

THE RABBINIC CONCEPTION
OF
THE UNIVERSAL JUDGMENT
at the time of the Messianic advent.

by

BERNARD J. BAMBERGER, A.B.

Thesis submitted in
partial fulfillment
of the requirements
for the Rabbinical
degree.

HEBREW UNION COLLEGE
CINCINNATI, OHIO.

5686 - 1926

Mic 1/6/75

CONTENTS.

BIBLIOGRAPHY.....	ii
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS.....	iv
CHAPTER I: INTRODUCTORY.....	1
II: GENERAL CHARACTERISTICS OF THE MATERIAL....	5
III: DIVISIONS OF THE PERIOD TREATED.....	7
IV: THE COMING OF THE END.....	14
V: THE PANGS OF THE MESSIAH.....	33
VI: THE WARS OF GOG AND MAGOG.....	46
VII: THE LAST JUDGMENT.....	51
VIII: THE FATE OF THE WICKED.....	63
IX: SUFFERING DURING THE MESSIANIC TIMES.....	68
CONCLUSION.....	70
APPENDICES..... <i>to be added later</i>	71

N. B. Numbers in the text enclosed in parentheses refer to additional notes at the end of the various chapters.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

A. SOURCES.

- Mishnah, cited by Perek and Halakah.
 Tosefta, ed. M. S. Zuckermann, Pasewalk, 1881, cited by Perek and Halakah.
 Babylonian Talmud, cited by page and column.
 Palestinian Talmud, " " " " of the Krotoschin ed., 1866.
 Derek Erez Zutta (in Talmud edition), cited by chapter.
 Abot de Rabbi Nathan, ed. S. Schechter, Vienna, 1887, cited by chapter and page.
 Targumim-to Pentateuch and Esther cited from the Homesh, ed. Lemberg, 1909.
 -to Prophets cited from the Rabbinic Bible, ed. Warsaw, 1874.
 Mekilta } cited from Malbim's edition of the Pentateuch (reprinted,
 Sifre } Vilna, 1922) according to chapter and verse of the Bible.
 Midrash Rabba, ed. Vilna (originally published 1878) with numerous commentaries. The Midrashim on the Pentateuch are cited by parashah and paragraph of this ed., those on the Megillot by chapter and verse of the Bible.
 Pesikta de Rab Kahana, ed. S. Buber (originally published Lyck, 1868, reprinted Vilna, 1925). Citations give chapter and page in Lyck and Vilna ed., e.g., PRK. 5.47b.42a.
 Midrash Tanhuma, Lublin, 1913, cited by Biblical parashah.
 Midrash Tanhuma, ed. S. Buber (reprinted Vilna, 1913), cited by Biblical parashah and the subdivisions of the editor.
 Midrash Tehillim, ed. S. Buber, Vilna, 1890, cited by Psalm and the subdivisions of the editor.
 Pesikta Rabbati, ed. M. Friedmann, Vienna, 1880, cited by ch. and p.
 Seder Eliahu Rabba V' Zutta, ed. M. Friedmann, Vienna, 1902 } citations
 Pseudo-Seder Eliahu Zutta, " " " " " " 1904 } by ch. & p.
 Aggadot Bereshit, ed. S. Buber (reprinted Vilna, 1925), citations by chapter.
 Pirke de Rabbi Eliezer, English translation of a revised text by Gerald Friedlander, London, 1916. Cited by chapter and page of the translation.
 Midrash Hag-gadol, ed. S. Schechter, v.1, Cambridge, 1902. Cited by chapter and verse of the Bible.

B. CHIEF SECONDARY SOURCES.

- W. Bacher, Die Agada der Tannaiten, 2v. Strassburg, 1884-1890.
 Die Agada der Palästinenensischen Amoräer, 3 v., Strassburg, 1892-1899.
 Die Agada der Babylonischen Amoräer, (revised ed.), Frankfurt, 1913.
 R. H. Charles, A Critical History of the Doctrine of a Future Life, etc., 2nd ed. London, 1913. Cited as "Charles".
 H. Graetz, History of the Jews, English translation, v.2. Philadelphia, 1902. Cited as "Graetz".
 J. Klausner, Die Messianische Vorstellungen der Juden in Zeitalter der Tannaiten. Berlin, 1904. Cited as "Klausner".

- The Jewish Encyclopedia, 12 v., N. Y., 1901-1906. Especially the articles on ESCHATOLOGY (Kohler) and MESSIAH and APOCALYPTIC LITERATURE, NEO-HEBRAIC (Buttenwieser).
- P. Volz, Jüdische Eschatologie von Daniel bis Akiba. Tübingen, 1903. Cited as "Volz."

C. OTHER WORKS CONSULTED.

- N. Messel, Die Einheitlichkeit der Jüdischen Eschatologie, Giessen, 1915.
- J. H. Greenstone, The Messiah Idea in Jewish History, Philadelphia, 1906.
- R. H. Charles, ed. The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament. 2v., Oxford, 1913.
- E. Schuerer, A History of the Jewish People in the Time of Jesus Christ. English translation by J. Macpherson. N.Y., no date.
- I. H. Weiss, דור ודור, 5.v. Reprinted, Berlin, 1924.
- I. Halevy, Dorot Harishonim, 2 v. Frankfurt, 1901-1906.
- A. Hyman, Toldoth Tannaim Ve'Amoraim. 3 v. London, 1910.
- H. L. Strack, Einleitung in Talmud und Midrasch. 5th ed., Munich, 1921.
- J. H. Rabnizky and C. N. Bialik, ספר האגדה. 3v. Berlin, 1912.
- S. Schechter, Some Aspects of Rabbinic Theology, N.Y., 1919.
- The Hebrew Union College Annual, v.1. Cincinnati, 1924.
- J. D. Eisenstein, ed. אוצר ישראל, 10 v. N. Y., 1906-1913.
- אוצר מדרשים, 2.v. N. Y., 1915.
- (Containing the late Midrashic and apocalyptic writings originally published in Jellinek's Bet Hamidrash, etc.)
- J. Cohen, The Babylonian Talmud: Berakot. English translation and notes. Cambridge, 1921.
- L. Goldschmidt, Der Babylonische Talmud, etc. Edited with a German translation, v. 1-8. Leipzig, 1899-1922.
- M. Jastrow, A Dictionary of the Targumim, the Talmud, etc. 2v. London and N. Y., 1903.
- J. Levy, Neuhebräisches und Chaldäisches Wörterbuch. 4 v. Leipzig, 1876-1889.

At this point I may express my indebtedness and my gratitude to Prof. Lauterbach for his advice and assistance.

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS.

Agg. Ber.	Aggadat Bereshit
Am.	Amos
A. M.	Anno Mundi
Araḳ.	Araḳin
ARN.	Aboth D' Rabbi Nathan
art.	article
AT.	Aggada der Tannaiten (Bacher)
AZ.	Abodah Zarah
b.	ben, bar
BA.	Aggada der Babylonischen Amoräer (Bacher)
BB.	Baba Batra
Ber.	Berakot
c.	circa
Cant.	Canticles
C.E.	Common Era
ch.	chapter
Dan.	Daniel
Deut.	Deuteronomy
DEZ.	Derek Erez Zutta.
Eccl.	Ecclesiastes
Erub.	Erubin
Esth.	Esther
Ex.	Exodus
Ez.	Ezekiel
f., ff.	following page, pages
Gen.	Genesis
Hab.	Habakkuk
Hag.	Haggai
Hos.	Hosea
ib.	ibidem
Is.	Isaiah
J.	Jerushalmi
JE.	Jewish Encyclopedia
Jer.	Jeremiah
Ket.	Ketubot
Lam.	Lamentations
Lev.	Leviticus
loc. cit.	locus citatus
Meg.	Megillah
Mek.	Mekilta
Mic.	Micah
Mid.	Midrash
Mid. Til.	Midrash Tillim
n.	note
Nid.	Niddah
NT.	New Testament
Num.	Numbers
OT.	Old Testament
p.	page
PA	Aggada der Palästinensischen Amoräer (Bacher)
Pes.	Pesahim
Pes. R.	Pesikta Rabbati
pet.	petihta
PRE	Pirke D' Rabbi Eliezer

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS (continued).

PRK	Pesikta D' Rab Kahana
Ps.	Psalms
Pseud.-Jon.	Pseudo-Jonathan
R.	Rab, Rabbi, Rabba, Rabbati
R. H.	Rosh Hashanah
Sab.	Sabbath
Sanh.	Sanhedrin
SER.	Seder Eliahu Rabba
SEZ.	Seder Eliahu Zutta
Sot.	Sotah
Suk.	Sukkah
s.v.	sub voce
Taan.	Taanit
Tan.	Midrash Tanhuma
Tan. B.	" " edited by Buber
Tos.	Tosephta
v.	volume, verse
Yeb.	Yebamot
Zeb.	Zebahim
Zech.	Zechariah
ed.	edition, edited.

THE RABBINIC CONCEPTION OF THE UNIVERSAL JUDGMENT
AT THE TIME OF THE MESSIANIC ADVENT.

CHAPTER I: INTRODUCTORY.

The purpose of this study is to present the material found in Rabbinic writings which deals with the destructive and minatory aspects of the occurrences at the end of days. The word judgment in our title is used in the double sense of forensic act and of punishment. (1) We concern ourselves with those concepts which German scholars have grouped under the term Unheilseschatologie.

The material which we shall examine consists of official pronouncements, made either in lectures and discussions in the schools, or else in public sermons, by the Palestinian and Babylonian Rabbis of the first five centuries C.E. Tho the same teachers may have likewise cultivated certain esoteric doctrines, the latter will be left out of consideration.

These limitations are entirely arbitrary, designed to restrict the scope of the present study, lest it swell beyond the size of a graduation thesis. As a matter of fact, study of the sources has convinced me that truly adequate treatment of any phase of Jewish eschatology must be preceded by a thoro study of the subject as a whole. The eschatology of destruction and redemption, of damnation and salvation are organically connected. Similarly, we cannot isolate the official Rabbinic eschatology, as embodied in the Talmuds and the orthodox Midrashim--in contradistinction to less authoritative works like Pirke d' Rabbi Eliezer--from the rest of the eschatological and Messianic literature and doctrine produced by Judaism in the course of fifteen hundred years or more. It seems probable that Messel's thesis of the unity of Jewish eschatology might be so

extended as to prove that from the late Biblical period--when Daniel and Isaiah 24-27 were composed--down thru the seventeenth century--when the disastrous Sabbetarian movement cast a permanent discredit upon extensive Messianic speculation--that thru all this time, Jewish eschatology is essentially a unit; and that for its full understanding the old apocalyptic literature preserved by the Churches, the Rabbinic sources, the Neo-Hebrew apocalypses of Gaonic and post-Gaonic times, and the Cabalistic writings must all be taken into account. With all this--which I am, of course in no position to prove at present--it must be borne in mind that despite the affinities between the eschatological writings of one age and those of another, each individual production must nevertheless be studied in the light of its own historical background.

Scholars in this field have, it seems, tended to neglect one or other of the two factors that enter into a proper interpretation of the material. These factors are a) relation to general eschatological tradition, and b) historical background and development. Thus on the one hand Volz (*Jüdische Eschatologie von Daniel bis Akiba*) and Kohler (article *ESCHATOLOGY* in *JE* v.5) cite passages from early Palestinian, Alexandrian, and Rabbinic writings indiscriminately and as a rule without noting what historical event or condition may have been responsible for the particular opinion quoted. (2) On the other hand Klausner (*Die Messianische Vorstellungen der Juden in Zeitalter der Tannaiten*) who lays great stress on the historical setting of his material, pays almost no attention to the Apocalyptic literature, and as a result arrives at several unwarranted conclusions. (See below, p. 9 ff.)

That there is a close relationship between the Apocalyptic

writings and the Rabbinic utterances cannot be questioned. The numerous parallels between Talmudic writings and the Apocalypses of Baruch and Esdras which have been collected by students of the latter productions (3) are alone sufficient proof of this. There is every reason, in fact, to believe that Baruch and Esdras emanated from some of the Rabbinic schools, where they constituted a part of that secret lore cultivated by many leading Tannaim. The manifest relationships between certain of the older Apocalypses and some of the Neo-Hebrew revelations can only be explained by assuming that much study of the former went on in private thruout the Talmudic period. At the same time, the silence of the Talmud on some topics and the fragmentary character of its utterances on other may be of some significance. (Cp., e.g., below p.50, 52).

The ideal method of studying the material at hand--a method which, unfortunately, cannot at this time be fully carried out--would involve:

- a) the satisfactory determination of what are and what are not genuinely eschatological utterances, since many statements phrased in eschatological terms are demonstrably devoid of eschatological significance. (4)
- b) the clear-cut distinction between folk-lore and theology, the necessity for which has been so well emphasized by Ginzberg. (5)
- c) the study of parallels in older and later Apocalyptic.
- d) the study of the historical background.
- e) the reconstruction--on the basis of all these studies--of the evolution of eschatology in its relation

to general religious development.

NOTES TO CHAPTER I

(1) Cp. Rashi's comment on Ex. 28.15 'ג' **מִשְׁפַּחַת מִשְׁפַּחַת מִשְׁפַּחַת**
לְשׁוֹנוֹת-דְּבַר בְּעַל הַדִּין וְעוֹנֵשׁ הַדִּין

(2) Note also Schechter's unproved assertion of the homogeneity of Rabbinic theology during a period of over five hundred years: *Some Aspects of Rabbinic Theology*, p. xi f.

(3) See the introductions to Baruch and Esdras in Charles: *Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the OT*, v.2, and further literature cited there; also JE, art. Baruch v.2, p.551 (Ginzberg) and Esdras v.5, p.221 (Kohler).

(4) Thus, for example, the dictum of Eleazar b. Simon "The Messiah will not come until judges and rulers are removed from Israel (Sanh 98a) and the similar utterance of the sons of Hiyva (ib. 38a) are simply expressions of dissatisfaction with the Patriarchate and its tyrannical policies, as Klausner points out (p.42f.). The declaration that the Messiah will be named Shilah (Sanh 98b) is according to Bacher (BA p.35) simply a compliment paid to R. Shela by his admiring pupils. Moreover, many passages in Abot referring to judgment (**דִּין**), retribution (**פְּרִיָּצוֹת**), to the book in which deeds are recorded, etc., refer most probably not to the end of days, but to the annual judgment in Tishri, or to the just workings of God's Providence in general.

(5) In the H.U.C. Annual, v.1, p.313.

CHAPTER II: GENERAL CHARACTERISTICS OF THE MATERIAL.

We have not mentioned so far that source which might be regarded as most important for our subject, namely the ancient synagogal prayers, particularly the Tephillah. The fact is that the eschatology of the liturgy is rather vague, and does not even touch upon the particular phase which we are treating. We gather from the prayers that the people expected a speedy deliverance from their woes, the restoration of Jerusalem and the Temple and the reestablishment of the Jewish state under a Davidic leader. Curiously enough, altho the belief in the coming of a Redeemer is mentioned in the very old Abot benediction, the section which immediately follows it, voicing belief in the resurrection, and which is of equal antiquity, makes no attempt to combine this belief with the Messianic hopes. In the Musaph of New Year's Day--as also in the so-called Teki'ata de Rab, which has since become part of the daily service under the name 'Alenu--the hopes expressed have a more broad and universal outlook: in the future idolatry and wickedness will disappear from the earth, and all men will be united in God's service. (1)

These passages, if vague and general, are at least easy to understand. The opinions cited in Talmud and Midrash, however, frequently display the enigmatic qualities of Apocalypse, which are intensified by their brief and fragmentary character. Often we shall find ourselves completely baffled in our attempts to determine the significance of a dictum. For example. R. Johanan b. Zakkai is said to have exclaimed just before his death "Prepare a throne for Hezekiah, King of Israel, who cometh!" (Ber 28b; ARN ch.25, p.80; j. Sot. ch.9 end, p.24c). Most recent scholars have taken this to be the expression of a belief in the speedy advent of the Messiah, tho the traditional commentators, following Rashi, suppose it to mean that

the dying Rabbi saw the spirit of Hezekiah approaching to escort him into the next world. J. Levy, however, basing himself on several similar reports found in the context of the Jerushalmi, concludes that by "Hezekiah" the sage meant to designate R. Gamliel. (2) Finally, an honest doubt may be expressed as to whether these words mean anything. It is easy to suppose that an incoherent phrase mumbled by the expiring teacher was interpreted by his attentive disciples as full of profound significance; and thus it happened--according to the Jerushalmi--that R. Eliezer on his death-bed deliberately patterned his last words after those of his master.

In the course of this study we shall find many passages as obscure as this. The only general thesis we shall attempt herein to substantiate is this: that our ignorance on the subject of Rabbinic eschatology is profound, and that most of the problems connected therewith have not been settled so far by writers on the subject.

NOTES ON CHAPTER II.

- (1) The liturgical passages of eschatological significance are translated and discussed by Volz, p.44 f.
- (2) The Messianic interpretation is upheld by Klausner, p.6, Bacher in JE v.7, p.215, Friedmann, Introduction to SER and SEZ, p.21, Volz p. 164. Cohen, in his translation of Berakot, p.188, n.4, follows Rashi. For Levy's view, see Neuhebräisches und Chaldäisches Wörterbuch s.v. *אוד*

CHAPTER III: DIVISIONS OF THE PERIOD TREATED.

All writers on the subject have recognized that the Messianic and eschatological ideas of the Jewish people have been intimately bound up with and affected by the conditions and events of the various periods during which they lived. In particular it has been pointed out that, for evident reasons, persecution and suffering have usually had the effect of heightening and intensifying the interest of the people in such speculations, and not only their interest but also their belief in them. It would seem, then, that the widely differing circumstances which existed at various times thru the Talmudic epoch should have affected in divergent ways the hopes and dreams of the future.

The Talmudic period falls into two main divisions--the Tannaitic, ending about 200 C.E., and the Amoraic, ending some two hundred fifty to three hundred years later. The former may be divided further into the following sub-periods:-- a) previous to the fall of the Second Temple, b) from the year 70 to the outbreak of the Bar Kokba revolt in 130 C.E., c) the period of the war and the resultant persecution under Hadrian, d) the period of recovery leading up to the codification of the Mishnah under Rabbi, c. 220 C.E. Such an elaborate subdivision of the Amoraic period is unnecessary; but the main geographical division must be borne in mind. Thruout the first two centuries of this period there were two parallel trains of development, in the schools of Palestine and Babylonia respectively. The Palestinian academies came to an end sooner, due to persecution by the Byzantine rulers; in fact, the Palestinian Jews suffered more or less from oppression thruout the Amoraic period, except for a brief respite under Julian the Apostate. It is noteworthy, however, that the friendly advances of the latter, including

even a promise to rebuild the Temple, seem to have roused but feeble response in the hearts of the Jews. In Babylonia the Jewish position was on the whole more tolerable, tho in various times and places persecutions occurred, due sometimes to the religious fanaticism of the Magi and sometimes to political causes. These outbreaks were for the most part of passing duration, never as cruel and relentless as the Hadrianic tortures. (1)

Klausner has attempted to trace the development of Messianism thru the various periods and sub-periods(pp.1-16). He notes that we have no Messianic dicta from teachers who lived before the destruction of the Temple, and explains that while they no doubt cherished the same hopes as those expressed in the Apocalypses, Psalterium Salamontis, etc., dating from the same period, they did not feel any need for encouraging and strengthening these hopes, so long as the least semblance of national independence remained. Instead the early authorities directed their efforts toward spreading the study of the Torah. With the fall of the state, however, Messianic ideas took on a more vital importance, and we possess a considerable body of Messianic material emanating from the pupils of Johanan b. Zakkai. (From the venerable Johanan himself we have nothing on the subject except the obscure and possibly non-Messianic utterance we discussed on p.5 f; the other eschatological statements he made on his death-bed deal with the fortunes of the soul immediately after leaving the body, and not with the end of days.) During the pre-Hadrianic period, according to Klausner, the Messianic hopes were essentially nationalistic, looking forward to the restoration of a Jewish state under a political and military chieftain. This view is substantiated by the expectations expressed in the Tephillah--edited at this time under the direction of R. Gamliel--, by various utterances

of Rabbis during the period, and by the fact that Bar Kokba could be accepted by Akiba and most of the common people as the Messiah, tho he was not from the Davidic family and had no marked spiritual qualifications. But after the terrible disillusionment of the years that followed the revolt, a change came over the hopes of the people. The catastrophes that resulted from the attempt for political independence made them chary of nourishing political expectations. As a result the Messianic hopes became more mystically religious, less nationalistic; the concept of the Messiah b. Joseph, which arose at this period, was the outcome of this change of attitude, in Klausner's opinion. Moreover, due to the dreadful sufferings of the period, the notion of the pangs of the Messiah came to be emphasized. This conception, says Klausner, "altho it had been attached to Messianism, since the latter was engendered by suffering, did not at an earlier date evoke any clear ideas" (p.10).

It seems to me necessary to point out that this distinction between the character of pre- and post-Hadrianic Messianology is not altogether warranted. The Apocalypses of Esdras and Baruch, which represent more or less orthodox tho't during the pre-Hadrianic period, both voice a thoroly unpolitical, unworldly, spiritualized viewpoint, of the sort which Klausner considers characteristic of the post-Hadrianic era. (2) The prophecy of R. Jose b. Kisma (below, p.21 f.) may likewise possess something of a mystic coloring, as also certainly the opinions of R. Eleazar of Modin, whose main activity falls before the Bar Kokba revolt, of which he probably disapproved. (3) As for Klausner's views about the pangs of the Messiah, they are absolutely unfounded. We possess accounts of the Messianic woes, fully as clear as those of the pupils of Akiba and often presenting striking parallels thereto, not only in Baruch and Esdras, which date from after

the year 70, but also in much earlier writings such as the book of Jubilees. (4)

To continue with Klausner's analysis. In the succeeding period Messianic speculation still continued, tho with less intensity, due to two reasons: the yet fresh memories of the tragedy of Bar Kokba, and the comparatively mild treatment which Rome accorded the Jews in the time of Rabbi. Gradually a complete change came over the Messianic and eschatological expectations of the Jews, so that by the beginning of the Amoraic period, the old hopes had vanished and new ones had replaced them. The old-fashioned Messianism ended with the Tannaim--this is Klausner's amazing conclusion, derived from three isolated statements by Samuel, R. Hillel, and R. Johanan. The first reads "This world differs from the days of the Messiah only in that we lack political independence" (Ber. 34b, Sab. 63a, 151a, Sanh. 91b, 99a). The second declares "Israel has no Messiah any more; they have already consumed him in the days of Hezekiah" (i.e., the Messianic prophecies were all fulfilled in H: Sanh. 99a). R. Johanan's statement is to the effect that "The Son of David will come only to a generation that is completely righteous or to one that is completely guilty" (Sanh. 98a, PRK 5.51b.46a), a statement, which according to Klausner (p.13) is equivalent to saying that the natural advent of the Messianic age is impossible, or practically so.

This sentence of R. Johanan may be dismissed at once. What it means I am not prepared to say with certainty; but that Klausner's interpretation is wrong I am sure. Johanan was the author of any number of Messianic utterances, of which we quote here only a few:

"When you see a generation whose troubles come flooding in like a river, look for him" (the Messiah--Sanh. 98a). "God says to Israel:

'Tho I have appointed a limit when the end of days will come whether

Israel repents or not--in its time it will come--yet if they would do repentance for a single day, I would bring it ahead of its time.'" (Ex. R. 25.12). A list of signs for the coming of the Messiah is also ascribed to R. Johanan (Sanh. 97a top). The anti-Messianic meaning which Klausner reads into this one obscure dictum is thus excluded; what the sentence may actually have implied is discussed on p.21.

The statements of R. Hillel and Samuel remain. On the first we can build absolutely nothing. We do not even know for sure who the author was. It cannot have been Hillel the Elder, who never was called by the title Rabbi. Nor is it probable that it was the Patriarch Hillel II, for the latter assumed the patriarchate in 330, while R. Joseph, who discussed the statement under consideration, died in 333. (5). Bacher (PA iii p.703 f.) thinks it most likely that the Hillel in question was the son of R. Samuel b. Nahman, and that his remark was directed against the Christian apologists, who were reading all sorts of Christological nonsense into the Messianic prophecies of Isaiah. At any rate, we can view this statement only in the light of a curiosity. Indeed, if it is actually an anti-Messianic utterance, it rests on a flimsy basis, as R. Joseph well remarked. "God forgive R. Hillel!" he exclaims as if puzzled, and then points out that while Hezekiah lived before 586, the post-Exilic prophet Zecharaah was still foretelling the advent of the Messiah (Sanh. 99a).

Samuel's view is of more importance, both because of the eminence of the author and because it is so frequently cited. It is based on the verse "The poor will not cease out of the land." (Deut. 11.21) In this dictum Samuel denies that anything of the supernatural will be connected with the Messiah. He will simply be a political ruler--and the implication is that there is little use in fasting and praying for his coming. It is probable that this utterance had

a definite practical purpose--to discourage Messianism because of its tendency to increase spiritual and political unrest. It is well known that Samuel was on good terms with the Persian government (6); he was eager to strengthen the cause of his people by strengthening their loyalty to the ruling power. To achieve this end he did not hesitate to attack a doctrine which might rouse disaffection among the Jews and thus work their own harm. Whether he was as thoroughgoing a rationalizer as might appear from this one saying is, however, questionable. In Sanh. 97b he contradicts the view of Rab that Israel must repent before the Messiah can come; in Ket. 112b he approves and even exaggerates a sign given by one of his pupils for the advent of the Son of David, etc.

In referring to Samuel's maxim, Klausner (p. 13) remarks, "Alle Messianischen Hoffnungen, alle glänzenden Verheissungen der Propheten werden einfach ausgemerzt: Samuel bezieht sie sämtlich, wie es scheint, auf die 'zukünftige Welt.'" Now R. Johanan, whose obscure remark Klausner then proceeds to quote in support of his theory, expressed the exactly opposite view in his famous declaration "The prophets prophesied only concerning the days of the Messiah; but concerning the future world Is. 64.3 is applicable: no eye has seen it but Thine, O God!" (Sanh. 99a, Ber. 34b). That the contradiction here involved escaped Klausner is the more remarkable since it is explicitly brot out by the Gemara (Sanh. and Ber. loc. cit.)

We conclude then that no solid grounds exist for the theory that during the early Amoraic period there was a reaction against the old Messianism. We cannot, in fact, trace a consistent and steady development of Messianic and eschatological ideas thru the pre- and post-Hadrianic, the Palestinian and Baylonian Amoraic periods. Sometimes, however, we can ob

times, however, we can observe the influence of particular events on particular utterances, and these cases will be pointed out as we proceed. Incidentally, no conclusion is to be drawn from the fact that we have much more eschatological material from the Palestinian Amoraim than from their Babylonian contemporaries. This need not mean that Messianic hopes were stronger in Palestine, ^hwhere patriotism was more ardent and persecution more severe. It probably means nothing more than that Haggadah was more popular in Palestine--where there lived a number of Rabbis like Simlai and Abbahu whose legal attainments were not exceptional and who were famous simply as popular preachers--while the schools of Babylon concentrated their interest upon Halachic casuistry in the main.

NOTES TO CHAPTER III.

- (1) For the detailed history of these periods see the works of Graetz, Weiss, Halevy, and the various articles in JE.
- (2) See Charles, p.299, and the already cited works on the separate apocalypses.
- (3) Cp. the story of his death, j. Taan. 68d, his apparent disapproval of preparing extensively for future emergencies, Mek. to Ex. 16.4, and see below, p. 52.
- (4) See Charles, p.237 f., 328 f., etc.
- (5) See Strack, Einleitung, p. 144 f.
- (6) See Graetz, v.2, pp. 520 ff.

CHAPTER IV: THE COMING OF THE END.

A. COMPUTATIONS AND CALCULATIONS.

The strictly eschatological Weltanschauung is deterministic. It regards the entire history of the world as foreordained by God, and as approaching its end in accordance with a plan previously arranged by Him. At the conclusion of a certain definite period of time the Messiah must arrive, the end of time transpire, the new heaven and earth be created. But human beings, groaning beneath the burden of persecution and suffering, are impatient. The mere knowledge that some day the iniquitous order will pass away is insufficient comfort. They want to know how long they will have to endure their agonies before the arrival of the Messiah will put an end to present woes. Thus arises the impulse to pry into the hidden workings of Providence in an effort to solve the question: How long must we suffer? Attempts to ascertain the exact time when the Messianic advent will occur, which occupy an important place in Apocalyptic writings, also appear in Rabbinic sources.

Sometimes, in imitation of a favorite method of the Apocalypse, a certain number of world-kingsdoms is enumerated, each of which must have its period of power and dominion before the advent of the deliverer. Thus, following Daniel, a reckoning of four world-empires--Babylon, Persia, Greece, Rome--appears in Lev. R. 13.5, Mek. to Ex.20.16, Sifre to Deut. 32.11.* Other authorities, following a tradition likewise preserved in Enoch, IV Sibyllines, and Latin Esdras (1) count ten world-kingsdoms from creation to the end of days, including the Messianic kingdom,--the first and last being the Kingdom of God. (Targum Sheni 1.1, PRE 11.80 f.)

Calculations of a definite number of years were more popular because more exact. Sometimes they were based on Biblical prophecies,

a method even more popular among the Apocalypsts. For instance an older Tannaitic opinion cited by R. Nathan (Sanh. 97b) finds the end indicated in the verse "They shall be given into his power for a time, times, and half a time." (Dan. 7.25). The method in which the Rabbis applied this verse is not stated; Rashi's conjectures on the subject, borrowed from one Samuel b. David, who seems to have been a Cabalist, are unsatisfactory. Klausner (p.31), assuming from the context that the opinion probably dates from the time of Akiba, supposes that the verse was taken to point to a Messianic deliverance two and a half generations after the fall of the Temple; and this is probably correct. Nevertheless we must remember that the identification of the word 'iddan (ידן) with generation, and the selection of the year 70 as the terminus a quo are purely conjectural.

This anonymous opinion is followed by another ascribed to R. Simlai. Since the latter was an Amora, we must either assume that we have to deal here with a later insertion into the Beraita of R. Nathan, or more probably, following Klausner (p. 31, n.2), read Ishmael instead of Simlai. According to this authority--whoever he may have been--a token of the end is found in Ps. 80.6: "Thou hast given them tears to drink in triple measure." Probably the thot is that the end will come three generations after the fall of Jerusalem. This same Beraita of R. Nathan also cites an opinion of R. Akiba, which will be discussed below (p. 29).

More frequently the Rabbinic calculations are independent of the Bible. A statement found in SER 2.6, and appearing in Sanh. 97a with the heading תנא דבי אליהו, divides the history of the universe into three periods of 2000 years each--the first period chaos, the second, the reign of Torah, the third the days of the Messiah. Chaos no doubt here means simply the spiritual anarchy that reigned

prior to the appearance of Torah in the world. According to an old tradition, preserved by Rashi, and used by the tenth century glossator who supplied the dates in SER loc. cit. and 6.37, the first period ended in the fifty-second year of the life of Abraham, and the Messianic advent was expected by this authority in the year 242 C.E. The tradition in its present form has undergone a modification which will be treated on p. 29 f.

A somewhat similar view ascribed to R. Ketina (Sanh. loc.cit.) counts 6000 years to the world, of which the first one or two millenniums constituted the period of primeval chaos. At the close of six thousand years will come a final Sabbatical millennium. This Memra seems, however to put the Messianic era in the far distant future.

A belief that the deliverance would come four hundred years after the fall of the Temple seems to have found wide acceptance: it appears in utterances dating from different periods and diverse places. The number four hundred was selected no doubt as a parallel to the four hundred years of Egyptian bondage predicted in Gen.15.13.

(2). R. Hanina states the view explicitly (AZ. 9b): Four hundred years after the fall of the Temple, buy no property, no matter how cheap; for the Messiah is coming. In this the Amora was only paraphrasing a Tannaitic statement (במתיא וזא) to the same effect, except that instead of reckoning from the year 70, the Beraita sets the date 4231 Anno Mundi, (The Temple fell in 3831 A.M.)

The Babylonian Amoraim took up this idea. In a curious passage (Sanh. 97b) we read: "R. Hanan b. Tahalifa (3) sent this message to R. Joseph: I met a man who had in his possession a scroll written in square characters in the Hebrew tongue. I asked him "Where did you get this?" He replied: "I engaged to serve in the Persian army, and I found this among the Persian archives". In (the scroll)

was written: After 4291 years from the creation the world will be orphaned. Some of them (i.e., the immediately succeeding years) will witness the wars of the dragons (4), some of them, the wars of Gog and Magog, and the rest will be the days of the Messiah. But God will not regenerate His world until 7000 years after creation.--R. Aha b. Raba says (the text should read) 5000 years."

Klausner concludes on stylistic grounds that the reckoning here set forth is of Tannaitic origin. He corrects the number 4291 to 4231, offering a plausible explanation of how the supposed scribal error occurred, and thus equates the opinion with that just cited from AZ. 9b. This is all more dubious than he seems to think. To assume that the MS. was Tannaitic because it was written in Hebrew is dangerous; for the conversation between R. Hanan and the nameless soldier, as well as the framework of the message to R. Joseph, is in the same Neo-Hebraic idiom as the text of the scroll itself. And the origin of the scroll is difficult to account for. What would a Hebrew scroll--above all, one of Tannaitic origin--be doing in the Persian archives? There is no reason, moreover, to doubt that during the Amoraic period there were still scholars who could write Hebrew; and actually the style of the scroll is not particularly elegant. For these reasons I am inclined to view this scroll as an early sample of the Neo-Hebrew apocalypses, like the "Elijah Apocalypse" and the "Signs of the Messiah", all other examples of which--in their present form at least,--are of later date. To this conclusion the mysterious origin of the scroll seems to point, as well as its peculiarities of language--'the world will be orphan', 'wars of the dragons'. If neither R. Hanan nor his unknown informant was responsible for passing off a pious fraud--it is not exactly a pseudepigraph--and if the soldier's story was true, it is still likely that the scroll is fairly

late. The Persians would hardly have possessed any religious documents of the Jews dating from before the time of Mar. Samuel. Of course the ideas of the scroll may have come originally from the Tannaim, just as the Tannaitic beliefs on the subject originated from pre-Rabbinic teachings.

In the next century, R. Judah, the brother of R. Sala the Pious, who was believed to have intimate dealings with the prophet Elijah, received from that deathless seer the revelation that the world would last not less than eighty-five jubilees (4250 years) and that the Messiah might be expected some time during the eighty-fifth jubilee. Thus 439 C.E. is set as a terminus a quo for the advent of the Messiah. This calculation (found in Sanh. 97b) is followed by an explanatory remark by R. Ashi: "Until 4200 years have elapsed there is no use looking for the Messiah to come; only thereafter can you begin to hope for his arrival. Graetz has commented sagaciously on this remark of Ashi (v.2, p.610 f.). He finds it a level-headed attempt to discourage such Messianic enthusiasms as led to the tragedy of Moses, the Cretan Pseudo-Messiah. It is probable that Ashi had heard of this incident, even tho no mention of Moses of Crete occurs in old Jewish sources. We can easily understand that during the fifth century C.E., Messianic hopes must have run especially high, when the disorders occurring at that time in both Rome and Persia seemed to verify the old traditions which placed the Messianic advent in that century.

A passage interpreted by Bacher as Messianic (in PA iii p.679) appears in j. Sab. 8d in the name of R. Hanina b. Abahu to the effect that Balaam lived in the middle of the days of the world. Now according to the traditional chronology contained in Seder Olam Balaam flourished about 2487 A.M. The end of the world would thus be placed about 4976 A.M., or 1214 C.E. The remoteness of the limit thus

obtained, as well as the ambiguity of the phrase *במהרה של עולם*, makes me doubt the Messianic character of this Memra. (5)

On the other hand Bacher denies the originally Messianic nature of a statement of R. Aha in Tan. B. Toledoth 4, declaring that the unquestionably Messianic amplifications in the parallel (Gen. R. 63.13) represent a reworking of the sentence in a spirit foreign to its original significance (PA iii p.121). These two statements are both based on the expression *מִן* in Gen.25.31, the word day being interpreted, as often, in the sense of a thousand years. (Cp. Ps. 90. v.4). The version of the Tanhuma reads: "Anyone who knows how to reckon properly...Israel took in this world only a thousand years". The reading of Bereshit Rabbah is: "Anyone who knows how to reckon (the days of the Exile) will find that for one day Jacob dwelt in peace (in the shade of Esau)". Bacher wants to omit the words enclosed in parentheses as a later reinterpretation; and finds in the original dictum the idea that Esau renounced his birthright only for a thousand years, which have now elapsed in the course of history, so that Esau has again assumed the birthright. But it is difficult to imagine a Rabbi entertaining the idea that Israel is not to be regarded permanently as the first-born. The text of the Tanhuma is palpably incomplete and nothing should be built on it. Probably the passage is Messianic, tho I am at a loss to say what it means.

Likewise arising out of the concept of predestination, if differing in form from the foregoing calculations is the following: The Son of David will not come until all the souls which are in the Guf (*גוף*) have been consumed (AZ. 5a, Yeb. 62a, Nid. 13b). Rashi on these passages explains that Guf (literally, body) is the name applied to the treasury in which are kept those souls which have not yet been

incarnated in human bodies. Not until this stock is entirely exhausted can the Messiah arrive. The correctness of this explanation is unquestionable in the light of the parallel (Gen. R. 24.4): King Messiah will not come until all souls which God thought of creating have actually been created. (6) Klausner (p. 37) has offered an ingenious explanation of this statement in the light of the conditions of the Hadrianic period. According to some versions the author of the sentence is R. Jose, who experienced the persecutions of the time. So severe was the oppression, which made the practice of circumcision and other Jewish rites a capital crime, that many Jews despairingly refused to have families. R. Ishmael, a great authority of the period, voices the feeling that it would be best for Israel to practice race suicide (BB. 6Ob). Klausner sees in the remark of R. Jose a protest against this attitude; he cites as a parallel the Beraita that the advent of the Messiah is delayed by those "who play with children" (Nid. 13b), where the reference is evidently to some non-productive sex act.

Klausner's explanation is logical, though not proved beyond doubt. According to Yeb. 62a, 63b, the author of this statement is R. Assi, not Jose; and this ascription is accepted by Bacher (PA 11 p.172). The similar view in Gen. R. 24 comes from R. Tanhūm b. Hiyya, an Amora of even later date than R. Assi. Moreover, as Klausner himself points out (p.37, n.1) the concept is also found in Apocalyptic literature. It is thus possible to regard the opinion as a deduction from the principle of predestination, borrowed by the Rabbis from the old body of eschatological tradition, without reference to the events of any particular period.

B. SIGNS OF THE MESSIANIC ADVENT.

So far we have dealt with calculations that embraced the entire world-plan. In addition the Rabbis often indicate certain practical signs which indicate that the Messianic advent will speedily occur, and which must inevitably precede that event. These signs are usually of an ominous character, and most of them are embraced under the headings Pangs of the Messiah and Wars of Gog and Magog, which will be treated in the next two chapters. Here we shall consider only those omens which do not fit into either of these two categories.

R. Johanan's queer remark "The Son of David will come only to a generation that is either totally innocent or totally guilty" (Sanh. 98a, PRK 5.51b.46a) has already been mentioned (above, p. 10) and we have shown that Klausner's interpretation of it is untenable. For its proper explanation we may compare the remark of R. Eleazar b. Pedat, a pupil of R. Johanan: "The Son of David will come only to a generation that is worthy of extermination" (Pes.R. 1, end) as well as the gloomy pictures of moral decline mentioned among the Messianic woes (see next chapter). The exact force of R. Johanan's utterance remains, however, a matter of doubt.

Difficult to understand also is the prophecy which R. Jose b. Kisma made to his pupils and confirmed by a miracle: When this gate shall have fallen, been rebuilt, and fallen once more, there will be no time to build it up again before the Messiah arrives. (Sanh. 98a). Volz (p.172) for no earthly reason states that the word gate refers to Jerusalem, an interpretation that makes the entire prediction hopelessly obscure. Klausner (p.39) following Bacher (AT i p.401, n.1) makes much better sense by locating the discussion at Tiberias, near which were the springs whose waters the Rabbi turned

to blood in order to substantiate his prediction. The word gate would then refer to the Roman stronghold in Tiberias; and the entire prophecy would mean that deliverance could not come until Roman military power had been weakened by repeated defeats. That R. Jose--tho himself on good terms with the Roman officials--hoped for something of the sort is indicated by the statement he made shortly before his death that the country would one day be overrun by Persian troops. (Sanh. 1b.)

This view that the independence of Palestine would be bhot about by the defeat of Rome by Persia was shared by later Rabbis--the Tanna Simeon b. Johai and the Palestinian Amora Abba b. Cahana (Cant. R. 8.9, Lam. R. 1.13, where Babliim means the Persians). Rab, however, who had suffered under the Persian yoke in Babylonia, expected just the opposite--that Rome must extend its power over the entire world ere the final deliverance would arrive (Yoma 10a; cp. Bacher BA p.23). Rab's teacher, Judah the Prince, held a similar view, but in his case the feeling behind it was rather friendliness toward Rome than hatred against Persia. Rabbi found Scriptural support for his view in Mic. 5.2 (Sanh. 98b); his principal debt to the verse was probably the selection of nine months as the length of time during which the Roman sway would be complete and universal. His general proposition is, however, only the amplification of an old tradition (Gen. R. 63.9, Eccl. R. 1.9, Mid. Haggadol to Gen. 25.26, and perhaps R.H. 31b; see below, p. 30) that immediately upon the fall of Rome, dominion will revert permanently to Israel. R. Hama b. Hani-na did not expect the Messiah until after the destruction of the Roman power. (Sanh. 98a).

Perhaps the view of R. Eleazar b. Abina (Gen. R. 42.4) .

that general warfare among the nations will precede the Messianic advent is a more vague statement of the same belief; or this may be simply one more picture of the pre-Messianic horrors which we shall discuss at length in the next chapter. The other signs which the Rabbis enumerate are all of that gloomy character, with the single exception of this remark of R. Abba: "You can find no clearer sign of the end than Ez. 36.8, 'But ye, O mountains of Israel, ye shall shoot forth your branches and yield your fruit to My people Israel, for they are near at hand to come'" (Sanh. 98a). The other teachers give exactly opposite signs (ib.)

C. OPPOSITION TO THE CALCULATIONS.

Under this heading we shall consider two different types of sayings: the first attack Messianic reckonings directly and for a practical consideration; the second group imply indirectly--and perhaps unconsciously--antagonism to some of the fundamental concepts of eschatology.

The denunciations hurled against those who sought to calculate the moment of the end (*מחשבי קץ*) were occasioned by a purely practical reason, we have said. It was feared that should some erroneous calculation prove illusory, the faith of the people in the Messiah's ultimate advent might be shaken--so says R. Jonathan (Sanh. 97b). The horrors of the Hadrianic persecution must have led the cooler-headed leaders to oppose anything that might incite further revolt and result in further misery. That these protests were of little avail may be deduced from the number of calculations which are still preserved and which we have considered thus far. It is indeed interesting to note that the protests date from widely different periods, a fact which testifies sufficiently to the persistent

activity of the calculators; the most violent of these attacks, however, emanate from the younger generation of the Hadrianic period. R. Jonathan roundly curses the calculators (Sanh. 97b) and his contemporary R. Jose b. Halaftha denies them a portion in the world to come (DEZ ch. 10) (7). There is another saying of R. Jose, cited by R. Alexander in Lam. R. pet.21, that anyone who knows how many years Israel served idols will be able to reckon how many years must elapse before the Messiah arrives: Jer. 5.19, Hos. 2.15, and Zech. 7.13 are then quoted to support the view that the Galut will last as many years as Israel practiced idolatry. In view of Jose's violent polemic against the calculators it seems likely that the present statement was ironical, meaning--it is as impossible to determine the length of the Exile as to compute the exact number of years, that Israel, those inveterate backsliders, prayed to idols. But if R. Alexander was right in taking the statement seriously, we must conclude either that R. Jose changed his opinions in the course of time or that we have to do here with two different teachers of the same name.

If the calculations of the end were an acute cause of trouble in the days of R. Jose, the evil continued in a chronic form for years after. In the next generation R. Nathan voices his disapproval of the calculations of earlier Rabbis (see above p.15) and quotes as his own motto Hab.3.3: "For the vision is yet for the appointed time, and it declareth of the end and doth not lie. Tho it tarry, wait for it, because it will surely come, it will not delay" (Sanh. 97b). The Mishnah names among those subjects on which speculation is forbidden the things that are ahead. An anonymous Beraita, of considerable antiquity since it is found already in Mek. to Ex.17.32 (also Pes. 54b, Gen. R. 65.12, Eccl. R. 11.5), names among the seven things that we

cannot discover "the day of comfort" and the day when Rome will fall. The Amoraim speak in a similar strain. R. Johanan and R. Lakish interpret Is. 63.4 to mean that God has not revealed the "day of vengeance" except to His own heart (Sanh. 99a); elsewhere R. Johanan and R. Eleazar b. Pedat declare that as the sins of the first exiles (those taken captive by Nebuchadrezzar) were made public (by the denunciations of the prophets), so also the length of their exile was announced--whereas we, whose sins are secret, are left in the dark as to the length of our exile (Yoma 9b). R. Zeira believed the Messiah would arrive when least expected (Sanh. 97a). R. Levi warns us against trying to reveal the end (Ket. 111a); in a similar strain R. Helbo (Cant. R. 2.7).

The same feeling is probably behind the legend that Jacob sought on his death-bed to reveal the end to his sons, whereupon it was suddenly hidden from him (R. Eleazar b. Abina in Gen.R. 98.3; Mid. Til. 31.7, Agg. Ber. ch.82) and the similar legend which relates how Jonathan b. Uzziel was interrupted in his translation of the Hagiographa (Meg. 3a).

.....

It may seem unwarranted to include under this heading those passages in which a marked ethical interpretation is put upon the coming of the end. The fact is, however,--whether the Rabbis realized it or not--that such views are out of harmony with the old eschatological conceptions. For while, of course, Jewish eschatology always distinguished sharply between good and evil, righteous and wicked, these ethical considerations affected only the outcome of the final judgment, but neither hastened nor delayed the Messianic advent. The latter would come at the end of an arbitrarily predestined

period. When, however, the coming of the Messiah is made dependant upon the performance of righteous acts or on repentance, all the vapourings about world-cycles and treasuries of souls go by the board. It seems that quite a few of the Rabbis were in accord with the spirit of Mar Samuel, who tried to stabilize the temperament of the people and to reduce fanatic and fantastic expectations by stripping the Messiah idea of those very supernatural elements that gave it such fascination. These teachers preferred to hearten the people by giving them an ethical goal to strive for rather than to console them with mystic calculations and mysterious predictions about the end of days.

Thus, for example, R. Hana asserts that the Son of David will not come until the haughty cease from Israel (Sanh. 98b). A statement already mentioned (Nid. 13b, see above p.20) ascribes the delay of the Messianic advent to proselytes--who were viewed with suspicion as still partly heathen--and to those who waste their sexual energy. The Targum to Mic.4.8 states that the Messiah is hidden because of the sins of Israel. We may perhaps include here the addition to the Beraita about the three world periods, cited above (p. 15 f.) from Sanh. 97a-97b and SER 2. According to this addition the years of "Torah" have been prolonged beyond their allotted measure of two thousand and extended into the period assigned to the Messiah "because of our sins, which are many." The motive for this appendix was, however, more probably, simply to explain away the non-fulfillment of the prophecy, rather than the desire to give an ethical reinterpretation of eschatology.

An extensive passus in Sanh. 97b-98a discusses the problem: must Israel repent before they can be redeemed? The affirmative view was held by R. Eliezer; his opponent, R. Joshua, always the less

rigorous, believed that the end would not be prolonged beyond the fixed limit: if Israel had not repented by that time, God would even send oppressors against them till they would have to repent perforce. The two disputants assailed each other with Biblical quotations each in support of his own views; but when R. Joshua cited Dan. 12.7, Eliezer was silenced.* This dispute was continued among the Amoraim. Rab, following Eliezer, asserted "All the limits set by the calculators have passed (without the Messiah arriving), and the matter now depends only on repentance" (Sanh. ib.). To this Samuel is said to have answered "It is enuf for a mourner to pass thru his regular mourning period." Rashi ad loc. is unable to decide whether God or Israel is designated by the word Mourner. But at all events, the Gemara, by equating this dispute with that of the Tannaim shows that the general trend of Samuel's statement was to this effect: that when the end comes, God will redeem Israel whether they are penitent or not, without further delay. It is interesting to observe that Samuel the rationalist was not so entirely indifferent to Messianic speculation as might appear from his famous dictum discussed above, p. 11 f.

These statements in which the advent of the Messiah is made dependent on the fulfillment of an ethical requirement represent no small advance over the old notions. The earlier view was that when the time was ripe, i.e., completed, the end must come, and nothing could delay it. In fact it was believed by some that God in His impatience might hasten the end. Numerous examples of this view are cited by Volz (p. 164 f.) from Apocalyptic writings; but only one instance of it occurs in Rabbinic writings. This is in a teaching of R. Eliezer b. Jacob, a Tanna of the third generation. Commenting on Cant. 2.8, he remarks that God will not insist on an exact literal fulfillment of all the antecedent requirements which have been laid

down as necessary for the Geullah, but will "skip over the mountains and bound over the hills", permitting a very broad interpretation of these requirements so that the redemption may be hastened (PRK 5.4^{7b}.42⁶; Pes. R.15.71b, Cant. R. 2.8). (8) In contrast to such a doctrine the view was held by some teachers that sin might delay the deliverance even beyond the appointed time, as we have seen. And many who could not find it in their hearts to believe that God would delay the end and prolong their suffering nevertheless introduced the ethical note by teaching that tho the end was fixed and would not be delayed, it might be hastened thru righteous conduct. R. Simeon b. Johai, for instance, declared that if Israel observed two Sabbaths properly they would be redeemed (Sab. 118a). The Amora Johanan expressed himself even more emphatically and clearly: "There is a fixed limit when the end of days will arrive whether or not Israel repents--in its time it will come--but should they repent for but a single day, the Messiah would come immediately." (Ex. R. 25.12) The same opinion is ascribed to R. Levi in j. Taan. 64^a*, Cant. R. 5.2; in Ex. R., loc.cit., he is represented as saying that proper observance of one Sabbath would bring about the redemption. The same idea is preserved in an utterance of R. Joshua b. Levi, and also in a legend about the same teacher. His statement runs: "If Israel does God's will, the end will be hastened, otherwise it will come only in its appointed time" (Sanh, 98a on Ms. 60.22). The legend (1b.) which contains some obscure details, relates how the sage beheld the Messiah seated among the lepers and mendicants at the gate of Rome (according to other readings, Eden). He asked the Son of David when his advent would occur, and received the answer "To-day." Returning to his friend the prophet Elijah, the Rabbi complained that the Messiah had mocked

him. Thereupon Elijah explained that by to-day was meant "To-day-- if ye would but hearken to His voice" (Ps. 95.7).

From all this it becomes clear that some of the Rabbis evidenced a marked tendency to eliminate the old-fashioned calculations and omens, substituting for them ethical requirements, and thus using the Messianic hope, not merely as a means of encouragement after the fashion of the Apocalypsts, but also as a vehicle for moral inspiration.

D. THE END NEAR OR FAR?

It is characteristic of Apocalyptic teaching to regard the end of the world as close at hand. "The Kingdom of God is among you." This is in the nature of the case, for Apocalyptic took its rise out of suffering, and consequently the hope of a speedy release was always prominent. Similarly, the wording of the Tephillah indicates the belief that the Messiah was expected daily; a large number of Rabbinic utterances justify the same conclusion. In fact, when we meet anything else, when the advent of the Messiah is put any great distance into the future, we may ipso facto regard this as a departure from and a modification of older views. The very raison d'être of the old eschatology was its consoling and inspiriting message that the days of trouble were almost over and relief speedily approaching.

Many of the views we have treated in this chapter imply the expectation of an early deliverance. The Rabbis criticized by R. Nathan (above, p.15) all cherished this hope; we learn from the same authority that Akiba adduced Hag. 2.6: "It is a little while, and I will shake the heavens and the earth", to support the claims of Bar Kokba. The Beraita of the school of Elijah (above, p. 15, 16, 26) in its original form set the year 242 C.E. (in all probability) for the

date of the Messianic advent. To these instances we may add the opinion of R. Zeira that the Messiah will come when least expected. (Sanh. 97a). There is also a somewhat obscure statement of R. Johanan in R. H. 31b (see above, p. 22) to the effect that just as the Shekinah made ten 'journeys' in departing from the first Temple (according to Ez. 9-11), so the Sanhedrin has made ten journeys since the year 70, each station being lower than the last. The tenth and lowest stop is Tiberias. And from the lowly dust, says the Rabbi, quoting Is. 29.4, they will be redeemed. This may mean that Johanan expected an early destruction of the Roman world-power, but is not quite explicit enuf to make us absolutely sure.

On the other hand the prophecy of R. Jose b. Kisma (above, p. 21 f.) indicates that even during the pre-Hadrianic period there were some who did not expect the deliverance for a long time yet. The bitter remark of R. Johanan b. Torta "Akiba, grass will be growing out of thy cheeks, and still the Messiah will not have come" (Lam. R. 2.2) is a statement more political than theological: it is evidently an attack on Akiba for supporting Bar Kokba. Nevertheless it indicates that even among the contemporaries of Akiba there were some who could conceive of the deliverance as still far distant.

From the Amoraic period we have likewise several statements that imply that the Messianic advent is still in the dim future. Such are R. Ketina's milennial calculations (above, p.16) and the notion that Balaam lived in the middle of the days of the world (see p. 18 f.). There is a similar implication in some of the ominous signs of the Messianic advent,--for instance the opinion that he would not arrive until Rome had become entirely Christian, or according to another view had been overthrown (see p. 22 and 40). For the consum-

mation of such events, considerable space of time must have been allowed.

Those predictions which place the Messianic coming in the fifth century present an interesting case. (Above, p. 16,ff.) We have seen that these predictions probably arose at first out of the tendency to draw parallels between the experiences of Israel in Egypt and their experiences in the later Galut. The oldest of these predictions is Tannaitic; hence the advent is here placed at least two hundred and fifty years ahead of the time when the saying was formulated. The statement is repeated in paraphrase by R. Hanina (perhaps a half-century later); the same ^egeneral view is expressed in the scroll brot to R. Hanan b. Tahalifa, another generation later still, [✓] and in Elijah's revelation to R. Judah, the brother of R. Sala the Pious, who lived in the fourth century. But when the time draws nigh for these prophecies to be fulfilled, we find R. Ashi doing his best to weaken and "water" them, so that the people will not place too much faith in them.

E. CONCLUSION.

From the consideration of the material we have presented, it becomes clear that the Rabbis inherited much of the old deterministic material and spirit. Calculations of the end, and the discovery of omens presaging the arrival of the Messiah absorbed not only the common people, but many of the leaders as well. Nevertheless we are able to observe the reaction of a small but influential minority against all this. We find outstanding teachers insisting on the one hand that the plans of God are not for man to spy out, and that we should await the deliverance patiently, without seeking to determine

the exact moment when it will occur; on the other hand, declaring that the approach of the redemption is not a matter of theory to be speculated on, but a practical consideration to be brot about by means of repentance, good deeds, and devotion to the Torah.

NOTES TO CHAPTER IV.

(1) See Volz, p. 168.

(2) The comparison of the Egyptian bondage to the Galut and the Exodus to the future redemption is common in Rabbinic sources. For instance Raba states that the same number will be redeemed in the future as went forth from Egypt (Sanh. 111a); Eleazar b. Pedat expected Rome to be punished in the same manner as was Egypt (Tan. B. Vaera 15); the redemption--according to R. Joshua--will occur in Nisan (Mek. to Ex. 12.42, where, R. Eliezer, however, sets the time for the future deliverance in Tishri; Abaye expected the Messiah to arrive on the 9th of Ab, PRK. cited in Rabnitzky and Bialik's Sefer Ha-Aggadah, v.3, p.54). Cp. also Fragment-Targum to Ex. 12.42, and Pseudo-Jonathan, Ex. 40.9-11. Cp. Pes. R. 136a bottom

(3) It is not sure whether his name was 'Anan or Hanan; see Hyman, pp.471 and 986.

(4) אֵלֶּהמוֹת תַּנִּינִים, so far as I know, the only occurrence of this expression in Rabbinic literature. Perhaps the direct source of this idea was Is. 27.1. The figure of a mythological dragon-monster is, of course, frequently found in the Apocalypses, being ultimately derived from the Babylonian Tiamat-myth.

(5) A table of the traditional chronology according to Seder Olam is given in Eisenstein's Ozar Yisrael, v.5, p.292 f.

(6) Cp. also the view ascribed to Resh Lakish in AZ. 56, and to R. Judah b. Simon in Gen. R. 24.4, that all souls and their future spheres in life were preordained from creation.

(7) It may well be that this is only a hyperbolical expression of strong disapproval, and that there are no real theological implications in the practice. 2

(8) Cp. also Mark 13.20, and Charles p. 383.

CHAPTER V: THE PANGS OF THE MESSIAH.

It was a commonplace of eschatology that the sufferings of the present--which were the immediate cause of any particular Apocalypse--would have to become even more severe, and that just before the arrival of the Messiah they would reach their height. Things must grow worse before they can become better. Hence in many Apocalypses, as well as in Rabbinic literature, we find extensive descriptions of the pre-Messianic woes, called by the Rabbis the "birth-pangs" or sometimes the "footsteps" of the Messiah. With this conception Volz joins likewise the War of Gog--the final attack of the heathen powers on Israel--grouping the two ideas under the heading "Die Letzte Böse Zeit" (pp. 173-190). He holds that the two concepts are corresponding elements in the two types of Jewish eschatology, namely, the universal-individual and the national. Whether this is true or not insofar as origins are concerned, the two notions are kept strictly apart in Rabbinic doctrine. Thus Bar Kappara enumerates as distinct events the wars of Gog and Magog, the pangs of the Messiah, and the Judgment of Gehenna. (Sab. 118b). R. Eleazar (probably E. of Modin) distinguishes between the day of Gog, the pangs of the Messiah, and the great Day of Judgment (Mek., to Ex. 16.25.) The birth-pangs of the Messiah are, as the name implies, that of as preceding the Messianic advent, while the war of Gog usually follows it, the Messiah himself frequently being represented as defeating the heathen invaders.

We have said that the Rabbinic pictures of the dire portents and dread happenings of this time closely resemble the accounts of the Apocalypses (above, p. 9 f.). The name "pangs of the Messiah" (חבלי משיח, חבלי של משיח) applied to these occurrences, is, however, peculiar to Rabbinic sources. The term occurs but once--so

far as I know--in an extra-Rabbinic work, namely in Mark 13.9. This passage of the Gospel, according to Charles (p.384, where he adduces the support of other eminent NT scholars) is an adaptation of an originally Jewish apocalypse, dating from the years 67-68 C.E. Graetz (v.2, p.412f.) places it in the Hadrianic period. The Rabbis occasionally call the Messianic woes by the term "footsteps of the Messiah" (עקבות משיח), an expression derived from Ps. 89.52.

So much for the name. In considering the content of the idea, it is necessary to turn to Sanh. 97a, the locus classicus for the subject. There we find, in addition to numerous brief utterances, each emphasizing some single feature of the "pangs", several complete pictures of the pre-Messianic terrors. These statements offer many interesting problems, not only of interpretation, but also of text-criticism and transmission. The details will be presented in a note (1). Here we will state the difficulties briefly. The text of Sanhedrin contains five pictures; the first is a Memra of R. Johanan, the others are Beraitot, of which one is anonymous, and the rest ascribed to R. Judah, Nehemiah, and Nehorai. These statements are repeated in PRK. 5.51.46, Pes. R. 15.75, Cant. R. 2.10, DEZ. ch. 10, Pseudo-SEZ. ch. 16, p. 11 f. In almost every case these versions present variants of considerable importance, not only of the text of the sayings themselves, but also of the names of their authors. Thus, the statement ascribed to R. Judah in Sanhedrin is assigned elsewhere to R. Abin, Resh Lakish, and Rabban Gamliel! In several cases the statements of R. Nehorai and R. Nehemiah are fused and confused into one. Finally, in the last Mishnah of Tractate Sotah the views of R. Judah, Nehorai, and Nehemiah are jumbled into one, presented practically thruout in the language used by these

Rabbis, but without the name of any authority. Altogether it is a remarkable confusion.

Klausner is at great pains to demonstrate that the four Beraivot all come from younger pupils of Akiba, who experienced the Hadrianic persecution. The anonymous statement he ascribed to Simeon b. Johai on the authority of DEZ ch. 10; it is a matter of common knowledge that Judah and Nehemiah were pupils of Akiba; and the obscure R. Nehorai is identified by Klausner (p. 11, and 51, n.5) with R. Meir, on the basis of Erub. 13b. However this may be, there is not as much significance to it as Klausner seems to think. For though the Hadrianic horrors may have intensified the pessimistic strain in eschatology, the concept of the pangs of the Messiah was, as we have pointed out (p.9f) fully articulated in pre-Hadrianic days.

Now as to the statements themselves. The Memra of R. Johanan is as follows: "In the generation during which the Son of David is to come, scholars will become few, the eyes of the rest of the people will be worn by reason of sorrow and sighing; great troubles and oppressive decrees will arrive; while one is being enforced, the next will be hastening to come." This presents little difficulty, being simply an elaboration of R. Johanan's other remark: "When you see a generation flooded by troubles as by a river, look for him" (Sanh. 98a). The only questionable word in the present utterance is decrees, which may mean either decrees of the government, or perhaps divine dispensations.

The second picture, ascribed in one source to the mystically minded revolutionary Simeon B. Johai runs: "The week (i.e., the seven-year period) during which the Son of David is to come--the first year will be fulfilled Am.4.7: 'I have caused it to rain on one

city and not on another'; the second year, arrows of famine will be sent forth; the third, there will be a great famine, men, women, and children will die, likewise hasidim and miracle workers, and the Torah will be forgotten by its students; the fourth year, there will be plenty and not plenty; the fifth, great plenty, they will eat, drink and rejoice, and the Torah will return to its students (another reading: to its former flourishing state *להידור*); in the sixth year there will be voices (*קולות*); in the seventh, wars; at the end of the seventh year the Son of David will arrive."

This is rather more difficult. It seems to mean that as the result of a drought in the first year a famine will ensue, reaching its height in the third year. After this conditions improve again, and by the fifth year everything is once more flourishing. This feature is queer and almost unparalleled (2); usually the ~~the~~ ^{hot} is that conditions get steadily worse up to the very last moment. The meaning of the word *golot*, the omen of the sixth year, is likewise most uncertain. Klausner (p. 52, likewise Bacher AT ii p.145) translates "Gerüchte (über die ⁿnahenden Ereignisse vernehmbar)"; but the word may just as likely mean ⁿoutcries of the sufferers, or battle-shouts, or thunder--always regarded as a portent. As for the wars, it is hard to say whether they are the general world-tumult referred to in Gen. R. 42.4, Pes. R. 36.162a) or whether the reference is to the last attack on Jerusalem under Gog. The Messiah arrives, it appears, just when the wars are at their height.

This picture was the target of some criticism by later teachers, apparently because of its over-systematic form. R. Joseph complains (Sanh. 97a and parallels) that the signs have been fulfilled over and over again without the Messiah having arrived; and Abaye

points out (ib.) that we must not expect the signs to transpire in the exact order laid down in the Beraita. In the versions of the Pesikta and Canticles Rabbah, these Rabbis and R. Abahu (but this is probably a scribal error for Abaye) are represented as rejecting the predictions of this Beraita in favor of those given by R. Judah.

The latter are as follows: "In the generation during which the Son of David is to come, the assembly-houses (of scholars) will be given over to lewdness; Galilee will be devastated and Gablan destroyed; the inhabitants of the boundary will go about from city to city, but receive no mercy; the wisdom of the scholars will be loathsome, those that fear sin will be despised; the faces of that generation will be dog-like; 'truth will be driven forth and those who turn from evil will be mocked' (Is. 59.15)".

These signs are quite in the traditional style: misery, wickedness, and the decay of scholarship are constant elements in the pictures of the Messianic woes. The only difficulty centers around the words Galilee, Gablan and Haggebul, which we have translated the boundary. We have followed here the text preserved in Sanh. and Sot.; in the Midrashim the text reads אַנְשֵׁי הַגָּלִיל, 'the men of Galilee', instead of אַנְשֵׁי הַגְּבוּל, 'the men of the boundary'. Some authorities identify Gablan with Gaulonitis, a trans-Jordanic section; Jastrow, however, regards Gebul and Gablan as variants of the same word, meaning Highland. The notion seems to be that the outlying sections of Palestine will be devastated, and that their inhabitants, naturally the first to suffer in war, will be driven to beg in the cities of the interior; so great will the suffering be even there, however, that the beggars will have no success. (3)

R. Nehorai's forecast is based on Micah 5.6. In its

original form--for in some texts it has been confused with the predictions of R. Nehemiah--it reads: "In the generation during which the Son of David is to come, youths will shame elders, elders will have to rise up before youths, a daughter will rise up against her mother and a bride against her mother-in-law, and the faces of that generation will be dog-like, and a son will have no respect for his father."

R. Nehemiah's opinion offers special textual difficulties. It declares: "In the generation during which the Son of David is to come, impudence will be great.....the vine will give its fruit, but wine will be expensive, the entire government will adopt the views of the heretics, and there will be no rebuke." The dots represent two words which are not only obscure, but which appear in the different versions in equally difficult variant readings. They may mean "The nobility will be oppressive (or offensive)" or according to a different interpretation, "Dearth will reach its height" or "Dearth will continue for a long time." The variants and the diverse explanations given thereof by scholars are treated fully in note (4).

The impudence predicted by the Rabbi is likewise characteristic of the Messianic woes, according to many descriptions; any of the multitudinous translations of the second sign would also seem to fit in pretty well. The exact import of the third sign is not quite clear; the grapes will be grown, wine will be expensive, due to profiteering perhaps; or it may be that some sort of ill luck is implied. The fourth sign--that Christianity will establish itself officially--is probably a way of indicated that the gravest apostacy and the most utter depravity will hold sway.

As we have noted above, the predictions of Judah, Nehorai,

and Nehemiah are combined into a single anonymous statement at the end of Mishnah Sotah. (Whether this passus is really a part of the Mishnah proper is disputed: Klausner, p.49, n.4.) This statement is introduced by the words **בְּעֻקְבוֹת מָשִׁיחַ**, lit. "on the heels of the Messiah" or "in the footsteps of the Messiah." Dr. Lauterbach has suggested that this passage is not to be understood as Messianic, but as a description of actual conditions in Palestine after the rise of Christianity. This theory he bases on the fact that the passus follows immediately upon a statement of R. Gamliel describing the pathetic state of affairs in Palestine after the fall of the State, and on the word **בְּעֻקְבוֹת**, which he thinks means after more likely than before. But the fact is that this word was derived from a Biblical verse (Ps. 89.52) which is interpreted elsewhere in a Messianic sense (see below, p.40). In addition we must reckon with the fact that the statements found in Sotah are all borrowed from unquestionably Messianic utterances, which date from a time long before Christianity became the state religion, that the verbs are all in the future tense--the frequentative imperfect being highly unusual in Mishnaic Hebrew--, and that the use of the word Messiah in reference to Jesus, without anything to show that the expression is ironical, is highly unlikely.

In addition to these more or less extensive accounts of the pre-Messianic sufferings, we possess a number of briefer statements, which present a single feature of those dread times. Thus we find in several places the announcement that close to the days of the Messiah a great ^{pestilence} ~~thing~~ will come to the world, and the wicked will be destroyed. (PRK. 5.51a, Pes. R. 15.75a, Cant. R. 2.10 in the name of R. Hiyya b. Abba; Pes. R. 1 end (fragmentary) in the name of R. Levi).

~~What the great thing may be is only to be guessed at.~~ This view seems to assign a rather passive role to the Messiah, since the extermination of the wicked will be accomplished before his advent. Even this, however, is uncertain, since "near the days of the Messiah" may simply mean before the Messianic kingdom is fully established. In this case the great thing would not mean the pangs of the Messiah at all, but the final judgment. In this connection we may note also Pes. R. 1 end: "R. Eleazar says: Near the days of the Messiah, ten places will be swallowed up, ten places overturned, and ten places killed (!)". This is enigmatic indeed.

The remaining dicta on the subject fall into a few groups and agree substantially in presenting a picture of a time of poverty, ignorance, sin, and despair.

The Messiah will not arrive until the last copper is gone from the purse (Sanh. 97a, Sifre to Deut. 32.36); prices of all commodities will be equally exorbitant (Sanh. 98a); so scarce will food be that a fish will not be obtainable for an invalid (ib.). The scholars in particular will suffer from poverty (ib.) and from persecution (Ket. 112b); as a result their numbers will diminish (Sanh. 97a).

There will be a sort of reign of terror in those days. The Messiah will come only to a dog-like generation, says R. Abba b. Cahanah; only to an impudent generation worthy of extermination; according to R. Jannai--who bases himself on Ps. 89.52--you may expect the Messiah when you see a blasphemous, profane generation. (Pes. R. 1 end, 15.75b, Cant. R. 2.10; in the different versions the names of the authors are confused.) The Son of David will not arrive until the ruling power has been completely converted to Christianity, says R. Isaac (Sanh. 97a: **סִימְטָא** is evidently a substitute for **מִינִי**,

as it is given in Arukh Sifra
 61111

made to satisfy the censor).

So severe will the suffering be that redemption will be despaired of (Sifre to Deut. 32.36, Sanh. 97a). According to Mid. Til, 2.9, all the suffering which Israel must undergo thruout its entire history may be divided into three equal parts--the suffering endured by the patriarchs and their posterity, the suffering of the Hadrianic period, and the suffering of the generation of the Messiah. This statement, by the way, is the work of an Amora, R. Iddi; despite the explicit reference to the Hadrianic persecution, it dates from a later period. This likewise indicates that it is not necessary to follow Klausner (p. 41 f.) in assuming that the anonymous Beraita about the week of years must be Hadrianic, even tho some of the omens therein given can be interpreted as actual pictures of conditions during that time. In further testimony to the dreadfulness of the pangs of the Messiah, we have the remark "Let him come, but let me not see him" ascribed in Sanh. 98b to R. Johanan and to Ulla; these teachers were willing, it seems to forego the bliss of beholding the Messiah if they could escape the horrors that would inevitably precede his advent. The same notion is found in the Apocalypses (Volz, p. 178).

It is a little difficult to decide whether the accounts of the Messianic woes found in Pirke de-Rabbi Eliezer and Pesikta Rab-bati should be considered here; for these pictures have considerable affinity with the Neo-Hebrew apocalypse. In many respects, however, they are in accord with older views. Thus PRE. (ch. 30, p.221 f.) enumerates persecution, the decay of truth, the neglect of Torah and concomitant increase of sin as among the occurrences preceding the final deliverance. The only indication of poverty is the state-

ment that there will be worm-crimson in the wool. Like the Beraita ascribed to Simeon b. Johai (above page 36) this passage seems to foretell an improvement of conditions before the final war; but in the PRE., this improvement is probably a reflection of actual historical events.

The Pesikta Rabbati contains old Midrashic material on our topic, which has already been presented. But in piskot 34 and 36 of this work there are two special descriptions that, like the rest of the contents of these sections, contain many unique features. The accounts have of course certain points of contact with the older Rabbinic views; thus in chapter 34 we read that one of the principal features of the pre-Messianic suffering will be a great famine (p. 158b). The idea that the sufferings will increase continually likewise reminds us of the older opinions. This passus, by the way, mentions a portent common in Apocalyptic, but not found elsewhere in Rabbinic sources--unseasonable storms.

Piska 36 devotes much space to the sufferings undergone by the Messiah himself--a subject that need not concern us here. The following remark of R. Isaac is, however, noteworthy: "The year when King Messiah is revealed, all the heathen kings will fight against each other. The King of Persia will war against the King of Arabia, and the King of Arabia will go to Edom (Rome) to take counsel. And the King of Persia will turn and devastate the entire world. All the peoples will quake and be affrighted and fall upon their faces; pangs will seize them as of a woman in labor," etc. (p. 162a). In its picture of a general world struggle this recalls Eleazar b. Abina's prediction (Gen. R. 42.4, above p. 22 f.); in the notion of a world conquest by Persia it reminds us of the words of Jose b. Kisma (Sanh. 98b, above p. 22). According to Bacher, however (PA ii p. 294, n. 4),

this statement as it stands in the Pes. R. is the expansion of an utterance of the Palestinian Amora Isaac, which has been reworked by a later hand to make it applicable to the war between the Sassanides and the Arabs.

We have attempted to point out an anti-eschatological or at least anti-apocalyptic trend among the Rabbis, which led them to interpret the coming of the end in ethical instead of in purely deterministic terms. Such interpretations of the concept of the Messianic woes are rare. The very root of the idea was that the righteous must suffer heavily ere they can enjoy the bliss that is to be theirs. This is the reason why some of the Rabbis did not even want to witness the Messiah's advent. Three statements, however, are extant in which immunity from the pangs of the Messiah is promised as a reward for meritorious behavior. R. Eliezer (Sanh. 98b) declares that one can avoid the pangs of the Messiah by study of the Torah and good deeds. R. Eleazar and Bar Kappara (Mek. to Ex. 16.25 and Sab. 118b respectively) are more specific. R. Eleazar promises an escape from the pangs and from other troublous occasions to those who keep the Sabbath; and Bar K^Ppara mentions particularly that they must eat the three Sabbath meals. But perhaps we should regard these as hyperbolic expressions of the importance of Sabbath observance, not as eschatological dicta--the Rabbis were fond of such exaggerations (5).

In a unique remark, Abaye denies that the pangs of the Messiah will be felt in Babylonia (Ket. 111a). All sorts of deductions can be made from this Memra, but in the absence of any further information, it is useless to make guesses.

only in one anton locality - Babylon

NOTES ON CHAPTER V.

(1) It is likely that the text of the Babylonian Talmud Sanhedrin is the most reliable, and the composite at the end of Sotah generally agrees with it. All the variants and likewise suggestions for settling the various difficulties can be found in Buber's note on the version of PRK. and Friedmann's notes on the Pes. R. and SEZ. The following table exhibits the chief variants in convenient form.

Sanhedrin 97a	(1) Johanan	(2) Anonymous (תנו רבנן)	(3) Judah	(4) Nehorai	(5) Nehemiah
Pesikta de- Rab Kahana. 5.51.46	Johanan slight var.	רבנן אמרי abbrevia- ted	Abin incomplete r. גליל for גבול	Nehorai somewhat confused with Neh.'s view	-----
Pesikta Rabbati 15.75	Johanan slight var. חכמים מתיים for חכמים	ת"ר slight var.	Abin, as in PRK	Nehorai as in PRK.	-----
Cant. R. 2. 10 f.	תנו רבנן	Johanan full	Resh Lakish full	Nehorai nearly as complete as Sanh.	Nehemiah for var. see n. (4)
Derek Erez Zutta, ch. 10	-----	Simeon b. Johai	Gamliel r. גליל for גבול	Nehorai	Nehemiah see n. (4)
Pseudo Seder Eliahu Zutta ch. 16, p. 11.	Johanan	Anonymous	Judah r. גול for גבול	Nehorai, as in Cant, R.	Nehemiah, as in Cant. R.

Klausner asserts categorically that the ascription of these statements to R. Gamliel, Resh Lakish, etc., are false. But it is questionable logic to accept the testimony of DEZ as certainly correct in the case and certainly false in another. It is true that Friedmann points out that the Beraita ascribed to Simeon in DEZ is in Cant. R. assigned to R. Johanan, whom we know, transmitted many of Simeon's utterances (see Hyman on the two Rabbis). This might seem to indicate that we have here another instance in which Johanan is handing down the words of the older teacher, the words 'in the name of R. Simeon b. Johai' having dropt out. Against this view we may point out simply that the headings of sayings (1) and (2) have been interchanged in Cant. R., the statement elsewhere always ascribed to R. Johanan being there presented as if it were an anonymous Beraita. The prophecy of the world week may

very well be quite old, and may antedate R. Simeon as well as R. Johanan. Its very artificiality of structure may be taken as an indication that it does not date from a period of actual suffering.

(2) A parallel may exist in PRE, ch. 30, p. 221 f. See also p. 42.

(3) See Jastrow s.v. גבול, גבלא, גבול. Levy has a similar interpretation. Note that Gabla sometimes refers to Idumea.

(4) The first sign, according to Sanh. and DEZ is the increase of impudence העזות תרבה; Sot. gives חופצא יסגא, the Aramaic equivalent. This is preferable to העזות תרבה 'poverty will be great', the reading of Cant. R. and SEZ., the corruption being easy to account for.

The second sign reads in Sanh. ה' יוקר יעות, in Sot. ה' יוקר יאמיר. Klausner and Levy translate יוקר in the common sense of dearth, Jastrow takes it in the sense--found elsewhere occasionally--of nobility. Klausner says that יעות means 'will last a long time', comparing Is. 40.4; Jastrow renders 'will be offensive'; Levy offers no assistance. Conceivably the phrase might also mean "That which is honorable (precious) will be perverted": cp. the reading יעות in DEZ. For the reading of Sotah the following translations are given: The dearth will reach its height (Klausner, comparing Is. 17.6,9); the nobility will be oppressive (Jastrow, citing Ps. 94.4); respect will disappear (Goldschmidt, deriving יאמיר from Aramaic אס 'abspe- stig werden', a sense not found in Jastrow); trouble (occasioned by the tyrannical government) will increase (Levy). The reading ה' יוקר "poverty will exist" is to be rejected on the old principle that a more difficult reading is likely to be original: this is the surer since Cant. R. is a late production. Another reading of Cant. R. "the wine will be fetid", instead of "the wine will be dear" is likewise to be rejected.

The reading "Sadducees" in Sanh. is undoubtedly a change for the benefit of the censor; the other versions all read "heretics", a reading supported by the sense.

(5) For instance Akiba's "Profane the Sabbath rather than become obligated to others (Sab. 118a) and the discussion of the Am Ha'aretz in Pes. 49b.

CHAPTER VI: THE WARS OF GOG AND MAGOG.

References to Gog and Magog occur now and again thruout Rabbinic literature without, however, there being any extensive modification or amplification of the prophecy of Ez. 38-39. The only new feature, which moreover, does not appear in all the Rabbinic accounts, is the association of the Messiahs with this war.

Probably the oldest extant reference is that in Mishnah Eduyot 2.10, in the name of Akiba: "The judgment of Gog and Magog will last twelve months." This is quite ambiguous: what is meant by judgment? The Rabbinical commentators (see Tosaphot Yom Tob ad loc.) suppose that it refers to the period during which the defeated armies of the invaders are being hunted down and destroyed--a sort of prolonged death-agony. Volz (p.275) thinks that the twelve months of judgment are those which Gog must spend in Hell. But this is almost certainly erroneous; for since any ordinary sinner must suffer in Gehenna for a year, why should there be any special mention of this in connection with the arch-criminal Gog, who should be, if anything, punished longer? Klausner (p.8) comes nearer the truth, I believe, when he explains the expression as referring to a "protracted war with the enemies of Israel, which will last a full year."

This is one of the few eschatological statements preserved in the name of Akiba, a fact that is easy to understand. Akiba, believing that he had found in Bar Kokba the realization of the prophetic promises, devoted himself rather to action than to speculation. This statement about Gog and Magog may very likely, as Klausner points out (ib.) refer to the revolt against Rome, to whom the name of Gog may have been applied. In general, however, the Rabbis did not use Gog as a nickname for Rome. In PRK. 32.148a.132b a clear distinction is made between Edom (Rome) on the one hand, and Gog and

Magog on the other. Pes. R. 37. 163a mentions as separate events the days of the Messiah, the fall of wicked Rome, and the war of Gog and Magog. In Yoma 10a, Magog is identified with Candia (Crete). In SER ch.1, p.5, Gog is not a separate personality or nation at all, but a collective title for all the heathen. This passage--in variance with the splendid liberal spirit which marks other sections of the book--consigns all the Gentiles to Hell in punishment chiefly for their heartlessness at the time when the First Temple was destroyed.

How will Gog and Magog go about their attack? In answer to this question, let us first cite an oft-repeated homily of R. Levi, found in PRK. 9.79a.70b, Lev. R. 27.11, Tanh. Emor, Esth. R. 3.12, Mid. Til. 2.4, Agg. Ber. ch.2. The Rabbi pictures Israel's arch-enemies --Pharaoh, Sennacherib, Haman, etc.--as each trying to profit by the mistakes made by his predecessors in their attacks on Israel, and yet as each in his own turn coming to grief. At length Gog appears on the scene. He explains the ill success of the others by the fact that they warred against Israel without first defeating God, the source of Israel's strength. Accordingly battle is now prepared "against the Lord and against His anointed"(Ps. 2.2). But "He who sitteth in the heavens laugheth" (ib. v.3). Most of the versions of this Midrash conclude with God addressing the attackers in scornful wrath, threatening to annihilate them Himself, or enumerating the multitudinous powers He can command for their destruction. In the Aggadat Bereshit, however, it is said that the nations will be destroyed by the curse of rotting. In passing we may note that the interpretation of Psalm 2 as referring to Gog and Magog is rather a common-place of Rabbinic exegesis.

According to a well established tradition found in Sanh.

Sanh. 17a (1), the young prophets Eldad and Medad prophesied concerning Gog and Magog. Accordingly the Palestinian Targumim to the Eldad and Medad episode (Num. 11.26) furnish this prophecy in full. Pseudo-Jonathan says: "They both prophesied together and said, 'Lo, a king shall come up from the land of Magog at the end of days, and shall gather all the kings who wear crowns and the prefects girded in chain mail; and all the peoples shall obey him and set in battle array in the Land of Israel against the Children of the Captivity. But the Lord will be ready for them in the hour of trouble and will kill them all with the burning of His breath, with the flame of fire that shall issue from beneath His Throne of Glory. And their carcasses shall fall upon the mountains of Palestine and the beasts and the fowls shall devour their bodies. And after that all the dead of Israel shall be quickened,' " etc.

The Fragment-Targum to this passage is considerably different. It reads: "At the very end of days, Gog and Magog will go up against Jerusalem; but into the hand of King Messiah will they fall; and for seven years the people of Israel will make fires of their weapons", etc. (see Ez. 39.9 f.).

The scene of the final battle, according to Mek. to Ex. 17.14, Sifre to Deut. 34.3, is not Jerusalem, but the plain of Jericho. A remarkable picture presented by R. Huna and others in Mid. 2 Til. 119.2 enumerates three attacks made by Gog upon Israel. The third will be the final advance on Jerusalem; and as the heathen armies proceed, they will draft into their host many of the Judeans, each of whom will be guarded by two powerful warriors to prevent his escape. The Judeans, unable to desert, will pray to God that when the battle takes place they may be delivered into the hands of the

defenders, and not the reverse. As a reward for this unselfish patriotism God will cause special strength to descend upon them and they will be enabled to overcome their guards. Perhaps some special historical occurrence is at the bottom of this Midrash.

Altho the defeat of Gog is assured from the start, the invaders will cause great terror before they are finally crushed. As a result those Gentiles who will have been refused admission to the congregation of Israel (in accordance with the principle that no proselytes will be accepted in Messianic times: AZ. 3b, Yeb. 24b), and who therefore became Jews of their own making (גרים גזירים) will when the foreign power appears renounce their adopted faith in fright, strip off their Tephillin and flee (AZ. 3b.).

Who will destroy Gog and Magog? According to the passage cited above from Pseudo-Jonathan, the invaders are slain miraculously by God Himself--the vague doom predicted by Ezekiel being made more definite by the Targum. No mention of the Messiah appears. The Fragment-Targum presents the more widely accepted view, that the Messiah will effect the destruction of the hostile armies. This very view is in fact found elsewhere in Pseud.-Jon., namely Num. 24.17-20, where the Messiah is represented as slaying Gog as well as Israel's ancient foes. It is also in agreement with Tan. B. Terumah 6, where Resh Lakish asserts that the Messiah will destroy the idolaters, and many similar passages, which, since they contain neither the name of Gog nor the picture of an organized attack on Palestine, will be treated below in connection with the final judgment. A third, but rare view is that the conqueror of Gog will be the Messiah b. Joseph, Pseud.-Jon. to Ex. 40.11. We read likewise in PRE.18.31 of a Messiah named Menahem b. Amiel b. Joseph, who will gore the heathen like an

ox; and an old tradition that the seed of Esau (Rome) can only be conquered by the seed of Joseph (Gen. R. 73.7, 75.5, 99.2, cited by Samuel b. Nachman; cp. Pes. R. 12.49b-50a) is generally interpreted as a reference to the Ephraimite Messiah.--But as we have seen, Rome and Gog are not to be identified.

The accepted view is that the Messiah b. Joseph, far from conquering Gog, will be killed in the war, altho this notion is found only once in strictly Talmudic literature, and there only by implication. This is in Suk. 52ab. There we read that the Messiah b. David, asked by God to name his dearest wish, requests life because he perceives that the Messiah b. Joseph has been slain. The verse Zech. 12.10 is also explained in this passus as referring to the mourning over the death of the Ephraimite Messiah. Rashi ad loc. explains that the Messiah b. Joseph was slain in the wars of Gog and Magog; and while his interpretation is no doubt based on the Neo-Hebrew eschatological writings, we need not hesitate to accept it, since it fits in well with the sense of the text. (2). The prevailing view, however, is that the Davidic redeemer will be the agent for the extermination of the heathen hosts.

NOTES TO CHAPTER VI

(1) Ascribed in the printed editions to R. Nahman; according to Klausner, p. 100, who cites Bacher AT ii p. 235, n.3, the tradition goes back to the Tanna Nehemiah.

(2) A full discussion of the concept of the Messiah b. Joseph is outside the scope of our study. For an account of the rise of this idea, see Klausner pp. 86 ff., and literature there mentioned.

CHAPTER VII: THE LAST JUDGMENT.

The concept of the final judgment was never^{worked out} thoroly or consistently by the Rabbis. They offer us a number of accounts of the yom haddin, but they never distinguished clearly between the judgment on the nations--in which whole peoples are judged en masse--and the individualistic judgment which every soul must undergo. The suggestion that according to the traditional view the Goyim are to be judged as a group, while every Israelite will be given a separate hearing (cp. Charles, p. 107)--a suggestion intended to reconcile two unequal elements--is untenable. In both aspects it is refuted by such statements as "All Israel has a share in the world to come" (Mish. Sanh. 12.1) and "The pious of the heathen have a share in the world to come" (Tos. Sanh. 13.2). Cp. also the statement that when God judges Israel, He will do so standing up, i.e., briefly and superficially; but when He judges the nations, He will do so sitting down, i.e., at length and thoroly (Gen. R. 82.8). We must recognize that the Rabbis did not care to harmonize the contrasting and often contradictory views of the judgment.

It should also be remarked that many of the passages which treat of the judgment of the individual do not clearly refer to the last Judgment Day. Sometimes they seem to refer to the annual judgment in Tishri (e.g., R.H. 37a), sometimes to a judgment immediately after death (e.g., R. Johanan b. Zakkai in Ber. 28b), sometimes to retribution in general, even perhaps in this world (e.g. Abot, passim). Finally, we must repeat, our material is frequently obscure and fragmentary. In view of all this, we shall not be able to do much more than present the material, without drawing many conclusions therefrom.

A. THE JUDGMENT OF THE NATIONS.

We consider first an account of the judgment which appears in several widely differing versions, and the constant element in which is an argument submitted by the nations before God's tribunal: why should we be punished more severely than Israel, who are just as guilty as we? n

The oldest form of the picture is that of R. Eleazar of Modin (Cant. R. 8.8, Mid. Til. 1.20). The nations approach God, and point out that Israel is equally guilty with them of the three capital crimes, murder, incest and idolatry; why then, they argue, should He be more merciful to Israel? In reply God proposes a trial by ordeal. Let all the nations pass thru Hell, each with its own God; He will accompany Israel thru the fires. (Mic. 4.5). The clear implication--not stated in this passus, tho plainly set forth elsewhere, as we shall see--is that the nations and their deities will be annihilated together by the flames of Gehenna, while Israel, guarded by God, will be unharmed. It is interesting to speculate as to whether the original Beraita of R. Eleazar was not more complete: but in the other versions as well, the account does not go beyond the point of discussion and the outcome of the judgment is left to the imagination.

The second version is that of R. Johanan (Ruth R. pet. 1.1) which has been reworked in Mid. Til. 20.3 (1) with the following interesting exordium:...."The day which all agree will be a day of woe for celestial and terrestrial beings, a day of which even the ministering angels are afraid" (as proved by Jer. 30.6). The Gentiles and Israel will of course be greatly affrighted. "God will say to the nations, 'Come and enter into judgment with My children the people of Israel.' They answer, 'Master of the world! Who can enter into judgment with Israel? They have the record (commentarius)

of our transgressions, but who will present the record of theirs?'" (2). When God offers to perform this function, they launch into their argument, and the rest of the passage is substantially the same in both sources. When the nations have presented their case, Michael the advocate of Israel, is unable to offer any refutation. Perceiving this, God Himself offers to save Israel by speaking of their righteousness: Is. 63.1. This righteousness (צדקה) consisted in their acceptance of the Torah, by which act, according to the Rabbinic interpretation, they not only saved their own lives and brot about the recognition of God's Kingdom, but also prevented the world from returning to primeval chaos. At this point the scene ends.

A third variation, the latest and least interesting, is the work of R. Judah b. Simon. (Cant. R. 8.8, Mid. Til. 15.5) According to this account God answers the nations by quoting "We have a little sister and she hath no breasts." This means: Just as a minor is not held responsible for its actions until it reaches maturity, so Israel is not called to account for its transgressions until the Day of Atonement--and then they are forgiven. This weak argument is reinforced in the version of Mid. Til. 15 by the following: "God quotes 'If a man were to give all the wealth of his house for love, he would be condemned.'" (Cant. 8.7). 'Shall I', He continues, 'despise Israel (who love Me)?' Then the nations offer their treasures as an atonement for their sins, but God declares that the greatest treasures in the world cannot compensate for the slight to smallest letter in the Torah, which they have spurned.

Besides the three forms of this Midrash which have been presented, there is likewise a noteworthy passage in Lev. R. 21.4 (in the name of Samuel b. Isaac), where the angelic patrons of the

nations as coming before God every Yom Kippur with exactly the same argument as that which we have just seen put into the mouth of the heathen at the final judgment.

It is necessary to point out that tho the framework and language of all these versions are much alike, the view of R. Eleazar of Modin, with its proposal of a trial of strength, is fundamentally different from the strictly forensic accounts of the othwr teachers. It has certain implications, half-theological, half-mythical, which are further elucidated by other passages. The notion that the final judgment will affect not only the heathen, but also their gods is fairly common, and may have been influenced by such passages as "Also on the gods of Egypt will I execute judgments" (Ex. 12.12; on the frequent parallels between the Exodus and the future redemption see above note (2) to Chapter IV). This view is stated expressly in Tan. B. Shofetim 10: the false gods will be judged along with their worshippers. When they are unable to withstand the flames of Hell, they (3) will soar flutteringly in the air, whereupon God will send after them angels to fetter them and drag them into the fire once more. Another statement (ib.) represents the nations as accusing their gods of having led them (the people) astray. Come now, they demand, and let us worship the trae God together; at which the idols vanish (Is. 2.18). God will not, however permit all the blame to be laid on the idols; He seizes the nations and thrusts them into Gehenna. R. Mani in an outburst of homiletical enthusiasm (j. AZ. 44a) represents the false gods as spitting upon and shaming their former worshippers, then prostrating themselves humbly before God, and only then vanishing from the world. It is difficult to judge to what extent these pictures were

intended by their authors to be taken literally, and to what extent they were merely sermonic elaborations of Samuel's prediction (Mid. Til. 9.6) that the idolaters will one day call upon their idols and receive no answer, on God and He will hide His face from them.

The most elaborate and amazing picture of the last judgment is the famous passage in AZ. 2a ff., usually attributed to Simlai, tho some authorities ascribed it to R. Hanina b. Papa, who lived a generation later. There is a much briefer and simpler account of the judgment ascribed to R. Hanina in Pes. R. 35 end, which is noteworthy for one point: it is on the evidence of the proselytes that their former coreligionists are condemned and driven from the world. The AZ. passage indicates a more highly developed power of imagination. The substance of the original sermon, to which many later comments of the Gemara have become attached, is as follows:

At the end of days God will summon all those who have kept the Torah to come and receive their reward. At once all the nations will arrive in great disorder, each scrambling for a gift. God will then rebuke them, and sending them forth, order them to re-enter one nation at a time. Rome first advances, and claims a reward on the ground that all its public institutions were intended for the comfort of Israel so that the latter might devote themselves to the Torah. God confutes them: their public buildings were intended for their own convenience and often to serve immoral purposes. Rome being discomfited, Persia enters, and claims that it had built bridges and roads only for the service of Israel. Persia too is answered: all this work was undertaken only for military purposes or in order to collect tolls. Thus one nation after another is put to shame. They now object: You never pressed the Torah upon us with as much insis-

tence as you did upon Israel. God replies, You did not even observe the Noahitic laws that are binding upon all mankind. To this they retort, Neither did Israel. The question of evidence on the last point now arises. The nations object to God Himself testifying, since a father is not admitted as witness in a case affecting his son. They likewise refuse to admit the testimony of the heavens and earth, for these too are interested parties--their existence is dependent upon the acceptance of the Torah by Israel. When, however, God summons witnesses from among the nations themselves, they are compelled to drop this line of argument. Tacitly admitting their guilt, they request another chance. God gives them to understand that they are not deserving thereof; nevertheless He offers them the opportunity to observe the commandment of the Sukkah. They exit hastily and erect booths; but when God, to test them, sends unseasonable weather, they kick down (4) their Sukkot at once in rebellious anger. Then "He who dwelleth in Heaven will laugh." (Ps. 2.4).

On first impression, this sermon seems to be merely the literary production of an imaginative and ingenious preacher, who employed the dramatic form and the eschatological setting to characterize the oppressors of Israel and exalt the cause of his people. To the weary Palestinians, suffering from injustice and over-taxation, such preaching must have been tremendously heartening. But how seriously did they take it? Are we justified in assuming that this picture is merely a homiletical fancy? To answer apodictically is, I feel, unwarrantable. It may well be that Simlai expected the final judgment to tally in a general way, even if not in every detail, with his predictions. We must beware of interpreting ancient documents in the light of our sophistication. Often, by the side of advanced re-

ligious conceptions, old primitive notions will persist long after they should logically have been discarded. R. Simlai is considered to have been an enlightened man for his age; but to say that this sermon is all poetic imagery is making too much of an assumption.

It is to be noted that in all these pictures of a final judgment in forensic form, the nations are "licked before they start." It is taken for granted that they are guilty and cannot be proved otherwise. God allows them to argue in their own defense, apparently, only in order that He may, in answering them, make His triumph over them more exultant. In but a single passage (AZ. 4a in the name of R. Alexander) is there even a suggestion that God will try to find some ground for extending mercy to the Gentiles; and there also the implication is that the attempt will be fruitless. There is also a statement by R. Johanan (Mid. Til. 1 end), that the nations will accuse God of arbitrariness in condemning them; at which He will declare that it was only to spare their feelings that He refrained from announcing all their sins publicly. Now, however, since they demand it, He produces the register of their misdeeds, and at once they are forced to descend into Gehenna.

In addition to these strictly forensic accounts, there are many other statements regarding the judgment on the nations in which the forensic framework is not brot into prominence. In most of these passages likewise the Goyim are condemned out of hand. Thus we read in the names of R. Johanan and R. Samuel b. Nahman (Mid. Til. 31.3) that the nations will be ignominiously treated, driven from the world, consigned to Hell, etc. R. Elbo (Cant. R. 2.2) pictures the whole Gentile world as a clump of noisome weeds growing about the fair lily Israel, which weeds are to be removed by fire. The

prevailing view is that Gentiles have no share in the future world (R. Eliezer in Tos. Sanh. 13.2, R. Hiyya b. Abba in Gen. R. 13.6, R. Hanina in Lev. R. 13.2; also Tan. B. Shofetim 10, Mid. Til. 2.14, Cant. R. 7.3, Pes. R. 10.36a).

Nevertheless a more liberal attitude was maintained by a minority that included some of the most eminent teachers. In the passages just cited from Tos. Sanh. and Gen. R., the broad-minded Joshua b. Hananiah and Joshua b. Levi respectively uphold the view that the pious of all nations have a share in the world to come. According to Pes. R. 1.2a, those nations that have not enslaved Israel will be accepted by the Messiah. Contradicting the view that no proselytes will be accepted in the Messianic era, R. Jose (AZ. 3b) voices the belief that all nations will ultimately be converted: this opinion is also ascribed to R. Joseph (1b. 24b). Pes. 118b states that the Messiah will at first refuse gifts brought to him by Egypt and other nations, his action being evidently dictated by patriotic zeal; but at God's command he will later accept them. Moreover there is a universalistic, as well as a chauvinistic interpretation of the name Hadrak (הדרק: Zech. 9. 1), which the Rabbis took to be a name of the Messiah. R. Nehemiah derived the name from the words חמץsharp and יָרֵךְtender: the Messiah will be harsh to the Gentiles and tender to Israel. But another interpretation--perhaps the work of R. Judah--(5)derives the title from הַדִּירto lead: the Messiah is he who will lead to repentance all those who come into the world (PRK. 20, 143a.128a, Cant. R. 7.5). Most notable of all such passages is that found in Mid. Til. 87.6 in the name of R. Eleazar (b. Pedat), R. Judah b. Simon, and R. Berakya; it also appears in Ex. R. 19.4, where a similar Tannaitic discussion between Aquila and the

Rabbis is reported. This opinion declares that at the appearance of the Messiah the nations will bring him gifts, restore--on his command--Israel's exiles with great honor, and that some of the Gentiles will become God's priests. While this utterance is merely a restatement of certain Biblical passages (notably Is. 66.21), it is nevertheless to be regarded as specially significant. For to many of the Rabbis, embittered by suffering and persecution, the universalistic passages of the Bible made little appeal, and the less elevated prophecies of revenge were more acceptable.

In a few curious cases both attitudes are combined, broad ethical and religious principles being joined to the natural desire for vengeance. Thus, in the Messianic sentences of R. Aha, collected by Bacher in PA iii p. 122 f., both aspects appear.--God, he asserts, offered the nations an opportunity for repentance and conversion (Cant. R. 5.16); He welcomes the homage of submissive Gentiles (Mid. Til. 100.1). Yet even the covenant with the Sons of Noah will eventually be annulled (Gen. R. 34.11), and the Gentiles--above all, Rome--severely punished (ib. 78.5). In Tan. Shofetim end, the two viewpoints are combined into a single: at first the nations submit docilely to Messiah's rule; suddenly, however, they are seized by a spirit of confusion (6) and rebel. Thereupon the Messiah will slay them with the breath of his mouth (Is. 11.4). It may be however, that this account belongs more properly to the topic of the wars of Gog and Magog, along with those descriptions (Mid. Til. 2.3, 21.3) where the Messiah is depicted as exterminating the rebellious hosts by commands to the locusts or to the Angel of Death.

B. THE INDIVIDUAL JUDGMENT.

On this topic not much is to be said. In the last chapter of Sanhedrin (Mishnah, Tosefta and Gemara) we have lists of those who will and will not share in the future bliss. At times the atmosphere becomes almost Calvinistic, for instance when the question arises as to the fate of the children of the wicked, and as to the point in its embryonic development when a child becomes eligible for future life (Sanh. 110b).

There are a good many generalizations about the terrors of the last day. God is both Prosecutor and Judge: who can stand before such a court? exclaims R. Eleazar b. Azariah (Gen.R. 73.11). A similar feeling is expressed by R. Johanan (Tan. Vayiggash): no one can survive the terrors of that day save by a miraculous act of God. The judgment is absolutely just and without possibility of appeal, declare Akiba and Pappos (Mek. to Ex. 14.28, Cant. R. 1.9). No mortal can stand unabashed before God's judgment, asserts R. Eliezer the Great (Ara. 17a). Even Johanan b. Zakkai, "lamp of Israel, right-hand column, mighty hammer" faced the final judgment with unfeigned anxiety (but see above, p.51). In the face of these and other similar statements we can hardly avoid the conclusion that the promise of immunity from the great Day of Judgment made by R. Eleazar to those who observe the Sabbath properly (Mek. to Ex. 16.25) is not to be taken literally. It is merely a hyperbolical method of stressing the value of Sabbath observance; cp. note (5) on Chapter V.

In a considerable number of utterances we hear about a divine court, but it is usually difficult to decide whether they refer to a permanent court now sitting or to the special tribunal of the last day. Instances in point are the sayings of Akabya b. Mahallel,

Akiba, Eleazar Hakkapar, and others in Pirke Abot, which speak of a Judge, a record-book, witnesses, etc., as also DEZ ch.4, where it is stated that the witnesses are absolutely incorruptible. A few details as to the procedure of the court are given. According to Yoma 35b, those who have neglected the Torah will be summoned to justify themselves. But whether they plead poverty or preoccupation due to extreme wealth, or the distractions of the flesh, they will be confuted by the example of famous men who labored under these handicaps and yet were great in the study of the Law. The notion that human deeds are weighed in the balance, and a verdict rendered according to the preponderance of good or evil actions, appears in Tannaitic teachings (Akiba, Ben Azzai, et. al. in Eccl. R. 10.1) and is found also in the later Pes. R. 20.95b. Finally we may refer to the parable of the blind and lame watchman (Sanh. 91 ab, Lev. R. 4.4, Tan. Vay-yikra), the sense of which is that the resurrection will precede the final judgment, so that the body and soul may be judged together for their sins.

As a rule stress is laid on the absolute domination of God in the judgment scene. Even the angels are terrified on that day, (Mid. Til. 20.3), or if they take any part in the judgment it is purely subordinate. In two passages, however, we read of assistants in the divine tribunal. R. Akiba expected the Messiah to occupy a throne next to that of God in the Judgment Place (Sanh. 38b on Dan. 7.9). He was however, severely criticized for this interpretation by R. Jose and Eleazar b. Azariah, who stigmatized him as a bungler in Haggadic exegesis. Another opinion, probably also Tannaitic, (7) states that the elders of Israel will likewise take part in the judgment (Tan. Kedoshim beg. on Is. 3.14 and Ps. 122.2).

NOTES ON CHAPTER VII.

(1) Buber, in his introduction to Mid. Til. p.29a, takes the opposite view, that Ruth R. is the later work, and that it borrowed the passage from Mid. Til. The question cannot be settled finally, since it is impossible to fix an exact date for the compilation of either of these Midrashim. But since the version of Ruth R., while presenting a coherent and apparently unbroken text, is much less elaborate, I am inclined to regard it as the original.

(2) My rendering is free: the general meaning of the passage is clear, tho the language of the text is somewhat confused. See Buber's note ad loc.

(3) I have preserved in the paraphrase the ambiguity of the original: they most probably means the false gods, but conceivably might refer to the heathen.

(4) The word **לעג** implies both the physical act of kicking and the contemptuous scorn that accompanies it.

(5) But in the version of PRK., the view here ascribed to Nehemiah is reported in the name of R. Judah.

(6) Read **רוח תזית**; see Kohler's note in JE. v.5, p.218b and Jastrow s.v. **רוח תזית, תזית**.

(7) The Tanhuma, both in the usual printed editions and in that of Buber, introduces the statement with the expression **רבוץ אמרי**; Bacher, however, (PA iii p.86) ascribes it to R. Reuben.

CHAPTER VIII: THE FATE OF THE WICKED.

The conception of eternal damnation, in the sense of ceaseless torment, is rarely encountered in Rabbinic writings. The fate to which the wicked are usually consigned is that of annihilation, non-existence. This is the plain meaning of the oft-repeated phrase *אין לו חלק לעולם הבא*, "He has no portion in the world to come", and is also implied by the expression *טורד מן העולם* "to drive out from the world" (e.g., Mid. Til. 31.3). According to the most widely accepted view (see below) Gehinnom was--for all except a very few--only a temporary abode of the wicked, and annihilation was the final result of damnation.

It may have been the impulse to harmonize the concept of an ever burning Hell with that of annihilation which led R. Jannai and Resh Lakish to deny that Gehinnom is a place; they explain that it is a day when the wicked will be consumed, in accordance with Mal. 3.19. (In some versions of this Midrash, Resh Lakish is more explicit in his description: The sun will be on that day removed from its sheath, which now somewhat reduces and diffuses the solar heat; at once the wicked will be burnt up by its scorching rays. But to the righteous the sun will bring "healing on its wings.") Joined to this view in our sources is the still more radical opinion of the Tanna Judah b. Ilai, who denied that Gehinnom is either a place or a day. The word means, he asserted, rather that fire will issue from the body of the sinner himself to destroy him. (See Ned. 8b, Az. 3b, Gen. R. 6.6, 26.6, Mid. Til. 19.13, Eccl. R. 1.5; there are a number of variants of names of authors, etc.)

The majority of the Rabbis, however, firmly believed in the existence of Hell, a belief buttressed by their interpretation of

Is. 31.9 (Gen. R. 26.6, etc.). They even discussed the location of the entrances to Hell (Erub. 19a). We do not, however, find any elaborate description of the place such as appear in earlier writings like Slavonic Enoch or in later works like Masseket Gehinnom. The most extensive Talmudic discussion of the subject occurs in Tos. Sanh. 13.3-5. Here the school of Shammai advances the idea of Gehinnom as a place of purgation as well as of damnation. The notion is that those who can not be classed as either wholly righteous or wicked must spend a year of suffering and purification in Hell ere they can enter upon a life of bliss. Bet Hillel are, as usual, less rigorous. They assert, that God, being merciful, is always inclined towards mercy, and will be lenient in all doubtful cases. Both groups of scholars are, however in agreement regarding the destiny of the absolutely wicked: they must burn in Hell for a year, at the end of which they will have been utterly annihilated. But certain arch-sinners are singled out who will never be allowed even the peace of non-existence--their torment will be eternal.

It is necessary to point out here that, whatever may have been the intent of these teachers, Jewish tradition has interpreted these teachings about the twelve months in Hell as referring, not to the end of days, but to the year immediately after death--an interpretation embodied in the custom of the Mourner's Kaddish.

The renowned Joshua b. Levi, whom legend reports to have penetrated into many secrets of the after-life while he was yet in the flesh (se JE. v.7, p.294, and more fully, Bacher PA i p. 187-194), has several remarkable statements regarding Gehenna. He pictures the wicked as being shown the Bliss of the righteous in Paradise, and the righteous as beholding the torments of the damned.

Then God exhorts both groups to learn from the sight. From afore-time there is ordained for every man a share both of bliss and of torment. If his conduct proves to be righteous, he receives not only the bliss originally set aside for him, but also the portion intended for someone who developed into a wicked man. If he does evil, he must suffer not only his own share of torment, but that which some pious man escaped (Mid. Til. 31.6). Elsewhere the Rabbi states explicitly his belief that the judgment of Hell is conditional, and that repentance can save even the damned (Erub. 19a). This, by the way, is an advanced doctrine, rarely found in eschatological sources; and Charles (p. 399 f.) is at great pains to find it even by way of implication in the teaching of the Synoptic Gospels. Joshua b. Levi affirms the opinion in no equivocal terms. It might indeed be possible to interpret this also as one of the Talmudic hyperboles (see note (7) to Chapter IV and note (5) to Chapter V), intended merely to emphasize the importance of repentance. But most likely we should take the statement literally, as the Gemara in fact does, citing immediately after in a contradictory opinion of R. Lakish. The latter asserts that "the wicked, even at the threshold of Gehinnom, cannot repent any more." (This recalls Dante's famous "Abandon hope all ye who enter here!") The Gemara then attempts to harmonize the contradiction in its usual manner: R. Joshua's statement, it explains, refers only to Jews who have been condemned, while Resh Lakish is speaking of Gentiles. The first half of this explanation can be dismissed as probably incorrect, in view of R. Joshua's well-known liberalism of outlook (see above, p. 58). But the Gemara substantiates the correctness of its interpretation of Resh Lakish's Memra by citing another remark of the same author-

ity to the effect that the fire of Hell cannot hurt even the sinners of Israel. By this no doubt he meant that the fire can only purify them, whereas it completely destroys the Gentiles. The word we have paraphrased 'hurt' means literally 'to have dominion over'--a rather inexact expression.

The association of fire with the punishment of the wicked is of course the general rule in Jewish and Christian eschatology. Aside from the flames of Hell, we hear also of a flood of fire and brimstone that is to destroy the idolaters (R. Judah in Tos. Taan. 3-2.1; cp. above p. 63). The flood of fire is also referred to by R. Eleazar of Modin (Zeb. 116a); but as Volz (p. 105) points out, he merely refers to the possibility of such a thing. R. Eleazar did however, expect that the fire of Hell would be a means of testing the nations and their gods (above p. 52). The same notion that fire will be used for the purposes of an ordeal appears in the statement of Resh Lakish about the function of the sun on the Day of Judgment (above, p. 63). This conception of the purpose of the fire is to be distinguished from the purely punitive use elsewhere assigned to it.

We do hear, however, of other means by which the wicked will be eliminated. Aside from the destruction of the hosts of Gog in war--by natural or supernatural methods--we read of a "flood of pestilence" which R. Jose expected rather than the flood of fire predicted by R. Judah (Tos. Taan. loc. cit.) and of a destructive East wind. (Mek. to Ex. 14.21).

It seems that Jews--^{בני רומני} ~~רומנים~~--cannot be utterly inhumane even in treating of Hell. According to R. Akiba, the damned receive a respite each Sabbath day (Sanh. 65b, Gen. R. 11.5).

Apparently the whole concept of Gehinnom was discarded

by R. Abbahu, who simply denied that the wicked would partake in the resurrection. (Taan. 7a). Since, however, this remark is introduced as a side-issue into a Memra dealing with the importance Of rain, our deduction may be unwarranted. It seems logical, and is consistent with the fundamental view that the fate of the wicked is simply annihilation. Yet all deductions are dangerous. Nowhere is our uncertainty more strikingly displayed than in this chapter, where he have had occasion to note two statements by Resh Lakish, in one of which he denies the existence of Hell as a place, and in the other of which he refers to the gate of Hell!'

CHAPTER IX: SUFFERING DURING THE MESSIANIC TIMES.

The subject of the suffering Messiah hardly belongs within the scope of this thesis. The concept is of late development in orthodox Judaism; the early accounts of the Messiah b. Joseph represent him simply as a warrior, and his death in the war with Gog is not supposed to have any atoning power. The passages in *Sanh.* 98a,b, in which the Messiah is called a leper are of very obscure origin and significance. It is only in the *Pesikta Rabbati* that the concept of the suffering Messiah appears in its developed form, and then only in a few sections of marked individuality of form and content, to which a late date must be assigned. We can therefore disregard the topic, since our study is confined to the more generally accepted views propounded by the official exponents of Judaism.

We must, however, note a unique Midrash of the Palestinian Amoraim, which cannot be classified under any of the heads thus far treated. It deals with the temporary disappearance of the Messiah after he has already arrived. The notion is based on the disappearance of Moses during the forty days he spent on Mt. Sinai--one more instance of the Rabbinic fondness for making parallels between the Exodus and the final redemption. According to the Midrash in question, the Messiah will at some time after his advent disappear for forty-five days. At the end of this time God will reveal Himself in His Glory to the people, and the manna will fall. This Midrash appears in *PRK.* 5.49b.44a, and is repeated in *Pes. R.* 15.72a, *Cant. R.* 2.9, *Ruth R.* 2.15, *Num. R.* 11.2. A number of teachers are mentioned as co-authors, the oldest being R. Hanina, Hoshaya, Judah b. Rabbi, Hama b. Hanina, and Isaac b. Meryon.

A statement in *Pes. R.* 34.158 that angels of destruction

will be going about all the days of the Geullah, but will not hurt the "Mourners of Zion" may refer to the wars of Gog and Magog, or more probably to an extended period of judgment and "reconstruction". It is in line with the numerous utterances in which the Messianic era is held to be only a middle point between this world and the world to come, and which expect complete bliss only after the Messianic reign is at an end, and a new heaven and earth come into existence.

CONCLUSION.

The constructive achievements of this study have been practically nil. All that was possible was to collect various scattered statements under a few heads, and to try to elicit their significance, usually with doubtful success. To articulate these sayings into a systematic presentation has been impossible; but this was not the fault of the student. To attempt to fit inconsistent and often contradictory elements into a systematic scheme would only be falsification. More light might have been thrown on the topics we have treated, had it been feasible to make a thoro study also of the concepts of the Messiah, resurrection, the role of Elijah, and the beneficent aspects of eschatology--redemption and bliss. Yet even Rabbinic Eschatology as a whole will not be capable of very thoro synthetic presentation, because of three factors:

1. The material is both fragmentary and in many cases enigmatic in the fashion of the Apocalypse.
2. In this field the Rabbis took the fullest advantage of that freedom of speculation on non-Halakic matters which is expressed in the maxim *אין משיבין על הדיוט*. As a result there is little inner unity in the material.
3. Many of the statements on this subject can be understood only in the light of historical events or conditions of which we are ignorant.

In view of these considerations it is unlikely that we shall ever be in a position to formulate a complete system of Rabbinic Eschatology. All we can do is to sketch its broader outlines, as one section in the corpus of general Jewish Eschatology.

APPENDIX.

I. INDEX OF PASSAGES CITED.

The references are to the corrected text of the thesis: see corrigenda on p. . In addition to the references to the Bible here listed, see also references to Mekilta and other Midrashim cited by Biblical verse.

a. Bible

Genesis	page	H	Hosea	page
15.31	16		2.15	24
25.31	19			
			Amos	
Exodus			4.7	35
12.12	54			
28.15	4		Habakkuk	
			2.3	24
Deuteronomy				
15.11	11		Zechariah	
			7.13	24
Isaiah			9.1	58
2.18	54		12.10	50
3.14	61			
11.4	59		Malachi	
17.6,9	45		3.19	63
31.9	64			
50.4	45		Psalms	
59.15	37		2.2	47
60.22	28		.4	47, 56
63.4	25		80.6	15
64.3	12		89.52	39, 40
66.21	59		90.4	19
			94.4	45
Jeremiah			95.7	29
5.19	24		122.5	61
30.6	52			
			Canticles	
Ezekiel			8.7	53
9 to 11	30			
36.8	23		Daniel	
38, 39	46		7.9	61
39.9f.	48		.25	15
			12.7	27

b. Talmud

Mishnah	page	Babli, cont.	page
Sotah 9.15	34-39, 44, 45	Yebamot 24b	49
Sanhedrin 10.1	51	62a	19, 20
Eduyot 2.10	46	63b	20
Abot, passim	51, 61	Ketubot 111a	25, 43
		112b	12, 40
		Nedarim 8b	63
Tosefta		Baba Batra 60b	20
Taanit 3-2.1	66	Sanhedrin 17a	48
Sanhedrin 13.2	51, 58	38a	4
.3-5	64	38b	61
		65b	66
Jerushalmi		91ab	61
Sabbath 8d	18	91b	10
Rosh Hashanah 57a	51	97a-99b	see note
Taanit 63d	27	110b	60
64a	28	111a	32
68d	13	Abodah Zarah 2a ff.	55, 56
Sotah 24c	5	3b	49, 58, 63
Abodah Zarah 44a	54	4a	57
		5a	19, 32
		9b	16, 17
Babli		24a	58
Berakot 28b	5, 51	Zebahim 116a	66
34b	10, 12	Arakin 17a	60
Sabbath 63a	10	Niddah 13b	19, 20, 26
118a	33, 43, 45	Abot De R. Nathan 25/5	
118b	28	Derek Erez Zutta 4	61
151b	10	10	24, 34-39, 44, 45
Erubin 13b	35		
19a	64, 65		
Pesahim 49b	45		
54b	24		
118b	58		
Yoma 9b	25		
10a	22, 47		
35b	61		
Sukkah 52ab	50		
Rosh Hashanah 31b	22, 30		
Taanit 7a	67		
Megillah 3a	25		

NOTE : I have not listed the pages of the thesis in which passages of Sanhedrin 97a-99b are treated since quotations from these folios are to be found thruout the thesis on almost every page, in particular in Chapters IV and V.

c. Midrash

Mekilta	page	Sifre	page
Exodus 12.42	32	Deuteronomy 32.11	40, 41
14.21	66	34.3	48
.28	60		
16.4	13	Aggadat Bereshit	
.25	33, 43, 60	Chapter 2	47
.32	24	82	25
17.14	48		
20.16	14		

c. Midrash (cont.)

NB. For methods of citing see the Bibliography, p.ii.

Midrash Rabba	page	Midrash Tanhuma	page
Genesis 6.6	63 f.	Vayyiggash	60
11.5	66	Vayyikra	61
13.6	58	Kedoshim, beg.	61
24.2	32	Emor	47
.4	20	Shofetim	59
26.6	63 f.		
34.11	58	Tanhuma Buber	
42.4	22, 36, 42	Toledot 4	19
44.17	14	Vaera 15	32
63.9	22	Terumah 6	49
65.12	24	Shofetim 10	54, 58
73.7	50		
75.5	50	Pesikta	
78.5	58	Chapter 5.47.b, 42b	28
82.8	51	.49b.44a	68
93.11	60	.51b.46a	10, 21, 34-39, 44, 45
98.2	25	9.79a.70b	47
99.2	50	20.143a.128a	58
Exodus 19.4	58	22.148a 132b	46
25.12	11, 28	32
51.7	14		
Leviticus 4.5	61	Pesikta Rabbati	
13.2	58	Chapter 1.2a	58
.5	14	1.end	21, 39, 40
21.4	53		41
27.11	47	10.36a	58
Numbers 11.2	68	12.49b-50a	50
Ruth pet.1.1	52	15.71b	28
2.15	68	.72b	68
Lamentations pet.21	24	.75ab	34-39, 41
1.13	22		44, 45
2.2	30	20.95b	61
Ecclesiastes 1.5	63	34.158b	68
.9	22	35.end	55
10.1	61	36.162a	36, 42
11.5	24	37.163a	47
Canticles 1.9	60		
2.1	52	Seder Eliahu Rabba	
.2	57	Chapter 1.5	47
.7	25	2.6	15, 16, 26, 29
.8	28		16
.9	68	6.37	
.13	34-39, 41, 44, 45		
5.2	28	Seder Eliahu Zutta	
7.3	58	Chapter 16.11 f.	34-39, 44, 45
.5	58		
8.8	53	Midrash Haggadol	
.9	22	Genesis 25.26	22

c. Midrash (cont.)

Midrash Tehillim	page	Pirke De R. Eliezer	page
1.20	52	Chapter 11.80 f.	14
1.end	57	18.131	49
2.3	59	28.201	14
.4	47	30.221	41, 45
.9	41		
.14	58		
9.6	55		
15.5	53		
19.3	63		
20.3	61		
21.3	59		
31.3	57, 63		
31.6	65		
31.7	25		
52.8	14		
87.6	58		
100.1	59		
119.2	48		

d. Targum

	page
Pseudo-Jonathan Exodus 40.9f.	32
40.11	49
Numbers 11.26	48
24.17f.	49
Fragment Targ. Exodus 12.42	32
Numbers 11.26	48
Targ. Prophets Micah 4.8	26
Sheni Esther 1.1	14

II. LIST OF TANNAIM AND AMORAIM MENTIONED IN THE THESIS.

NB: This list is based on the researches of Bacher and Strack.
T equals Tanna; A, Palestinian Amora; bA, Babylonian Amora. The numerals give the generation to which the respective teachers belonged.

Abba (dubious) A
Abba b. Kahana, A3
Abahu, A3
Abaye, bA4
Abin, A4
Aha, A4
Akabya b. Mahallel, T1
Akiba, T2
Alexander, A2
Aquila, T2
Ashi, bA6
Assi, A3
Bar Kappara (Eleazar b. K.) T5
Ben Azzai (Simeon b. A.) T2
Berakya, A5
Bet Hillel and Bet Shammai, T
Eibo, A4
Eleazar b. Abina, A5
Eleazar b. Azariah, T2
Eleazar b. Pedat, A3
Eleazar b. Simon, T4
Eleazar Hakkapar, T4
Eleazar of Modin, T2
Eliezer b. Hyrkanos (the Great) T2
Eliezer b. Jacob, T3 (probably: there were two Tannaim of this name.)

Gamliel II, T2
Hillel (see p. 11)
Huna, A4
Hama b. Hanina, A2
Hanan b. Tahalifa, bA3
Hanina (b. Hama), A1
Hanina b. Abahu, A4
Hanina b. Papa, A3
Helbo, A4
Hiyya, T5
Hiyya b. Abba (II), A3 (probably)
Iddi, A5
Isaac, A3
Isaac b. Meryon, A3
Ishmael (b. Elisha) T2
Jannai, A1
Johanan (b. Nappaha) A2
Johanan b. Torta, T2
Johanan b. Zakkai, T1
Jose b. Halafta, T3
Jonathan, T3
Jose b. Kisma, T2
Joseph, bA3

LIST OF TANNAIM AND AMORAIM (cont.)

Joshua (b. Hananiah) T2
 Joshua b. Levi, A1
 Judah (b. Ilai) T3
 Judah b. Rabbi (dubious, probably scribal error)
 Judah b. Simon, A4
 Judah, brother of R. Sala the Pious, bA5
 Judah the Prince (Rabbi) T4
 Ketina, bA2
 Levi, A3
 Mani, A5
 Meir, T3
 Nahman, A5
 Nathan, T4
 Nehemiah, T3
 Nehorai, T3
 Pappos, T2
 Rab (Abba Areka) bA1
 Rabbi, see Judah the Prince
 Resh Lakish (R. Simon b. Lakish) A2
 Reuben, A2
 Samuel (Mar S.) bA1
 Samuel b. Isaac, A3
 Samuel b. Nahman, A3
 Shela, bA1
 Simlai, A2
 Simeon b. Johai, T3
 Tanhum b. Hiyya, A3
 Ulla, A5
 Zeira, A3

III. ADDENDA AND CORRIGENDA.

- p. 10, 1. 14--for Sab. 151a, r. Sab. 151b
 11, 1. 26--for Deut. 11.21, r. Deut. 15.11
 14, 1.21--omit Sifre to Deut. 32.11, and add "Gen.R. 44.17, Ex. R. 51.7, Mid. Til. 52.8; note the interesting variation in PRE. 28.201, dating from after the rise of the Mohammedan power."
 1. 22--for Latin Esdras, read Ethiopic Esdras.
 16, 1.2---before "glossator" add "edator or".
 20, 1.5---for p.37, r. p. 37 ff.
 bottom--for p. 37, n. 1, r. p. 38, n.1
 22, 1. 16--omit the sentence beginning "Rab's teacher." The statements in Sanh. and Yoma are identical, the confusion being due to a misreading of the abbreviation
 24, bottom--for Mek. to Ex. 17.32, r. Mek. to Ex. 16.32.
 , 1. 23--for Hab. 3.3, r. Hab. 2.3 .
 25, 1. 15--for Gen. R. 98.3, r. Gen. R. 98.2.
 26, 1. 12--for Hana, r. Hanina.
 1. 13--for Sanh. 98b, r. Sanh. 98a.
 1. 27--after Sanh. 97b-98a, insert (also in j. Taan. 63d).
 28, 1. 12--for Sab. 118a, r. Sab. 118b.
 1. 17--the citations are confused. The version of j. Taan. 64a credits R. Levi with the same view as that found in Ex. R., namely that the proper observance of a single Sabbath would bring about the redemption. The view that a day's repentance would accomplish the same end is ascribed in this source to R. Tanhum b. Hiyya.
 32, note (6)--for Gen. R. 24.4, r. Gen. R. 24.2.
 pp. 34, 39, 40, 44--for Cant. R. 2.10, r. Cant. R. 2.13.
 p. 41, 1.11---for p. 41 f., r. p. 11.
 43, 1. 16--for Sabbath 118b, r. Sab. 118a.
 45, note (4)--for Is. 40.4, r. Is. 50.4.
 46, bottom --for PRK. 32, etc., r. PRK. 22.148a.132b.
 49, bottom --for PRE. 18.31, r. PRE. 18.131.
 51, 1. 11---for Sanh. 12.1, r. Sanh. 10.1.
 1. 21---for R. H. 37a, r. j. R. H. 57a.
 52, 1. 7 --for Cant. R. 8.8, r. Cant. R. 2.1.
 58, 1. 14 --for AZ. 24b, r. AZ. 24a.
 60, 1. 10 --for Gen. R. 73.11, r. Gen. R. 93.11.
 61, 1. 14 --for Lev. R. 4.4, r. Lev. R. 4.5.
 bottom--for Ps. 122.2, r. Ps. 122.5.
 62, note (6)--for JE., v.5, p. 218b, r. JE., v.5, p.215a.
 68, 1. 23 --for Pes. R. 15.72a, r. Pes. R. 15.72b.
 bottom--for Pes. R. 34.158, r. Pes. R. 34.158b.