffers when Israel is in distress, see note 4 on vol. II, pp. 183-184, and vol. III, p. 63.

<sup>116</sup> ShR 2. 5-6; Tan. Shemot 15; Tan. B. II, 8.

<sup>117</sup> For the first paragraph, see ShR 3. 1 and 455; Tan. Shemot 19; Tan. B. II, 9; Mekilta RS, 167; MHG II, 26; Lekah; Exod. 3. 7 (emphasis is laid upon the fact that it was an angel, not God Himself who appeared to Moses; see note 115). As to Amram, see Sifre N., 116; vol. II, pp. 259-260 and 320; on Moses' humility, see vol. III, pp. 84-85. The description of the ascension of Moses is taken from a small Midrash entitled *Gedullat Mosheh* which is devoted entirely to this subject. The Midrash published, from a manuscript, by Wertheimer, *Batte Midrashot* IV, 22 *seq.*, under the title *Midrash Ketappuah Ba'aze ha-Ya'ar*, is identical with *Gedullat Mosheh*, of whose existence Wertheimer was ignorant. A manuscript of an Arabic translation of this Midrash is found in the library of Berlin.—A few remarks on this Ascension of Moses will not be out of place. The ascension takes place amidst the sounds of music, like the ascension of the Shekinah to heaven (vol. I p. 124). On the view that Moses' body was changed to fire, see vol. I, p. 40, and *Zohar* I, 66a. The "tall angel", whom Moses saw in the third heaven, is undoubtedly identical with Sandalfon (see vol. III., p. 111). The name Nuriel given to him in Wertheimer's edition is due to a scribal error, since Nuriel is stationed in the second heaven, as is explicitly stated a few lines before. On the angels of destruction Af and Hemah, see vol. II, p. 328; vol. III, p. 124; vol. IV, p. 150. They are very likely identical with Azza and Azazel



mentioned elsewhere; see Index, *s. v.* The prince of the Torah Zagzagel is, of course, identical with Zagzagel who, according to Targum Yerushalmi Exod. 3. 2, appeared to Moses in the bush (for other views concerning the angel of the bush, see note 115), and who is said by the Kabbalists to have been the teacher of Moses, while Adam's teacher was Raziel (see Index, *s. v.*), Shem's Yofiel, Abraham's Zadkiel (comp. Is. 41. 2 and note 98 on vol. I, p. 232), Jacob's Raphael, Joseph's Gabriel (see vol. II, p. 72.), and Elijah's Maltiel; see Recanati, and Ziyoni, Exod. 3.2. The legend knows of several ascensions of Moses; the first, at the beginning of his career, is elaborately described in Gedullat Mosheh and hinted at in ShR 3. 1; the second took place at the revelation of the Torah (see vol. III, pp. 109-114); the third was shortly before his death (see vol. III, pp. 443-448). Medieval authors quote fragments from descriptions of Moses' ascension, but we are not in position to tell which of the three is referred to. See, *e. g.*, Hasidim 394 with regard to the praise of God which Moses learned from the angels. The anonymous author of Orehot Zaddikim (26, beginning) quotes the following from a Midrash on the ascension of Moses: In the first heaven Moses saw a division of angels reading in the Torah the section concerning the the first day of creation. Having finished reading, they chanted the praise of the Torah. In the second heaven he saw a division of angels reading in the Torah the section concerning the second day of creation. Having finished reading, they chanted the praise of Israel. In the third heaven he saw the angels reading in the Torah the section concerning the third day of creation. Having finished reading, they chanted the glory of Jerusalem. The Er'elim (the fourth rank of angels; comp. the sources referred to in note 64 on vol. I, p. 16) in the fourth heaven read in the Torah the section concerning the fourth day of creation. Having finished reading, they chanted the glory of the Messiah. In the fifth heaven Moses saw the angels reading in the Torah the section concerning the the fifth day of creation. Having finished reading, they announced the torture of the wicked in Gehenna. The angels in the sixth heaven read in the Torah the section concerning the sixth day of creation. Having finished reading, they announced the joy of the righteous in paradise. On entering the seventh heaven, Moses was greatly terrified at the sight of the Seraphim, Ofanim, angels of mercy, angels of love, angels of grace, angels of fear, and angels of dread. In his terror of the numerous awe-inspiring angels he caught hold of God's throne for protection (comp. vol. III, pp. 112-113). He

then heard the angels surrounding the throne read in the Torah from the section concerning the Sabbath, the seventh day of creation. Having finished reading, they proclaimed the great power of repentance. He then knew that repentance reaches God's throne. Comp. Yoma 86a; PK 25, 163b; PR 44, 185a. As to this description of the seven heavens, see vol. I, pp. 9-10, and Index, *s. v.* "Heavens", as well as the legend about the first seven things created, vol. I, p. 3.

<sup>118</sup> Gedullat Moshéh = Midrash Ketappuah Ba'aze ha-Ya'ar; see preceding note. The part dealing with paradise and hell is not only faulty, but also incomplete. Of the seven divisions of hell only six are described, and inasmuch as the description of the sixth division is a doublet of that of the fifth (in both descriptions the sinners are punished with fire and snow; on the cold hell see Seder Rabba de-Bereshit 17-18), it would seem that two sevenths of the text are missing.—A few remarks on this description of hell may not be out of place here. Gabriel leads Moses to paradise; the same is found also in vol. III, p. 477. As to the fire which consumes the fire of hell, see vol. I, p. 16, and vol. II, p. 303. On Sargiel who fills hell with the souls of the wicked, see 2 Alphabet R. Akiba 63 (אלב"ם); Apocalypse of Daniel (end); comp. further 'Abodah Zarah 17a; Tehillim 31, 241; ER 18, 108 (on the text comp. Recanati, Wa-Yelek); Shabbat 104a. In view of the fact that Nergal is the Babylonian God of hell, it is inadvisable to look for a Persian etymology for Nasargiel. Sar + Nergal, or Nergal + Sar (prince, Nergal) could easily become Nasargiel. Of theological importance is the statement of this Midrash that God makes no distinction between Jew and Gentile; the pious Gentile enters paradise, and the wicked Jew is punished in Gehenna. The prevalent view in rabbinic literature is that hell is exclusively reserved for the heathen; see note 318 on vol. I, p. 306; ARN 16, 64; Zohar Hadash, Balak; 'Emek hu-Melek, 117a. It is, however, true that the Kabbalists maintain that even the righteous have to pass through Gehenna before entering paradise. This view is probably influenced by the Christian doctrine of Jesus' descent into hell to save the righteous who died before his time. As to God's descent into hell to save the pious, see Tehillim 1, 21, and *Nispahim* 35.—As to the thrones upon which the pious sit, see Ascension of Isaiah 7. 22, 8. 26, 9. 10, *seq.*, 11. 40; Enoch 108. 12; Matthew 9. 28; Revelation 3. 21 and 4. 4. Attention should be drawn to the fact that in old rabbinic literature the thrones are said to be reserved for the time after the resurrection; comp., *e. g.*, Hagigah 14a. While in our Mid-

rash the "greatest of all the thrones is Abraham's", in Zohar I, 97 it is Jacob who has this distinction. The rivalry between Abraham and Jacob is already found in old sources; see note 35 on vol. I, 317. Of theological importance is the view of our Midrash that Terah, though a sinner, received a seat in paradise on account of his son's merits. The old rabbinic sources emphatically declare that "no man can by any means redeem his brother" (Ps. 49. 8), nor a father his son, nor a son his father; see Sifre D., 328; Tehillim 46, 272; Sanhedrin 104a. In the last source, however, the statement is made that while a father cannot redeem his son, a son can redeem his father. The warning against relying on the merits of the fathers (2 Enoch 53. 1) is, in content and form, in full agreement with the rabbinic sources referred to. Charles' remarks on the Pharisaic doctrine of intercession are to be corrected accordingly. The reading in Gedullat Mosheh **מִי שְׁהוּא רִשָּׁע וְאָבִיו צְדִיק** אוֹ לְמִי שְׁהוּא לְרִשָּׁע וְאָבִיו צְדִיק is the correct one, and not the one of Ketappuah **אוֹ לְמִי שְׁהוּא צְדִיק וְאָבִיו לְרִשָּׁע**, as our Midrash very likely based the view concerning intercession on Sanhedrin, *loc. cit.* The doctrine of intercession as taught by later authorities (comp., *e. g.*, Lekah and Midrash Aggada on Lev. 1. 6; Shu'aib, Lek, 7a; Hashkem 3a-3b) may safely be attributed to Christian influence. Comp. also EZ 17, 22-23 and the parallel passages cited by Friedmann in connection with the story about the origin of Kaddish; 2 Maccabees 12. 43, Index, *s. v.* "Intercession" and "Merits of the Fathers".—On the four streams see vol. I, p. 20.—The description of paradise and hell in this Midrash displays a striking resemblance to the Christian (?) Revelation of Peter. The oldest source in which Moses' visit to paradise and hell is mentioned is the Apocalypse of Baruch 4. 5 and 59. 4. Comp. also Tan. Mass'e 4.

<sup>119</sup> ShR 2. 6.

<sup>120</sup> Sukkah 52a. Comp. Index, *s. v.* "Shepherds, Seven".

<sup>121</sup> BR 55. 6; ShR 2. 6; DR 2. 7; Zebahim 102a; Tan. B. II, 9; Tan. Shemot 19; Mekilta RS, 167; MHG II, 26; ER 18, 90. The descendants of Moses did not inherit his dignities; he was king and priest (see note 139 and Index, *s. v.* "Moses"), but they were merely ordinary Levites.

<sup>122</sup> Zohar III, 198a; comp. the numerous other passages of Zohar dealing with this legend in Yalkut Reubeni on Exod. 3. 5. That Moses lived apart from his wife from the time of his election by God until his death is maintained in the old sources; see vol. III, pp. 107, 256, 394, 472, 480; vol. IV, p. 260; Philo, *Moses*, 2 (3). 2. Among

mortals Moses was "almost perfect"; he would have been "entirely perfect", if he had fulfilled his conjugal duties. The small letter of ויקרא (Lev. 1. 1) hints at this shortcoming of Moses; Yalkut Reubeni, Lev., *loc. cit.* Moses like his disciple Joshua, received the same command to remove his shoes (comp. Exod. 3. 5 and Joshua 5. 15). But there was a difference between the two commands: to the former it meant the renunciation of conjugal joys for life; to the latter only during the campaign. Comp. Zohar Hadash, Ki-Teze, and see also MHG II, 26; Lekah, Exod. 3. 5. In connection with taking off the shoes, the following remark is found in ShR (end): One must stand barefoot in the presence of the Shekinah...and for this reason the priests were barefoot while performing the service in the temple. The same remark is also found in Theodoretus, Exod. 3. 5. Comp. Rosh ha-Shanah 31b and Shekalim 5. 48d.

<sup>123</sup> ShR 3. 2 and 2. 4; Tan. Shemot 14 and 20; comp. Shir 1. 7; vol. I, p. 265; vol II, p. 539; vol. III, p. 127.

<sup>124</sup> Tehillim 18, 150; comp. PK 5, 47a-47b, and parallel passages. As to the compounding of the four hundred years of Egyptian slavery, see note 126; vol. I, p. 237; vol. III, p. 18.

<sup>125</sup> ShR 3. 4.

<sup>126</sup> Tehillim 18, 150, and 102, 435. The rabbinic literature offers many solutions of the contradiction between Gen. 15. 13 and Exod. 12. 40. The prevalent view is that the slavery of Abraham's descendants began with the birth of Isaac (Mekilta Bo 14, 15b; Mekilta RS, 27; Seder 'Olam 3; PRE 48; Targum Yerushalmi Exod., *loc. cit.*), while their stay in Egypt amounted only to two hundred and ten (according to some, to two hundred and four) years, of which eighty-three (PRE) or eighty-seven (Seder 'Olam) were years of suffering. Comp. also ps., Philo, 10C, and Ephraim I, 202 A, who agree with these chronological theories of the Rabbis. An unknown Midrash, quoted in *Shitah Mekubbezet*, Nedarim 31b, maintains that God hastened the course of the planets during Israel's stay in Egypt, so that the sun completed four hundred revolutions during the space of time of two hundred and ten regular years.

<sup>127</sup> ShR 3. 6; Tan. Shemot 20; Berakot 9b. As to the name of God first revealed to Moses see vol. II, pp. 320 and 339. The proverb "Sufficient unto the day, etc." is also found in Matthew 6. 34. On the appearance of God's majesty in the hair of man, see note 6 on vol. II, p. 227, and vol. IV, p. 48. The suffering of Israel in the Egyptian exile was worse than in any of the other exiles; Me-

kilta RS, 168; MHG II, 27. Comp., however, Yerushalmi Sukkah 4, 54c, where Israel is said to have suffered more in Babylon than in Egypt.

<sup>128</sup> Tehillim 72, 324; ShR 3. 3. Comp. vol. I, p. 414, and vol. II, p. 303. This explanation of the name *Ehyeh Asher Ehyeh*, like the numerous other expositions given in rabbinic literature (comp., e. g., Alphabet of R. Akiba 25 = MHG II, 29) are based on the view that these words imply the immutability and unchangeability of God in His attributes of goodness, sublimity, and faithfulness. According to an unknown Midrash, quoted by numerous authors, these words signify: As thou (art) to Me, so shall I be to thee, i. e., God deals with man according to his merits; see R. Bahya, Gen. 2. 4, and *Kad ha-Kemah, Shebuah*, 74a; Ziyoni, Exod. 3. 14; Gabbai, 'Abodat ha-Kodesh, 16; at great length in Wehizhir, Exod. 85, which is perhaps the source of the last three authorities referred to. Revelation 1. 8 likewise contains an interpretation of the name *Ehyeh*, as may be seen by comparing this passage with ShR, *loc. cit.* See also Philo, *Quod Det. Potiori Insid. Soleat*, 46, and *De Mut. Nom.*, 3.

<sup>129</sup> PRE 40; comp. Alphabet of R. Akiba 26; vol. IV, p. 360. See also Josephus, *Antiqui.*, II, 12. 3.

<sup>130</sup> ShR 3. 8-9 and 5. 12; WR 211. 8; Tan. Shemot 29; Sifre N., 92; Mekilta Bo 11, 11a; Mekilta RS, 20 and 96; MHG II, 30.

<sup>131</sup> Abkir in Yalkut I, 171.

<sup>132</sup> ShR 3. 12-13; PRE 20; Tan. Shemot 23; MHG II, 32-33; Abkir in Yalkut I, 171; Lekah, Exod. 4. 6-8. The last-named source reads: The rod, as well as the hand of Moses, proclaimed in a loud voice what happened to them. Comp. note 53 on vol. I, p. 78; vol. III, pp. 319, 335, 472. As to the statement made in the last passage referred to above to the effect that Moses was never afflicted with leprosy, see Lekah, *loc. cit.*, and Josephus, *Antiqui.*, II, 12. 3.

<sup>133</sup> Mekilta RS, 3; MHG II, 33 and 34.

<sup>134</sup> Tan. B. V, 4-5; Alphabet of R. Akiba ('D) 42-43, whence it was borrowed by *Hadar* and *Da'at* on Exod. 4. 13. Comp. also Targum Yerushalmi and Lekah, Exod., *loc. cit.*

<sup>135</sup> Mekilta RS, 3; MHG II, 34-35. Comp. Matthew 26. 53. On Amram see vol. II, p. 262; on Aaron see vol. II, p. 329.

<sup>136</sup> ShR 3. 15-16, 15. 14, and 17. 5; Tan. B. II, 10. For different versions concerning Moses' impediment of speech see vol. II, p. 326 and note 140. On Hagar see vol. I, p. 239.

<sup>137</sup> PRE 40; Targum Yerushalmi, Exod. 4. 13; comp. also 2 ARN 40, 111.

<sup>138</sup> Abkir in Yalkut I, 173 (in ed. prin. מדרש without the addition אבכיר found in the later editions); Alphabet of R. Akiba (צ); MHG II, 35. Comp. vol. III, p. 115.

<sup>139</sup> Zebahim 102a; WR 11. 6; ShR 3. 17; Shir 1. 7; Tehillim 18, 157, and 99, 424; PK 4, 38a-38b; PR 14, 63b; Ta'anit 11b; Yerushalmi Yoma 1, 38b and 38c; Seder 'Olam 5 and 7. Opinions in these sources differ as to whether Moses performed the priestly service during the week of dedication only or also after Aaron and his sons had been appointed priests. According to one view, Moses remained high priest even after the dignity of that office had been conferred upon Aaron. Comp. note 121 and vol. III, pp. 190 and 400.

<sup>140</sup> Lekah, Exod. 15. 14; ShR 3. 17 (the text is incomplete); MHG II, 37 (note 1). According to the legend recorded in vol. II, pp. 324-325, Moses' impediment of speech was for a time removed by God's will. Philo, *Vita Mosis*, 1. 14 (comp. also *De Praemiis et Poen.*, 9), maintains that Moses became slow of speech at the time when he heard God's voice addressing him. A similar statement is found in MHG II, 33 and 86. For another legend on the cause of this imperfection of Moses, see vol. II, p. 274 (bottom and note 136).

<sup>141</sup> PRE 45.

<sup>142</sup> Nedarim 64a and Yerushalmi 9, 41c; ShR 5. 4; PRE 40; BR 71. 6; Ekah 3, 124; Tan. Zaw 13; Targum Yerushalmi Exod. 4, 19 and 10. 29, as well as Gen. 30. 1. On the view that the poor, blind, leprous, and childless are considered like dead, found also in ps.-Philo, see vol. I, p. 364.

<sup>143</sup> Nedarim 65a; ShR 4. 1-4; Tan. Shemot 20; Tan. B. II, 10; ER 17, 83; MHG II, 38-39. Comp. vol. II, pp. 300 and 328, with reference to the conditions imposed upon Moses by his father-in-law on the occasion of his marriage to Zipporah. Moses, although he obtained Jethro's permission, did not proceed to Egypt until a heavenly court, presided over by God, absolved him of the oath he had given to Jethro; see the sources quoted at the beginning of this note. The Hellenist Ezekiel, 440, maintains that the cause of Moses' return to Egypt was a dream, which, as interpreted by Jethro, implied the prediction that Moses would become king of his people and the teacher of humanity. Comp. vol. II, p. 329.

<sup>144</sup> PRE 31, which is probably directed against Mark 11. 21.

This ass is undoubtedly considered in legends to be an "immortal"; comp. Index, s. v. "Animals, Immortal"; PRK 30b.

<sup>145</sup> Midrash Aggada, Exod. 3. 24, which should read: יבעס עלי הקב"ה. Comp. note 126.

<sup>146</sup> Nedarim 32a, which contains also the dissenting view that it was Satan himself who attacked Moses; this view is adopted by Wa-Yosha' 43 (comp. the extract from it in vol. II p. 295), and perhaps also by Targum Yerushalmi Exod. 4. 25. Yerushalmi Nedarim 3, 38b has מלאך instead of שטן, and even in Babli some texts have the same reading as Yerushalmi; see also MHG II, 41. ShR 2. 8 takes pains to explain that it was a "benign angel" who attacked Moses for the sole purpose of urging Zipporah to circumcise her son. Midrash Aggada, Exod., *loc. cit.* identifies this angel with Uriel, whereas Zohar I, 93b, says that Gabriel, in the form of a fiery serpent, attempted to slay Moses. Comp. Yashar Shemot, 141b. As to Uriel's attack on Moses, comp. Ginzberg, *Unbekannte Sekte*, 35-37, and note 2 on p. 245.

<sup>147</sup> Lekah, Exod. 4. 25, which is very likely based on Tan. B. II, 6 (comp. Lekah, Exod. 2. 21), but in our text of this Midrash Zipporah's "nimbleness" refers to her speed in bringing Moses from the well to her father's house. Tan., *loc. cit.*, offers still another explanation why Moses' wife was called "bird": she purified her father's house of idolatrous pollution, even as a bird purifies a leper of his uncleanness; comp. Lev. 14. 43, *seq.* Allegorical interpretations as to the name Zipporah (= "bird") are given by Philo, *De Sacrif. Ab. et Caini*, 12 and 13, as well as *De Mut. Nom.*, 20.

<sup>148</sup> Mekilta Yitro 1, 58a. According to other authorities, it was Moses' second son who was uncircumcised; see vol. II, p. 295, and ShR 5. 8. The Church Fathers Aphraates, 110, and Ephraim, I, 200 D, blame Zipporah, and not her father, for having prevented Moses from circumcising his son. The Haggadah finds in ויאל (Exod. 2. 21) a hint at the fact that Moses "swore" to his father-in-law; comp. notes 108 and 143.

<sup>149</sup> Nedarim 32a, which contains also the dissenting view to the effect that it was Moses' younger son who was attacked, and not he himself. The views of the Rabbis differ also with regard to the subject of לרגליו (Exod. 4. 25). According to some, Zipporah touched the feet of her babe, while others think that she touched Moses feet. There are still others who are of the opinion that she touched the feet of the angel. Opinions differ as to whom Zipporah applied the

term "bridegroom of blood" to, Moses or his young son; see Mekilta Yitro 1, 58a; Babli Nedarim, *loc. cit.*, and Yerushalmi 3, 38b; Targum Yerushalmi Exod. 4. 25-26; Wa-Yosha' 43. Ephraim I, 205 A-205 B, following Jewish tradition, refers לַרְנַלִּי to the angel and מֹשֶׁה to Moses.—As to the name Gershom, see note 98; on the name of his brother Eliezer, see 4 Maccabees 6. 5, where it is explained to mean "the divine seed", *i. e.*, וְרַע אֱלֹהִים = אֱלֹהִים. On the angels Af and Hemah see vol. II, p. 308; vol. III, p. 129.

<sup>150</sup> Tan. B. II, 11-13; Tan. Shemot 26-28; ShR 5. 9-10; Shir 1. 10; Midrash Shir 34a; Shemuel 9, 73; Shabbat 139a; Batte Midrashot III, 16 and 18; 2 ARN 40, 111. Comp. vol. II, p. 323; vol. III, p. 257.

<sup>151</sup> Mekilta Yitro 1, 57b; Mekilta RS, 86; Ephraim I, 205D. Comp. vol. II, p. 327.

<sup>152</sup> Shir 4. 5; ShR 5. 11. In Shir, as in many other passages of rabbinic literature, emphasis is laid on "the complete equality" of the two brothers; comp. BR 1. 15, and the numerous parallel passages cited by Theodor. Comp also Philo, *De Mut. Nom.*, 37.

<sup>153</sup> ShR 5. 13-14; Tan. Shemot 24; Tan. B. II, 13; PRE 48; MHG II, 42 (where it is stated that Jacob before his death performed the same three miracles which were later repeated by Moses to prove that he was the promised redeemer); Midrash Shir 76. Comp. also ShR 5. 2 and 15. 26 (on the text see MHG, *loc. cit.*); vol. II, pp. 139, 179, 320, 363-364.

<sup>154</sup> Tan B. II, 19; Tan. Wa-Era 5; Midrash Shir 7b; ShR 5. 14; MHG II, 43.

<sup>155</sup> Abkir in Yalkut I, 173; MHG II, 45. As to the vastness of the palace and the large number of the armies, see Midrash Shir 7b; MHG II, 28. The printed text of Abkir is very likely abridged; see the reading of this Midrash quoted by Epstein, *Ha-Eshkol*, VI, 205, from a manuscript. Artapanus, 434d, narrates that Moses was cast by Pharaoh into prison on the very day he delivered the divine message unto him. On the following night the gates of the prison opened themselves; some of the guards died, and others sank in a deep sleep, while their weapons broke into pieces. Moses then entered the royal palace, where Pharaoh, like his guards, was sunk in a deep sleep. When the king awoke he asked Moses the name of his God; but no sooner did Moses whisper it in his ear than the king fell down like dead, and remained so until Moses brought him back to life. Thereupon Moses wrote the "Name" on a tablet, which he sealed.



A priest, "who made light of what was written on the tablet", was seized with convulsions, and died. On the miraculous opening of doors, see note 88 on vol. IV, p. 392. Comp. Index, s. v. "Name of God".

<sup>156</sup> Dibre ha-Yamim 8 (which is very likely based on Yashar Shemot, 142a, which the author of Dibre ha-Yamim had in a fuller form). As to animals being affectionate to saints, see Günter, *Legende*, s. v. "Thier".

<sup>157</sup> Alphabet of R. Akiba ('פ), 44-45; MHG II, 43; Midrash Shir 8a; Abkir in Yalkut I, 241; Wa-Yosha' 40; Mishle 26. 101; ShR 5. 14; Tan. Wa-Era 5. As to the angelic forms of Moses and Aaron, see Artapanus, 436c, and Yashar Shemot, 142a. Comp. vol. III, p. 24.

<sup>158</sup> ShR 4. 14; Tan. Wa-Era 5; comp. the sources quoted in the preceding note. The phrase "to seek the living among the dead" is also found in Luke 24. 5.

<sup>159</sup> Alphabet of R. Akiba ('פ), 45-46; ShR 5. 14; Tan. Wa-Era 5. Comp. also the sources referred to in note 157.

<sup>160</sup> Mishle 27. 101; Yashar Shemot, 142b-143a; the sources referred to in note 157. Midrash Shir 8a adds that from that moment the wisdom of the Egyptians began to decline.

<sup>161</sup> Yashar Shemot, 142a-142b; Dibre ha-Yamim 8. Jannes and Jambres, the opponents of Moses, are mentioned in 2 Timothy 3. 8, whereas *Zadokite Fragments* 18 speaks of Jannes (יחנן) and his brother. Pliny, *Natural History*, 30. 1, 11, and Apuleius, *Apologia*, 90, know only of Jannes. It is therefore safe to assume that the older form of the legend knew only of Jannes; see Ginzberg's remarks in *Unbekannte Sekte*, 240; Schürer, *Geschichte* (4th edition), III, 402-405; Index, s. v. "Jannes".

<sup>162</sup> ShR 9. 6-7; Tan. B. II, 27-28; Menahot 85a (here the original names of the two magicians are given; they are מטרס, יחנן; comp. note 80); Dibre ha-Yamim 5.

<sup>163</sup> ShR 9. 7, based on Menahot 85a, while 9. 6 is independent of the Talmud; Yashar Shemot, 142b; MHG II, 61, which gives an elaborate form of this legend.

<sup>164</sup> ShR 5. 14-23; Tan. Wa-Era 1 and 6; Tan. B. II, 20-21 and 33. Comp. note 75; note 110 on vol. I, p. 235; vol. II, pp. 248, 250. As to the scrolls read by the Hebrews on Sabbath, see note 72 and vol. III, pp. 193, 249. Mekilta RS, 13, gives two views; according

to one the Hebrews were slaves of the royal domain; while according to the other, they were the slaves of the common people.

<sup>165</sup> Mekilta RS 5; MHG II, 46; Ozar Midrashim 62b. Comp. vol. II, p. 317.

<sup>166</sup> ShR 6. 4; Tan. Wa-Era 1; Koheleth 7. 7; Sanhedrin 111a. Comp. vol. I, p. 288; vol. II, p. 319; vol. IV, p. 428. It is not on account of Moses' superiority to the fathers that God revealed unto him the Name which remained unknown to them, but because the time demanded that this revelation be made to man; Alphabet of R. Akiba (א), 26, and Shua'ib, Wa-Era, 27a. On the difference between the revelations made to the fathers and those made to other prophets, comp. Mekilta RS, 170-171, and MHG II, 50. The fathers are the "Merkabah", *i. e.*, the bearers of the divine throne; their life was an uninterrupted revelation of God; BR 82. 6. A similar statement is made by Philo; comp. note 227 on vol. I, p. 375.

<sup>167</sup> Mekilta Bo 5, 5a, and 11, 11a; Mekilta RS, 20 (אֱלֹהִים = אֱלֹהֵינוּ); ShR 6. 5, 7. 3, and 16. 2; Sifre N., 91; Zebahim 102a. Comp. vol. II, pp. 320, 361; vol. III, p. 249, and note 628 on p. 320.

<sup>168</sup> Mekilta Bo 5, 5a-5b; ShR 6. 5; WR 22. 8; BaR 13. 8 and 20 (end). Comp. vol. II, pp. 259, 300; vol. III, pp. 201, 211. The first commandment given to the Israelites was to release the Hebrew slaves in the seventh year, in order that they themselves should be found worthy to be redeemed from the Egyptian slavery; Yerushalmi Rosh ha-Shanah 3, 58d.

<sup>169</sup> ShR 8. 1-2; a somewhat different version is given in MHG II, 54, according to which Aaron was first commanded to address the people, then to appear with Moses before Pharaoh, and finally to speak to the king. As to the question whether Aaron received direct revelations from God or not, see note 405 on vol. III, p. 210.

<sup>170</sup> Philo, *Vita Mosis*, 1. 17; Tan. Wa-Era 14; ShR 12. 4 and 15. 27. Comp. vol. II, p. 348. The gnostic Manoimus (*Philosophoumena*, 8. 7) finds some connection between the ten words of creation (see vol. I, p. 44) and the ten plagues; the power of God was manifested in the ten words as well as in the ten punishments brought upon the Egyptians. The Rabbis find in the ten plagues the reward of Abraham who stood firm in the ten temptations (see vol. I, p. 217); comp. ShR 15. 27; ARN 33, 95; Yelammedenu as quoted by Sabba, Wa-Era (end).

<sup>171</sup> Tan. Bo 4; Tan. B. II, 40; PK 7, 66b-67a; PR 17, 89b and

197a; Wa-Yosha' 44-45. As to the noise makers, see vol. II, p. 109; vol. III, p. 15.

<sup>172</sup> ER 7, 40-43; Tan. Wa-Era 13-14 and, with essential variants, Tan. B II, 43; Wa-Yosha' 49-51; Dibre ha-Yamim 9-10 (the text is to be completed in accordance with the parallel passages); ShR 9-14. For further details on the plagues, comp. vol. II, pp. 347-352. The saying "one receives the measure with which he measures" (Mekilta Amalek 2, 55a; Sifre N., 106; Sotah 1, 7, and in many more places of rabbinic literature, as well as in Matthew 7. 1) is applied by the legend to explain the punishments of the Egyptians as "measure for measure" (for this phrase see Sanhedrin 90a; it is of very frequent occurrence in post-biblical literature), maintaining that each plague corresponds to a crime committed by the Egyptians against the Hebrews. This view is found not only in the later Midrashim referred to above, but also in Mekilta Beshallah 6, 32; Tosefta Sotah 3, 13 as well as in Wisdom 11. 5, *seq.* The striking resemblance between these passages of Wisdom and the Midrashim would lead one to assume that a Palestinian Midrash was the source of this apocryphal work. The parallels which Wisdom draws between the plagues and the miracles, later performed for Israel in the wilderness, are also found in rabbinic literature; comp., *e. g.*, ARN 33, 95.

<sup>173</sup> Yelammedenu quoted by Sabba, Wa-Era, towards the end; Yalkut I, 182 where מדרש is given as the source. Comp. note 170.

<sup>174</sup> 'Eduyyot 2. 10; Seder 'Olam 3. According to one view, a warning of three weeks preceded each plague, which lasted for a week; but according to the other view the duration of each plague was three weeks, preceded by a warning of one week. See ShR 9. 12; Tan. Wa-Era 13; Tan. B. II, 29; Tehillim 78, 349. A dissenting view quoted in Lekah, Exod. 8. 10, from an unknown source, states that the plagues began the first of Shebat, and ended ten weeks later, on the fifteenth of Nisan. The difference of opinion concerning the duration of the plagues is in one way or another connected with the legend that Moses left Egypt for some time (three or six months) after his first visit to Pharaoh; see PK 5, 49a, and parallel passages cited by Buber; comp. also Buber's notes on Lekah, *loc. cit.*; vol. II, p. 295. See note 34 on vol. II, 240.

<sup>175</sup> ShR 9. 8; Tan. Wa-Era 14; Midrash Aggada Exod. 8. 16 (this is the only passage which remarks that the Egyptians are like asses; comp. vol. I, p. 279); Lekah, Exod. *loc. cit.* which quotes Hashkem. This legend, which is a satire on the deification of the Caesars, is found in

an expanded and elaborate form, in MHG II, 67. According to Mo'ed Katan 18a, Pharaoh was a magus and was therefore in the habit of bathing every morning in the water to perform his religious duties; comp. Rashi, *ad loc.*; Shabbat 75a; Targum Yerushalmi Exod. 7. 15. On the deification of the Caesars see vol. I, p. 178; vol. IV, p. 335.

<sup>176</sup> ShR 9. 9-11; Tan. Wa-Era, 13; Tan. B. II, 29. As to the warning, see note 174 and Lekah, Exod. 8. 15, 10. 23, where it is maintained that no warning was given before the third, sixth, and ninth plagues. Lekah is the source for many of the medieval writers (Shu'aib, R. Bahya, *Hadar*, and many others), who have this statement about the warning. The proverb "beat the idols, etc." is found in Ahikar (comp. Ginzberg, *Jewish Encyclopedia*, s. v. "Ahikar"). That the first plague was a punishment for worshipping the Nile is also found in Philo, *Vita Mosis*, 1. 17 and 2 (3). 24. Artapanus, 435c maintains that the inundation of the Nile never took place before Moses (Aaron?) smote it with his rod. The plague of blood was the punishment for drowning the male children of the Hebrews; Wisdom 11. 6 and MHG II, 62.

<sup>177</sup> ShR 9. 11; ER 7. 41 (see Friedmann, note 14); MHG II, 62. In the later source it is stated that even the juice of the fruit was changed into blood, and that all the liquids had the odor of blood. See also Yashar Bo, 143b, and vol. II, p. 367.

<sup>178</sup> Tehillim 88, 349; MHG II, 63; ShR 9. 10; Tan. Wa-Era 13; Zohar II, 28. Comp. also Josephus, *Antiqui.*, II, 14. 1; Wisdom 11. 6-8; Philo, *Vita Mosis*, I. 26. All these authors dwell upon the fact that the very same water which turned blood for the Egyptians remained in its natural state for the Hebrews. Artapanus, 435c writes: Threatened by Pharaoh with death, the magicians brought forth a serpent which made the water return to its natural state; hence Pharaoh remained stubborn. According to MHG II, 62, Pharaoh himself was not affected by the first plague (three reasons are given why he was spared), and hence the hardness of his heart. Comp. note 181.

<sup>179</sup> ShR 10. 2-6; Tan. Wa-Era 14; Tehillim 78, 450 and 452; ER 7. 41; Yashar Bo, 143b; Dibre ha-Yamim 9, which reads: The plague of the frogs was the severest of all the ten; see ShR 15. 21. In Sanhedrin 67b one opinion is quoted to the effect that only one frog came from the water, but in the shortest time conceivable it produced innumerable frogs. As to the croaking of the frogs, see, in addition to the sources referred to above, MHG II, 64, and note 171. On the sacrifices brought by the frogs in the fulfilment of their mission, see also Pesahim 53b; Tehillim 28, 229. Comp. also Philo, *Vita*

*Mosis*, 1. 18, and Josephus, *Antiqui.*, II, 14. 2. The crocodiles in the Nile are descended from the frogs sent over Egypt; MHG II, 64.

<sup>180</sup> Tehillim 27, 299.

<sup>181</sup> ShR 10. 5-6; Tan. Wa-Era 14. Comp. also MHG II, 64 (7) and 67, where Pharaoh's sufferings are described in detail; it is also stated that the king was the first to be attacked by the frogs; see ShR, *loc. cit.*, and ER 7. 41. Moses prayed for Pharaoh in a synagogue which was situated outside the city (comp. Exod. 9. 29 and Lekah, *ad loc.*), because he did not think it right to pray to God in a "city defiled by idols"; Mekilta Bo 1b; ShR 12. 5-6. Shemuel 8. 69, on the contrary, maintains that God revealed Himself to Moses in Pharaoh's palace; comp. vol. II, p. 361.

<sup>182</sup> Philo, *Vita Mosis*, 1. 26.

<sup>183</sup> ShR 10. 2, 6-7 and 15. 10; Tan. Wa-Era 14; MHG II, 62. The third plague is, according to the unanimous opinion of the Rabbis, the plague of lice (ER 7, 41 gives the names of fourteen kinds of them), whereas Philo, *Vita Mosis*, 1. 19, understands σκνις used by the Septuagint to translate the Hebrew כנב to signify a certain kind of gnat; Josephus, *Antiqui.*, II, 4. 2, agrees with the view of the Rabbis. Meiri, Abot 5. 5, quotes, from the Talmud, the following sentence concerning the lice: שדיו נמצאים אצלם ולא מויקים אוחם כלל. As far as can be ascertained, this passage does not occur in our texts of the Talmud. Shu'aib, Wa-Era, quotes the same sentence as דעת רז"ל, and does not give the Talmud as source.

<sup>184</sup> Mekilta RS, 172; MHG II, 66. Comp. the following note.

<sup>185</sup> ShR 10. 7 and 11. 2; Tan. Wa-Era 14; Sanhedrin 67b. These sources also give the dissenting view to the effect that the magicians were no more able to produce the first two plagues than the third; all they succeeded in doing was to produce an optical illusion upon Pharaoh, who was thus deceived in believing the claim of the magicians. Lekah, Exod. 8. 12, writes: Magicians are only able to perform their art when their feet touch the ground, and since the ground was covered by the lice (ShR 10.6 and Yashar Bo, 142b), they were doomed to failure. The same statement is also found in Shu'aib, *Hadar* and *Da'at* on Exod., *loc. cit.*, who are very likely based upon Lekah. The first two plagues were produced by the magicians with the assistance of Ben Zadua', the chief of the demons; Sabba, Wa-Era, 69d; comp. ShR 10. 4. "The finger of God" was apparent in the third plague, as it was a small gnat which caused such a lot of harm to the Egyptians; Philo, *Vita Mosis*, 1. 19; see the similar remark of the Rabbis concerning

the small "gnat" in Gittin 56b. The ground turned into lice (which stung the Egyptians like needles as soon as they put down their feet), with the result that the Hebrews were no longer forced to make bricks, as the material necessary was no longer available. MHG II, 65.

<sup>186</sup> Mo'ed Katan 18a; Targum Yerushalmi Exod. 7. 5; comp. note 175 (end).

<sup>187</sup> ShR 11. 1. Sabba, Wa-Era 69d, quoting from the "Book Concerning the Laws of Kings", writes: On the day of new moon and on the day of full moon the kings of Egypt used to offer sacrifices on the bank of the Nile before sunrise. ShR, *loc. cit.*, also presupposes that Pharaoh was in the habit of betaking himself every morning to the river's bank for the purpose of praying. Comp. the sources referred to in the preceding note and in note 175.

<sup>188</sup> Tehillim 78, 349-350 (נְעוּרֵיהֶם) from נָעַר "he mixed" (= עָרִיב); ShR 11. 2-3 and 16. 27; Yashar Bo, 143a; Dibre ha-Yamim 9; Wa-Yosha' 50; MHG II, 67-68; Tan. Wa-Era 14 and Bo 4; Tan. B. II, 43. The panthers and the lions (סִילֹנִיּוֹת) (see Yashar and Dibre ha-Yamim, not כַּמְלִיּוֹת or סַמְלִיּוֹת as in Tehillim) are mentioned in particular as the animals which caused the greatest havoc and destruction among the Egyptians. See also Midrash Aggada (which is very likely based on Yashar, reading יָרִים instead of אָמַח) and Sekel on Exod. 8. 20. The prevailing view in rabbinic literature, shared also by Josephus, *Antiqui.*, II, 14. 3, and Wisdom II. 15-20, is that the fourth plague עָרִיב consisted of a mixture of wild animals attacking the Egyptians, whereas Septuagint, Exod. 8. 17, and Philo, *Vita Mosis*, 1. 23, take עָרִיב to be the Hebrew name of the stinging fly. Some of the Tannaim (comp. ShR and Tehillim *loc. cit.*) agree with the latter interpretation of עָרִיב; hence the statement in ShR that the עָרִיב darkened the sun and the moon. The later rabbinic sources combine the two old views concerning עָרִיב; comp. also Targum Yerushalmi Exod. 8. 17 and ER 7, 42. After the third plague had forced the Egyptians to release the Hebrews from the work of making bricks (comp. note 185), they employed them as domestic servants to attend to their children. God therefore sent the fourth plague which killed many of the Egyptian children.

<sup>189</sup> ShR 11. 2-3. Comp. also MHG II, 68-69, and I, 160.

<sup>190</sup> Mekilta RS, 172; MHG II, 68-69 (here it is shown in detail how each plague caused death to man and beast alike); ShR 10. 2; Tehillim 78, 355. After the fourth plague had killed the children of the Egyptians (comp. note 188), the Hebrews were employed by

their masters as shepherds to take care of the animals. Whereupon the fifth plague came, and annihilated the live stock; MHG II, 68.

<sup>191</sup> ShR 11. 4-6; Tan. Wa-Era 14. BR 5. 7 and parallel passages cited by Theodor, as well as Midrash Tannaim 56, maintain that on this occasion a miracle happened and the "narrow space held much more than its capacity": the fist of Moses and Aaron held enough ashes to spread all over Egypt. Comp. the similar miracle vol. III, 180. The phrase "it reached God's throne" is also found in vol. I, p. 389.

<sup>192</sup> Baba Kamma 80b; comp. also Ketubot 77a; BR 41. 2 and Ozar Midrashim 55, with regard to the twenty-four kinds of this disease.

<sup>193</sup> PRE 48 (the complete text is only found in Yalkut I, 184); comp. ShR 11. 6 and 20. 1, as well as note 185.

<sup>194</sup> ShR 12. 1-7; Tan. Wa-Era 14-17; Tan. B. II, 34-37; Tehillim 78, 353-354; Targum Yerushalmi Exod. 9. 20-21 and 29; MHG II, 71-75; PK 1, 3b-4a; Philo, *Vita Mosis*, 1. 20; Wisdom 16. 15-23. Comp. also note 181; vol. I, p. 244; vol. IV, p. 10. On Job see Yerushalmi Sotah 5, 20c (bottom), and Zohar II, 34a. Sabba, Wa-Era (end) quotes an unknown midrashic explanation of Exod. 9. 32.

<sup>195</sup> ShR 13. 4-5.

<sup>196</sup> Lekah on Exod. 10. 10. Comp. vol. III, p. 13. Another version of this legend is found in Midrash Shir 15a-15b which reads: Pharaoh said: I see that the unlucky star by the name of Ra' (=evil) will meet you, and this indicates blood. His mistake was that this blood had reference to the blood shed at the circumcision performed by Joshua when entering the Holy Land (Josh. 5. 3), and not to the slaying of Israel.

<sup>197</sup> ShR 13. 6-7; Tan. Wa-Era 14; Targum Yerushalmi Exod. 10. 19. Zebahim 102a asserts that on this occasion Pharaoh boxed the ears of Moses who let this incident pass unnoticed, since one is obliged to be respectful to a king; comp. vol. II, p. 361 (end of paragraph).

<sup>198</sup> ShR 14. 1-3; Tan. Bo. 1-3; Tan. B. II, 38-40; Yashar Bo, 114b; Philo, *Vita Mosis*, 1. 21; Wisdom 17-18; Josephus, *Antiqui.*, II, 14. 5. The last-named writer speaks of the death of many people caused by the darkness. Similarly the Rabbis maintain that the wicked in Israel died during the darkness; Mekilta Beshallah (מקילתא בשאלה), 24a; Mekilta RS, 38; PK 5, 50b; Shir 2. 13; Targum Yerushalmi Exod. 10. 23; comp. vol. II, p. 345; vol. III, p. 42. As to the darkness

at the Red Sea, see vol. III, p. 21; on the darkness of hell see Seder Rabbah de-Bereshit 15. Comp. note 233.

<sup>199</sup> Philo, *Vita Mosis*, 1. 21.

<sup>200</sup> ShR 18. 1. Comp. Zohar I, 195b and II, 26a; vol. II, pp. 340-341, as well as note 197. According to PR, 197b, God revealed to Moses on this occasion that He would bring upon Egypt "one more plague", without informing him of the nature of the last plague. When the death of the first-born took place, Moses knew that this was the last plague of which God had spoken. Comp. note 181.

<sup>201</sup> Hallel 94; Tehillim 114, 472; PRE 29; ShR 17. 3; Tan. Wa-Era 4 (the redemption is described here as a reward for Abraham's piety); PK 5, 47a, and 7, 63b; Shir 1. 5; Mekilta Bo 11, 11a, Targum Yerushalmi Exod. 12. 21. Comp. notes 105-107 and 204.

<sup>202</sup> Mekilta Bo 1, 2b-3a; PK 5, 54b; PR 15, 78a; Tan. Shemini 8; Tan. B. II, 48; III, 28, IV, 46; WR 13. 4; BaR 15. 4; ShR 15. 28 (only this passage speaks of the holy anointing oil); Sifre N., 61; Menahot 29a; Hullin 42a. Comp. Astruc, 99.

<sup>203</sup> PK 5, 55a; PR 15, 78a-78b. According to ShR 15. 20, the first Nisan was "proclaimed holy" by the court consisting of God as the president and Moses and Aaron as His assessors. On the "secret of the calendar" (סוד העבור) revealed to Moses, see PRE 8; Leket Midrashim 2a; PK 5, 43b. Sabba Bo 71b, quotes, from an unknown source (the same as that referred to in note 194?), the statement that the Jewish calendar was introduced as a protest against the Egyptian one which was a part of their system of idolatry.

<sup>204</sup> PK 5, 47b; Shir 2. 8; ShR 15. 4. Comp. notes 105-107 and 201.

<sup>205</sup> ShR 15. 2-3 and 11. 3. Comp. the sources referred to in note 202.

<sup>206</sup> PK 5, 55a-55b; PR 15, 78b; ShR 16. 2-3; Mekilta Bo 5, 5b, and 6, 6b; Philo, Exod. 1. 6 and 2. 11-12. Comp. also the quotation from Tan. in Makiri, Ps. 119, 220; Targum Yerushalmi and Lekah on Exod. 12. 6. A different view is given in Wisdom 19. 9, according to which the Hebrews brought their sacrifice in secret, so that it should not be known to the Egyptians. The legend about the selection of the paschal lamb is an attempt of the Haggadah to explain the Halakah (see Tosefta Pesahim 8. 11-18), according to which the command concerning the selection of the paschal lamb, as well as several other regulations about the Passover service given in Exod. 12, are of temporary character, applying only to the first Passover.



Many medieval authors quote a Midrash to the effect that the Egyptians attacked the Israelites on the tenth of Nisan, when they saw the preparations made by them to kill the animals which the former worshipped. In remembrance of the great miracle performed to the Israelites on that day, the Sabbath preceding Passover is called The Great Sabbath (שבת הגדול), the tenth of Nisan at that time happening to be on a Sabbath. See *Ha-Orah* 20; Mahzor Vitry 222; *Shibbole ha-Leket* 159; *Orehot Hayyim* I, 70a; *Hadar*, Exod. 12. 3; Shu'aib, Zaw, 47c. On the origin of the name "The Great Sabbath", see Zunz, *Ritus*, 10; Chwolson, *Passamahl*, 65, note 3 (ignorant of Zunz's remarks); Elbogen, *Jüdischer Gottesdienst*, 550-551.

<sup>207</sup> ShR 16. 1. For the opposite view see vol II, pp. 330-331, and vol. III, p. 87, as well as MHG II, 43. In the last-named source it is said that the elders refused to accompany Moses and Aaron to Pharaoh. Their motive for this refusal was honorable, though mistaken, and was not due to lack of courage.

<sup>208</sup> ShR 1. 36 and 17. 2-3.

<sup>209</sup> ShR 19. 5; BaR 11. 3 and 14. 12; ShR 1. 12 and 3. 7 (משקד = מצרץ?); Ruth R 3. 8; Wa-Yosha' 47-48. Comp. note 201 and Index, s. v. "Circumcision".

<sup>210</sup> Targum Yerushalmi Exod. 19. 4. which is perhaps based on a text of Mekilta Yithro 2, 62b, different from that of the editions. "Flying in the air" is quite a common feat of saints in Christian legends; see Günter, *Legende*, 57 and 63.

<sup>211</sup> PK 7, 65a; PR 17, 88a; Tehillim 136, 520; Tan. B. II 51-52; Wa-Yosha' 50-51; Dibre ha-Yamim 10 (with some variants). In the battle between fathers and sons not less than sixty myriads (equal to the number of Israel at the time of the Exodus) were slain.

<sup>212</sup> PK 7, 64b; PR 17, 87b and 197b; Tan. B. II, 52; Dibre ha-Yamim 10; ShR 18. 3; Tehillim 78, 355, and 105, 452. The text of Tan. as given in the printed editions is abridged; Makiri, Ps. 105, 155, and Dibre ha-Yamim had the complete text before them. On the dissolute life of the Egyptians see note 68 on vol. I, p. 222.

<sup>213</sup> Mekilta RS, 52. This does not form part of the genuine Mekilta; see Ginzberg's remarks, *Geonica*, I, 167, where references are given to several medieval authors who mention this legend. The following references may be added: *Kozari* III, 73; *Pa'aneah* on Exod. 13. 18; Mahzor Vitry, 293; Passover Haggadah according to the Bagdad and Bene Israel rituals; comp. also Targum Yerushalmi Exod. 12. 12, and vol. III, p. 26. In tannaitic sources great stress is laid on the

fact that the slaying of the first-born and the redemption from Egypt were directly accomplished by God Himself (see Mekilta Bo 7, 7b, and 13, 13b; Midrash Tannaim 173; Passover Haggadah, and many other tannaitic sources), whereas in later literature the view is also expressed to the effect that the slaying of the first-born was performed by an angel; see ShR 15. 5 and 19, as well as 17. 5 and 29. 8; BaR 11, 89a (God appeared in Egypt alone without being accompanied by angels); Shir 1. 14; Targum Yerushalmi Num. 20. 16 is a literal translation of the Hebrew text. Zohar I, 117a, and III, 149a, gives a semi-mystical explanation why the redemption from Egypt was performed directly by God Himself. Comp. Yerushalmi Sanhedrin 2, 20a (where, perhaps, *ולא* instead of *וכל* is to be read), and note 216. That the last plague took place exactly at midnight (Moses, as a human being, said "about midnight"; see Exod. 11. 4) is also stated in Mekilta Bo 13, 13a. Comp. note 44 on vol. III, p. 26.

<sup>214</sup> ShR 18. 2; Shir 1. 14.

<sup>215</sup> Unknown Midrash quoted in Eshkol I, 17; *Shibbole ha-Leket* 41 (read *קח* instead of *אברהם*); *Orehot Hayyim* I, 43 (ב); Shu'aib, Bo, 29c. It is quite likely that Eshkol is the source (directly or indirectly) of the other authorities mentioned.

<sup>216</sup> Jub. 49. 2. Yalkut, Song of Songs 5. 2, quoting an unknown Midrash, reads: On that night God sent a sweet sleep over Israel, so that they should not be terrified by the "destroyer" (see Exod. 12. 23); they nevertheless noticed, in their sleep, the death agony of their enemies. Comp. Midrash Shir 38; Targum Yerushalmi Exod. 12. 42, and note 213. In Targum Yerushalmi Exod. 4. 25 "the destroying angel" stands for Satan, which is in agreement with Jub. 48. 2, where it is explicitly stated that Moses on his way to Egypt was attacked by Satan (comp. notes 99 and 146). See also Mekilta RS, 21. That the punishment of the Egyptians took place at night was due to the fact that the wicked are punished by God in the darkness of the night; see PR 19a; ShR 18. 9, and parallel passages given by Buber, Aggadat Esther 59. Comp. note 170 on vol. I, 253.

<sup>217</sup> Mekilta Bo 7, 7b and 13, 13b.

<sup>218</sup> Mekilta Bo 13, 13b; Mekilta RS, 23-24 (the number of the first-born who died amounted to sixty myriads; see note 211); comp. also Midrash Shir 24a, which is very likely the source of Lekah, Exod. 11. 9, and *Al-Zulm*, 110; PK 7, 64b-65a; PR 17, 87b-88a.

<sup>219</sup> PK 7, 65b; PR 17, 88b; ShR 18. 10.

<sup>220</sup> Mekilta Bo 13, 13b.

<sup>221</sup> Mekilta Bo 13, 13b; Mekilta RS, 13-14; Yashar Bo, 144b; Targum Yerushalmi Exod 12. 12 and Num. 33. 4; Tan. B. V, 32; Sukkah 29a. Comp. vol. II, pp. 250 and 348, as well as vol. III, p. 10. For further details on the punishment of the "gods" and the "heavenly princes", see note 41 on vol. III, p. 25.

<sup>222</sup> Mekilta Bo 13, 73a; Targum Yerushalmi Exod. 12. 29. Comp. Berakot 9b. Pharaoh himself, the first-born of his parents, was the only one who escaped death on that night; Mekilta, *loc. cit.* For a dissenting view see vol. II, pp. 297-298.

<sup>223</sup> Wa-Yosha' 48, which is very likely based on a fuller text of Tan. B. II, 52. Comp. the following note.

<sup>224</sup> Tan. B. II, 52; Wa-Yosha' 47 (a different source is made use of on p. 48). Comp. Mekilta Bo 13, 13b.

<sup>225</sup> Wa-Yosha' 48; Tan. B. II, 52-53. Moses refused to leave the house; see Mekilta Bo 13, 13b; Tehillim 113, 469; Hallel 87. That the Hallel was first sung on this night is also mentioned in Yerushalmi Pesahim 5, 32c, ShR 18. 9, and is very likely presupposed in Wisdom 18. 9; whereas according to Pesahim 117a, this paean was composed by Moses and Israel after they had crossed the Red Sea; see note 238 and vol. III, p. 31. Pesahim 117a, *seq.*, contains several other views concerning the composition of the Hallel. Towards the end of the second Commonwealth the Hallel was chanted in the temple during the sacrifice of the paschal lamb and at the time of the Passover meal. The latter custom is still observed to-day; see Pesahim 5. 7 and 10. 6.—The episode of the meeting between Pharaoh and Moses is differently narrated in Midrash Shir 24a, where it is said that Moses even refused to look at the king, reminding him of his own words warning him (Moses) never to see his face again; see vol. II, p. 361. On the death of those who had not been known to have been the first-born of their parents, see vol. II, pp. 365-366.—Jub. 49. 5 reads: And Israel ate the meat of the paschal lamb, drank wine (see Pesahim 10. 1), and gave praise and thanks. The Hebrew original read perhaps יהודיו ואמרו הלל, which means "they gave praise and chanted the Hallel".

<sup>226</sup> Yashar Bo, 144b-145a; PK 7, 65a; ShR 18. 3; Mishle 31, 111. On the view that Bithiah entered paradise alive see note 61. Artapanus, 433c-433d, maintains that Moses (before his flight from Egypt) called the place, where he buried his foster-mother, Merois, after her name, which was Meroe. The Egyptians, he adds, pay as much homage to Merois as to Isis. Comp. note 58 and vol. II, p. 297.

<sup>227</sup> Wa-Yosha' 48-49; Tehillim 113, 469-470. Comp. the following note.

<sup>228</sup> Pesahim 94a; Targum Yerushalmi Exod. 12. 31; Yerushalmi Pesahim 5, 32a, which has the additional remark that the voice of Moses was heard through the whole land of Egypt. The Hallel chanted on that occasion consisted of the first part (*i. e.*, Ps. 113) only. Comp. note 225. As to the voice of Moses see vol. III, p. 93.

<sup>229</sup> Tan. B. II, 52-53; Wa-Yosha' 4 (the text is incomplete); ARN 39. 8; Tehillim 113, 469.

<sup>230</sup> Mekilta RS, 24; Zohar II, 45a-45b (very likely on the basis of older sources), remarks that during this night three calamities befell the Egyptians: 1) the battle between the first-born and their fathers, which resulted in many deaths (see vol. II, p. 355); 2) the slaying of the first-born; 3) the carnage caused by Pharaoh among the magistrates who had advised him not to release the Hebrews from bondage.

<sup>231</sup> Targum Yerushalmi Exod. 12. 32. Comp. Mekilta Bo 13, 14a, and Onkelos Exod., *loc. cit.*

<sup>232</sup> Mekilta RS, 25-26; comp. vol. III, pp. 11 and 27, as well as vol. IV, p. 411. The holy spirit rested upon the Israelites, and caused the Egyptians not only to love them but also to fear them, as if they were gods. Although Moses and Aaron were too busy with other things (comp. vol. II, pp. 181-182, and vol. III, pp. 5-6; but nothing is said there about Aaron being extremely busy) to spend their time in borrowing silver and gold from the Egyptians, they nevertheless did not go out empty-handed, as they were in possession of many treasures deposited with them by the Egyptians, who had great confidence in them. Comp. the following note.

<sup>233</sup> Philo, *Vita Mosis*, 1. 25; Jub. 48. 18 (which reads: In return for the service which they were forced to render to the Egyptians); Sanhedrin 91a; Megillat Ta'anit 3 (scholiast); BR 28. 7 (which reads: The treasures which the Israelites took with them from Egypt became the cause of misfortune for them); Josephus, *Antiqui.*, II, 14. 6, who says: The Egyptians gave presents to the departing Israelites. The same view is held by Sa'adya (Responsum published by Kis, *Gaonic Responsumok*, 17 and comp. *J.Q.R.*, New Series, III, 427, as well as Poznanski, *Mabo*, 48) who remarks that מָנָה, Exod. 3. 22 and 11. 2, has the same meaning as מָנָה; accordingly God's command to the Israelites was to solicit gifts from the Egyptians. The commentators R. Hananel and RSBM on Exod., *loc. cit.*, follow Sa'adya Gaon without mentioning his name; whereas the Church Fathers ex-

cuse "the borrowing" on the same ground as Philo and the old rabbinic sources; comp. Tertullian, *Adv. Marcion.* 2. 30; Clemens Alexandrinus, *Stromata*, 1. 23; Augustine *C. Faustum*, 12, 71; Theodoretus *Exod.* 11. 2. See Lévi, *R.E.J.*, LXIII, 211 and 310. In Berakot 9b it is emphasized that the Israelites did not want to borrow from the Egyptians as they were commanded; they were satisfied with the regaining of their freedom, and did not care for riches. But God insisted that they should "oblige Him" in this matter, so that Abraham should not complain, saying: "God fulfilled His saying 'and they shall serve them, and they shall afflict them', but did not carry out His promise 'and afterwards shall they come out with great substance' ". Comp. Gen. 15. 13-14. Lekah, *Exod.* 11. 2, maintains that a part of the Egyptian treasure was appropriated by the Israelites during the three days of darkness, when the Egyptians could not see what the Israelites did to them. This view, however, flatly contradicts that of the old sources; see Mekilta RS, *loc. cit.*; Tan. B. III, 39, and the references given in note 198.

<sup>234</sup> PRE 48 and Targum Yerushalmi *Exod.* 24. 10 (which partly follows Yerushalmi *Sukkah* 4, 54c, where it is said, with reference to *Exod. loc. cit.*, that the "brick of sapphire" = the paved work sapphire, was placed under the divine throne in remembrance of the bricks which the Israelites had to furnish to their masters). *Hadar*, *Exod.* 4. 4, reads, in PRE, *loc. cit.*, Gabriel instead of Michael, and this reading is indirectly suggested by Targum Yerushalmi, *loc. cit.* According to a commonly accepted view, however, the Israelites at this time had ceased to serve the Egyptians; comp. Rosh ha-Shanah 11b, which reads: On the first of Tishri (*i. e.*, six and a half months before the *Exod.*; comp. note 174) our fathers ceased to serve the Egyptians.

<sup>235</sup> 1 Targum Yerushalmi *Exod.* 12. 42 and 2 Targum Yerushalmi *Exod.* 15. 18 (on the text of 2 Targum see Eisler, *Beiträge*, IV, 144-145, who is of the opinion that two readings are blended together in our present text; according to one, the second memorable night was the night in which God appeared to Abraham, and according to the other, this night refers to the one when Jacob crossed the Jabok); PK 17, 129b; PR, 195b-196a. It is quite likely that in the last-named passage reference is made to the time of darkness when God punished the wicked and not to the night of Passover; see ShR 18. 12; Yelammedenu in *Yalkut*, Ps. 25; note 216, and note 170 on vol. I, p. 253. Comp. note 76 on vol. I, p. 224; vol. IV, p. 431. As to the part to be played

by Moses in the time to come see vol. II, p. 302, and vol. III, pp. 312-313. Comp. Mekilta Bo 14, 16b; Tertullian, *De Baptismo*, 19; Alfred Jeremias, *Babylonisches im Neuen Testament*, 41.—In the time to come the redemption from Egypt will lose its significance, for the redemption from the "Kingdoms" will be uppermost in men's minds; Tosefta Berakot 1. 10; Babli 12b-13a; Yerushalmi 1, 9a. On the Passover in the Messianic times, see Lekah Exod. 12. 16. See also Berakot 1 (end).

<sup>236</sup> Tosefta Pesahim 10. 9 (at noon); Shabbat 86b; Mekilta RS, 24; PRE 48. There is a close relationship between this view and the legend that the first-born suffered the agony of death from midnight till the following morning, when they finally expired; see PR, 17, 87b; Semahot 1; comp. also for a dissenting view in ShR 18. 2; note 116.

<sup>237</sup> Zohar II, 38a-38b. A similar view is found in Wisdom 18. 15-20.

<sup>238</sup> Zohar III, 149a; comp. vol. III, p. 32.

<sup>239</sup> Tehillim 105, 452, and 114, 470.

<sup>240</sup> Zohar II, 45a. On "the exile of the Shekinah" comp. note 9 on vol. II, pp. 187-188; vol. III, p. 63; on the heavenly fragrance see vol. II, p. 364. Comp. vol. III, p. 78.

<sup>241</sup> Mekilta Bo 14, 14b, and Yitro 2, 62b; Mekilta RS, 26 and 40-41; Tan. Bo 9; Tehillim 107, 462. On the view that Moses' voice was heard throughout the land of Egypt, see note 228; on the extension of Egypt see vol. III., p. 364 and vol. III, p. 6. The "seven clouds of glory" are often spoken of in rabbinic literature; see Tosefta Sotah 4. 2; Sifre N., 83 (according to some authorities there were only four, while others maintain that there were only two clouds of glory); Sifre Z., 192; Baraita di-Meleket ha-Mishkan 14; Targum Yerushalmi Exod. 12. 37; BaR 1. 2; ER 12. 60; Mekilta Beshallah (פתיחתה), 25a; Tan. B. IV, 2-3, and מנחה, 146-147; comp. also Sifra 24, 43, and Justin, *Dialogue*, 131. See further vol. III, pp. 38, 54, 234, 316, 335.

<sup>242</sup> Sifre N., 83; Sifra 24, 3; Shabbat 22b; Baraita di-Meleket ha-Mishkan 14; Midrash Tannaim 13; comp. the references cited in the preceding note. The garments given to them by the angels (at the revelation on Sinai?) grew with them, and the clouds of glory caused them to remain clean and perfect during the forty years of their wandering through the wilderness; see PK 10, 92a-92b (מעטפין) implies that the clouds covered their garments like a cloak; DR 7.

11; Tehillim 13, 200; Shir 4. 11; Justin, *Dialogue*, 131. Comp. vol. III, pp. 331, 481.

<sup>243</sup> Mekilta RS, 41; Tehillim 105, 452. For the opposite view see Midrash Tannaim 13. They distinguished between day and night by the shade of the light spread by the clouds: it was red (glaring bright) after sunset, and white (pale) after sunrise; Baraita di-Mel-eket ha-Mishkan 14; Makiri on Is. 60, 1. Comp. vol. I, p. 162 (bottom).

<sup>244</sup> Mekilta Beshallah (בְּשַׁלַּח), 25b; Shabbat 23b; Tosefta Sotah 4. 2.

<sup>245</sup> Sifre N., 83; Sifre Z., 192; Zohar II, 191b (it is the only source which excludes the mixed multitude); comp. vol. III, p. 57.

<sup>246</sup> Mekilta Bo 14, 15a, and Shirah 9, 42b; Mekilta RS, 26; Targum Yerushalmi Exod. 12. 37-38. According to Philo, *Vita Mosis*, 1. 27, the mixed multitude consisted of two distinct classes: one was made up of bastards, the sons of Egyptian women and Hebrew men; to the second belonged all those who out of love for the God of Isreal followed His people. ShR 18. 1 likewise speaks of the pious among the Egyptians who even before the last plague had proclaimed their belief in the true God, and celebrated the Passover together with the Israclites. Comp. Index, *s. v.*, "Mixed Multitude".

<sup>247</sup> Mekilta Bo 14, 15b; ER 17, 85. Comp. vol. III, p. 37.

<sup>248</sup> Mekilta Bo 13, 14a; Mekilta RS, 24; Targum Yerushalmi Exod. 12. 34.





## LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS OF TITLES OF BOOKS

- Abkat Rokel רבך רובל... אבקת רובל, Warsaw 1876, quoted by book and chapter.
- Abudrahim אבדורחם, Warsaw 1877, quoted by section and page.
- Aggadat Bereshit אגדת בראשית ed. Buber, Cracow 1902, quoted by chapter and page.
- Aggadat 'Olam Katan אגדת עולם קטן ed. Jellinek, Bet Ha-Midrash, V, 57-59.
- Aggadat Shir אגדת שיר השירים ed. Schechter, Cambridge 1896.
- Al-Barceloni אלברצלוני... מירוש ספר יצירה להרב... ברצלוני ed. Halberstam, Berlin 1885.
- Aphraates. The Homilies of Aphraates ed. by Wright, London 1869.
- Alphabet of R. Akiba 1 and 2 מדרש אלפא ביתא דרבי עקיבא ed. Jellinek, Bet ha-Midrash III, 12-64.
- Alphabet of Ben Sira 1 and 2 אלפא ביתא דבן סירא ראשונה ושניה ed. Steinschneider, Berlin 1858.
- Alphabetot אלפא ביתא מדרש ed. Wertheimer, מדרש אחיות דרבי עקיבא, 81-121, Jerusalem 1914.
- ARN 1 and 2. מסכת אבות דרבי נתן בשתי נוסחאות ed. Schechter, Vienna 1887, quoted by chapter and page.
- Artapanus ארטאפאנוס in Eusebius, Praep. Evang.
- 'Asarah Haruge Malkut מעשה עשרה מכות הרוגי מלכות ed. Jellinek, Bet ha-Midrash VI, 19-35.
- 'Aseret ha-Dibrot עשרת הדברות מדרש ed. Jellinek, Bet ha-Midrash I, 62-90 (quoted by page) and in חבור מעשיות דבור מעשיות, Venice, 1605, quoted by Commandment.
- 'Aseret Melakim עשרת מלכים מדרש ed. Horowitz, Bibliotheca Haggadica I, 38-55, Frankfort o. M. 1881.
- R. Asher. Glosses on the Pentateuch by R. Asher b. Jechiel; comp. Hadar. Astruc. R. Solomon Astruc מדרשי החורף ed. Eppenstein, Berlin 1889.
- ATAO. A. Jeremias, Das alte Testament im Lichte des alten Orients, Leipsic 1907.
- Ayyumah Ka-Nidgalot איומה כנודלות by R. Isaac Onkeneira, Berlin 1701.
- Baer, Siddur סדר עבודת ישראל ed. Roedelheim 1868.
- R. Bahya. Commentary on the Pentateuch by R. Bahya b. Asher, Warsaw 1853, quoted by chapter and verse.
- Bar. מדרש במדבר רבה ed. Wilna 1887, quoted by chapter and paragraph.
- Baraita di-Ma'aseh Bereshit ed. Chones in Buber, יריעות שלמה, 47-50, Warsaw 1896.
- Baraita di Mazzalot בריתא דמזלות ed. Wertheimer, אוצר מדרשים כתבי יד, 1-28, Jerusalem, 1913.
- Baraita di-Shemuel בריתא דשמואל הקטן ed. Frankfort o. M. 1863.
- Barceloni; See Al-Barceloni.
- Baruch, Greek. The Greek Apocalypse of Baruch ed. James, Texts and Studies vol. V, Cambridge, 1897.
- 3 Baruch. See Baruch, Greek.
- Batte Midrashot בתי מדרשות Vols. I-IV ed. Wertheimer, Jerusalem 1893-1897.
- Ben ha-Meleq בן המלך והמיר ed. Mantua 1557, quoted by chapter.
- Bertinoro. Glosses on the Pentateuch in בעלי החוספות על חמשה חומשי תורה ed. Warsaw 1876.
- BHM Vols. I-VI. בית המדרש ed. Jellinek, Leipsic 1853-1877, quoted by volume and page.
- BR. מדרש בראשית רבה ed. Wilna 1887, quoted by chapter and paragraph Comp. also Theodor.

## List of Abbreviations

- Caro, Isaac חזקוני, Constantinople 1518, quoted by chapter and verse.
- Codex Naz. Codex Nazareus ed. Norberg, Copenhagen s. a.
- Da'at ספר דעת זקנים והוא חבור כולל על התורה הראשון מרבתינו בעלי התוספות... והשני ספר מנחם יהודה מרבינו יהודה בר אליעזר, Leghorn 1783.
- Debir דביר מאסף עתי לחכמת ישראל, Berlin 1923.
- Demetrius *περὶ τῶν ἐν τῇ Ἰουδαίᾳ βασιλέων* in Eusebius, Praep. Evang. Derek Erez Z. ארץ וזמא ed. Tawrogli, Königsberg 1885.
- Dibre ha-Yamim or Hayyamim דברי הימים של משה רבינו ע"ה ed. Jellinek, Bet ha-Midrash, II, 1-11.
- DR מדרש דברים רבה ed. Wilna 1887, quoted by chapter and paragraph.
- DZ לקוטים ממדרש אלה הדברים [זוטא] Buber, Vienna 1885.
- Ekah מדרש איכה רבה ed. Buber, Wilna 1899, quoted by chapter and page, or ed. Wilna 1887, quoted by chapter and verse.
- Eldad אלדד הדני ed. Epstein, Presburg 1891.
- Eleh Ezkerah מדרש אלה אזכרה ed. Jellinek, Leipsic 1853.
- 'Emek ha-Meleך עמק המלך by R. Naphthali b. Elchanan, Amsterdam 1648.
- Emunot we-Deot והדעות והדעות ספר האמונות וחברו... רבינו סעדיה ed. Cracow 1880.
- 2 Enoch. The Book of the Secrets of Enoch translated from the Slavonic by W. R. Morfill and edited ... by R. H. Charles, Oxford 1896.
- Enoch Hebrew; See Sefer Hanok. Ephraim. Ephraemi Syri Opera Omnia ed. P. Benedictus and Assemanus, Rome 1737-1743.
- ER and EZ סדר אליהו רבה וסדר אליהו וזוטא ed. Friedmann, Vienna 1900, quoted by chapter (old numbering) and page.
- Eshkol אשכול הכפר להרב רבנו יהודה הדיסי Goslow 1836, quoted by No., folio and column.
- Eshkol ספר האשכול יסודו רבנו אברהם ב"ר יצחק ed. Auerbach, Halberstadt 1867-1869, quoted by volume and page.
- ha-Eshkol מאסף ספרותי ומדעי ed. Fuchs and Günzig, Cracow 1898-1909.
- Eupolemus *περὶ τῶν ἐν τῇ Ἰουδαίᾳ βασιλέων*, in Eusebius, Praep. Evang. Eusebius, Praeparatio Evangelica ed. Gifford, Oxford 1903.
- EZ. See ER.
- Ezekiel, the tragedian. 'Εξαγωγή in Eusebius, Praep. Evang.
- 4 Ezra, Liber Esdrae Quartus ed. G. H. Box, Ezra Apocalypse, London 1912.
- Gadol u-Gedolah גדול וגדולה ed. Jellinek, Bet ha-Midrash III, 121-130.
- Gedulat Mosheh גדולת משה ed. Amsterdam 1754.
- Ginzberg, Comptes Rendus. Comptes Rendus des Mélanges Israëliques Lewy, Paris 1914 = Rev. d. Etud. Juiv. LXVI, 297-315 and LXVII, 133-151.
- Güdemann, Religionsgeschichte. Religionsgeschichtliche Studien, Leipsic 1876.
- Hadar סדר זקנים... הורחן של ראשונים רבותינו בעלי התוספות ולה"ה על התורה... דבר חדש... הוא הרא"ש ed. Leghorn 1840.
- Halle מדרש הלל הנקרא ספר המעשים ed. Jellinek, Bet ha-Midrash V, 87-110.
- Haserot מדרש חסרות ויתרות ed. Wertheimer, Jerusalem 1900.
- Hashkem ספר השכם מדרש השכם ed. Likkutim I, 2-20; comp. Likkutim.
- Hasidim ספר חסידים ed. Wistinetzki, Berlin 1891.
- Hazofeh הצופה מארץ הגור vols. I-IV, V, VII לחכמת ישראל ed. Blau, Budapest 1911-1923.
- Hekalot or 1 Hekalot רבתי היכלות in Jellinek, Bet ha-Midrash III, 83-108.
- 3 Hekalot פרק מפרקי היכלות in Jellinek, Bet ha-Midrash III, 161-163.
- 5 Hekalot or Hekalot V מכתב היכלות V in Jellinek, Bet ha-Midrash II, 40-47.

## List of Abbreviations

- 6 Hekalot or Hekalot VI ספר היכלות | KANEH or Kanah ספר והוא הפליאה  
in Jellinek, Bet ha-Midrash V, 170-190. ed. Koretz 1784.
- Hemdah ha-Hemdah לקוטים מס' חמדת | KAT. E. Schrader, Die Keilinschriften  
ננוי ירושלים, ed. Wertheimer, and d. alte Testament; third edition  
III, 13b-15a, Jerusalem, 1902. by Winkler and Zimmern, Berlin 1902-  
1903.
- Hemdah Genuzah ספר חמדה גנוזה והוא חמדת | Kebod Huppah; See Huppah Eliyyahu,  
חשובות הנאונים 1863. ed. Wertheimer, Jerusalem 1863. Kebuzzat Maamarim ספר  
חסד לאברהם, ed. Azulai, Lemberg 1860. אברהם נייגר... על ידי שמואל אברהם  
Hibbur ha-Ma'asiyyot; See 'Aseret ha- פאונאסקי, Warsaw, 1910. (with notes  
Dibrot. by Louis Ginzberg).
- Hippolytus, Philosophumena ed. Migne Ketoret ha-Sammim... ספרת הסמים...  
P. Gr. 16. 3. תרגום, Amsterdam 1671.
- Ps.-Hippolytus. Sermo in Sancta Theo- Keli-Yakar. Solomon Ephraim b. Aaron,  
phania, Migne Pat. Gr. 10. כל יקר, Lublin 1602 and frequently  
reprinted.
- ha-Hoker ספר חמדת עתי מקדש לחכמה | Kinyan-Torah קנין תורה. The so called  
ישראל ed. Fuchs, Cracow 1891-94. sixth chapter of Abot found in most  
Huppah Eliyyahu חופת אליהו ed. Horo- editions of this Treatise.  
witz 45-56, Frankfort o. M. 1888.
- Irenaeus, Adversus Haereses ed, Migne, P. Gr. 7.
- R. Isaac ha-Kohen ספר איוב עם פירוש | Kohemoth ז. סדרש קהלת רבנו ר' זושא  
שחרר, Constantinople 1545. מדרש זושא 83-130, Berlin 1894.
- Jerome. Hieronymi Quaestiones Hebraicae in libro Geneseos e recog. P. de Lagarde, Leipsic 1868.
- Joel, Chronography. Chronographia ed. Bekker, Bonn 1837.
- Joel, Blicke. Blicke in die Religionsgeschichte... I-II, Breslau and Leipsic 1880-1883.
- JQR. NS. The Jewish Quarterly Review, New Series ed. Adler and Schechter, Philadelphia 1910 seq.
- Jub. The Book of Jubilees by Charles, London 1902.
- Judah b. Barzilai; See Al-Barceloni.
- Kad ha-Kemah ספר חמדת קמח ed. Breit, Lemberg 1880-1892.
- Kaftor wa-Ferah. Estori Parhi, ספר חמדת | Maamar 'Aseret Melakim ספר עשרת  
לונדון, ed. Luncz, Jerusalem 1897-1898. מלכים ed. Horowitz, אגרות  
אגרות, Berlin, 1881.
- Kallah ספר חמדת קלה והוא חמדת | Ma'areket מערכת האלהות, Mantua 1558.  
אברהם, ed. Coronel, Vienna 1869, also reprinted in Talmud ed. Horowitz  
ed. Romm, Wilna 1895. אגרות אגרות in אברהם אבינו ע"ה, Berlin, 1881.
- 2 Ma'aseh Abraham ספר מעשה אברהם | Ma'aseh Abraham ספר מעשה אברהם  
Jellinek, Bet ha-Midrash II, 118-119. מעשה אברהם אבינו  
Ma'aseh Abraham ספר מעשה אברהם אבינו | מעשה אברהם אבינו  
Jellinek, Bet ha-Midrash I, 25-34. מעשה אברהם אבינו  
ע"ה מעשה שאירע לו עם נמרוד  
Bet ha-Midrash I, 25-34.

## List of Abbreviations

- Ma'aseh R. Joshua b. Levi מעשה דר' לוי יחושע בן לוי ed. Jellinek, Bet ha-Midrash II, 48-51.
- Ma'aseh Rokeah ספר מעשה רוקח ··· חברו ··· אלעזר ··· בן ··· יהודה ב"ר קלנימוס ממנציא Sanok 1912.
- Ma'aseh Torah מדרש מעשה תורה ed. Jellinek, Bet ha-Midrash II, 92-109.
- Maasehbuch מעשה בוך, Amsterdam 1723, quoted by No. and page.
- Ma'asiyyot or Ma'as. ed. G. Gaster, The Sefer ha-Ma'asiyoth, in "Judith Montefiore" College, Report for the year 1894-1895, Cambridge, 1896.
- Ma'ayan Hokmah מעין חכמה ed. Jellinek, Bet ha-Midrash I, 58-61.
- Magen-Abot. Duran, מגן אבות, Leghorn 1762.
- Maggid. R. Joseph Caro, מגיד משרים, Amsterdam 1708.
- Malala, John. Chronographia ed. Dindorf, Bonn 1831.
- Masnut; See Ma'ayan Gannim.
- Masseket Gan Eden מסכת גן עדן in Maskeket Gan Eden ברייתא דשמואל הקטן 1863. Comp. also Seder Gan Eden.
- Masseket Kelim מסכת כלים ed. Jellinek, Bet ha-Midrash II, 88-91.
- Mattenot Kehunah. R. Issachar Baer b. Naphtali מצות כהונה on Midrash Rabbah in ed. Wilna, 1887.
- Ma'ayan Gannim. Masnut, מעין גנים ··· על ספר איוב ed. Buber, Berlin 1889.
- Mekilta מספר מכילתא דרבי ישמעאל ed. Friedmann, Vienna 1870, quoted by masekta and folio.
- Mekilta RS מספר מכילתא דרבי שמעון בן יוחאי ed. Hoffmann, Frankfurt o. M. 1905, quoted by page.
- Melchizedek Fragment in Charles, 2 Enoch 85-93.
- MHG I and II מספר בראשית הגדול ··· ספר מדרש ed. Schechter, Cambridge 1902; מדרש הגדול ··· ספר שמוח ed. Hoffmann, Berlin 1913-1921.
- Midrash Abraham מדרש אברהם אבינו ed. Jellinek, Bet ha-Midrash V, 40-41.
- Midrash R. Akiba מדרש ר' עקיבה בן יוסף ed. Jellinek, Bet ha-Midrash V, 31-33; ed. Wertheimer, Leket Midrashim 18a-23b.
- Midrash le-Hanukkah מדרש לחנוכה ed. Jellinek, Bet ha-Midrash I, 132-136.
- Midrash Jonah מדרש יונה ed. Jellinek, Bet ha-Midrash I, 96-105.
- Midrash ha-Ne'elam; See Zohar Hadash. Midrash Shir השירים ed. Grunhut, Jerusalem 1897.
- Minhat Yehudah, see Da'at.
- Mishle מדרש משלי ed. Buber, Wilna 1893, quoted by chapter and page.
- Monatsschrift. Monatsschrift für Geschichte und Wissenschaft des Judenthums, Dresden (later Breslau) 1852 seq.
- Moses bar Cepha. De Paradiso ed. And. Masius, Antwerp 1569.
- Mota Muse. Faitlovitch, Mota Muse, Paris 1906.
- Nahmanides, Derasha תורת ה' המימה ed. Jellinek, Leipzig 1853.
- Neweh Shalom. Taussig, נוה שלום, Munich 1872.
- Nispaḥim, Friedmann, נספחים לסדר אליהו, Vienna 1904.
- Nur al-Zulm, Light of Shade and Lamp of Wisdom, by Nathanel Ibn Yeshaya, ed. Kohut, New York 1894.
- Nistarot R. Simon; See Pirke Mashiah.
- Or ha-Hayyim אור החיים ··· ר' חיים בר' יצחק, Mezirow 1801.
- Orient. Ltz. Orientalistische Literaturzeitung ed. Peiser, Königsberg 1898 seq.
- Otot ha-Mashiah אותות המשיח ed. Jellinek, Bet ha-Midrash II, 58-63.
- Ozar Midrashim אוצר מדרשים כתיבי יד I-II ed. Wertheimer, Jerusalem 1913-1914.
- Pa'aneah פענה רוא והוא פירושו יפה על קמשה חומשי תורה ··· חבירו ··· רבינו יצחק ב"ר יהודה, Prague 1607.
- Panim Aherim מדרש פנים אחרים ed. Buber, דאמרה 45-82, Wilna 1886.
- Pardes הפרדס ··· להאון רש"י לזה"ה ed. Constantinople 1802.

## List of Abbreviations

- Perek Gan 'Eden; Comp. Note 90 on p. 31.
- Pesikta Hadta פסיקתא חדתא ed. Jellinek, Bet ha-Midrash VI, 36-70.
- Pirke Mashiah ספר אליהו ופרקי משיח ed. Jellinek, Bet ha-Midrash III, 65-82.
- Petirat Moshe מדרש פטירת משה רבינו ע"ה ed. Jellinek, Bet ha-Midrash I, 115-129.
- Pirke RHK; See PRK.
- Pa.-Philo. Philonis Judaei Alexandrini, Libri Antiquitatum, Basel 1527.
- Philosophumena; See Hippolytus.
- PK מיוחסת לרב כהנא ed. Buber, Lyck 1860, quoted by Piska and folio.
- Poznanski, Einleitung or Mebo פירוש על חזקאל ותרי עשר לרבי אליעזר מבלונזי... וספר לו מבוא על חכמי ארפת מפרשי המקרא Warsaw 1913-1914.
- PR מדרש פסיקתא רבתי ed. Friedmann, Vienna 1880, quoted by Pesikta and folio.
- PRE פירוש רבי אליעזר, Amsterdam 1709 or Warsaw 1852.
- PRK פירוש רבינו הקדוש ed. Grünhut, Likkutim III, or פירוש רבינו הקדוש ed. Schünblum נפתחים ונפתחים, Lemberg 1877.
- Pugio Fidei. Pugio Fidei Raymundi Martini.... Adversus Mauros et Judaeos, Leipsic 1667.
- Rabbinovicz; See Variae Lectiones.
- RAsh; See R. Asher.
- Raziel ספר רזיאל המלאך ed. Wilna 1881, quoted by caption and page.
- REJ. Revue des Études Juives, Paris 1880 seq.
- RSBM. פירוש התורה אשר כתב רשב"ם ed. Rosin, Breslau 1881.
- Ruth R. מדרש רות רבה ed. Wilna 1887, quoted by chapter and verse
- Ibn Sabba' פירוש על התורה שחיבר... רבי אברהם סב"ע ז"ל וקרא שמו צרור המור, Venice 1523, quoted by Parasha and folio.
- Seder R. Amram... סדר תפלה כמנהג אשכנז ed. Frumkin, Jerusalem 1912.
- Seder Gan 'Eden סדר גן עדן ed. Jellinek, Bet ha-Midrash II, 52-53.
- Seder Rabba di Bereshit סדר רבה דבראשית ed. Wertheimer, Batte Midrashot I, 1-31.
- Seder Ruhot סדר רוחות רבה ed. Jellinek, Bet ha-Midrash V, 176-180.
- Sefer ha-Hayyim ספר החיים... ר' חיים Cracow 1593
- Sefer Hanok ספר חנוך ed. Jellinek, Bet ha-Midrash II, 114-117.
- Sefer Noah ספר נח ed. Jellinek, Bet ha-Midrash III, 155-160.
- Sefer ha-Yashar ספר הישר לרבנו תם Rosenthal, Berlin 1898.
- Sekel or Sekel Tob מדרש שכל טוב על ספר בראשית ושמות חברו רבינו מנחם ב"ר שלמה ed. Buber, Berlin 1900-1901.
- Sha'are Gan 'Eden גן עדן וגיהנם ed. Jellinek, Bet ha-Midrash V, 42-51.
- Sha'are Simhah. R. Isaac b. Judah ibn Gayyat, פירוש שמחה, Fürth 1862.
- Shalshelet ספר שלשלת הקבלה לחכם... גדליה' ז'ן חייא Venice 1587.
- Shem Tob b. Shem Tob דרשות התורה... דר' שם טוב ב' יוסף Venice 1547.
- Shemuel מדרש שמואל ed. Buber, Lemberg 1893, quoted by chapter and page.
- Shir מדרש שיר השירים רבה ed. Wilna 1887, quoted by chapter and verse.
- ShR מדרש שמות רבה ed. Wilna 1887, quoted by chapter and paragraph
- Shu'aib. Joshua ibn Shu'aib פירוש על התורה, Constantinople 1523, quoted by Parasha and folio.
- Shitah Hadashah שיטה חדשה לברכת יעקב מדרש בראשית רבה ed. Wilna 1887 pp. 376-377.
- Sibyil. The Sibylline Oracles. ed. Geffken, Leipsic 1902.
- Sifra ספרא דבי רב הוא ספר תורה כותבים ed. Weiss, Vienna 1862, quoted by chapter and verse.
- Sifre D. and N. ספרי דבי רב ed. Friedmann Vienna 1864, quoted by paragraph (D=Deuteronomy, N=Numbers) and sometimes the page is added.

## List of Abbreviations

- Sifre Z. Der Sifre Sutta... von Dr. S. Horowitz, Breslau 1910.
- ספר שפתי כהן... הכרז... Sifte Kohen ... הכרז... Wansbeck 1690.
- על דבר, Poznanski, Talmud Torah. הילקוט תלמוד תורה לר' יעקב בר' חננאל וסקילי (= Hazofeh III, 1-22) and in Festschrift-Maybaum, Leipsic 1915, ראשיתו של הילקוט תלמוד תורה לר' יעקב בר' חננאל סקילי.
- Syncellus. Chronographia ed. Dindorf, Bonn 1829.
- מדרש חדש או ברייתא דר' פנחס Tadshe בן יאיר. מקדמוניות היהודים ed. Epstein 1887 pp. I-XLVI.
- מדרש תנחומא... עם פירוש ענף יוסף ועץ יוסף... לה"ר הענין זוגריל בר' יוסף Wilna 1833, quoted by Parasha and paragraph.
- מדרש תנחומא הקדום והישן Tan. B. ed. Buber, Wilna 1885, quoted by Book and page.
- מבוא גדול, Introduction. Tan., ed. Buber, Wilna 1885. הדמפיץ אור על מדרש תנחומא.
- Targum Jerushalmi (1) Pseudo-Jonathan ed. Ginsburger, Berlin 1903.
- Targum Yerushalmi(2) Das Fragmententargum ed. Ginsburger, Berlin 1899.
- Tehillim מדרש תהלים המכונה שחר טוב ed. Buber, Wilna 1891, quoted by chapter and page.
- Tertullian—  
 1) De Jona et Ninive.  
 2) Sodoma.  
 3) Genesis.  
 5) De Execrandis Gentilium Diis.  
 6) Adversus Marcionitas or Adv. Marcionem.  
 7) Libellus Adversus Omnes Haereses.
- Testament of Job. Greek text in James, Apocrypha Anecdota pp. 104-137; English translation by Kohler in Kohut Memorial Volume pp. 264-338.
- Theodor מדרש בראשית רבא... על פי כתבי יד... עם מראה מקומות... ופירוש... מאתי יזודה שהענין יזודה Berlin 1912-1916.
- Theodoretus. Quaestiones in Genes. ed. Migne, P. Gr. 80.
- Theophilus or Theophil. Theophilus of Antiochia, πρὸς Ἀντιόχειον ed. Otto in Corpus Apol. 8.
- Tola'at Ya'akob. Gabbai, חולעת יעקב, Constantinoople 1560.
- Toledot Yizhak. See Caro.
- Tosafot. See Da'at.
- Tosefta מדרש פתח פי כתבי יד ערפוט וויניץ ed. Zuckerman, Pasewalk 1881.
- Tosefta Targum. Additions to the Targum on the Prophets found in ed. Leiria 1494 and in Lagarde, Prophetæ Chaldaice, Leipsic, 1872.
- TShBZ ספר חשב"ן מן רבינו שמשון בר ציוק Warsaw, 1875.
- Variae Lectiones. Rabbinovicz, Variae Lectiones in Mischnam et in Talmud Babylonico, Munich 1867-1897.
- Wa-Yekullu מדרש ויכלו ed. Grünhut in Likkutim II, 16b-19b.
- Wa-Yosha' מדרש וישע ed. Jellinek, Bet ha-Midrash I, 35-57.
- Wa-Yissa'u מדרש ויסעו ed. Jellinek, Bet ha-Midrash III, 1-5.
- WR מדרש ויקרא רבה ed. Wilna 1887, quoted by chapter and paragraph.
- Yad Yosef. Joseph b. Hayyim Zarfati מדרש ויד יוסף דרשו, Venice 1616.
- Yalkut Reubeni על ילקוט ראובני על התורה, Amsterdam 1700, quoted by chapter and verse, sometimes the folio is also given.
- Yashar מדרש וישאר, Venice 1624, quoted by Parashah and folio.
- Yelammedenu קונטרס אחרון ממדרש ילמדנו ed. Jellinek, Bet ha-Midrash VI, 79-90, quoted by No.
- ZATW. Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft, Giessen 1881 seq.
- Zawaat Naphtali מדרש נפתלי בן יעקב לבניו ed. Wertheimer in his edition of פירקי פירקי, Jerusalem 1890.
- ZDMG. Zeitschrift der deutschen morgenländischen Gesellschaft. Leipsic, 1847 seq.
- Zerubbabel or Zerubabel מדרש זרובבל ed. Jellinek, Bet ha-Midrash II, 54-57, ed. Wertheimer, Leket Midrashim, 9b-13b.
- Zohar מדרש זוהר חדש ed. Leghorn 1866, quoted by Parashah and caption, sometimes the folio is added.
- Zohar Ruth. See Zohar Hadash.













UNIVERSAL  
LIBRARY



126 654

UNIVERSAL  
LIBRARY